

*Dmytro Cyżewskyj*

A HISTORY OF  
*U*KRAINIAN  
LITERATURE

SECOND EDITION



WITH AN OVERVIEW OF THE  
TWENTIETH CENTURY

*George S. N. Luckyj*



**A HISTORY OF  
UKRAINIAN LITERATURE  
(From the 11th to the  
End of the 19th Century)  
*Second Edition***

**with**

**AN OVERVIEW OF THE  
TWENTIETH CENTURY**



---

---

*The Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences  
in the U.S., Inc.*

Vols. 17-19

Nos. 43-46

---

---

**A HISTORY OF  
UKRAINIAN LITERATURE**  
(From the 11th to the End of the 19th Century)  
*Second Edition*

**Dmytro Čyževs'kyj**

Translated by Dolly Ferguson,  
Doreen Gorsline, and Ulana Petyk

---

**with**

**AN OVERVIEW OF THE  
TWENTIETH CENTURY**

**George S. N. Luckyj**

**Edited and with a Foreword by George S. N. Luckyj**

1997

The Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences  
and

Ukrainian Academic Press

New York and Englewood, Colorado

Copyright © 1997, 1975 Ukrainian Academic Press  
All Rights Reserved  
Printed in the United States of America

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

UKRAINIAN ACADEMIC PRESS

a division of  
Libraries Unlimited, Inc.  
P.O. Box 6633  
Englewood, CO 80155-6633  
(800) 237-6124

*Project Editor:* Barbara Ittner  
*Copy Editor:* Barbara Ittner  
*Editorial Assistant:* Shannon Graff  
*Text Layout and Typesetting:* Judy Gay Matthews  
*Cover Design:* Paulette Livers Lambert

---

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Čyževs'kyj, Dmytro, 1894-

[Tschizewskij, Dmitrij, 1894- ]

[Istoriia Ukraïns'koï literatury vid pochatkiv do doby realizmu.  
English]

A history of Ukrainian literature, from the 11th to the end of the 19th century / Dmytro Čyževs'kyj ; translated by Dolly Ferguson, Doreen Gorsline, and Ulana Petyk ; with An overview of the twentieth century / George S.N. Luckyj. -- 2nd ed. / edited and with a foreword by George S.N. Luckyj.

x, 681; 683, 815 p. 17x25 cm.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 1-56308-522-4

1. Ukrainian literature--History and criticism. I. Luckyj, George Stephen Nestor, 1919- Overview of the twentieth century.  
PG3905.C513 1996

891.7'909--dc20

96-25814  
CIP

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION

by George S. N. Luckyj . . . . . xi

## TRANSLITERATION TABLE . . . . . xiv

## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

by George S. N. Luckyj . . . . . xv

## INTRODUCTION by D. Čyževs'kyj . . . . . 1

## I. PREHISTORIC PERIOD . . . . . 17

- A. Origins . . . . . 17
- B. The Oral Tradition . . . . . 18
- C. Scandinavian Elements . . . . . 25
- D. Indo-European Elements . . . . . 34

## II. TRANSLATED AND BORROWED LITERATURE . . . . . 38

- A. General Characteristics . . . . . 38
- B. Liturgical Books . . . . . 39
- C. Religious Literature . . . . . 41
  - a. Canonical Christian Literature . . . . . 41
  - b. Apocrypha . . . . . 45
- D. Secular Literature . . . . . 49
  - a. Scholarly Works . . . . . 49
  - b. The Narrative . . . . . 54
- E. Poetry . . . . . 60
- F. The Sources of Translated and Borrowed Literature . . . . . 61

**III. THE PERIOD OF MONUMENTAL STYLE****(The Eleventh Century) . . . . . 65**

A. General Characteristics	65
B. Sermons	69
C. The Tale	79
D. Hagiographic Literature	89
E. The <i>Collection</i> of 1076	97
F. The Works of Volodymyr Monomax	104
G. "The Pilgrimage of Abbot Daniel"	110
H. Chronicles	114
I. The Epos	123
J. Literature of a Practical Character	132

**IV. THE PERIOD OF ORNAMENTAL STYLE . . . . . 136**

A. General Characteristics	136
B. Sermons	140
C. The Tale	162
D. The <i>Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery</i>	165
E. Chronicles	171
F. The Epos	187
G. <i>The Tale of Ihor's Campaign</i>	191
H. The Tatar Invasion	209
I. Two Works of Questionable Origin	211
J. Literature of a Practical Character	218
K. The Significance of the Literature of the Kievan Period	222

**V. THE LITERATURE OF THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES . . . . . 226****VI. RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION . . . . . 236**

A. Renaissance and Reformation in Literature	236
B. The Tale	241
C. Holy Scripture	243
D. Polemical Literature	246
E. Satire	251



<b>VI. RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION (cont'd)</b>	
F. Poetry	254
G. The Historical Significance of the Literature of the Sixteenth Century	258
<b>VII. BAROQUE</b>	<b>260</b>
A. The Nature of Literary Baroque	260
B. Ivan Vyšens'kyj	263
C. Literary Baroque in Ukraine	274
D. Verse Poetry	278
E. The Epos	307
F. The Tale	313
G. The Theatre	319
H. Sermons	334
I. Historical Literature	343
J. The Treatise	349
K. Ukrainian Baroque Literature Against the Backdrop of World Literature	355
<b>VIII. LITERATURE WRITTEN IN LATIN</b>	<b>363</b>
<b>IX. THE LITERATURE OF "NATIONAL REVIVAL"</b>	<b>366</b>
<b>X. CLASSICISM</b>	<b>370</b>
A. Literary Classicism	370
B. The Beginnings	376
C. The Mock-Heroic Poem	381
D. Verse Poetry	404
E. Dramatic Literature	415
F. Prose	420
G. The Nature and Significance of Ukrainian Literary Classicism	431
<b>XI. UKRAINIAN SENTIMENTALISM</b>	<b>435</b>
<b>XII. ROMANTICISM</b>	<b>437</b>
A. Literary Romanticism	437

**XII. ROMANTICISM (cont'd)**

B. Ukrainian Romanticism	444
C. "Ukrainian Schools" in Foreign Romantic Literature	449
D. The Xarkiv Romantic School	455
E. Western Ukraine	478
F. Kievan Romanticism	495
G. Late Romanticism	535
H. Other Poets of Ukrainian Romanticism	568
I. The Significance of Ukrainian Romanticism	578

<b>XIII. "BIEDERMEIER" AND THE "NATURALIST SCHOOL" IN UKRAINE</b>	<b>585</b>
---	------------

<b>XIV. REALISM IN UKRAINIAN LITERATURE</b>	<b>588</b>
---	------------

<b>SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>619</b>
------------------------------	------------

<b>ABBREVIATIONS OF NAMES OF PERIODICALS, COLLECTIONS, AND SERIES</b>	<b>638</b>
---	------------

<b>INDEX OF NAMES AND TITLES, prepared by Alexandra Chernenko-Rudnytsky</b>	<b>641</b>
---	------------



## AN OVERVIEW OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

By George S. N. Luckyj

<b>1. EMERGENCE OF MODERNISM . . . . .</b>	<b>685</b>
Modernism . . . . .	685
Traditionalism . . . . .	702
<b>2. THE FAILED REVOLUTION, 1917-32 . . . . .</b>	<b>706</b>
<b>3. THE TRAUMA OF SOCIALIST REALISM, 1934-53 . . . . .</b>	<b>731</b>
<b>4. THE THAW AND AFTER, 1953-72 . . . . .</b>	<b>740</b>
<b>5. FROM STAGNATION TO RECONSTRUCTION, 1972-88 . . .</b>	<b>749</b>
<b>6. WESTERN UKRAINE AND EMIGRATION, 1919-39 . . . . .</b>	<b>758</b>
<b>7. THE SECOND EMIGRATION AND DIASPORA, 1945-90 . . .</b>	<b>764</b>
<b>8. THE ERA OF <i>GLASNOST</i>, 1987-90 . . . . .</b>	<b>771</b>
<b>9. AFTER INDEPENDENCE . . . . .</b>	<b>776</b>
Footnotes . . . . .	782
 <b>BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .</b>	 <b>793</b>
 <b>INDEX . . . . .</b>	 <b>801</b>



## FOREWORD TO THE FIRST EDITION

*Literary history tends to interest itself in the genesis of literature, its contents, its relationship to external reality, the changes in its meaning wrought by time. Style analysis bears upon the text, which is unchanging; upon the internal relationships among words; upon forms rather than contents; upon the literary work as the start of a chain of events, rather than as an end product. The two approaches are thus complementary.*

Michael Riffaterre

Recognition of Ukrainian literature in the English-speaking world has been severely hampered by the lack of translations of literary works and by the absence of a comprehensive, modern history of Ukrainian literature in English. The available brief studies by A.P. Coleman and C.A. Manning were too sketchy to be of any real use. What was needed was a scholarly account of the entire, complex history of the literature, which could serve as a reference guide for further study and at the same time offer a critical interpretation of the development of the literature from the eleventh to the twentieth centuries. The present volume will certainly help to fill this gap. It is the work of an eminent Slavist, without question the greatest living Ukrainian literary scholar. His approach, in this work as elsewhere, is well known. It is based primarily on literary analysis, without becoming narrowly formalistic. Combined with it is a constant regard for deeper cultural and social influences and undercurrents. Thus, Čyževs'kyj's concept of modern Ukrainian literature as "incomplete" and as a product of an "incomplete nation" is most illuminating. His discussion of Ukrainian Baroque or Romanticism shows not only great erudition, but an ability to relate these literary periods to other Slavic and non-Slavic literatures. The last chapter, on

Realism, which has been specially prepared for this edition, might, at first glance, seem inadequate. However, considering the weakness of Ukrainian Realism (in comparison with Russian and Polish literatures) it is not surprising that this period is treated as a transitional one. Hopefully, a second volume, by several other scholars, dealing with the twentieth century Ukrainian literature, will offer a more complete picture since, as Čyževs'kyj believes, the periodization of Ukrainian literature may be explained by "the repeated alternation of *opposite* tendencies: styles, and to a certain extent ideologies as well, oscillate between two opposite poles" (p. 14).

Alternation of styles alone does not explain the breaks in the literary tradition of Ukraine. For Ukrainians, the literature of the old Rus' (which is commonly regarded in the English-speaking world as Old Russian) is very much a part of that tradition. However, following the great flowering of Kievan literature, there was a sharp decline (fourteenth to fifteenth centuries) which in large measure was due to social and political conditions. The revival of the sixteenth to seventeenth centuries coincided with, but had little direct relation to, the great Cossack revolution. Finally, in the eighteenth century there was another decline, this time of the Old Ukrainian literary language which for a time was replaced by Russian. The birth of Ukrainian literature in the vernacular (Kotljarevs'kyj) led to a further momentum during the period of Ukrainian Romanticism and then declined slightly in the era of Realism. These fluctuations are discussed with great literary insight, although more space could have been devoted to oral literature (the *dumy*, the puppet theater *vertep*) and to general intellectual history. Yet the final result is very satisfying. The entire literary movement is recreated with unusual aesthetic sensitivity. The whole story of Ukrainian literature up to the end of the nineteenth century is told with great scholarly authority and detachment. What a pleasant change this is from the customary populist bias of the nineteenth century or the present socialist realist mush.

\* \*  
\*

The translation and editing of the present volume has been a formidable task. Some of the problems encountered may not have been solved to everyone's satisfaction. The procedures adopted were as follows: It was decided to follow the "philological" transliteration. The letters *г* and *и* appear as *g* and *i* since that is how they were pronounced up to the end of the fourteenth century. Later they become *h* and *y* respectively. Names retain their Ukrainian form (Ihor, Danylo, Volodymyr), although in the first two chapters some names are

given in their anglicized (or Latinized) version (Athanasius not Afanasij; Gregory, not Grigorij or Hryhorij). Quotations are first transliterated and then translated. Translations of quotations illustrating euphony or other linguistic aspects have been omitted. The translators had a difficult time, especially with Kotljarevs'kyj, but great efforts have been made to be faithful to the text since obviously linguistic and stylistic analyses are of great concern to the author. The bibliography, which the author compiled for the Ukrainian edition in 1956, has been supplemented by some items published since then. The following colleagues offered suggestions and were most helpful in the preparation of this volume: Professors D.G. Huntley, I. Ševčenko and G.Y. Shevelov. Exceptionally valuable assistance was rendered by Professor B. Budurowycz. None of them bears any responsibility for the final contents or appearance of the book. Alexandra Chernenko-Rudnytsky prepared the index.

George S.N. Luckyj

## TRANSLITERATION TABLE

The following transliteration of the Cyrillic alphabet in its Ukrainian variant is used in this book:

а	a	н	n
б	b	о	o
в	v	п	p
г	h	р	r
г'	g	с	s
д	d	т	t
е	e	у	u
є	je	ф	f
ж	ž (like s in pleasure)	х	x
з	z	ц	c (read like ts)
и	y	ч	č (read like ch)
і	i	ш	š (read like sh)
ї	ji	щ	šč (read like shch)
й	j (like y in young)	ю	ju
к	k	я	ja
л	l	ь	'
м	m		

The following transliterations are used for Old Church Slavonic characters:

ѡ	”
ѣ	ѣ



## PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

When first asked about adding a revised version of my *Ukrainian Literature in the Twentieth Century* to a second edition Dmytro Čyževs'kyj's *History of Ukrainian Literature*, I hesitated. The prospect, while intriguing, was also unsettling. My approach to literature is very different from Čyževs'kyj's and putting them in the same volume might be confusing, or so I thought. After reflection, however, I agreed to the undertaking on the condition that my part be treated separately (it was published as a "Reader's Guide"), offering an overview rather than a history of literature. Slight overlapping with Čyževs'kyj's last chapter was inevitable.

Čyževs'kyj's formalist approach is often combined with a regard for deeper cultural influences. In his own works, the periodization of Ukrainian literature may be explained by "the repeated alternation of opposite tendencies: styles, and to a certain extent ideologies as well, oscillate between two opposite poles." He pays a great deal of attention to "linguistic and stylistic devices." In my appendix, the emphasis is very different. It offers a contextual canvas of Ukrainian literature in the twentieth century, relating it to the cultural, political and intellectual background and offering a sampling of contemporary reaction and criticism. It is, as one reviewer put it, but "a key to many doors." While the survey of the century is basically chronological, two sections—the literature in Western Ukraine and on the literature of emigration—are interposed after 1987, because of their separate history and character. My account is not based on the spiderweb of any theory. It lists and relates, but does not interpret or evaluate.

For seventy years in this century (1920–90) most Ukrainian literature was written and published under the Soviet regime. It is, therefore, impossible not

to pay close attention to it, though most of it falls into the category of journalism worthy only of sociological analysis. I have tried here to offer a brief account of its stormy history, without neglecting contemporary criticism. If the Middle Ages deserve consideration, so does the Soviet era.

The caustic review of Čyževs'kyj's volume by G. Grabowicz prompted a decisive turn in approaching literary history and although its effects still resonate, so far they have not led to a new history of Ukrainian literature. The same review also pointed out many errors in the translation, which I have tried to correct in the present edition. In addition, I have added a new bibliography—of English works only—to the old one. A sizable collection of critical works and English translations of Ukrainian literary works is now available.

Recently, G. Grabowicz wrote perceptively of different “crises” of Ukrainian literature (*Slovo i čas*, 1, 1992). This observation was followed by other critics in Ukraine. Today we are in the middle of such a crisis, brought about by the recent history of the country. Not only literature, but ways of looking at it and assessing it, are changing. It is time, however, to offer for now not interpretative niceties, but a sobering review of the past.

I wish to express special gratitude to Marko Pavlyshyn, Mykola Riabchuk, Michael Naydan, and Larysa Onyskevych, who read the last chapter and offered valuable criticism.

George S. N. Luckyj

# INTRODUCTION

1. The material available to students of Ukrainian literature does not comprise an exhaustive catalogue of all that was written in Ukraine. Much of the occasionally outstanding literature of the earliest period (from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries) was lost in the course of the many subsequent historical upheavals—the Mongol invasions, the attacks of the Crimea Tatars, the period of Ruin, the change in literary tastes and the religious strife of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The fate of the monuments of the second epoch of cultural flowering in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is scarcely any better: the political and cultural decline of the post-Petrine era, the introduction of a new literary language in 1798, and later, the negative appraisal of the polemical works of the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries resulted in the preservation of only isolated copies of the printed works of this period, which should have had a better chance for survival than the earlier hand-written monuments. Almost the same condition prevailed in the nineteenth century; many works (even some of the works of Ševčenko and other leading figures) remained in manuscript form for many years. As a result of denationalization and political decline, there were few attempts to collect Ukrainian books and few books that appeared in more than one edition. In the twentieth century this same situation occurs. Only now, authors as well as books begin to disappear.

Therefore, only fragments of almost every period of Ukrainian literature have been preserved. However, fragments can provide us with a sufficient grasp of the “spirit” of an epoch to allow judgments to be made about the literary tastes and achievements of its writers.

Literary history is a young discipline. Until the end of the eighteenth century studies of old literature were largely purely bibliographical; that is, they were catalogues of literary works, occasionally including paraphrases or biographical information about the authors. Only in the nineteenth century were specific critical approaches applied to the study of Ukrainian literature. In the course of the nineteenth century, the approaches taken changed several times. In addition, both the publication of texts and the variety of critical approaches increased. A brief review of the history of the study of Ukrainian literature will illuminate its salient features.

2. The time has come to recognize the contribution of the Ukrainian writers of the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Through their efforts a great deal of old material was preserved. Ukrainian chroniclers—Samovydec', Hrabjanka, Velyčko or even Jerlyč, who wrote in Polish—included many excerpts from old works and sometimes entire shorter works in their chronicles. Almost without exception, however, these excerpts were taken from works dating back only as far as the sixteenth century. Only authors of drier instructional works, such as *Synopsis*—a history of Ukraine (and of all Eastern Slavdom in general) from the earliest times—looked further into the past. Unfortunately, authors of such works merely copied selected materials from old chronicles; consequently, the results were not always objective.

The contribution of those scholars of this period who worked with religious monuments is of greater significance. The most notable of these were the publishers of the *Kievo-Pečerskij Paterik* (*Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, published both in its original form and in Polish translation) and, especially, St. Dmytro Tuptalo of Rostov [his lengthy *Čet'i Minei* (*Menaea for Daily Reading*), a collection of the Lives of saints]. The contributions of these eminent scholars have not been exhausted to this day. While Tuptalo's prime concerns were literary and didactic, he did not hesitate to draw on the resources of old manuscripts and evaluate them critically. Thus, for example, in his *Lives of Saints Cyril and Methodius*, he employs the oldest manuscripts, the so-called "Pannonian Lives," discovered by modern scholarship only in the middle of the nineteenth century (1843), as well as a Greek text which appears to have been lost.

A very valuable contribution was also made by those modest lovers of the past who copied the texts of old monuments such as apocrypha, tales, verses, etc., for their own personal use.

This was the period of the collection of materials. However, only a very few collectors, such as professors of the Kievan Academy or scholars of the type of St. Dmytro Tuptalo, approached their material in a scholarly fashion. This type

of scholarship continued throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. (In the nineteenth century it was most often conducted by the clergy.) Unfortunately, the lists of old Ukrainian authors and works which they compiled were not always pertinent or accurate.

3. The publication of old texts began in the nineteenth century. While these editions are neither "critical" nor annotated, they nevertheless are of great value. This was the form in which old chronicles were published in the eighteenth century, the form in which K. Kalajdovič published the monuments of the twelfth century in 1821 and the form in which religious works were published throughout the nineteenth century by various religious newspapers. Because of the inaccessibility of the required materials, even scholars who recognized the importance of verification were occasionally compelled to produce editions that were not critical. The nineteenth century also saw the beginning of the reproduction of individual manuscripts—first, hand-written, and later, photographic. Good reproductions of manuscripts extant in only one copy would have been expedient and valuable; unfortunately, these reproductions were not always flawless. Even in the twentieth century certain scholars occasionally presented copies of manuscripts which they had made themselves to various libraries. Scholarly journals such as the famous *Kievskaja Starina* published monuments from copies made by amateurs.

Scholarship is, of course, not limited to the publication of texts. The nineteenth century also produced broader works attempting to comprehend certain specific literary epochs. In the earliest of these, the basic method was paraphrase; only a few comments were added to the summaries of the contents of the monuments. The first such surveys of Ukrainian literature were made by the Romantics. For the Romantics the "word" was one of the most vital elements of a culture, that element which expressed the most basic components of the human spirit in general, of the national spirit in particular, and of the spirit of each historical epoch, as well. As a result, emphasis is placed on the written and oral literatures of each nation.

The attempts of Ukrainian Romantics in this direction were few. There is, for example, the well-known article on Ukrainian folk songs by Nikolaj Gogol' (Mykola Hohol'); a few comments by Maksymovyč (in his editions of Ukrainian folk songs and in other works devoted to literary history); a few comments by Ambrosij Metlyns'kyj; and finally, Kostomarov's studies—his dissertation on folk poetry as a historical source, his essay in *Poezija slavjan* (*Slavic Poetry*, published by Gerbel' in 1871), and his article "*Dvi rus'ki narodnosti*" ("The Two Nations of Rus'"). From among non-Ukrainians, Stefan Ševyr'ov, professor at Moscow University, deserves attention. In his history of the literature of Kievan Rus' he

attempts to present the religious substratum of old Ukrainian literature. In some instances Ševyr'ov notes Ukrainian ("Little Russian") stylistic features of even the oldest monuments, such as *Molenie Daniila* (*The Supplication of Daniel*) and links them with the works of modern Ukrainian authors (Gogol').

Unfortunately, no Romantic, either Ukrainian nor non-Ukrainian, attempted to present a synthetic view of even a particular epoch of Ukrainian literature. In addition, there was much that was faulty in the romantic view of literature: on the one hand, a vague feeling that literary evolution is dynamic, that each epoch has its own literary and linguistic character, its own "taste" and "style"; on the other hand, the conviction that folk poetry as we know it now is almost identical to its ancient counterpart. Some Ukrainian Romantics, such as Kuliš, even believed that the contemporary Ukrainian language was the language of ancient Rus', the language expressing the soul of the people. Kuliš rejected the literature of the eleventh to the eighteenth centuries because it was written in an "artificial," "academic" language—the product of "academic obscurantism."

Ukrainian Romanticism entered a period of decline after 1848 (the epoch of Bach in Austria and the last years of the reign of Nicholas I in Russia). The rebirth of scholarship in the 1860s was linked with the new trends of this epoch. On the one hand, there was "scientific positivism," concerned solely with the collection of facts; on the other, social and political radicalism. The representatives of both of these new trends made some interesting and valuable contributions but ignored many problems and facets of literary history. The onesidedness of these approaches had the most profound negative effect on Ukrainian literary scholarship. The positivists succeeded in collecting a great deal of valuable factual information and in producing a great many "critical" texts, which unfortunately dealt primarily with the old period of Ukrainian literature. The most outstanding scholars of this approach, commonly referred to as the *philological* approach, were I. Sreznevs'kyj, M. Tixonravov, Suxomlinov, A. Pypin. Of those who worked on Ukrainian literature, mention should be made of O. Ohonovs'kyj, M. Petrov and M. Daškevyč. Daškevyč made valuable additions to Petrov's *Očerki istorii ukrainskoj literatury 19st* (*History of Ukrainian Literature in the Nineteenth Century*). But these works were largely encyclopaedic in nature. More significant was the publication of texts in "critical" editions—that is, editions that were based on the oldest manuscripts and compared with other known copies. In addition, many other types of materials were published: Byzantine monuments that are relevant for old Ukrainian literature, and the western European and Slavic works (both originals and imitations) with a significance for modern Ukrainian literature.

This kind of work—the production of critical editions, the establishment of the oldest forms of texts and the history of their transmission—continued in the early decades of the twentieth century and was frequently very scholarly and accurate. The most important scholars of this period were I. Franko and V. Peretc. The latter aroused the interest of many young students in purely Ukrainian themes and educated a whole group of Ukrainian scholars.

The following non-Ukrainian scholars must also be included in this group: the Slovenian professor V. Jagić, and the Russians—A. Sobolevskij, M. Speranskij and V. Istrin. Although anti-Ukrainian, Istrin made significant contributions in two areas: the publication and identification of texts. He established, for example, that some important monuments that had earlier been considered Bulgarian, were in reality monuments of Kievan Rus'.

A different approach was taken by A. Šaxmatov, whose interest was primarily in chronicles. He tried to identify traces of other literary works (both those that have and those that have not been preserved) in the chronicles of Kievan Rus'.

It is necessary to point out, however, that the work of those scholars of Slavic literature who followed the philological approach did not attain the same degree of perfection as the work of the classical philologists and scholars of European medieval literature. Truly “critical” editions of old Ukrainian monuments are still rare, and exemplary studies even rarer. However, scholarship of this type is continuing (one need only mention Adrijanova–Peretc’s book on the works about Saint Alexis, and O. Rystenko’s on Saint George and the dragon). Of great significance are the studies of the philological type related to the literature of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries. Although weaker than those dealing with old literature, these works delve into a period that had previously been all but ignored.

In spite of the great dedication of many scholars, even merely adequate editions of certain texts, such as the *Izbornik* (Collection) of 1073 are still lacking. Some important monuments, such as the “encyclopaedia” of judicial philosophy of the thirteenth or fourteenth century—the so-called *Mirylo pravedne* (The Just Scale)—have been published only in “uncritical” editions, and others have never been published in any form. Although of great importance for the study of style and its evolution, many religious texts also fall into the latter category (for example, John Klimakos’ *Climax*). But the situation is still worse with respect to later texts, especially the monuments of the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries. Only selections of Ukrainianized biblical texts are available and works (such as those of Antonij Radyvylov’s’kyj) that provide characteristic examples of the evolution of the Ukrainian language have not been

republished. Only excerpts from the works of such authors as Saint Dmytro Tuptalo of Rostov are available in their *original* form, and neither the so-called "Cossack chronicles" nor critical editions of poetic works have been republished.

The post-Romantic era also saw the emergence of the socio-political approach to the study of literature. While M. Drahomanov began to advocate this approach as early as the 1870s, the pinnacle of its development was reached in the well-known history of Ukrainian literature by Serhij Jefremov. After the Bolshevik revolution, the socio-political approach gained ascendancy, becoming increasingly entrenched in the 1930s and 1940s, in part as a result of the destruction of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and the tightening of controls after World War II. Two variants of this approach existed—the Populist (among older scholars) and the Marxist (among the younger Soviet scholars). Their common denominator lies in their predominant concern with the reflections of the social and political life in the works of both old and modern literature. Literary works are frequently studied solely as sources from which the social and political climate of the time may be deciphered. However, while the Populists arrived at their conclusions on the basis of their own independent research, contemporary Soviet scholars are guided by directives, which frequently designate *a priori* the conclusions to be reached. The common feature of all scholars employing the socio-political approach is their evaluation of literary works from the point of view of their *benefit* to the "people," the "proletariat," the "revolution," etc. In itself, this approach need not have a harmful effect on the study of literary works. However, these scholars frequently chose to study those monuments that are distinguished by their "love for the people" or other similar "positive" features. Conversely, they evaluate old monuments not in historical perspective but from the point of view of their own political programs. Their conclusions are therefore anti-historical and subjective.

Even some of the members of the philological school mentioned above were unable to avoid making superficial judgments of the socio-political type (for example, Pypin and sometimes even Franko).

Scholarship of the post-Romantic era was not limited solely to that of the philological and socio-political types. Two other approaches played a role in the study of Ukrainian literature: the historical and the comparatist (which someone christened "influenceology").

The historical approach aimed at uncovering either the world views of the authors of works, or the world view characteristic of the entire epoch or one of its social groups. It is necessary to note that representatives of this approach were few—they were historians of the Church, who were interested in the Christian foundations of old literature, or representatives of other trends, mainly



the philological, who occasionally uncovered individual characteristic features of various monuments. As the only consistent representative of the historical approach, mention must be made of F. Buslaev, who began his scholarly activity in the epoch of Romanticism. However, his works only rarely deal with Ukrainian literature.

The comparativist approach had many followers. Because it became fashionable, it had negative consequences: literary works were divested of all vestiges of originality and reduced to borrowings (for example, almost all of the themes, a large number of individual motifs and images of Ševčenko's poetry were said to have been borrowed from the Polish Romantics). Frequently, the mere similarity of themes was considered to be evidence of an "influence"; V. Rezanov's works on the old Ukrainian theatre, which are valuable in other respects, belong to this category. The most significant contribution of the Comparativists was in the area of old literature, for it was here that sources of influence had previously been ignored.

The historical and cultural-historical approaches frequently merged. Such is the case of Buslaev himself, who links the history of literature with the history of art. Furthermore, "similarities" were often viewed not as "borrowings" but as "parallels." Such an approach is frequently encountered in the works of the polyglot, Aleksandr Veselovskij.

M. Hruševs'kyj's monumental but unfinished history of Ukrainian literature stands alone. His unusual erudition enables him to employ several approaches in his work—the philological, the historical, and the socio-political. As a result of this, and of his knowledge of European scholarly literature, Hruševs'kyj was able to present an unsurpassed picture of old Ukrainian literature and folklore. His most original and valuable observations were on historical themes.

4. The intensity of the rebirth of literary history after the revolution of 1917, especially in the work of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, had a deep significance: the publication of studies by representatives of almost all the approaches of the post-Romantic era mentioned above was greatly increased.

In addition, an entire group of scholars working in the area of *stylistic analysis* appeared on the scene. Earlier, problems of style were studied solely in relation to modern writers and not very often at that. Only the scholars of Peretc's school ever made any observations about the style of older literature. A few unsystematic and subjective comments were also made by certain other literary critics (Jevšan).

Under the influence of contemporary European and Russian scholarship of the so-called "formalist" school (V. Šklovskij and others) studies of the formal aspects of Ukrainian literary works began to appear. M. Zerov, P. Fylypovyč, V.

Petrov, O. Doroškevyč, B. Jakubs'kyj, O. Bilec'kyj, and others published many monographs and stylistic studies, in which not only the content but also the form of literary works was studied. Their focus was on modern Ukrainian literature and, as a result, only occasionally did they turn their attention to works of the old or medieval periods. In Ukraine, unlike in Russia, there were no representatives of pure formalism—that is, there were no scholars who argued that the content of a literary work had *absolutely no* significance or that it was *totally* dependent on the form. The study of the form of Ukrainian literary works was almost never isolated from a careful analysis of their content, which in Soviet Ukraine was all too frequently made from the Marxist point of view. In addition, the representatives of Ukrainian formalism were often competent philologists and were able to supply many valuable critical editions of Ukrainian literary monuments. It is indeed possible to speak of this period as an entirely new epoch in the study of Ukrainian literature.

In this book an attempt will be made to employ the scholarship of all the groups mentioned above, even the now obsolete works of the Romantics. But attention will be focused on those problems that have not as yet been sufficiently studied—questions of form and periodization.

\* \*  
\*

5. The first problem which must be considered is that of language. Our interest here is not so much in the historical evolution of the language as in its “wealth” and the use of various of its “levels.” No living language is totally fixed and invariable; nor is it identical in all parts of each definite linguist area or in each level of the society that employs it. Each language contains *archaisms* (old words), which are used only rarely in genres such as solemn speeches, and *neologisms* (new words). This results in the stratification of language. In addition, there are words, forms and expressions that are used only in specific areas. The different pronunciation of the same words [compare *svobóda* and *svobodá* (freedom), etc.] is a particular example of words of this category. These words are *dialectisms*. And finally, each language has its *jargon* and *slang*—that is, various words, expressions and phrases used by people of specific social groups (peasants, shopkeepers, workers at specific trades, students, thieves, etc.). Just as it employs dialectisms and the language of specific levels of society, literature may also draw on the resources of jargon or slang.

In addition, these levels of language (historical, territorial, and social) have a different flavor for the average reader. Besides “ordinary” words [*stil* (table), *holova* (head), *žyttja* (life)], there are words that have a definite flavor: either “vulgar,” “common,” and “low” [such expressions as “*ljapasa daty*” (“to box

someone's ears"; "*vlipyty makohona*" ("to hit someone over the head"), which is employed by Kotljarev'skyj in his *Enejida*; there are also words that are not even used in print] or, conversely, "high," "solemn," and "elevated" (such as Church Slavonic elements in Ševčenko's poetry). Furthermore, the use of words from specific strata forms one of the definable traits of individual works, authors, and literary movements.

6. The most basic function of the language of a literary work is to give artistic form to the content. Therefore, when literary monuments are studied, attention must be paid to those devices of "linguistic ornamentation" that are used in the work. These devices had already been classified in ancient times (as we shall see, this classification was not unknown in the period of old Ukrainian literature). Devices of linguistic ornamentation are referred to as the "tropes and figures" of artistic language. We will cite but a few examples.

*Metaphor* (comparison)—the replacement of one image by another which is similar to it. The following are examples from Ševčenko's "*Topolja*" ("The Poplar"): "*kruhom pole, jak te more*" ("the surrounding fields, *like a sea*"); the girl "*den' i nič vorkuje, jak holubka bez holuba*" (the girl "coos day and night *like a dove without its mate*").

*Metonymy*—the replacement of a word that designates a definite object by another word that designates an object linked to the first by proximity in time or space (but not by similarity): for example, the addressing of a loved one as "*serden'ko*" [a person is not merely *serce* (heart)]; the designation of time by an expression such as "*pivni ne spivaly*" ("the roosters had not yet begun to crow"), which is but one of the signs of the approach of dawn; the use of "*zaščebeče solovejko*" ("the nightingale began to sing") instead of *večir* (evening), or "*spiva solovejko*" ("the nightingale was singing") instead of *nič* (night).

*Hyperbole*—exaggeration. In "The Poplar," for example, we find the following examples of hyperbole: "*skažy meni, de mij mylyj—kraj svita polynu*" ("tell me where my loved one is and I will *fly to the ends of the earth* to find him"); a poplar "*tonka, tonka ta vysoka, do samoji xmary*" ("very, very thin and tall, reaching *to the very clouds*").

*Epithet*—an attribute of some referent (word): "*blue sea*," "*dark eyes*," "*tall person*," "*broad leaf*," etc. Especially noteworthy are *fixed epithets*, characteristic of oral literature: "*blue sea*," "*white face*," etc.

*Antithesis*—juxtaposition: "*po tim boci—moja dolja, po sim boci—hore*" ("yonder lies my happiness, here—my sorrow").

*Parallelism*—the coupling of two similarly constructed sentences or images: "*jakby znala što pokyne, bula b ne ljubyla; jakby znala, što zahyne, bula b ne*

*pustyla*” (“had I known that he would leave me, I would not have loved him; had I known that he would perish, I would not have let him go”).

The devices of linguistic ornamentation mentioned above are linked to the content of a work, its idea, or the impression it wishes to create. But there are also purely auditory devices. In general, this kind of ornamentation is referred to as *euphony* (or “instrumentation”). One device of euphony is the repetition of the same sounds in neighboring words. In the phrase “*bez myloho skriz' mohyla*” (“When my loved one is absent, all that is around me becomes a graveyard”) from “The Poplar,” sounds or groups of sounds are repeated: z-z, m-m, yl-yl, oh-oh. Or to take another example: “*kraj dorohy hne topolju do samoho dolu*” (“on the side of the road it bends the poplar to the earth itself”), where r-r, do-do-do, oh-oh, o, etc., are repeated.

*Alliteration*—the repetition of the same sounds or groups of sounds at the beginning of neighboring words—is another device of euphony. Compare the following: “*bez myloho skriz' mohyla*” (m-m), “*po dibrovi viter yye*” (“the wind blows through the grove”) (v-v), “*bez myloho sonce svityt', svityt' ta ne hrije*” (“the sun continues to shine even when my loved one is gone, it shines but it does not warm”) (s-s).

Various forms of commonplaces from the author (in Greek, *topos-topoi*; in Latin, *loci communes*) constitute another group of stylistic embellishment. This device did not always have the negative connotations that it commonly has today. One of the traditional forms of commonplaces is the “*humility motif*”: either at the beginning or the end of his work an author was expected to apologize for his “lack of ability,” for the “poverty of his education,” for his “unworthiness” to write on such an important theme, etc. “*Motivation for writing*” is another motif belonging to this category; here, for example, the author may explain that no one has yet written on his theme, or that he does not wish to be a “slave to his laziness” and fail to utilize his knowledge for the general good. Finally, there are motifs characteristic of conclusions of literary works; the author may end by extending his best wishes to his readers or with a prayer, etc. Commonplaces from the author are also to be found throughout the main body of a work: in descriptions of the location of the action; in the evaluation of events, or the refusal to do so; in apologies for the incomplete nature of the narrative, for the fact that only a small amount of the wealth of available material has been included, etc.

Authors can alter the content of their commonplaces. Information about the sources of the material for a work, for example, must correspond to reality, but such information, whatever it may be, still belongs to “commonplaces.” Characteristic of old Ukrainian literature is the inclusion of laments for the

dead: the content of laments in various works is quite different, but the form of the lament itself is a *topos*.

Scholars of old literature frequently make the mistake of taking these traditional devices at face value; from humility motifs they deduce that the author really considered himself incapable or "unworthy," etc.

Scholars from ancient to modern times employ many other terms that designate specific devices of linguistic embellishment. Mention will be made of some of these later as they become relevant.

When attempting to isolate the characteristic features of a literary work, an analysis of the specific devices of ornamentation is not sufficient in itself. The frequency of the appearance of such devices or of particular linguistic levels in the works of an individual author must be considered. In Ševčenko, for example, euphony is frequent; in Kuliš or Kotljarev's'kyj, it is comparatively rare. Even more important is the reason for the use of a particular device. Vulgarisms, for example, are to be found even in the works of old Ukrainian literature. They are aimed at various foes: heretics (in sermons), the murderers of Borys and Hlib ("mad dogs"), etc. Kotljarev's'kyj's *Enejida* also contains many vulgarisms, but in this case they constitute an obligatory device of the travesty and serve to create humor: vulgarisms are used to describe Greek heroes or ancient gods ["*Junona suča dočka*" ("Juno the daughter of a bitch")], whereas "high style" was normally required for such "lofty" subjects. There are vulgarisms in Ševčenko as well, but again their function is different: they underscore the hidden vulgarity of the externally "lofty" [the tsar's palace in "*Son*" ("The Dream")]. The vulgarisms in Kostomarov's plays are in imitation of the vulgar scenes in Shakespeare. This coupling of "high" and "low" styles was particularly attractive to him because such a mixture of styles was one of the main requirements of Romanticism, and Kostomarov was a Romantic. Finally, in the works of Realists such as Nečuj-Levyč'kyj, vulgarisms characterize the social milieu of those who use them. Consequently, both the frequency and the function of various linguistic embellishments are important aspects of a literary work. Without a consideration of them no general characterization of a work can be made.

7. Besides the description and analysis of language, the *content* of a literary work must also be considered. Let us review briefly the main aspects of content.

First, there is the *composition* of a work; that is, its structure—its division into parts, the ordering of these parts, their interrelation, their similarity, or the opposition of one of them to another. The structure of a work as a whole may be harmonious or intentionally or unintentionally disharmonious.

The *theme* of a work is its idea: the idea of a work unites all its separate parts, down to the very basic level of the individual words from which it is composed. When a work contains several themes, we can speak of its "thematic structure." A specific form of the theme of "unhappy love"—the loved one appears to have died in a foreign land—can be found in Ševčenko's "The Poplar."

Each work also has a *plot* (occasionally plotless works are encountered). Plot is the general arrangement of events in time or the static interrelationships among various agents (usually characters). The plot of "The Poplar" is the transformation of a girl into a plant with the aid of sorcery (this plot is found elsewhere in Ševčenko's poetry and in the poetry of his contemporaries).

Except in miniatures, the plot is usually composed of separate *motifs* or is linked to them. Motifs are the basic elements of content. In "The Poplar," for example, the following motifs are to be found: "a loved one in a foreign land," "the engagement of a young girl to an old man whom she does not love," "a girl's loneliness," "sorcery," etc.

These elements must, of course, be studied not in themselves, but as they relate to the entire work or, frequently, to all the works of the particular author.

The *genre* of a work is also one of its important features. Each genre has its own norms recognized by writers, readers, and literary theoreticians alike. These norms (or conventions) relate both to form and content. The formal conventions determine the structure, the types of linguistic ornamentation that may or may not be used, the choice of lexical material, etc. The conventions related to content specify the nature of the theme, the plot, and sometimes even the motifs. Certain conventions also govern the characters if they are present in a work: they must belong to a specific social group or historical era. Each genre has many such conventions, but they are not hard and fast. Occasionally movements evolve that reject all conventions, even the distinction of genres (this was the aim of representatives of extreme Romantic groups).

We will discuss those main genres that are to be found in all epochs and those conventions of these genres that are universally accepted.

There are three main genres that contain all other literary genres: a) *epic*—any genre in which facts are narrated in objective, artistic form; b) *drama*—any genre in which literary material is presented solely by the characters themselves; c) *lyric*—any genre in which the author's subjective experiences, thoughts, or feelings are expressed. Sometimes these genres are mixed, as in the ballad form. How frequently specific genres are employed, how they are mixed, etc.—all this is also important in identifying features typical of particular epochs, authors, and literary movements.

8. Examination of the aspects of content leads us to the deeper

*idea-content* of a work. Each statement made by a person, especially a writer, reflects his world view—his view of life and the universe. An author's world view may emerge in his work "of itself"; that is, without his making a conscious attempt to convey it to his reader. However, it is frequent indeed that an author does consciously wish to offer certain ideas and views to his reader. In such cases we refer to the *tendentiousness* of the work. "The Poplar" is a work in which the tendentious element is absent (perhaps with the exception of Ševčenko's desire to reveal the poetic nature of folk beliefs and the oral tradition). On the other hand, "The Dream" and "*Neofity*" ("The Neophytes") are typical of Ševčenko's tendentious works.

In studying the idea-content of literary works, a scholar must frequently look beyond the confines of the work itself. He must direct his attention to other works by the same author or by his contemporaries, to biographical data about the author, to extra-literary works (letters, reminiscences) by the author or his contemporaries, to contemporary evaluations of the work (criticism, parody, etc.), to historical facts related to the period in which the work was written and, finally, to data pertaining to the education, reading habits (catalogues of the writer's library), and personal and literary ties of each author. Older scholarship frequently studied only such secondary sources and as a result occasionally came to completely erroneous conclusions. It is, of course, always necessary to begin with *the work itself*. The idea-content must emerge from the work: other sources should be given only an auxiliary function.

The explication of the main idea of a work is its "*interpretation*," or perhaps more precisely the "*interpretation of its meaning*," since the description of the elements of form and content mentioned above is sometimes referred to as "interpretation."

Only after an analysis of the form, content, and main idea of a work can its place in the historical evolution of literature be defined. This is the goal of the "synthetic" approach to literary evolution. In this respect, the question of periodization becomes very important.

9. The problem of the periodization of Ukrainian literature was brought to the fore by modern scholars. Older scholars viewed all of old literature from the eleventh to the eighteenth century as one whole, only rarely dissociating from it the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in which the literary language was already quite distinct from its older counterpart. In the nineteenth century the difference between Romanticism and Realism was perceived solely on the ideological level. Occasionally periods of literary evolution were defined by the political changes in the life of the Ukrainian people. Stylistic analysis revealed

that changes in style were the best and most intrinsic criteria for the periodization of literature.

Scholars (such as M. Zerov and others) were able to establish that authors or trends that had often previously been grouped together were stylistically very different. Also pertinent to this problem are the works of non-Ukrainian scholars devoted to such questions as the Baroque or the Biedermeier.

The main purpose of periodization is to characterize individual epochs. Here, the problems of the evolution of styles and of ideology become relevant. But the characterization of an epoch is not the final goal: it is also necessary to delimit the various periods, a task which is obviously not always easy. Only infrequently do individual literary groups criticize previous epochs on principle or (in the last century) express their own new ideas ("literary manifestos"). In earlier times changes in literary tastes and principles occurred slowly and were initiated by insignificant changes in style and ideology. As a result, it is possible to assign only an approximate date to the beginning of a period. The dating of the end of a period is even more problematic: representatives of the previous epoch do not merely abandon the literary arena but continue to write in the old style, occasionally even for an extensive period of time when new styles are already well established (for example, a Romantic like Kuliš in the age of Realism).

Difficulties in dating and characterizing literary periods are also created by authors and works with highly individual colorations—in Ukrainian literature such works as the "*Skazanie*" ("The Tale") of the murders of Borys and Hlib (see Ch. III, pt. C, no. 2), the works of Ivan Vyšens'kyj, and in part those of Ševčenko. Difficulties arise also from the sparsity of scholarship in some areas (the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries).

Nevertheless, it is possible to formulate a fairly clear scheme of the periods of evolution of Ukrainian literature.

It is also possible, it seems, to establish a pattern in the change of literary styles. This pattern is based on the repeated alternation of *opposite* tendencies: styles, and to a certain extent ideologies as well, oscillate between two opposite poles.

In spite of the great variety of literary styles in European literature, it is not difficult to isolate the two basic types with opposite characteristics: love of simplicity, on the one hand, and a preference for complexity, on the other; a preference for clarity based on definite rules of an established framework, on the one hand, and a predisposition to incomplete, fragmented, "free" form on the other. Similarly, it will be observed that there is either an inclination towards clarity of thought or its opposite—disregard for clarity, based on the belief that



“depth” is more important even if the reader does not always completely understand it; there is an attempt to establish a normalized, “pure” language or its opposite—a search for a unique, original language, a predilection for verbal games and the use of dialectisms and jargon; there is an inclination to precision or its opposite—a desire to provide the most complete expression even if this does not contribute to accuracy; there is an attempt to attain an overall impression of harmony or its opposite—tension, movement, dynamism. Representatives of these two differing types of literary styles value different literary qualities: clarity or depth, simplicity or ornamentation, peace or movement, limited or unbounded perspectives, well-defined norms or movement and change, unity or diversity, traditionalism or novelty, etc. On the one hand, the dominant ideal is calm, harmonious beauty; on the other, beauty is not the sole aesthetic value of a literary work—other values are equally important and ugliness finds a place in the aesthetic sphere.

These two types of styles will be designated as “1” and “2.”

Any such scheme of literary evolution is, of course, merely a generalization. As we will see later, each literary epoch encompasses various trends, individual variations and transitional elements. Furthermore, since Ukrainian literature experienced periods of relative decline, certain literary epochs—the Renaissance and Classicism—acquired but limited and vague expression.

10. The following (in the opinion of this author) is the general scheme of the evolution of Ukrainian literature.

- I. Period of monumental style—eleventh century.
- II. Period of ornamental style—twelfth and thirteenth centuries.
- III. Transitional period—fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (only a few monuments of this period have been preserved and these are in large part compilations or works that only border on literature).
- IV. Renaissance and Reformation—end of the sixteenth century.
- V. Baroque—seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.
- VI. Classicism—end of the eighteenth century and the first 40 years of the nineteenth.
- VII. Romanticism—from the end of the 1820s to the beginning of the 1860s.
- VIII. Realism—from the 1860s onward. Writers of the Realistic school are still to be found today.
- IX. Modernism—from the beginning of the twentieth century onward. Ukrainian Modernism embraces various literary trends, in part original and in part linked with various contemporary trends of world literature such as Symbolism, Futurism, etc.

Just before the Revolution new literary trends, such as Futurism, made their appearance. After the Revolution, together with the dominant trend of revolutionary literature, a distinctly neo-classical trend emerged. However, any definitive characterization of a recent literary trend is fraught with its own peculiar difficulties.

Of the periods mentioned above, I, IV, VI, and VIII belong to the first general literary type; II, V, VII and IX to the second. Since it is impossible to obtain all the necessary materials pertaining to more recent times, I was forced initially to end my study with the period of the beginnings of Realism. However, in this edition I have included a brief general survey of the period of Realism and the beginnings of Modernism. This survey is intended as a sketch of only the main features of these periods—those features which would form the basic guidelines of a more detailed study.

It must be remembered that in the earliest periods it is difficult to distinguish between Ukrainian and Belorussian monuments. In the initial period there are a few clearly definable Belorussian monuments. But the works of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries, which only infrequently had differing linguistic colorations, belong to the literary heritage of both peoples. Therefore, in the examination of the period prior to the seventeenth century, it will be necessary to discuss certain Belorussian works. Where possible an attempt will be made to note their Belorussian origin.

[This introduction was written in 1956 and was printed that year with D. Cyzevs'kyj's Ukrainian edition of *Istorijska ukrajins'koji literaturni*, published in 1956 by The Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in New York.]

# I.

## PREHISTORIC PERIOD

### A. ORIGINS

1. The oldest dated monument of East Slavic literature is the Ostromir Gospel from 1056 or 1057. But the vast majority of monuments from the eleventh and twelfth centuries are undated or extant only in later transcriptions. Clearly these are not the oldest monuments, for the literary language and traditions (Church Slavonic) unquestionably came to Kiev together with Christianity towards the end of the tenth century. However, it is certain that there were Christians in Kiev several decades earlier; one need only cite as examples either the Christian Varangians killed in the time of Volodymyr or Ol'ha, the wife of Prince Ihor. In the performance of divine service, if it was not Greek, Bulgarian or Moravian books could have been used. But it is not this aspect of the prehistoric period that concerns us here; borrowed books can hardly be considered part of Kievan literature. Also extra-literary are the translations of the treaties between Kievan Rus' and the Greeks (preserved in the chronicles) dating from 911 and 944. More interesting is the oral tradition (or folk poetry) which is believed to have already been in existence at that time. At this point in time, there can no longer be any question of attempting to deduce any specific information about this ancient and oral tradition from its more modern manifestations as the Romantics did in the nineteenth century.

More specific information about the oral tradition can be obtained from more modern sources (of the seventeenth and especially the nineteenth centuries) and from studies of the oral traditions of other peoples. These sources reveal how rapidly and fundamentally the oral tradition can change as a result of

various cultural influences. Byzantine, Bulgarian and, to a lesser extent, Moravian influences came to Kiev together with Christianity. Consequently, the only means to acquire knowledge of the oral tradition in the pre-Christian and early Christian eras is by reference to any traces or mentions of it in the old written monuments. However, such traces and mentions are few and not always reliable. Nonetheless, they are more reliable than the speculations of earlier literary historians.

2. Slavonic folk poetry is not the sole constituent of the prehistoric period of Kievan literature. Since the princely family, retinue and specific merchant groups were of Scandinavian (Varangian) extraction, it is not surprising that elements of the Varangian folk tradition and perhaps even some written Varangian fragments of the tenth and eleventh centuries are to be found in Kievan literature. While we are familiar with Scandinavian folk poetry only from its later forms, these Scandinavian elements must also be considered. However, it should not be assumed that those elements which Kievan and Scandinavian literature have in common were necessarily borrowed by Kiev from Scandinavia. Both the Varangians and the Slavs are Indo-European peoples; as a result, it is equally possible that these common elements may have been derived from their common Indo-European heritage. Unfortunately, material for the evaluation of this hypothesis is still lacking.

## B. THE ORAL TRADITION

1. A few references to the oral tradition in its pre-Christian form are found in the oldest written monuments. Unfortunately most of these references merely point to the existence of various types of folk poetry.

There is no doubt that Slavic and East Slavic folklore existed even in the pre-Christian era but written mentions of it are few and unreliable. The "singers" referred to are always singers of epic songs, those that were kept at the courts of the princes and their retainers. The information of Eastern wanderers is questionable. Ibn Fadlan, for example, describes the entire Slavic race as *rusy*, that is, as Eastern Slavs. Depicting the pagan life style of the Slavs, the chronicles and later, the sermons, allude to "singing and dancing" but none of them describe the songs. Possible exceptions are Cyril of Turiv, who speaks of "devilish songs" and "*Slovo nikojego Xristoljubcja*" ("Sermon of One Who Loves Christ," extant in a fourteenth century manuscript but unquestionably written earlier) where mention is made of "worldly songs." References are made to the "music of the Devil" (in the tale about Isaac—see Ch. 3, pt. C, sec. 3), to music at the courts of the princes ("Life of Theodosius") and occasionally to

music in general, but there is no way of knowing if these allude to Slavic *folk* music. Both the "music of the Devil" and the music of the courts could be of Byzantine origin. The first concrete information about folk songs comes from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: in 1571 the Czech scholar Jan Blahoslav recorded a song about Stephen the Voivode (but this song stems from the most western reaches of Ukrainian territory) and in 1625 Dzwonowski published a song about the Cossack Plaxta.

2. There is some information about ritual songs but primarily about those which are at least partly linked with Christianity. Most frequently mentioned are *koljady*. But again the references in sermons and other types of works do not discuss these ritual songs *per se* but speak rather of the celebration of the festival of *Koljada*. The first clear reference is from 1166 and of Novgorodian origin. It is true, of course, that there are many ancient elements in contemporary *koljady*: references to Constantinople, to the freeing of a city by the payment of tribute, to the "cutting down of a city" (the khan of the Polovci, Bonjak is said to have been preparing to "cut down" Kiev's Golden Gates). In addition old words are encountered: *pavoloky* [*šovky* (silks)], *žukovyny* (valuable gems), etc. However, from these facts we can only conclude that some kind of *koljady* already existed in the first decades after the acceptance of Christianity and that there were some pre-Christian elements in them. We cannot make any definite statements about their form or their relation to their modern counterparts. There is even less information about the songs associated with the festival of the *Rusalky* (*Rusalijs*): they are mentioned in the fragment of "*Slovo o karax Božijx*" ("Sermon about God's Punishments") which is included in the *Primary Chronicle* under 1068 but here again the reference is to the celebration of the festival and not to the songs themselves. The thirteenth century *Chronicle* mentions the songs associated with the festival of *Kupalo* (*Kupaliji*) but only in a very general fashion. Certain facts in Volodymyr Monomax's letter (end of the eleventh century) could be interpreted as references to wedding songs, for Volodymyr Monomax speaks of his desire "to replace the songs" of his son's widow's engagement and wedding parties with "laments" for his dead son (see Ch. III, pt. F, no. 4). On the other hand, it is equally possible that these are references to court music of Byzantine origin. Contemporary customs and songs as well as the information we have about the customs of the nobility of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries testify to the fact that many elements of the wedding customs of the folk were also to be found among the upper classes: both those customs which refer to the forceful abduction of the bride-to-be and the vocabulary of wedding songs [*knjaz'* (prince); *bojary* (boyars, nobility); *družyna* (the prince's retinue); *meč* (sword); *strily* (arrows); etc.] indicate that

the contemporary wedding ritual and songs in part filtered down to the common people from higher social levels during the princely era. However, no definite conclusions can be drawn about the wedding songs of the Kievan period from their contemporary counterparts.

3. By chance, one type of ritual song—the *plač*—is mentioned frequently; a *plač* is not really a song but rather a rhythmical lament for the dead. But evidence in this case is also sparse. The best literary imitations of laments are from the north—from chronicles which mention the “lamentations” of the family, retainers and people for their prince. It must be noted, however, that even these references are not totally convincing, for careful study reveals that the expression “to lament” (“*plakatisja*”) is a traditional formula employed by chroniclers to depict grief for the dead. Thus, in the narration about the death of Izjaslav Mstyslavovyč (1154), the *Chronicle* mentions the lament of the “black hoods” (that is, the Turkic people from the principality of Perejaslav) and in the account of the death of Volodymyr Vasylykovič in 1288, Germans and Jews are included among the “lamenters.” It is highly unlikely that foreigners performed Slavic laments over the coffins of Kievan princes. The references to the fact that “all the people” lamented over the body of Prince Oleh (who may have died in Scandinavia!), that Ol’ha “lamented” her husband’s death, that her sons and grandsons “lamented” the passing of their mother were added to the *Chronicle* (under the years 912, 945 and 969 respectively) only later, in the Christian era. Volodymyr Monomax’s expression of his desire to “lament” the death of his son together with his son’s widow is more convincing evidence. However, it must be remembered that Monomax’s work is literary and replete with images: when Monomax describes this same daughter-in-law elsewhere as “a dove seated on a dead tree,” etc., we must be careful about making literal translations. “To lament” sometimes simply means “to take part in a funeral” (1154). In other cases, “laments” for princes are coupled with other “ritual songs,” that is, the traditional funeral songs of the Church. Similarly it is also unlikely that “Volodymyr’s best men” (his boyars) performed “laments” over the body of their prince, since “laments” are always performed by women.

The only unquestionable evidence of the existence of folk “laments” is the use of this genre in the written monuments of old Ukrainian literature: in the “tale” of Borys and Hlib, Borys utters a moving lament for his father, Volodymyr the Great—and Hlib, for his murdered brother, Borys. The *Chronicle* records the lament of Prince Jaropolk and his retinue over the death of Prince Izjaslav in 1078: “Father o father! Could you have not been overwhelmed by grief in your earthly life when you were so often attacked by your own people and your own brothers?” Vjačeslav of Turiv, the uncle of the Kievan Prince,

Izjaslav Mstyslavovyč (died 1154), “laments” the passing of his nephew: “My son, you have gone in my stead but God’s will must be done.” “Volodymyr’s boyars ‘lament’ the death of Volodymyr Vasylykovič”: “It would have been far better, o Lord, if we had died with you . . . for now we can no longer cast our eyes upon you, our sun has now set forever and we are left in misfortune.” In *Slovo o polku Igorevi* (*The Tale of Ihor’s Campaign*) there are references to the “lament” of the wives of dead soldiers: “No longer can we call up memories or thoughts of our beloved husbands, no longer can we cast our eyes upon them.” In addition, in both *The Tale of Ihor’s Campaign* and in the *Chronicle*, the “lament” of the mother of Prince Rostyslav, who drowned on a “dark shore,” is mentioned. A comparison with the folk laments recorded in the nineteenth century reveals certain similar features: references to the deceased person (in both, the deceased person is occasionally compared to the sun), statements of a desire to die with or in place of the person lamented, feelings of having lost all that is important, and exaggerated portrayals of the grief inflicted by this loss. Later references to Ukrainian (or Belorussian) laments are found in Menecius’ work (1551), written in Latin. However, in spite of his assurances to the contrary, the fragments of laments included in his work are not Ruthenian but Polish. In addition, Klonowicz’s Latin text (1584) contains an imitation of a Ukrainian lament. All these allusions testify to the continuity of the tradition of the ancient lament. In the nineteenth century not only the dead were “lamented” but also recruits, houses which had been destroyed by fire, etc. There are indications that laments were also extended in this fashion in earlier times as well. In any case, the *Chronicle* mentions that “mothers lamented their children . . . as they would the dead” when Volodymyr the Great ordered them to be sent to school (988). Also interesting is the fact that echoes of folk laments—addresses to the deceased, etc.—are to be found in sermons and other religious works: in the sermons of Hilarion and Cyril of Turiv (lament of the Virgin Mary), in the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery* (lament of Peter the Doctor), in the *Galician Chronicle* (1288), in various works, employing an elevated Church Slavonic vocabulary. That the lament is found in such genres of old Ukrainian literature contributes to the uncertainty as to the origin of this form. Since laments also existed in Byzantium, they may have been transmitted to the upper classes of Kievan Rus’ together with Christianity and then have spread among the people. From the few available details, it cannot be concluded with certainty that the laments found in old Ukrainian literature are elements of Slavic antiquity. It should also be noted that there are “laments” in the Bible (David’s lament for Absalom and Jonathan) and in apocryphal works (Anna’s lament in the Gospel of Jacob).

4. While the themes of epic works of the Kievan period can be established with a high degree of certainty (see Ch. III, pt. I, and Ch. IV, pt. F), nothing definitive can be said about their *form*. Since there is little doubt that Slavic, Scandinavian and Byzantine elements were coupled in them, it is difficult to isolate their prehistoric elements. Pre-Christian themes are found in the folk epos (Oleh, Ol'ha) and in the chronicles (Rohnida, the death of Oleh). Folk epics frequently contain extremely old themes. Thus, in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*, Gothic songs about the "time of Bus" are mentioned. "Bus" could be the king of the Antes, Booz, who was defeated by the Goths in the fourth century. As a result, this motif probably originated in a period over 800 years prior to the writing of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*!

5. Relatively numerous examples of proverbs and sayings have been preserved in the chronicles and various other works of the Kievan period. Proverbs and sayings such as the following are uttered by various persons in the *Chronicle*: "If a wolf repeatedly visits a flock, he will eventually steal all the sheep," "Death is the same for everybody," "Because the inhabitants of Rus' love their swill, without it they cannot dwell," "You must kill the bees before you can eat their honey," "The dead have no shame." The chroniclers also used such expressions as "not until rocks float and foam sinks." Characteristic are the sayings directed at various peoples, cities, etc. For example, the following is said of the northern Slavic bathhouses "Here you can get washed but not tortured" (this expression is attributed to the Apostle Andrew in the *Chronicle*). In addition, we encounter "misery, the same as in Roden'" and "the inhabitants fled from Vovčyj Xvist\*." Such sayings existed long before they were incorporated into the *Chronicle*. In essence, they are condensations of entire stories. Such is the case in respect to the sayings referring to the condition of the people of Roden' when it was being besieged and to Vojevoda Vovčyj Xvist's victory over the Radimichians near the Piščana River, etc. Evidence of the existence of proverbs and adages is also found in later examples, such as: "O Roman, Roman, along the right path you do not go, if with the Lithuanians you plough" (about Roman of Galicia). But those proverbs and adages found in the monuments of old Ukrainian literature [for example, in the *Izbornik (Collection)* of 1076, in "The Supplication of Daniel," etc.] are only partly original. Many of them came to Kievan Rus' from other countries. The famous adage "*Pogiboša aki Obrě*" ("They died like the Avars") is perhaps of Czech origin (see Ch. II, pt. F, no. 4). Furthermore, a considerable number of modern proverbs did not derive from the folk (as the Romantics believed) but were translated

---

\*The name of a *vojevoda*, according to the *Chronicle*.



from the Greek. The following examples belong to this category: "*Vovka nohy hodujut'*" ("A wolf's legs keep him fed"), "*Za dvoma zajejamy poženěšja, ni odnoho ne spijmaješ*" ("If you chase two hares at one time you will not catch either one of them"), "*Pes na sini*" ("A dog lay in the hay"—indicates negligence), "*Ne mala baba klopotu, ta kupyla porosja*" ("The old woman did not have enough trouble so she bought a pig"), "*Mokryj došču ne bojit'sja*" ("A man who is already wet is not afraid of the rain"), "*ptyče moloko*" ("bird's milk"—indicating luxury), "*Povynnoji holovy meč ne siče*" ("A sword will not fall upon an important head"—mentioned by Ipatij Potij in 1599), etc. On superficial examination, it could easily be assumed that all these proverbs are of pre-Christian Slavic origin. An even larger proportion of the proverbs with a Christian coloration are of Greek origin. The proverb "*I čortovi treba svičku zapalyty*" ("One should also light a candle for the Devil") provided the theme for one of Rudans'kyj's *spivomovky*. Even such apparently Ukrainian proverbs as "*Jazyk do Kyjeva dovede*" ("Your tongue will lead you all the way to Kiev") or "*Z moskalem družjy. . .*" ("If you are friends with a Russian. . .") are old translations from Greek, in which "Constantinople" is replaced by "Kiev" and "dog" by "a Russian," respectively. Another such example is to be found in a letter written by Myxajlo Rohoža in 1593: "*Komu poklonytysja zavtra, toho s'ohodni ne hnivy*" ("If you intend to ask a favor of someone tomorrow, do not antagonize him today"), which is the old variant of the modern proverb, "*Ne pluj v kryncju, zhodyt'sja napytysja*" ("Do not spit in a well if you intend to drink from it later") and a translation from the Greek.

On the other hand, evidence indicates that proverbs and adages existed in the pre-Christian period. The *Chronicle* confirms the fact that their "form" was the same as it is today, consisting of two approximately equal parts frequently parallel in structure and employing either rhyme or alliteration (*movenie-mučenie, piti-biti*). However, it is impossible to establish which proverbs and sayings existed in the pre-Christian era.

6. A separate category of the oral tradition is formed by incantations (to exorcise diseases) and spells, which are known to have existed among the Eastern Slavs in the pre-Christian era. The incantations included in the treaties between Rus' and the Greeks (907, 949, and 971) testify to this fact. The first of these mentions that Oleh's men swore an oath in which they called upon their swords and the gods, Perun and Volos. In the second, the reference is more specific; the representatives of Rus' are said to have collected their arms and sworn upon them to abide by the terms of the treaty, adding that anyone who failed to do so was "worthy to die by his own sword." The third treaty includes the full text of the oath, which was coupled with an incantation: "If we do not abide by the

above-mentioned terms . . . may we be cursed by the gods in which we believe—by Perun and by Volos, the god of cattle, may we become as yellow as gold and may we be cut down by our own swords.” However, this incantation may be of Varangian origin. Furthermore, the text of this treaty included in the *Chronicle* is but a translation from the Greek original and as a result reproduces the content but not the form of the incantation.

7. The set phrases frequently encountered in the chronicles and in other works of the Kievan period may also have derived from the pre-Christian oral tradition—that is, from its formal or linguistic aspects. A victorious prince is said to have returned “with victory and great glory” or “amidst great praise”; peace among the princes is described as “peace and love”; to “raise a banner” or to “break a banner” is to begin a battle [*“kop’e izlomiti”*] (“to throw down the banner”)\*—a symbolic act performed first by the prince. Such an event is narrated in the *Chronicle* under the year 946]; old age and the approach of death is expressed by the phrase “sitting on a sleigh” since the dead were carried to their final resting place on sleighs and the dying were placed on them even in summer. (Such was the case with Theodosius, according to the entry in the *Chronicle* under the year 1074!) As the above examples reveal, such set phrases are frequently condensed renderings of various customs. Extremely typical is the phrase in which Rohnida expresses her refusal to marry Volodymyr the Great, the son of Ol’ha’s housekeeper. She says that she does not wish to remove shoes from the feet of a servant. The significance of her reply derives from its double meaning. While wedding ritual required that a bride remove her husband’s shoes, in Germanic juridical custom, the act of removing someone’s shoes symbolized subordination to the person whose shoes were removed. Also related to law is the striking expression used by Volodymyr of Volhynia (noted under the year 1288 in the *Galician Chronicle*), who is said to have begged his brother Mstyslav not to give George even “a handful of straw.” This expression [and its modern counterpart *“Syla i solomu lomyt”*] (“Force can even break a straw”)] acquires meaning for the contemporary reader only when it is pointed out that in the past straw symbolized the consolidation of authority. The customs upon which

---

\*Similar customs—the dropping of a spear or other object (such as a burned branch)—are found among the old traditions of other Indo-European peoples. Varangian custom dictated that a spear be thrown in the direction of the enemy before a battle. A very similar symbolic act was performed in Imperial Rome (after the birth of Christ) before the troops set out on a campaign: one of the priests (*pater patratus*) threw a spear dipped in blood “in the direction of the foreign land” to which they were going. Cicero notes the existence of this custom among the Samnites (a Roman tribe). Hindu custom required that a burned branch be thrown over the heads of the enemy. There are indications of the existence of similar customs among the Persians, Celts, Lithuanians and Greeks. It also appears to have been preserved among the Slavs.

these expressions were based were partially of Germanic (Varangian) origin. However, since they came down to us in the East Slavic language, they therefore already belonged to the heritage of the East Slavic poetic language. On the other hand, it is not always possible to ascertain whether such a fixed phrase is Slavic or a translation from the Greek. The *Chronicle*, for example, describes a prince returning from military exercises as “wiping away tears” or “wiping sweat” from his brow (“He wiped from his brow the sweat which bore witness to his efforts on behalf of the land of Rus’”). In this case, the expressions used are direct translations from Greek.

8. The existence of folk beliefs and symbols is also attested by various monuments of the Kievan period. It was believed, for example, that during an eclipse, the sun and the moon were devoured (by a serpent or a wolf?), that certain ghosts (*navyje*) were able to participate actively in earthly life (by “beating” the living, for example); that birds arrived from certain warm regions; and that the tree symbolized law (as, for example, in the translated tale by Gregory of Nazianzus dating from the eleventh century). Pre-Christian elements can be found in some of the beliefs and symbols which were derived from later customs [such as *mohoryč* (the sealing of a bargain with a drink—which is obviously a very old custom corresponding to the German *litkouf*); *paruboc'ki hromady* (groups of young men, with their military symbolism, which are carry-overs from the customs of the prince's retinue, etc.)].

Many other hypotheses about the old elements in the contemporary oral tradition have often been made but such hypotheses are unwarranted. As has been pointed out above, monuments of the Kievan period provide little information about the folk tradition of the pre-Christian era. The available material does provide evidence of the existence of certain types of folk poetry in this period, but little is revealed about its style, as most formal aspects (language, images, comparisons, etc.) go unmentioned. On the basis of this information, it is impossible to support the hypothesis of the nineteenth century Ukrainian Romantics—the hypothesis that ancient and modern folk poetry are almost identical. The conclusions that can be drawn are few. However, it is far better to be left with only a few hard facts than to make unfounded sweeping generalizations.

### C. SCANDINAVIAN ELEMENTS

1. The Scandinavian royal family (there were obviously many different families), the Scandinavian retinue and the advent of new Scandinavian elements in Eastern Europe must have had an influence on the Slavs. A limited number of

Scandinavian words\* and some Scandinavian proverbs (particularly those pertaining to Scandinavian princes) were incorporated into the East Slavic heritage. However, it is not always possible to establish the Scandinavian origin of individual proverbs. As was mentioned above, the discovery of similar proverbs among the Scandinavians and the Slavs does not prove that the Slavs adopted them from the Scandinavians. It is equally possible that either the opposite occurred or that both peoples acquired them from their common Indo-European heritage. The Scandinavian proverbs which will be discussed here are known to us from even later copies than their Slavic counterparts. The problem becomes more complex when similar proverbs are also found in the folk traditions of other peoples—those that were neighbors of the Eastern Slavs and could have had a cultural influence on them, notably the Greeks from whom both the Slavs and the Scandinavians could have borrowed. Many such parallels with the Scandinavian heritage are contained in the tales of the *Chronicle*.

2. The most outstanding of these is the tale about Oleh and his horse. From sorcerers (*kudesniki*), Oleh learns that his death will in some way be caused by his horse. As a result, he no longer rides this particular horse but orders that it be cared for. Several years later Oleh discovers that this horse has already died. Scoffing at the sorcerers, he decides to have a look at the horse's remains; but while he is doing this, a snake crawls out from among the horse's bones, bites him and he dies (entered in the *Chronicle* under the year 912). This tale has many parallels of both Eastern and Western origin. Common to all the variants is the theme of death resulting from an inanimate object against which the person concerned has already been warned (in one case, the person dies from a wound caused by a tooth of a dead wild boar; in another, from an infection caused by a splinter from a felled tree; and in still another, from the bite of a scorpion hidden on a statue of a lion, etc.). The closest parallel to the legend of Oleh's death is contained in the Icelandic *Edda*. The tale is presented here in a greatly expanded form: a sorceress predicts that Orvar-Odd will be bitten by a poisonous snake which "will emerge from among Faxi's dead bones" (Faxi is Odd's horse). Odd kills his horse, buries it in a very deep hole and leaves his native land. After 300 years he returns. Meanwhile, the wind has bared the horse's bones and the prophecy comes true. It must be noted that this version not only appears to derive from a later period in the development of this theme (its breadth and the fairy-tale-like aspects of Odd's life) but also that it is poorer structurally. While the *Chronicle* account does not reveal how the prophecy will

---

\*The latest research indicates that there were at most about 20 of them and that they are either rare words found mostly in dialects or words that have long since fallen out of use.

be fulfilled until the very end (since the horse is already dead), the *Edda* version states at the very beginning that the cause of death will not be the horse *per se* but a snake hidden among its bones. The actualization of the prophecy is unexpected only because Odd has buried his horse's body very deeply in the sand. Consequently, if the Slavs did borrow this tale from the Varangians, it must have been transmitted to them in some earlier form.

Another tale which has a Scandinavian parallel is that of Ol'ha's fourth act of revenge against the Derevljanians who killed her husband. After besieging the Derevljanian city of Iskorosten' for a year, Ol'ha requests but a small tribute from them—three doves and three sparrows from each household. After the Derevljanians have complied, a match is tied to each bird, the matches are lit and the birds are set free. The birds fly back to their nests and set the city on fire (the *Chronicle* under 946). This tale has many parallels from various periods and of various national origins—English, French, Scandinavian, Armenian. From among the Slavic variants, mention should be made of *Dalimil's Chronicle* (Czech) which recounts the story of the capture of Kiev by the Tatars in a similar fashion and of *Hajek's Chronicle* where Heinrich of Plauen is described as capturing the Czech city of Saaz by employing this same strategem (fifteenth century). It is interesting to note that this same theme—the burning of a city or fields with the help of various animals and other similar tactics employed against the enemy—is also to be found in the heritage of antiquity. Hannibal is said, by Livy, to have released against the Romans 3,000 oxen to which torches had been attached, while the Bible recounts a similar tactic employed by Samson against the Philistines—the release of foxes with torches attached to their tails into the Philistines' fields. There is also a similar incident in one of Aesop's fables. In any case, there is a definite similarity between the tale of Ol'ha's fourth revenge contained in the *Chronicle* and various Scandinavian tales. However, the *Chronicle* tale is much more successful. While the Scandinavian variants have the besiegers catch the birds, in the *Chronicle*, Ol'ha obtains the birds as tribute from each household in Iskorosten' thereby assuring that each building in the city will be set on fire and making the inhabitants the cause of their own downfall! Here again the *Chronicle* account is the older form (it is one hundred years older than its Scandinavian counterpart!). In fact, there is no evidence indicating the Scandinavian origin of this tale.

There are also other old Ukrainian tales with parallels in other literatures. Tales of the founding of a city (in the case of old Ukrainian literature, the city is Kiev) by three brothers or of the invitation of three brothers to be rulers of a people are quite numerous; occasionally some of these are older than the Slavic variants (for example in *Beda's Chronicle* from the seventh or eighth century,

but here there are only two heroes). Attempts have been made to give factual explanations of the tales about boats on wheels such as the one included in the description of Oleh's capture of Constantinople: the Varangians were able to pull their relatively small boats past the chains closing off the entrance to the harbor. There are also several similar Byzantine tales about the outwitting of Pečeneg besiegers: their representatives are shown two wells; in order to convince them that the city had a sufficient amount of food, the inhabitants place a pail of honey in one well and a pail of *kisel'*, a kind of jelly, in the other. The theme of a hero doing battle with a giant appears twice in the *Chronicle*: in one case it is a fight between some young Kievan man and a Pečeneg giant; in the other, Mstyslav of Tmutorokan' and Rededja (entered under the years 922 and 1022, respectively). However, tales of this general type are encountered in the legacies of many peoples (compare the battle of David and Goliath in the Bible).

3. The derogatory attitude toward the Slavs expressed in some tales allows us to assume that they are of Varangian origin. One example of this type of narrative is the story of the division of the booty near Constantinople (entered under the year 907 in the *Chronicle*): the Varangians (Rus') chose heavy silk (*pavoločiti*) for their sails but the stupid Slavs select light silk (*kropin'ni*), which will be quickly torn by the wind. Another example is provided by the story of Jaroslav's campaign against Svjatopolk (1015), where the Kievan vojevoda Svjatopolk scoffs at Jaroslav's army which contained many Novgorodians, i.e., Slavs: "You are carpenters . . .," he says. Such derogatory comments are few, as a Slavic chronicler would hardly be prone to include anti-Slavic anecdotes in his work!

Perhaps the most interesting are those sections which are clearly anti-Slavic and deal with the Varangian custom of bloody retribution. Such is the story about Jaroslav immediately before the campaign against Kiev mentioned above. Because they were mistreated by Jaroslav's Novgorodian retinue, the inhabitants of Novgorod attacked and killed the Varangians. Becoming very angry, Jaroslav said: "These men cannot be resurrected" ("*Uže mni slix ne krisiti*") and, having had the leading citizens of Novgorod brought to him, he had them killed by way of retribution. But that same night he received news of Volodymyr's death and of Svjatopolk's subsequent seizure of power. Greatly regretting the loss of his retinue and the Novgorodians whom he had had killed, Jaroslav had to be content with the "remaining Novgorodians." The meaning of this story, in the opinion of this writer, lies in the sentence "These men cannot be resurrected"; this was perhaps a fixed phrase used to initiate an act of retribution (such fixed phrases existed whenever the institution of retribution existed; the use of such a symbolic phrase was one of the first steps in the limitation of this cruel custom).

The phrase “*ceduleju odpovidnoju*,” announcing hostility, was preserved in Ukraine until the sixteenth century. This phrase announced that the norms of morality and the conventions of hospitality would no longer be observed. The Novgorodian Slavs did not understand this expression, this threat against them made by their prince. A similar incident is recounted in the *Chronicle* account of Ol’ha’s revenges. After having killed her husband, Ihor, the Derevljanians ask Ol’ha to marry their prince, Mal, and she replies: “I cannot resurrect my husband” (“*Uže mni muža svoego ne krisiti*”). After this Ol’ha begins her acts of retribution by having the Derevljanian emissaries killed. In this case also, the Slavs did not understand this expression. Her first act of revenge is clever but cruel: Ol’ha advises the emissaries to demand that they be carried to her palace in a boat. The Slavs again fail to grasp the symbolic import of this act, for they do not know that the Scandinavians traditionally use a boat as their coffin. Near the castle the boat carrying the Derevljanian emissaries is dropped into a hole and covered with earth. The ironic tone of this tale identifies it as being of Scandinavian origin. After this incident Ol’ha carries out three more acts of revenge. While there are no close Scandinavian parallels for the remainder of the story, the attitude of the narrator to the Slavs, in the opinion of this writer, makes a good case for its Scandinavian origin. The set phrase “He cannot be resurrected” later lost its original meaning and became solely a poetic device. Such is the case in the story about the death of a prince (1151) recorded in the *Kievan Chronicle* and in *The Tale of Ihor’s Campaign*. (The fixed nature of this expression in the latter becomes evident from the very fact that it is repeated twice: on the other hand, its use in conjunction with Svjatoslav’s call for retribution, for revenge against the Polovci for their victory over Ihor, indicates that its original meaning had not yet been lost.) However, the chroniclers who copied the story probably no longer knew the meaning of this phrase.

Other fragments of Scandinavian customs were perhaps preserved in some juridical expressions and customs. Several other examples may be added to those discussed in the earlier part of this chapter: the taking of an oath with a piece of sod placed on the head, and someone else’s key as a symbol of subordination [in *Rus’ka pravda* (*Rus’ Law*) and in one of Theodosius’ sermons].

4. The isolation of the formal elements of the tales of Slavic origin is a difficult task. It is possible that those sentences which contain riddles and have parallels in Scandinavian sagas are derived from Scandinavian poetic practice. Unfortunately, the *Chronicle* includes very few of these. One example of the use of such a poetic formula is found in the scene describing the indirect exchange between Jaroslav and Svjatopolk during the campaign of 1015. Jaroslav’s emissary asks one of Svjatopolk’s men what should be done “if we have only a

little mead but a great many retainers." The latter replies: "If you have only a little mead but a great many retainers then [the mead] should be distributed in the evening." "And Jaroslav understood that [Svjatopolk] had ordered the battle to be begun in the evening," the *Chronicle* adds. The phrase "He cannot be resurrected" discussed above as well as other later phrases used to signal certain actions, including "You must kill the bees before you can eat their honey," belong to this category.

Certain parts of the *Chronicle* and *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* are reminiscent of the Scandinavian *kenningar* (singular: *kenning*). *Kenningar* are fixed expressions used in place of the usual term employed to designate a definite object or action. In *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* "bloody wine" is used instead of "blood"; "to offer the enemy wine," "to treat him with wine" or "to thrash him" instead of "to do battle with him," etc. (See the later sections on *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* and on the *Hypatian Chronicle*.)

Another stylistic feature shared by the *Chronicle* tales and the Scandinavian sagas is narration in the form of dialogue. This trait is encountered more frequently in the later chronicles—the *Kievan Chronicle* from the twelfth century and the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* from the thirteenth century. However, while it is unlikely that these works were strongly influenced by Scandinavian sagas, Byzantine influences are numerous.

The rhythmical style of the *Chronicle* legends and the ample use of alliteration may also be attributed to the influence of Scandinavian sagas. The rhythmical quality of these legends is not very pronounced. Resulting in large part from the short sentences in which the tales are frequently narrated (which could simply be the product of the primitive stage of development of the language) and from the use of syntactical parallelism (encountered only rarely), the rhythmical quality of these tales could simply be accidental. However, the numerous alliterations cannot be accounted for in this way. Alliteration is not employed in other parts of the *Chronicle*, such as the account of Ol'ha's baptism not to mention the various religious sections (the speech made by the Christian philosopher in the presence of Volodymyr or the account of the creation of the Slavic alphabet), the geographical descriptions, the treaties with the Greeks, etc.

The following example of alliteration is taken from the conversation between Jaroslav and one of Svjatopolk's men:

<i>Źto ty tomu veliši tvoriti?</i>	t-t-v-t
<i>malo medu vareno</i>	m-m-v
<i>a družiny mnogo</i>	m



<i>dače medu malo</i>	d-m-m
<i>a družiny mnogo</i>	d-m
<i>da k" večeru v"dati. . .</i>	d-v-v

("What do you advise us to do if we have only a little mead but a great many retainers?" . . . "If you have only a little mead but there are many retainers, then [the mead] should be distributed in the evening.")

From the account of Oleh's capture of Constantinople we have another good example:

<i>i povelě Oleg voem" svoim"</i>	p-v
<i>kolesa izdělati</i>	k
<i>i postaviti na kolesa korabli</i>	p-k-k
<i>i byvšju pokosnu větru</i>	p-v
<i>v"spjaša parusy s polja</i>	v-p-p

("And Oleh ordered his men to make wheels and to place their boats on these wheels and when a favorable wind caught the sails the boats moved off from the ground.")

Also characteristic is the use of alliteration towards the end of rhythmical units, as in the legend of Oleh and his horse:

<i>I prispě osen'</i>	i-p-o
<i>i pomjanu Oleg" kon' svoj</i>	i-p-o-k
<i>iže bě postavil" kormiti</i>	i-p-k
<i>i ne vsědati na n'</i>	i-n-v-n
<i>bě bo v"prašal" vol"xvov"</i>	
<i>i kudesnik"</i>	b-b-v-v-k
<i>ot" čego mi est' umreti?</i>	o
.....	
<i>I povelě osedlati konja:</i>	i-p-k
<i>"a to vižju kosti ego"</i>	k-e
<i>I priide na město,</i>	i-p
<i>ideže běša ležašče</i>	
<i>kosti ego goly</i>	k-e-g
<i>i lob" gol"</i>	i-l-g

<i>i posmėjasya reče:</i>	i
<i>“ot” sego li lba</i>	s-l-l
<i>smert’ bylo vzjati mně?”</i>	s-v
<i>i vstupi ногоju na lob’”;</i>	i-v-n-n-l
<i>i vyniknuvši zmia izo lba</i>	i-v-i-l

(“And autumn came and Oleh remembered the horse which he had ordered to be put out to pasture but he did not ride him for he had asked the magicians and sorcerers: ‘What will be the cause of my death?’ . . . And he ordered that a horse be saddled: ‘I will go to see its bones.’ And he came to the place where its bare bones and skull lay and dismounted from his horse and laughed, saying: ‘Was it this skull that was to cause my death?’ and he stepped on the skull and a snake crawled out of it.”)

And from the tale of the siege of Bilhorod:

<i>I povelě ženam” stvoriti</i>	
<i>čěž’;</i>	i-p
<i>v nem’že varjat’ kisel’;</i>	v-v-k
<i>i povelě iskopati kolodjaz’;</i>	i-p-i-k
<i>i vstaviti tamo kad’;</i>	i-v-k
<i>i naljati čěža kad’.</i>	i-k
<i>I povelě drugyj kolodjaz’</i>	
<i>iskopati;</i>	i-p-k
<i>i vstaviti tamo kad’;</i>	i-k
<i>i povelě iskati medu;</i>	i-p-i-m
<i>oni že šedše vzjaša medu</i>	
<i>lukno;</i>	v-m
<i>bě bo pogrebena v knjaži</i>	
<i>meduši;</i>	b-b-p-k-m
<i>i povelě rosytiti vel’mi</i>	i-p-v
<i>i v”ljati v kad’</i>	i-v-k
<i>v družem” kolodjazi. . .</i>	v-k

(“And he ordered the women to make a solution in which *kisel’* is cooked and to dig a well and to place a pail in it and to fill the pail with the solution. And

he ordered that another well be dug and that a pail  
be placed in it and that mead be found; they went to  
fetch the mead with baskets because it was kept in  
the Prince's mead cellar; and he ordered that it be  
diluted and poured into a pail in the second well. . . .")

And in the account of the death of a prince of the Polovci:

<i>priim'' luk svoj</i>	s
<i>i naloživ'' strělu,</i>	i-s
<i>udari Itlarja v serdce,</i>	i-s
<i>i družinu ego vsju izbraša;</i>	i-i
<i>i tako zlé isproverže</i>	i-i
<i>život svoj Itlar'. . .</i>	s-i

("He took his bow and placed an arrow in it and shot  
Itlar' in the heart and took his retainers for himself;  
and that is how Itlar' lost his life miserably. . . .")

Alliteration is a very characteristic feature of the old literature (not only *belles-lettres*) of all Indo-European peoples: it is encountered in the ancient Frisian Laws, in the Oscan-Umbrian Inscriptions, in Celtic and Germanic poetry, etc. In such monuments alliteration is found in stressed syllables: the location of stresses in old Slavic languages is not always known and, in addition, alliteration appears to have been used only in the territory of the Eastern Slavs; all this indicates that foreign influences (i.e., Scandinavian) may have played an important role in this sphere. However, the alliteration found in Kievan monuments bears little resemblance to its Germanic counterpart. Germanic monuments contain only a limited number of words employing alliteration and they are distributed throughout the poems in a specific manner. In Kievan literature the rule seems to have been the more alliteration the better (see Ch. IV, pt. 7). Although the Norse sagas contain something similar, the alliteration in Kievan literature is more reminiscent of that found in Celtic monuments. Furthermore, alliteration is very rare in Greek literature. All this points to the complexity of the question of the origin of the alliteration frequently encountered in old Ukrainian literature.

5. Consequently, pre-Christian Scandinavian elements cannot be identified with certainty. It even appears that those tales without Scandinavian parallels are more definitely of Scandinavian origin than those with apparently "striking"

parallels (Oleh-Odd, Iskorosten'). The explanation of this phenomenon could lie either in the common Indo-European heritage of the Slavs and Scandinavians or in their borrowing from a common third source. Further research into this problem could best be directed to the identification of all Scandinavian elements in old Ukrainian monuments, especially those of a more secular character (the *Chronicle*, *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*).

#### D. INDO-EUROPEAN ELEMENTS

1. It is logical to expect to find Indo-European elements in the Ukrainian oral tradition. A cursory examination of the subjects, themes and motifs of contemporary folk poetry reveals the great number of themes shared by the Indo-European peoples. Only a few decades ago, this was considered as proof of the common origin of these elements. However, more careful studies soon rejected the possibility of clearly reconstructing the epics, tales and customs of the Indo-European period. While it was established that some of these common elements were borrowed by one tribe from another, most of them were also found among a broad spectrum of non-Indo-European peoples. As a result, it became clear that the existence of similar or identical elements in the folk poetry of any two Indo-European peoples was not a sufficient basis for postulating that they were of common Indo-European origin. Although linguists encountered similar problems, they succeeded in developing techniques which allowed the origin of similar words to be accurately identified as either Indo-European or later borrowings by one people from another. However, such is not the case in the realm of ethnography: there is no definite method whereby the common origins of customs or traditions can be established. Consequently, although there is no doubt about the existence of common Indo-European themes, motifs and linguistic embellishments, it remains impossible to identify them.

The greatest obstacle in this area is the almost total absence of older copies of stories, tales and epics. Serious collection of folklore began only in the nineteenth century; there are few copies dating from the eighteenth century and only isolated ones from earlier periods. As a result, it is possible that these oral tales were adopted from foreign sources or native written monuments in later times and do not derive from the Indo-European heritage. Such a process was observed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries when some of the poems by Ševčenko, Šchoholiv and Rudans'kyj were discovered among Ukrainian folk songs and some of Tolstoj's stories among Russian folk tales.

No attempt to provide definite conclusions about the Indo-European

elements in Ukrainian folklore can be made here. We will limit ourselves in this popular study to a brief discussion of but a few of those subjects and themes which have sometimes been identified as Indo-European.

2. There is, for example, a Ukrainian tale reminiscent of the ancient Greek legend about Odysseus and the Cyclops, Polyphemus. Odysseus and his companions happen upon the island on which Polyphemus lives, and are trapped in his cave. They make their escape by burning out Polyphemus' eye and hiding beneath the bellies of his sheep. In his search for his escaped captives, Polyphemus feels only the backs of his sheep. Having succeeded in reaching his ship, Odysseus puts to sea, scoffing at Polyphemus, but the Cyclops hears him and throws giant rocks at Odysseus' boats. Similar motifs—a hero blinding a giant and making his escape hidden under a sheep's skin, a giant throwing rocks at escaping boats, etc.—are encountered in the northern legends about Egil and Asmud, about Hrolfr and about Odd. As was noted above, the latter is reminiscent of the *Chronicle* tale about Oleh. In the Ukrainian oral tradition there is a tale about a one-eyed, man-eating old woman called *Lyxo-odnooke* (One-eyed misery). Here also the hero blinds his captor, makes his escape in a sheepskin coat which he has turned inside out and hides among a herd of rams. While he is escaping the old woman throws an axe at him. Similar tales are also found in Russian folklore.

Despite the great similarity between these tales, scholars have not yet been able to establish whether this theme was derived from the Indo-European heritage or borrowed later by one people from another. Tales such as these are believed to have originated in Sicily (a colony of Greece in ancient times). It is possible that the Scandinavians adopted this tale from the Greeks. (This possibility must always be considered because the Scandinavians are known to have visited Byzantium. In one case, they were there in the capacity of mercenaries and could easily have brought back many Byzantine legends, tales and stories.) On the other hand, the Slavs could have acquired it from either the Greeks or the Scandinavians and this could have happened at a much later date (perhaps only in the seventeenth or eighteenth century through the newly established schools).

3. Tales on the theme of a contest between a father and a son whom he has never seen are also widespread. Among Indo-European peoples this theme has even become the basis for several epics: for example, the German song about Hildebrand (eighth century), the Persian tale about Rustam and Suhrab included in Firdusi's long epic *Shah Namah*, the contest between Odysseus and his son Telegonos (not included in Homer's account of Odysseus' adventures), similar Celtic tales and finally the contest between Il'ja Morovec' ("Muromec'") and his

son "Skol'nik" in a Russian epic song. However, as was the case with the theme of the blinding of the giant, no definitive explanation of this recurring theme has been made. While some scholars argue that the theme of the German epic was borrowed from the Slavs (which must have occurred before the eighth century), others believe that it came to the Slavs from Persia as late as the sixteenth or seventeenth century. In its contemporary form, the epic song about Il'ja Morovec' and his son does have features that are of later origin but this does not mean that its *theme* was not known to the Slavs in an older form. It may have been of Indo-European origin.

4. There are many more themes which were widespread among the Indo-European peoples, even occasionally among those which had hardly any direct contact (the Slavs and the Celts, the Slavs and the Hindus).

Among these are the many variants of the theme of the slaying of a dragon (among the Eastern Slavs—Dobrynja, Michael Potok, Kožumjaka). However, in this case we have definite indications of foreign influences, that is, of the influence of the Christian tradition, which provided the models for the dragon-slayers (Saint George, Saint Theodore Tyro) as well as the general format of the legends (the East-Slavic Michael Potok was modelled on the Bulgarian saint, Michael of Potok).

Heroes that are fatherless in the literal sense of the word are also common to the folklore of Indo-European peoples. They are fathered by trees, born from eggs or magically conceived as a result of the fact that the mother ate a pike or drank some broth made from it (the mother is a dog, a cow, etc.). The Russian epic hero, Vol'ga, is said to have been born in such an unnatural manner. In fact, the circumstances of his birth are reminiscent of the account given in an old romance of the birth of Alexander of Macedon (see Ch. II, pt. D, sec. b, no. 2): his mother has a dream about a serpent. Furthermore, even the historical Prince Vselav is described by the *Chronicle* as "having been born to his mother with the aid of sorcery." This motif could be of Indo-European origin—it is encountered also in Celtic folklore (even with respect to *historical figures*). However, this fact has also not yet been established.

Many common features are found in tales such as the one about Ox. (Ox appears when the father sighs, uttering the sound "ox.") Ox takes the father's child away with him. The child returns later, having learned the art of metamorphosis and sets about acquiring wealth for the father: he transforms himself into a horse, then a hawk, then a greyhound, has his father sell him and returns home afterwards in human form. This motif (and sometimes even the entire tale) is common to the Mongols, the peoples of the Caucasus, the Abyssinians and some of the Indo-European peoples—the Hindus, the Greeks

and the Italians (where the same name "Ox" is used). It also appears in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Erysichthon and his daughter Mestra). Examples of this type are numerous.

5. Some of the examples discussed above clearly date from very early times and belong to the period of old Ukrainian literature. The tales about Oleh, Prince Vseslav, Dobrynja, Vol'ga, Michael Potok, Kožumjaka and Il'ja Morovec' can be ascribed to the Kievan period with a certain amount of confidence (see Ch. III, pt. I, and Ch. IV, pt. F). However, the time when ethnographers will be able to devise even isolated criteria on the basis of which they can draw conclusions about the Indo-European origins of individual tales and elements is still in the future. The fact that it is occasionally possible to establish the "genealogy" of individual tales even now indicates that this task is not hopeless. At present, we can only assert that some contemporary tales which have been preserved from the pre-Christian and Kievan periods were not of Indo-European origin, but we cannot specify which of them belong to this category.

## II.

### TRANSLATED AND BORROWED LITERATURE

#### A. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. The beginnings of literature among the Eastern Slavs are linked with the adoption of Christianity. The first literary center was Kiev. Only much later did literary activity begin in Novgorod, and later still in the northeast (Suzdal', etc.). Borrowed and translated literature formed the main constituent of the oldest literature. From the very beginning Kiev was able to utilize the relatively well-developed literature of the previously Christianized Balkan and Moravian Slavs. The process of borrowing from the Church Slavonic heritage of other peoples progressed quite rapidly. In the initial stages, Kiev appears to have been more closely linked not with the Greek but rather with the Bulgarian Church.

2. However, it was not long before translations began to be made specifically for Kievan Rus'—partly perhaps in Constantinople with only the participation of Kievans, and later in Kiev itself. The *Chronicle* mentions that translation and copying was being done in Kiev during the time of Jaroslav: "And he collected many scribes and many books were copied or translated from Greek into Slavonic" (1037). As we shall see, it is even possible to specify approximately what was translated by Jaroslav's "commission."

The works translated by this commission were numerous and quite broad in scope. This not only enriched Kievan literature but also changed its character somewhat, as Jaroslav's commission translated secular as well as Church books.

3. In the following periods this dual process of borrowing and translating books of South or West Slavonic origin continued. Later the center of translation was transferred in large part from Kiev to Mount Athos.



Periods of political or stylistic change or cultural decline had a marked impact on original monuments; the nature of original works changed quite rapidly and occasionally quite decidedly from century to century. Originals were sometimes almost totally reworked several times within a short period (the *Chronicle*, Daniel's "Supplication," etc.). Conversely, relatively few translated works were subjected to such a basic reworking; frequently they were preserved for centuries with few or no changes. As a result, translated works extant only in sixteenth, seventeenth, or eighteenth century copies frequently allow judgments to be made about their original form.

4. While our primary concern will be with the original literature of Ukraine—Rus'—we cannot ignore the translated works of this period, which played an important role in the evolution of the original literature. The language, style, structure, and content of the latter were greatly influenced by translated works. To the extent that such judgments can be made, this influence can also be observed in the sphere of folk poetry.

In large part these translated works were of early Christian or Helleno-Christian origin; uniquely Byzantine influences did exist but they were not dominant.

## B. LITURGICAL BOOKS

1. One of the basic motivating forces behind the development of literature in Kievan Rus' was the need for liturgical books and texts of the Bible itself. Both already existed in Moravian and Bulgarian translations. Necessary for divine services, they were brought to Moravia and Bulgaria together with Christianity.

2. The Bible was used both in teaching the basic principles of the Christian faith and in the performance of divine service. Thus, the Gospel existed in two forms: as the full text of the Gospel [*Četveroevangelie (Tetraevangelion)*], or as texts of those passages that were read in church throughout the week (*Evangelije-aprakos*), only on Sundays (such was the *Ostromir* Gospel of 1056-57, preserved in the oldest dated East Slavic manuscript and written perhaps by a Kievan scribe for the Novgorodian mayor, Ostromir) or throughout the year (Galician Gospel from 1144). In addition, there existed two analogous forms of "The Apostle"—the full text (extant in thirteenth century manuscripts), or texts of passages selected for divine services (extant in twelfth century manuscripts). The Book of Psalms (*Psalter*) was the most widespread and significant of the books of the Old Testament. Some variants of the Psalter (*tolkovaja Psaltir*) included explanations of difficult passages (such annotations were made by Athanasius of Alexandria and Theodosius of Crypt). In addition,

the Book of Psalms was used for fortune-telling; there were variants (fortune-telling *Psalters*) that contained numerous comments about the significance of various passages. It was believed that knowledge about the future and the unknown, or advice about what should be done in a given situation, could be obtained by opening the book at random and reading the first passage that struck the eye.

For several centuries after Christianization the Old Testament was mostly known in the form of the *Paremejnik* (*Paroemenarium*—a selection of quotations used during divine service). The *Paroemenarium* was not only read by the clergy in church but was also carefully read and reread by the flock: numerous quotations from the *Paroemenarium* are to be found in works of the eleventh and twelfth centuries (e.g., the *Chronicle*). Translations of the *Pentateuch* (the Books of Moses) and the *Octateuch* (the *Pentateuch* and the Books of Nahum, Judges, and Ruth) also existed. And finally, there were Books of the Prophets in both plain and annotated versions (the annotated versions did not include the full text).

The literary aspects of the Bible—the broad scope of its subject matter and the great variety of styles—must also be considered. The rhetorical style of the Prophets, the attractive images and comparisons (parables) of the Gospels, the elevated poetry of the Book of Psalms, etc.—all of this, from the point of view of both content and style, undoubtedly had a great impact. In fact, imitations of the various styles found in the Bible are encountered not only in religious literature (sermons) but also in secular monuments (in the *Chronicle* and even in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*). In addition, direct quotations from the Bible are frequently included in various literary works, as many of the Books of the Bible (Proverbs, Zachariah, Ecclesiastes) are composed mainly of interesting proverbs. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, F. Skoryna expressed just such a thought in his introduction to his edition of the Bible: “The Bible contains military and chivalrous tales that are more authentic than those about Alexander and Troy” as well as a moral philosophy. Furthermore, for those who “wish to learn music, or rather songs [Skoryna is referring to “poetry”], [the Bible] will provide numerous examples of poetry and holy songs.”

3. Liturgical books also belong to the category of poetry, for they contain the best Greek Christian poetry from a period of several centuries. There can be no doubt that in the first centuries after Christianization both the aesthetic and spiritual aspects of the liturgical songs had a great impact on their listeners, since, at that time, the Church Slavonic language was closer to the vernacular and more readily comprehended than in later times. That such in fact was the case is testified to by the *Chronicle* tale about the Greek divine service witnessed

by Volodymyr the Great's emissaries in Constantinople. They are said not to have known "if they were on earth or in heaven" and to have told Volodymyr: "We will never forget its beauty." Such aesthetic impressions favored the utilization of elements of liturgical and Biblical poetry in the monuments of old Ukrainian literature.

The most frequently used liturgical books were the *Služebnik* (*Liturgicon*) and the *Trebnik* (*Euchologion*), which provided instructions on how divine services and church ceremonies were to be performed. These books provided many good examples of religious poetry. And finally, there were also collections of Church songs such as the *Triod'* (*Triodion*), the *Pisna* (songs for Lent), the *Cvitna* (songs for Eastertide), and the *Oktojix* (*Oktoechos*). In the so-called *Služebnye Minei* (*Menaia for Church Services* extant in eleventh century transcriptions from Novgorod), such songs (hymns, canticles, etc.) were arranged in the order in which they were to be sung throughout the year. The first texts to come to Kiev were Slavonic translations of Bulgarian *Menaia*. Later, the translated text was supplemented by original Slavic material. Of high literary value, these books had a great influence on the original literature of Kievan Rus', on numerous services performed for Slavic saints, on the form of prayers, and also on secular literature.

## C. RELIGIOUS LITERATURE

### a. Canonical Christian Literature

1. The Bible was designated for reading as well as for use in divine services. Especially among the clergy, who constituted a large proportion of the writers of Kievan Rus', there were many individuals who were well acquainted with the texts of the Bible and the liturgical books. However, there were also religious works meant specifically for reading—hagiographic and homiletic literature.

2. "Lives" are a very old form of Christian literature. Translated hagiographic works existed in two forms: as collections of Lives and as individual Lives. *The Menaia for Daily Reading*, a large collection of "Lives" consisting of 12 volumes, each of which was designed for a specific month of the year and including sermons as well as Lives, was translated in Bulgaria (perhaps not all of its volumes). The Lives were quite broad in scope and extremely varied in content, and they provided a large gallery of "Christian heroes." Frequently well written and at least as interesting from the point of view of plot as the secular novels, hagiographic works were repeatedly reworked in later periods. In addition to biographies of saints, the *Menaia for Daily Reading* also includes

migratory legends connected with one saint or another: the Life of Philaretus the Charitable is similar to the Faust legend; the Life of Conon of Isauria is akin to the legendary tale about demons who obey a saint, etc. These Lives were read both for their didactic content and their entertainment value.

Short Lives were collected in a rather large, two-volume miscellany, *Prolog* (*Prologue*; Synaxarion or Menologion): this miscellany consisted of moralistic tales and of short Lives arranged according to the days of the year. Translated first either in Kiev or in Constantinople with the participation of a Kievan translator, *Prologue* was acquired by the South Slavs only later. This translation appears to have been made at the beginning of the twelfth century. Over the centuries, *Prologue* was reworked and enlarged; already in the thirteenth century it was three times as large as the Greek original. The additions consisted of moralizing tales from various Lives and from the Patericons, of which more will be said later. *Prologue* contains a great variety of material: numerous aphorisms, maxims, short moralizing tales (for example, about the beggar whose prayer pleased God more than the prayer of the bishop, about how Christ in the guise of a pauper visited the abbot, about the simple shepherd who was holier than the ascetics in the desert, etc.) and tales of legendary or fantastic character. Most interesting from the literary point of view are the Patericons, known from the very earliest times of the Kievan period (*Prologue* borrowed some of its tales from the Patericons). The Patericons did not include the full texts of Lives but only segments of them that provided examples of devoutness, asceticism, and good deeds. The tales of which each individual Patericon was composed derived from one particular country. The earliest of such works to reach Kievan Rus' were *Patericon of Sinae* (Palladius, fourth century), *Patericon of Skete* (Moschos, seventh century, widespread in Kievan Rus' in reworked form), *Limonar'* (*Leimonerion*, *The Spiritual Meadow*) and *Patericon of Rome* (Pope Gregory's collection from the seventh century—see pt. F, no. 3). Later many other Patericons reached Kiev. Neŭstor refers to "Patericons" in his Life of Theodosius, and the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery* was modelled on them. Patericon tales are devoted to individual episodes in the lives of saints or devout people and almost always end with a statement of the moral of the story. Such, for example, are the tales about how an angel freed a man from prison at the time when church services requested by the prisoner's relatives were being performed, about the monk Gerasimus who befriended a lion in the desert, and about the devoted ascetic who was provided with food by a magic tablecloth and who no longer knew whether the world still existed. In addition we encounter tales in the form of dialog containing witty aphorisms, and so on.

One tale describes an encounter between an ascetic and the Devil. The Devil

says: "I do precisely what you do: you fast and I eat absolutely nothing; you sleep very little and I do not sleep at all. But I can do you no harm because your humility is greater than mine." In another tale, a hermit is called to a meeting of monks at which the sinful life of one of their brothers is to be discussed. He arrives carrying a basket full of holes through which the sand it contains spills out onto the ground. When he is asked the meaning of this demonstration, he replies: "My sins also fall out behind me like this and I do not even see them. Nonetheless, I come here to judge the sins of another." In yet another tale a hermit comes to visit a bishop, who treats him to a meal containing meat. To the hermit's remark that he has never eaten meat, the bishop replies: "And I never go to bed if I have had an argument with someone." The hermit concludes that the life of a bishop is better than his own life of fasting. This tale testifies to the fact that Patericons frequently value good deeds more than asceticism. As the tales cited above indicate, the Patericons played an important role in educating their readers in the spirit of Christianity.

Individual hagiographic works dealing in more detail with the lives of particular saints were also widespread. Such Lives frequently included sections that were akin to theological tracts (such as descriptions of the end of the world, etc.). To the more important long Lives translated in the oldest period belong the Life of Anthony the Great, whose rules of self-discipline for ascetics later became a model; the Life of Sabbas of Palestine, whose type of asceticism influenced the Kievan Caves Monastery (see Ch. III, pt. D, no. 4); the Life of the popular saint, Nicholas the Wonder-Worker; the Life of Andrew the Simple, which included a fairly detailed description of his visions of the end of the world; the Life of John Chrysostomos, famous for his sermons; the Life of Alexis, which had perhaps the greatest influence on Ukrainian literature; and finally, the Lives of two Czech saints, St. Václav (Wenceslas) and St. Ludmila. These hagiographic works, which were intended as tools of instruction in Christian ethics, had a tremendous influence on the entire process of literary evolution.

3. Equally significant in this respect were the sermons, which were perhaps even more widespread than hagiographic works. While a large portion of them were translated in Bulgaria, a few translations were made in Kiev. Since this genre has not yet been thoroughly studied, erroneous conclusions are often drawn; those sermons that have been preserved only in later copies are often mistakenly attributed to various authors. Sermons were designated for reading. They provide a complete system of theology—predominantly moral theology—as well as Christian dogma and even Christian philosophy. Most frequently translated were the sermons of John Chrysostomos, Ephrem Syrus, Basil the

Great, Gregory of Nazianzus, Theodore of Studion, and Cyril of Alexandria. Occasionally sermons were collected into anthologies (this was done earlier with Byzantine sermons) under various titles: *Zlatoust* (*Chrysostom*), *Margarit* (*The Pearl*); *Izmaragd* (*The Emerald*), *Zlataja cip*' (*The Golden Chain*—both this collection and *The Emerald* later included some original Kievan sermons), and *Zlataja maticja* (*The Golden Mother*). Other collections, such as *Biser* (*The Pearl*), *Žemčug* (*The Pearl*), and *Glubina* (*The Depths*), have been lost. These sermons were of great literary value; among their authors were the most outstanding Byzantine practitioners of the rhetorical style with its logical movement of thought and its interesting rhetorical devices and images.

The following excerpt from *Chrysostom* (Kievan manuscript from the twelfth century) provides a good example of the style of these sermons. John Chrysostomos compares "the soul of a meek man" with a scene of nature at peace: "It's as if you were standing on the top of a mountain where a pure wind blows, where the sun shines, where there are pure springs, beautiful fragrant flowers and enchanting gardens. And the voice [of this person] is as sweet to those who listen to it as if various song birds—nightingales, swallows and bullfinches—perched at the top of oak trees had joined their voices into one sound; or as if the wind were blowing lightly from the east, shaking the quivering leaves, murmuring in the groves and as if the top of that mountain were covered with flowers—purple, red and white ones . . . and a breeze made them ripple like waves. Anyone who stands here will never have his fill of the fragrance and beauty of its flowers and . . . will believe himself to be in heaven not on earth. And as if from a mountain . . . a stream flows and murmurs gently, beating against the stones. . . . When you see such a scene, you understand how pleasing is a patient and gentle person." Equally graphic is Chrysostomos' description of an irritable man, whom he compares to a tempestuous and noisy city.

4. In addition to the more popular works discussed above, purely theoretical works on theological subjects were also known in translation. Among them were ascetic works (*Climax* by John Klimakos) and John Damascenus' *Theology*, which discusses questions of philosophy and language as well as purely theological issues. Commentaries on the Gospels (by the Bulgarian writer of the tenth century, Constantine the Presbyter) also existed. Such works were occasionally written in the form of questions and answers (sometimes the questions were akin to riddles), as, for example, Athanasius' *Questions*, extant in an eleventh century manuscript.

## b. Apocrypha

1. While canonical Christian literature had a great influence on the language and style of the original literature of Kievan Rus', the apocrypha had an equally significant influence on its subject matter, themes and motifs.

Apocrypha are works devoted to those events and figures of sacred history that are not recognized as canonical by the Church and are treated only sketchily in the Scriptures. Among both the Jews and the Christians, these events and figures gave rise to legends, some of them migratory in character and others original. These legends were recorded in very early times; in order that they might appear authoritative, they were frequently attributed to patriarchs or prophets, the Apostles, the Church Fathers, etc. Some of them were very widespread; many of them were used by "heretics" and some of them even originated among heretical circles. In any case, along with apocrypha that do not contradict Christian dogma, there are also those that express views that are either contrary to this dogma or blasphemous in character. As a result, the Church quickly assumed a hostile stance toward apocryphal works, banning some and tolerating others. Lists (or "indexes") of condemned works were compiled repeatedly. In Kievan Rus' mention is made of apocryphal literature as early as 1073, in the *Collection*, copied from the Bulgarian original for Prince Svjatoslav of Kiev.

2. The Old Testament apocrypha are the oldest, having originated among the Jews before the advent of Christianity. These apocrypha are based in part on ancient Jewish legends. In the Christian era there was a desire to establish stronger links between the Old and New Testaments and, consequently, the number of Old Testament apocrypha increased. Typically these legends are devoted to such subjects as the creation of the world, the lives of Adam and Eve before and after their expulsion from Paradise, the story of Noah and his ark, the lives of Moses, Abraham, David, or Solomon, as well as of persons only mentioned in the Bible (Lamech, Melchizedek). "The Commandments of the Twelve Patriarchs" were apocryphal works modelled on the prophetic books of the Bible. Others are eschatological in character, describing either the heavenly realm or the end of the world.

Equally widespread among Christian peoples were the New Testament apocrypha. They recount the events of Christ's childhood, the Virgin Mary's life, Christ's condemnation, the wanderings and fates of the Apostles, and the Apocalypse. The story of the temptation of Christ by the Devil and the story of His descent into Hell before His resurrection (the fact of Christ's descent into Hell does not itself contradict Christian dogma) also provide ample material for

apocryphal works. "The Tree of the Cross" is an example of the type of apocryphal tale that attempted to link the Old and New Testaments.

And finally, official Lives were complemented by apocryphal ones, also frequently banned by the Church. Such hagiographical works contain legendary episodes, fantastic miracles or incredible sufferings. In other cases, prophecies about the end of the world are included.

3. In spite of the prohibitions of the Church, apocryphal literature was widespread in the Christian world. In both Eastern and Western Christendom, it was of basically the same content. References to it are even to be found in the New Testament (as in The Letter of Jude, where the prophecies of Enoch are described; however, no such description is to be found in the Old Testament). The apocrypha had an enormous influence on world literature. Echoes of them are found in the Western oral tales about the magician, Merlin, in mystery plays, in the works of Dante and, in modern times, in epic works on themes from sacred history by such authors as Milton, Klopstock, Ševčenko [*"Marija"* ("Mary")], and Rilke (*"Marienlieder"*). In Ukraine in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the previously existent apocryphal material was supplemented by new translations or oral tales of Western origin. Many apocryphal themes and motifs found their way into the oral tradition, especially the legends and the so-called spiritual verses. Apocryphal literature also had a great impact on the visual arts; ancient icons include numerous details derived from apocrypha.

4. It is difficult to establish precisely which apocrypha were known in Kievan Rus'. There are some apocryphal works extant in manuscripts from this early period: "The Acts of Paul and Thekla" (eleventh century), "The Virgin's Harrowing of Hell" (twelfth century), "The Word of Aphroditian" (thirteenth century), etc. Evidence of the existence of apocrypha is also provided by references to them and quotations from them found in monuments of the Kievan period; aside from collections of Old Testament stories, which are composed in large part of apocryphal material, such references are found in the chronicles (several apocryphal motifs are included in the sermon that the Greek "philosopher" preached before Volodymyr the Great) and in the "Tale" of Borys and Hlib, where the apocryphal Life of Nicetas is mentioned. Numerous apocryphal motifs are found in *"Хо́женіє па́ломника Даниїла"* ("The Pilgrimage of Abbot Daniel"). Cyril of Turiv refers to apocrypha, and echoes of them are even encountered in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* (the phrase "Not of their own free will have the trees shed their leaves" is reminiscent of the apocryphal "Confession of Eve"). Also known in the Kievan period were the apocrypha connected with the Bulgarian heretical sect, the Bogomils (tenth and eleventh



centuries), and the Gospel of Nicodemus, which probably came to Kiev from the western Slavs (see below). The apocryphal elements in the visual arts provide only questionable evidence of the existence of apocrypha in Kievan Rus', as they may have been borrowed directly from Byzantine models; knowledge of literary works was not always obligatory.

5. Thus we can conclude that the following Old Testament apocrypha were known in the Kievan period: tales about Adam; "The Confession of Eve"; Bogomil apocrypha, in which the Devil is a co-creator and contaminator of the world; the legend of Adam's temptation and his signing over of his soul to the Devil; "The Tree of the Cross," where it is said that Adam's grave was beneath the tree from which was made the cross on which Christ was crucified, and in this way Adam's skull found its way to Golgotha where the Saviour's blood dripped on it, "washing away" Adam's sins (a typical naive tale, based on the biblical image of "washing away sins"); "Enoch's Book," which describes Enoch's visions in heaven and his descendents up to and including Noah; the legend about Lamech, who supposedly killed Cain; "The Commandments of the Twelve Patriarchs," moral tales (of Jewish origin) linked with Old Testament prophecies about the coming of the Messiah; the legend of Abraham (particularly interesting is his battle against paganism); the life of Moses; the apocalypses of Baruch and Isaiah.

6. In the category of New Testament apocrypha known in Kievan Rus' we can include the Gospel of Jacob, which describes the events of the Virgin Mary's life (her childhood, the annunciation by the Angel Gabriel, the birth of Christ) and the fate of John the Baptist (his mother, Elizabeth, takes him to the mountains where she hides him from his would-be murderers dispatched by Herod) and the death of his father, Zacharias; the Gospel of Thomas, in which the depiction of Christ's childhood includes many miraculous events (the bringing to life of birds fashioned by the child, etc.); Christ is here such an un-Christian and cruel legendary figure that this apocrypha was not widely known (the oldest manuscripts are from the fourteenth century and of Bogomil origin). The important Gospel of Nicodemus and the apocryphal works linked with it ("The Letter of Pilate to Emperor Tiberius," "The Death of Pilate," and the story of Joseph of Arimathea) all recount—in more detail than the Bible—the passion and death of Christ as well as His descent into hell; selections from the Gospel of Nicodemus were even read in Church during Holy Week. Two translations of it existed—one was of Bohemian-Moravian origin (made from the Latin text) and the other of Bulgarian origin. Linked with the Gospel of Nicodemus were the apocryphal sermons of Euphemius of Alexandria and Epiphanius of Cyprus. There are also apocrypha that describe the sermons given

by the Apostles, the miracles they performed, and their deaths. Some Bogomil apocrypha tell of how Christ "was invested into the priesthood" or "how He plowed a field," etc. Also widespread were both "The Word of Aphroditian about the Miracle in the Land of Persia," which recounts the story of the prophecies about the coming of Christ made by Persian idols at the time of His birth, and "The Virgin's Harrowing of Hell," a depiction of hell and its tortures, similar to the "Revelations of the Apostle Paul."

7. Also popular were the apocryphal Lives such as those of Georgius, Nicetas, and Theodore of Tyro. Some of them influenced either secular tales (Michael of Potok) or religious tales about dragon-slayers (George, Theodore of Tyro). Other apocryphal Lives describe the end of the world: "The Revelation of St. John the Divine on Mount Tabor," "Colloquy of the Three Prelates," "The Revelation of St. Methodius of Patara" (or Olympus), "The Life of Basil the New," and "The Life of Nyfont." In Kievan Rus' some of these were not proscribed.

There were also shorter apocryphal works, such as sermons containing apocryphal details and sometimes even elements of superstition.

On Slavic territory works based on superstition were linked with the truly apocryphal works. Most of the apocrypha mentioned above were labelled as "rejected books," but those based on superstitions were described as "hated books rejected by God." These were mainly "handbooks" for fortune-telling. Thunder, lightning, or the flight of birds could be used to foretell the future; needless to say, dreams were also used. However, this kind of literature is linked with apocrypha only in that it too was proscribed. Indications are that most of it came to the eastern Slavs only later and primarily to Moscow, at that. Consequently, its literary significance is not very great.

8. The subject matter of the apocryphal works had a much greater influence on the original literature of Kievan Rus' than did their form. Insofar as apocrypha were not under the protection of the Church, their language and style changed readily from one copy to the next. In addition, the original texts were quite primitive in form and the Slavonic translations of them were frequently made without sufficient attention to their stylistic aspects. But because their subject matter was most often very interesting and of legendary character, they lent themselves to secular adaptations in the form of either written or oral tales. However, some apocrypha were also significant as religious works, such as the moving story of the torments in hell and Virgin Mary's kindness to sinners. Others served to popularize Christian dogma; such were "The Tree of the Cross" and the outstanding Gospel of Nicodemus. Still others painted sentimentalized and idyllic pictures of the lives of the Virgin Mary and Christ (Gospel of

Jacob, etc.). In any case, apocrypha belong not only to the category of superstition but also to the realm of Christian faith.

## D. SECULAR LITERATURE

### a. Scholarly Works

1. The “secular” nature of the translated literature in general and the scholarly works in particular is only relative. In the tenth and eleventh centuries the belief that total harmony did and ought to exist between religion and other spheres of knowledge was so strong that any issue could be resolved merely by reference to Christian dogma or the Holy Scriptures. Thus, while many of the scholarly works of the Kievan period may now appear to have too great a religious and ecclesiastical coloration, in their historical context they satisfied the requirements of scholarship. However, most of the “scholarship” of Kievan Rus’, with the possible exception of theological works, was exclusively of the popular variety. In large part, works of this type were translated in Kiev.

2. A significant part of scholarly literature is formed by historical works. A translation of the *Chronicle of John Malalas* (sixth century) came to Kievan Rus’ from Bulgaria; it records mainly the events of ancient and early Byzantine history to the time of Emperor Justinian and includes many interesting tales of a fantastic nature. Since the *Primary Chronicle* quotes from it under the year 1114, it must have come to Kiev in the eleventh century. The *Chronicle of John Malalas* was later included in various chronicle compilations (see Ch. III, no. 5). The less interesting *Chronicle of Georgius Hamartolos* (“the sinner”) focuses on Byzantine history, presenting a rather superficial account of events, much anecdotal material and a great deal of historico-cultural information pertaining to such things as theological debates and even philosophy (later copies frequently abridged these sections). Indications are that the *Chronicle of Georgius Hamartolos* was translated collectively, as the language of the Slavonic text contains various old East Slavic elements as well as South Slavic and Moravian ones. This fact can be explained in two different ways. It can be postulated that these various linguistic elements testify to the fact either that Jaroslav’s translation commission was composed of people of various Slavic nationalities or that the translation was made in Constantinople. The *Chronicle of Georgius Hamartolos* was widely known in Kievan Rus’ and was even employed by the author of the *Primary Chronicle*. The *Chronicle of Georgius Sincellus* (eighth or ninth century), which provided a much more condensed account of both sacred and Byzantine history, was not as widely known. Other

chronicles are either less interesting (such as the history of the oecumenical councils included in the *Collection* of 1073), or their existence in the Kievan period is doubtful (*Chronicle of Constantine Manassius*, written in a very ornamental style, came to the eastern Slavs only later).

In the Chronicles mentioned above (Malalas, Hamartolos, Manassius), motifs of the so-called "euhemeristic" type are encountered. Formulated in the fourth century before the birth of Christ by the Greek philosopher Euhemerus, euhemerism held that the pagan "gods" were merely later deifications of important figures (princes, political and cultural leaders) of earlier times. This view is even occasionally expressed in some religious literature (the Lives of Paul and Juliania, which were translated from the Greek, and some old Jewish works). It later became standard practice to include mention of euhemerism in chronographic works. Such was even the case in the Kievan portion of the *Hypatian Chronicle*, where this theory was included under the year 1114. Together with the officially sanctioned theory that the pagan religion was the Devil's creation, euhemeristic theory was still widely known as late as the sixteenth century.

3. Josephus Flavius' *History of the Jewish War* (covering the period from the second century before Christ to the destruction of Jerusalem) was interesting to its readers by the very nature of its content. The Slavonic translation, which appears to have been made in Kiev, contains expanded versions of the lives of Christ and John the Baptist. (The origin of these additions has not yet been established. While they are not present in any of the manuscripts that have been preserved, it is possible they were included among those that were lost.) Interest in Flavius' narrative also stemmed from its masterful form: this work provides one of the best examples of the style of the Byzantine military tale. Furthermore, its high literary value was not obscured by the Slavonic translation, which was light and natural. Some parts of it, such as the descriptions of the Roman army ("Their ears were sharply attuned, their eyes fixed on the banners, their arms tensed for battle") and of battle scenes ("And you could see the breaking of spears, and the clashing of swords, and shields being cleft and the earth drinking the blood," "arrows darkened the sun," the dead "feel like bales of hay," etc.) influenced the military tales included in the chronicles and even *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*.

4. The most important works on natural science were the "Hexaemeron" ("Šestodnevi")—compilations of the facts of natural history related to the six days of creation. In these works we find short résumés of secular theories and polemics with them, as well as discussions of the philosophic teaching about the elements, the movement of the heavenly bodies, and information about animals

and plants. "Hexaemerons" were not solely encyclopaedias of factual material, since they also provided symbolic interpretations of natural phenomena and drew moral or religious conclusions from various theories of a popular character. Both of the "Hexaemerons" preserved from the Kievan period were translations from Bulgarian—the *Hexaameron of Basil the Great* and its adaptation by the Bulgarian writer John the Exarch (ninth and tenth centuries) who expanded Basil's text by adding material probably taken from other Hexaemerons. In these works mention is made of Plato, Aristotle, and other Greek philosophers. Unfortunately, the manner of exposition is not very successful. The *Hexaameron* was included in the so-called *Tolkovaja Paleja* (*Explanatory Paleja*—Old Testament stories with commentaries).

*Fiziolog* (*Physiologus*) was another popular work of this type, containing tales about animals, rocks and trees. In addition, it included fantastic details about animals and their symbolic meanings: the bee signified industriousness; the phoenix, resurrection; the dove, loyalty (the image of the dove that cries for its mate found in Volodymyr Monomax's "Letter" is also included in *Physiologus*). Real and legendary facts are explained (e.g., a lioness' cubs are born dead but in three days' time the lion breathes life into them: a symbol of resurrection). Mention is also made of other mythical creatures such as the salamander, which was supposed to be able to live in fire. The images presented in *Physiologus* were even employed by the Church Fathers and in sermons as late as the eighteenth century; there are many of them in Skovoroda's works.

The geographic and cosmographic outline of Cosmas Indicopleustes (sixth century) was translated in Kiev in the twelfth century (one manuscript contains a great many drawings); the description of the earth conforms to the popular conception of that time (the earth is a rectangular plane, etc.). Among other things, information about exotic animals is given.

5. Of lesser literary significance are the translations of works on ecclesiastical law, such as *Kormčaja* (or *Nomocanon*). The first translation of Johannes Scholasticus' *Nomocanon* belongs to the period of Cyril and Methodius. While Patriarch Photius' version arrived later, even his annotated version was known by the thirteenth century. The Eastern elements in the translation (*Kormčaja*) testify to the Moravian origin of at least some of its parts.

6. Some miscellanies are of a more secular nature. Svjatoslav's *Collection* of 1073 contains historical (about the cathedrals of various lands, about chronology) and literary items (about "tropes and figures" and "images" by George Choeroboscus) in addition to theological ones. Choeroboscus' short work served as the manual of poetics in Kievan Rus'. Each literary device named is accompanied by an example. Thus, to describe a person as rushing along "like

the wind” is given as an example of hyperbole (exaggeration), while antonomasia (the use of a person’s characteristics instead of his name) is illustrated by examples in which the name of a person is replaced by “the lame one” or “the carpenter.” By a strange coincidence both of these are employed by the *Chronicle* in the section describing the war between Jaroslav the Wise and Svjatopolk; when Jaroslav comes to Kiev with his army of Novgorodians, the Kievans laugh at him: “And why have you carpenters come here with this lame one?” (Jaroslav really was lame.) Examples of various types of irony are also provided.

Collections of quotations and adages (by Maximus the Confessor from the seventh century and its later reworkings) were very widespread. Occasionally the quotations were expanded to the extent that they formed miniature fables. Taken mostly from philosophers and writers, these quotations were almost always didactic in nature. Maximus’ *Melissa* was probably first translated in Kiev in the thirteenth century; later, this initial text [*Pčela (The Bee)*] made its way to other centers and was subjected to alterations. Similar collections, such as *One Hundred Maxims* by Gennadius of Constantinople, also existed (in the *Collection* of 1076—see Ch. III, pt. E). In addition, both shorter bits of a more secular nature (in the collection mentioned above) and collections of questions and answers whose originality is debatable [*Izbornik (Collection)*] from the thirteenth century—see Ch. IV, pt. I] were known in the Kievan period.

Collections of quotations were either expanded or abridged in later years, individual articles from various miscellanies were selected for recopying, and new collections containing both translated and original material appeared. In addition, the material that was copied was also frequently altered.

*The Bee* contains many short didactic tales that would now be called anecdotes. Socrates is said to have told the following to a person who wished to have his picture painted on a rock: “You wish that the rock should resemble you but you are not interested in guaranteeing that you yourself do not come to resemble the rock.” A witty retort to a person who rebukes him for visiting unclean places is ascribed to Diogenes: “The sun also shines on unclean places and does not become soiled.” Having been informed that he had been abused by someone, Isocrates is said to have replied: “If you had not listened to his remarks with so much interest, he would not have abused me.” The statement that “if God answered everyone’s prayers . . . then the entire human race would become extinct, for in their prayers people ask God to bring misfortune to others” is attributed to Epicurus. There are also anecdotes emphasizing the value of culture. Such is the description of the encounter between the King of Sicily and Xenophon, who was asked his opinion of Homer by the King; when

Xenophon abuses Homer, the King asks: "How many slaves do you have?" to which Xenophon replies: "I have two slaves and I can barely keep them fed." Then the King replies: "And you are not ashamed to revile Homer who feeds thousands of people even after his death." (The King is referring to those people who made their living performing Homer's works.) Most of the anecdotes are didactic in character, such as the phrases ascribed to Aristotle: "The man who triumphs over passion is stronger than the one who conquers warriors"; and to Plato: "He who accepts great power must have great intelligence" and "True knowledge begins when one recognizes one's lack of knowledge." There are also many aphorisms of a secular nature: in *The Bee*, Alexander the Great is alleged to have said to warriors who wanted to attack the enemy at night: "This would not be a princely victory" (the code of chivalry). Similar in character is the report of an encounter between Cyrus, the Persian king, and some young men who were accused of abusing him while they were drunk; asked by Cyrus if this were true, one of the young men replies: "We did say such things and would have said even more if we had more wine." Furthermore, these miscellanies also include rather lengthy tales, some of which formed the basis of Ukrainian folk anecdotes, adages, and proverbs. Encountered even in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are expressions such as: "It is not the wealthy man who is happy but the man who has no need of wealth" (a similar expression is found in Skovoroda's works) or "I was born naked and naked will I go to my grave" (this is the theme of one of Velyčkovs'kyj's poems). Some of the anecdotes in these collections also appear in various Patericons. Each section of *The Bee* begins with a quotation from the Bible or the Church Fathers, and only then are more secular materials recorded.

In addition to the miscellanies mentioned above, several other shorter collections of quotations have been preserved. Almost all of these were translations from Greek, while a few also contain Latin and Polish elements. All such collections contributed to the treasury of Ukrainian proverbs.

The most interesting of these shorter collections was the one that included selections from the comedies of Menander (fourth century before Christ). While it is possible that a small fraction of these quotations were merely ascribed to Menander, nonetheless this collection, as well as *The Bee*, provided the reader with authentic facts about Greek literature and especially about its moral values.

7. Almost exclusively of a popular character, scientific literature, with the exception of historiography (chronicles and chronographs) and the biblical exegeses (such as that by Clement Smoljatyč), did not succeed in laying the foundations for independent scholarly activity. However, its literary significance was great. From the medieval point of view, all aspects of the universe were

believed to have a symbolic and religious meaning: historical events, animals, plants, heavenly bodies and rocks were all assumed to have parallels in the heavenly realm. As a result, writers of religious works eagerly drew on this scientific material. Some scientific works (Malalas, Flavius, the “Hexaemeron” and *Physiologus*) were used as models of literary style in various genres. Therefore, it is of little wonder that the chronicles bear traces of various scientific works. Even more influential were collections, such as *The Bee*, which had an impact on a broad spectrum of literary genres, from the sermon to folk proverbs and adages. It is interesting to note that the works translated in Kiev from Bulgarian texts were significantly expanded by the inclusion of new material. Furthermore, the translations done in Kiev were broad in scope: works such as those of Hamartolos and Flavius consisted of numerous volumes. Although the flowering of activity in the realm of translation did not last very long, its products continued to exist even in the eighteenth century. Works translated in Kiev penetrated into the Balkans. Some of them remained of interest for many centuries; such, for example, was the work of Flavius, which was translated anew from Polish in the seventeenth century.

## b. The Narrative

1. As has been demonstrated above, the translated scientific literature both provided the reader with a great deal of interesting material and unquestionably had a great influence on the original literature of the Kievan period. At the same time individual narratives were also translated, very probably by the same group of Kievan translators who worked on the translation of religious and scientific works. In any case, from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries several narratives were translated.

2. *Aleksandrija* (*Alexandreis*) is the story of Alexander the Great, a favorite theme of medieval literature. To the real adventurous events of this famous warrior's life, this work adds numerous fantastic or legendary ones. Alexander's campaigns provide an opportunity for a great deal of information about the various peoples that he encounters to be included in the narrative. The facts of Alexander's life and the tragic fates of his enemies were themselves sufficient to surpass the bounds of reason. Although attributed to Callisthenes, a contemporary of Alexander, this romance was probably written in the second or third century after the birth of Christ in the area of the cultural hegemony of Alexandria (the role of Egypt is hyperbolized); for this reason it is referred to as “pseudo-Callisthenian.” In the fifth century it was simultaneously reworked in both Greek and Latin texts, to which an even greater number of fantastic details



were added. A later Greek version with a Christian orientation portrays Alexander as a supporter of Jewish monism (Aristotle) and as a prophet of the coming of Christ. The Slavic translations of this romance were made from the second Greek text, which was simultaneously reworked and Christianized. In Bulgaria, it was included in the *Chronicle of John Malalas* and was then incorporated into various Kievan chronographs in this form. In the thirteenth century (probably in the northeast) it was revised again, with new Christian elements being added. In the East Slavic version Alexander is the son not of Philip but of the Egyptian king-priest Nektanebus; his birth is preceded by various omens (thunder, lightning and an earthquake) and his fate is predicted by magical signs. His upbringing, his horse (who eats human flesh), his youthful games—all are unusual. Immediately upon his ascension to the throne, he begins his campaign against the Persians. In addition to his great victories over the Persian king, Darius, and over the Indian king, Porus, the romance describes real (Palestine) and legendary or semi-legendary countries and peoples (the Amazons, the Raxmans or Brahmins), the wonders that Alexander saw in these places, and the interesting adventures that he experienced. In Babylon his wine is poisoned and he dies amidst numerous signs. The most widespread East Slavic version of this romance originated in a later period, but the style of this narrative affected earlier works such as the *Galician Chronicle* and various epic tales (e.g., about Vol'ga—see Ch. III, pt. I, no. 4).

3. *Trojanskoe dejanie* (*The Deeds of Troy*) also derives from the Greek and Roman classics (Homer, Virgil). It came to Kiev from Bulgaria in a version attributed to Dictys as part of the *Chronicle of John Malalas*. The events near Troy are said to have occurred before the time of David. In addition to the Trojan wars, the narrative includes accounts of Odysseus' escape and the fate of the Greeks after the end of the war. Divergences from the Homeric version are numerous, and it includes a broad spectrum of Greek legends. The style is dry but not totally lacking in narrative skill. The description of characters is interesting: Helen is "attractive in appearance and height; she has a well-shaped bosom, is as white as snow and young in appearance; her brows, nose and face are charming; she has golden blond hair, large eyes, a cheerful disposition and a soft voice; an amazing specimen of womankind, her age was twenty-six." Although it is impossible to provide specific examples of the influence of the story of Troy on the literature of the Kievan period, it was included in the same chronographs as the *Alexandreis*.

4. *Devgenievo dejanie* (*The Deeds of Digenis*), a translation of the Greek epic about Digenis Akritas, is the most interesting monument. The original Greek text is not extant and it is known only in a later amended version

(sixteenth or seventeenth century) that was not republished until the nineteenth century. Of the translations made in the Kievan period, only four were preserved; three of these are incomplete, while the fourth was destroyed by fire just before it was to be published. The following is a summary of its content: the Arabian king Amir ("the Emir" in the Greek text) abducts a Greek girl; persecuted by her brothers, he decides to embrace Christianity. From this union Digenis Akritas ("born of two races": of a "Saracen" and a Greek) was born. Even in his childhood, he is attracted to the sword and lance and loves to ride horses. At the age of fourteen he goes hunting, at which time he kills an elk and a bear with only his bare hands, by ripping them apart, and he kills a lion with his sword. While washing away the blood at a spring, Digenis kills a many-headed dragon that attacked him. Then he begins to dream about military feats, and an opportunity to fulfil his dreams soon arrives: King Filipat ("Philippapos" in the Greek text) and his daughter Maximijana ("Maximo the Amazon" in the Greek text) send him an invitation to visit their palace, but when he arrives he is attacked by their army, which he defeats. However, he learns from Filipat and his daughter that there is a still stronger enemy, Stratyh ("the General" in the Greek text) whose daughter, Stratyhovna ("the General's daughter" in the Greek text) is even more beautiful than Filipat's daughter, Maximijana. Digenis accepts the challenge. When he arrives he reveals himself a gallant cavalier, plays serenades under Stratyhovna's windows, and succeeds in making her fall in love with him so that this unapproachable beauty even agrees to run off with him. With his sons and his army, Stratyh pursues them, but he is defeated by Digenis, who then marries Stratyhovna. After this, Digenis also defeats King Basil and conquers his lands. According to a prophecy, Digenis is destined to live only twelve years after this. In later Greek versions, he still has various adventures, but this part of the story is absent in the extant Slavic manuscripts. It is possible that the original was composed of separate episodes or songs (the childhood of Digenis, his battles with Philippapos, the General, and Basil). As was the case with religious poetry, the translation of *The Deeds of Digenis* was made in prose. It is not impossible that the original was in poetic form and that there were two distinct translations.

*The Deeds of Digenis* is not merely an interesting example of an epic work that influenced the Kievan epos, but also perhaps the best and stylistically most luxuriant of all the works known in this period. The descriptions are extremely picturesque and replete with colors: Digenis is "very handsome, his face is [white] like snow and red like a poppy, his hair is like gold, his eyes as big as saucers and his appearance awe-inspiring"; his clothing complements his physical characteristics: he wears "black clothing interwoven with real gold and

his oversleeves are set with expensive pearls, his kneecaps are of precious silk while his boots are of gold and are decorated with precious pearls." The other characters are dressed in a similar fashion. Stratyh's "armour is of gold and his gold helmet is set with expensive stones and pearls while his horse is covered with green silk. . . ." Amir's tent is "basically red with green trim at the bottom and is decorated at the top with gold, silver, pearls and various precious stones; his brother's tent is basically blue with green trim around the bottom. . . ." Digenis' horse is "white, precious stones are woven into his mane and among these stones are golden bells"; "the horse began to prance and the bells to ring sweetly." The deeds of the characters are also described in a legendary style: "They rode off like golden-winged hawks and their horses seemed to fly beneath them"; "his horse was swift and pranced beneath him while the daring young man knew how to straddle his horse"; the heroes fight "like good mowers cut grass"; Digenis "grabbed his spear, put its tip into the river bottom and jumped across the river . . . and mounted his horse and began to race around like a good reaper mows grass"; "he descended upon them like a strong falcon and like a good mower he cut the grass." This epic even includes letters, some of which are of a romantic nature. Thus, Maximijana writes a letter to Digenis in order to entrap him like "a rabbit in a snare"; "O, light, o radiant sun, glorious Digenis: you rule . . . over all the courageous and powerful just as the month of May rules over all other months: in May all earthly beauty flowers and trees don their foliage and . . . in such a way, you, O glorious Digenis, flower among us." There are also prophetic dreams, emotional and even sentimental experiences, all expressed in the same luxuriant language: the mother of a girl abducted by Amir complains: "He stole my heart's roots and pierced my flesh as if I were a soulless reed. . . ."

This exuberant language was reflected in such historical and epic works as the *Galician Chronicle* and *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*. The Slavonic translation of *The Deeds of Digenis* appeared in Kiev not later than the twelfth century.

5. Among the translated works of the Kievan period we also encounter narratives of an "ideological," didactic character with a definite literary merit. The first of these is the "Tale of Akir the Wise," a very ancient story that originated in Assyria in the seventh century B.C. Two centuries later, it was translated into the Aramaic language, and only then did quotations from it find their way into Greek literature; in the fifth century A.D. it was translated into Syrian, while the Greek translation was made only in the tenth century from a later Arabian text (ninth century). Not later than the twelfth century, it was translated in Kiev from either the Greek or the Syrian text. The subject matter

of this tale is quite complex: Akir, counselor of King Sinagrip of Nineveh, is falsely accused by his own pupil and sentenced to death. However, he is successful in hiding from his would-be executioners. In the meantime, the Egyptian Pharaoh demands that Sinagrip either perform certain difficult tasks (build a castle in the air, sew up broken handmills, etc.) or pay tribute, but such difficult tasks can only be successfully performed by Akir. The friend at whose house Akir was hiding informs the King that Akir is still alive. Akir is sent to Egypt where he fulfills the Pharaoh's demands (in order to sew up the handmills he requests threads made from other handmills; he has boys raised into the air in baskets carried by eagles and the boys ask for building materials which the Egyptians can find no way of getting up to them, etc.). When Akir returns, he is again given the same pupil but he affects him in such a way that the boy dies. This story is interesting not so much because of the nature of its content or even because of Akir's successful performance of difficult tasks, but rather because of the numerous proverbs found amidst Akir's wise teachings. This old Assyrian tale seems to have even influenced certain books of the Bible—the Book of Zachariah and Solomon's Parables. The following are examples of some of the aphorisms included in this tale: "One small bird in the hand is worth more than a thousand birds in the air"; "When rivers flow backwards . . . or the bile tastes sweet, then the stupid will become wise"; "What you do not hear with your ears you will feel on the back of your neck," etc. Some of the proverbs are expanded into fables. These aphorisms and proverbs were utilized by the writers of the Kievan period in both original and adapted form and were also included in collections of quotations.

6. *Stefanit i Ixnilat* (*The Crowned and the Tracer*) is another "ideological" story of ancient origin. It originated in India in approximately the fifth century B.C. and was later translated into one of the old Persian literary languages. From this text it was then translated into Arabian in the eighth century (*Kalila and Dimna*) and from the Arabian into Greek in the eleventh century. In the thirteenth century, a translation from the Greek text was made in Bulgaria. This tale came to the Eastern Slavs only in the period of the Tatar yoke and later had certain Christian passages incorporated into it. Its content is similar to that of a fable: a "philosopher" recounts parables of a moral character to the King. The first of these is the story of two jackals, Stefanit and Ixnilat, who then also proceed to recount various fables. The participants are animals, some of which are exotic: wolves, foxes, rooks, elephants, lions, monkeys, etc. Individual motifs from these fables found their way both into literary works and particularly into popular tales about animals.

7. Much more significant, however, is the novel *Varlaam i Ioasaf* (*Barlaam*

and *Josaphat*), which is ideological and even philosophical in character and which tells a story about Buddha. It originated in the sixth century A.D., but the complete history of its various translations is not known. However, in the seventh century it was translated into Greek and Christianized, although individual episodes from it were known to the Greeks at an earlier date. The Greek adaptation is attributed to John of Damascus. Here Buddha becomes Josaphat, an Indian prince, while Barlaam is a hermit who also appears in the original Indian text. In the eleventh century, it was translated in Kiev (individual parts may have been translated earlier in Bulgaria) and at about the same time it appeared in the West, where it was also very popular. The moving story of Buddha, a prince who rejected the pleasures of this world because of their questionable nature, is supplemented by interesting tales narrated by Barlaam, and by other materials. Among them is one of the gems of world literature, a story about a traveller pursued by a unicorn. In order to escape from his pursuer he climbs onto a branch overhanging a ravine in which there lies a dragon, but the traveller catches sight of some honey on the tree, begins to eat it, and forgets about both the dragon and the unicorn. This symbolic tale speaks of the transitory nature of human life. Another tale tells of a bird who succeeded in obtaining his freedom from a hunter as a reward for telling the hunter the three most important rules of life: not to desire that which you cannot acquire, not to believe in things that seem false, not to regret things that were done in the past. However, the hunter forgets these rules when the nightingale tells him that it has a huge diamond in its stomach. Also interesting are the didactic tales recounted by Barlaam. The Slavonic translation of this work conveys the style of the original quite well. Its success among the Eastern Slavs is testified to by its popularity and its use (in the Ukrainian text from 1634) by poets even in the nineteenth century (by Franko among others). In the Kievan period it was included in *Prologue*, and individual tales from it were used by Kievan writers, such as Cyril of Turiv.

8. The "Story of the Indian Kingdom" is of Western origin. It appeared in the eleventh or twelfth century as the "Letter of Prester John" (a Christian Indian king) about his kingdom. A Christian utopia, the "Story of the Indian Kingdom" contrasts the strong Indian theocracy to the constant disorder in Europe. It is possible that this religious utopia was supplemented only later with legendary materials and descriptions of the luxurious life in this kingdom. In Byzantium this work came to be viewed as a pamphlet directed against the pretentiousness of the Emperor Manuel Comnenus (the story was in the form of a letter from Prester John to Manuel), whose worldly orientation is contrasted to the Indian theocracy. Translated from Latin into Slavonic somewhere in

Dalmatia, the "Story of the Indian Kingdom" undoubtedly first found its way to Galicia in the thirteenth century. (At this time one of Manuel's relatives was temporarily hiding in Galicia.) The description of the huge utopian kingdom (in one direction, it is said to extend a distance that would require a ten-month walk; in the other, the end "cannot be reached"), its mythical inhabitants (satyrs, creatures which are half-man and half-tiger, etc.), animals (griffins, phoenixes, etc.), precious stones, plants, the luxuries of the palace which exceeded those of its Byzantine counterpart, the beautiful castles and other wonders, but most importantly, the union of ecclesiastical and secular power—all this must have greatly interested its readers. The mythical details of this tale undoubtedly influenced the Galician epos (about Djuk Stepanovyč and Čurylo—see Ch. IV, pt. F). It is even possible that it influenced the *Galician Chronicle*. A large part of it was also utilized in one adapted version (northeastern) of the *Alexandreis*.

9. As has been demonstrated above, the translated tales available in Kievan Rus' were quite diverse in nature. There were heroic adventure novels akin to the epos, novels similar to Lives, "ideological" stories and military tales. These various tales provided good examples of techniques of composition, linguistic exuberance, the genre of the fable, and conciseness of expression. The influence of this type of translated literature was great both in Kiev and in Galicia. It is interesting to note that these narratives even had an impact on genres such as the chronicle.

## E. POETRY

1. East-Slavonic literature appears to have had absolutely no poetry. In view of the fact that poetry was a significant genre in Czech literature of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and in Byzantine literature, this may seem odd. In fact, the Byzantine verse form with its definite number of syllables in a line, its caesura (not obligatory), and perhaps also its stress on the penultimate syllable did come to Kievan Rus'. These old verses were recopied even later, but the features of verse that they contained were no longer noticed. Contributing to this was the change occurring in the language: by the eleventh century the back and front jers were no longer voiced. Indications are that no original poetry was written in Kiev. The word "verse" was used to designate prose adaptations of hymns.

2. The number of verses preserved is quite small. Most of them are from the Kievan period, while the later Russian ones derive from this earlier tradition. With the exception of such things as the two panegyrics to the Bulgarian king

Samuel (one of them is contained in the *Collection* of 1073), one prayer, and an introduction to the Bible in verse form, these verses were mainly of the acrostic type, in which the first letter in each line consisted of the letters of the alphabet in order. Some of these verses have over 100 lines. Here is an example (if the front and back jers are voiced, the first is similar in sound to the letter “i” and the second to the letter “u”):\*

	Number of Syllables when the jers were Voiced	Number of Syllables when the jers were No Longer Voiced
Az” slovom’ sim’ moljusja Bogu:	12	9
Bože v’sēja tvari i zižditelju	12	11
Vidimym” i nevidimym”	12	10
Gospoda Duxa pos”li živuščago,	12	11
Da v”d”xnet” v” s”rd’ce mi slovo,	12	8
Eže budet” na uspěx” v’sěm”,	12	8
Živuščim” v” zapověd’x” ti. . .	12	9

(“I pray with this word to God: Lord and Architect of all Creation, visible and invisible, send your living Holy Spirit to me so that He may inspire me with the word as it will be of benefit to all who live according to your commandments . . .”)

## F. THE SOURCES OF TRANSLATED AND BORROWED LITERATURE

1. While they accepted Christianity from Byzantium, the Eastern Slavs could not import a ready-made literature from this same source. Circumstances necessitated the formation of close ties with Bulgaria, the country from which both the alphabet and the ready-made translations of liturgical books, various other monuments, and some original literature came. Ties with Bulgaria had existed even before the Christianization of the Eastern Slavs. In the first fifty years of its existence, the links of the Church of Kievan Rus’ were with Bulgaria, not Byzantium: it is logical to assume that the first Kievan Church hierarchy came from the same place as the East Slavic literary language and literature.

---

\*The so-called nasal vowels are replaced by “u,” “ju,” and “ja.”

2. The main translations of liturgical books were undoubtedly made already in the time of Cyril and Methodius in Moravia. From Moravia they were transmitted to Bulgaria and perhaps from Bulgaria to Kievan Rus'. The language of the East-Slavic liturgical books does not reveal any evidence of their Moravian origin: Church Slavonic arose under the influence of Macedonian as a literary language for various Slavic peoples. Works of the "Golden Age of Bulgarian literature," the epoch of Tsar Simeon (ninth and tenth centuries), also came to Kiev: the *Hexaemeron of John the Exarch of Bulgaria*, Constantine the Presbyter's commentaries on the Gospel, translations of John Damascenus' "Theology" and others. Furthermore, Svjatoslav's *Collection* of 1073, the multi-volumed *Menaia for Daily Reading*, the works of John Chrysostomos and the *Chronicle of John Malalas* were also borrowed from Bulgaria. Earlier literary historians considered almost all of the translated literature of the Kievan period to have come from Bulgaria. However, it was later demonstrated that a part of this literature must have been translated in Kiev since some of these monuments contain elements peculiar to the East-Slavic language.

The Kievan Church appears to have been linked to the Patriarchate of Oxrida in the far western part of Bulgaria. Most of the works mentioned above originated or are believed to have originated in eastern Bulgaria. Probably of western Bulgarian origin are those monuments in which the older Glagolitic alphabet is used, as this alphabet was rarely employed in eastern Bulgaria. Traces of western Bulgarian linguistic elements are to be found in the Book of Psalms annotated by Athanasius (manuscripts from the eleventh and twelfth centuries).

3. An especially interesting group of monuments of Moravian and Czech origin are those that originated during the period when the divine service in these areas was performed in Church Slavonic. Since the churches of the western Slavs were closely connected with the Catholic Church, the liturgical books employed were frequently translations from Latin. The language of these monuments contains typically Czech words [*ponevažē, peča, izvoliti* (to select), etc.] and elements of Catholic terminology: *oplatok*" (oblation), *papěž*" (the Pope of Rome), *kostel*" (church) and *Sv. Marija* (Virgin Mary, used instead of Mother of God). Such monuments survived for many centuries. *The Discourses of Pope Gregory* or the *Patericon of Rome* even became the source of some of the additions to *Prologue*. Among the monuments of Moravian origin we have the Lives of various Western saints—Benedict, Vitus, John the Good, Apollinary of Ravenna, Stephen, Chrysogonus and some others—as well as those of Czech saints—Wenceslas and Ludmila (especially interesting is the long Life of Wenceslas, the so-called Gumbold Life, translated from Latin). Also derived from this period of Moravian Church history are the Gospel of Nicodemus and some



prayers that make mention of Western saints—Florius, Walpurgis, Vitus, Magnus, Canute, Votus, and others. Works of Moravian origin were quite popular in Kievan Rus' and had a great influence on its literature. Thus, the influence of the Life of Wenceslas can be seen in the Lives written by Nestor (see Ch. III, pt. D, no. 2-4), while the Gospel of Nicodemus had an especially broad impact.

4. It is interesting to note that definite traces of certain Bulgarian and Moravian monuments which have not been preserved are to be found in the literature of Kievan Rus'. Thus, the tale about Svjatoslav in the *Chronicle* describes circumstances in Bulgaria with a degree of familiarity that could not have existed in Kiev; it is possible that this tale incorporated elements of Bulgarian tales about internal politics. In some of its variants the tale of Volodymyr the Great's baptism and especially his test of various faiths contains anachronisms (Patriarch Photius, the "philosopher" and missionary, Cyril), which indicate that this tale is an adaptation of the Bulgarian tale about the baptism of the Bulgarian Tsar, Boris.

Similar elements of Moravian origin are also to be found. The most important of these are the tales in the *Chronicle* about the development of the Slavic alphabet and the translation of the Bible. There follows an account of the migration of the Slavs, which includes details that could only have been of interest to the western Slavs. All these parts of the *Chronicle* could be adaptations of Moravian historical oral tales. The *Chronicle* mentions the Avars (*Obrě*), who greatly oppressed the Slavic tribe of the Dulebians and later disappeared without a trace, giving rise to the adage "*pogiboša aki Obrě*." These Dulebians are perhaps the Czech "Dudlebian," for the eastern Slavs had hardly any contact with the Avars; as a result, both the tale and the adage are perhaps of Czecho-Moravian origin. And finally, the tale by the Greek chronicler about the death of Attila reveals its Western origin by the use of such words as *kostel*" and *volox*" (an Italian).

5. However, more interesting from our point of view are those works that were translated in Kievan Rus'. In addition to certain phonetic and morphological features, words not employed by other Slavs, such as the Slavic words: *posadnik* (alderman), *grivna* (a monetary unit), *kuna* (coin), *nasad* (ship), *kožux* (fur coat, sheepskin coat); or the borrowed words: *plug* (plough), *tiun* (bailiff), *šovk* (silk), *žemčug* (pearl), *uksus* (vinegar), *kad'* (pail), *obez'jana* (monkey), *lar'* (chest); or the proper names: *Surož*, *Sud* (the inlet near Constantinople), *obez* (Georgian), etc., indicate the eastern Slavic origin of these translations (it is possible to distinguish between Kievan and Novgorodian monuments). Let us limit ourselves to the monuments mentioned above. Those translated in Kiev include the annotated letters of the Apostle Paul, the Song of Songs, the Book of

Esther, *Prologue*; the Lives of Andrew the Simple, Stephen of Šurož, Theodore of Studion; the miracles of Nicholas the Wonder-Worker, some of those of Demetrius of Salonica, Cosmas and Damian in Korsun, and George; the sermons of Theodore of Studion; the Epistle by Peter of Antioch; the tales of the transfer of the relics of Nicholas the Wonder-Worker in Bari, of the building of the Church of Saint Sophia in Constantinople and of the statue of Theodore of Studion; the Pandects of Nikon of Montenegro. Among the apocryphal works, the Life of Moses, various tales about Solomon, the Life of Macarius of Rome and the tale of Abgar were translated in Kiev, while the more secular works include the works of Cosmas Indicopleustes and Josephus Flavius, *Physiologus* (second version), *The Bee*, Menander's aphorisms, the *Chronicle of Georgius Hamartolos* (translated at least with the aid of a Kievan), the stories about Digenis and Akir. As we can see this is quite an imposing list. While it is possible that some of these monuments acquired East-Slavic or Ukrainian features only after their initial translation, there were certainly many other translated works that have been completely lost. In any case, translated works of the Kievan period were numerous and varied, while activity in the field of translation was broad in scope.

### III.

## THE PERIOD OF MONUMENTAL STYLE (The Eleventh Century)

#### A. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. Our primary aim here is to isolate the general literary characteristics of this period of Ukrainian literature. However, this task is not an easy one, since very little work has been done on the stylistic aspects of eleventh century Kievan literature: most of the scholars of this period were adherents of either the philological or the sociological approaches. The accomplishments of the philological school are in the area of the explication (to the extent possible) of the histories of individual works of this period, their dating, origin, authorship, and so on. Unfortunately, the material available does not always allow definite conclusions to be drawn: some of the monuments are extant only in much later copies, frequently dating from the fifteenth or even the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; as a result they differ substantially from one another. In some cases, all efforts to establish the date of a monument (e.g., "The Supplication of Daniel," which has been said to have originated either in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries or in the eleventh) or the place of its origin (e.g., the *Chronicle of Georgius Hamartolos*, the linguistic features of which make the place of its origin uncertain) have resulted in failure.

The authorship of works also frequently remains uncertain; for example, various doubts have been expressed about Nestor's participation in the writing of the *Chronicle* and Theodosius' authorship of many of the sermons attributed to him. On the other hand, scholars of the philological school were often successful in tracing the pre-history of extant monuments from later references to them even when there was no direct evidence of their prior existence, and in

discovering literary influences to which no direct references are made (e.g., the influence of Moravian literature, etc.). This kind of work is unusually interesting and valuable, representing one of the important contributions of the philological school. Approaches of the sociological or historical type are of less value in that they are concerned solely with unearthing the historical determinants of literary monuments. Studies employing such approaches frequently provide good commentaries on isolated parts of literary works and occasionally also explain their ideological content. Studies devoted to the purely literary aspects of works, even such stylistically interesting ones as the *Chronicle*, are few.

In the opinion of this writer, a distinct stylistic change occurred at the beginning of the twelfth century, a change which can be observed by comparing the older version of the *Chronicle*—*Nestor's Chronicle* (including events up to 1113)—with the *Kievan Chronicle* (broader accounts beginning in the 1120s and 1130s) and the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*. A similar difference exists between the sermons of the eleventh (Theodosius) and twelfth centuries, and the Lives of the eleventh century and the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery* of the thirteenth. Works in other literary genres also exhibit this same kind of contrast: the style of Volodymyr Monomax's "*Poučenie*" ("Instruction") contains features common to the eleventh century, while that of Daniel's "Supplication" belongs to the later period of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Typical of the style of the later period is *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*, which is linked stylistically with the sermons of Cyril of Turiv or the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*. However, it must be noted that certain works of the eleventh century, such as Hilarion's "*Slovo o zakone i blagodati*" ("Sermon on Law and Grace") and especially the "Tale" ("*Skazanie*") of Borys and Hlib, also contain stylistic elements that are somewhat similar to those of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In view of the fact that so few monuments from the eleventh century have been preserved, such exceptions are highly significant.

2. In general, the works of the eleventh century are characterized by a certain *monumentality* in style: that is, these works tend to employ a limited number of stylistic elements and stylistic embellishments, while focusing primarily on content. The dominant concern of the authors of this period appears to have been the businesslike exposition of their message. As a result, the structure of their works is relatively straightforward. Characteristically, thoughts are expressed in aphoristic form, usually toward the end of the work, but occasionally also in various places in the main body. The entire work or, minimally, each of its individual parts, is devoted to one thought and rarely deviates from it: the exposition is "mono-thematic"—it contains but one thought.

3. On the stylistic level, this monumentality in theme frequently gives rise

to obscurity in narrative structure and simplicity of syntax. When the author is faced with a large amount of factual material (as in Nestor's Life of Theodosius) or must express a variety of thoughts (Volodymyr Monomax's "Instruction"), he is not particularly concerned with putting these individual elements into a logical order, for he views them all as an organic whole, as being dominated by one or several main ideas: as a result, the narrative proceeds in simple chronological order (typical deviations from this ordering of events are introduced by a phrase like "Let us return to what we were discussing earlier"). This simple and sometimes even unorganized structure is in harmony with the simplicity of the syntax of these works: they are frequently composed of short sentences that follow one another abruptly, sometimes partly repeating each other. Repetitions of the subject or complement in successive clauses is frequent ("Go to the town and tomorrow I will leave the town and set off for my own town") as is the repetition of the name of a character (in the *Chronicle* under the year 1096 or in the Life of Theodosius).

4. Among the characteristic features of the style of this period belongs the use of set phrases, frequently repeated in one work, in one section of a work or in several of its parts. These set phrases were derived either from the Bible or from among those commonly employed in those times. Furthermore, repetition was a common device and was consciously used. Authors frequently included exact quotations both from their own works and from the works of other authors.

5. Stylistic ornaments are few. The most common device is parallelism of the syntactical structure of neighboring sentences or of the thoughts expressed in them, this being further strengthened by the repetition of individual words and names (see above). Another important device of the monuments of this period is alliteration, which also often serves to underscore the frequently encountered parallelisms. Similes and metaphors are not numerous but are clear and apt [arrows fall "like rain," enemy troops are "like forests" ("*aki borove*"), the hermit monk is a hero ("*bogatir*") and a warrior ("*xrabr*"), etc.]. However, the later symbolic aspect of similes and metaphors is still absent. A partial exception to this rule is Hilarion's "Sermon on Law and Grace," modelled on Byzantine works. Epithets are also infrequent; with the exception of by-names ["*Svjatopolk-Okajannyj*"] ("*Svjatopolk the Accursed*"), "*Bonjak Šoludyvyj*" ("*Bonjak the Mangy*"), no group of preferred epithets was developed. In general, the embellishments do not expand into involved ornamentation, which would obscure the simple construction of sentences and the clear movement of thought or the apparent lack of it (the abrupt movement of the narrative referred to above), as the case may be.

6. It is also possible to indicate some of the main ideological features of this initial literary period. However, be it for the eleventh or the twentieth centuries, the formulation of a complete general characterization of an entire literary epoch is not an easy task. Nonetheless, two such general features are clearly visible: first, the ideology of statehood—the idea of the dynastic and tribal unity of Rus’—is present in spite of the fact that in reality such unity could hardly be said to have existed (dynastic differences are toned down in the *Chronicle*, while the independence of Novgorod, Polock, and Tmutorokan’, and the conflicts between Černihiv and Kiev are presented as exceptions to the general rule); secondly, Christian optimism, a joy that Rus’ was chosen by God to become part of Christianity in “the eleventh hour,” just before the end of the world. This baptism into the true faith is viewed as a pledge of salvation; the posture towards God is one of boundless gratitude and love; ascetic motifs are rare.

In comparison with these dominant ideological constants, all other ideological tendencies appear considerably weaker. There is, for example, a marked difference in various evaluations of the significance of the Greeks for Kievan Rus’: the stance taken toward Greek culture is occasionally panegyric but most often skeptical, negative, and even derisive (because the Greeks were believed to be deceivers—*l’stivi*). Alongside the feeling of unity we encounter traces of psychological (not solely political) frictions between the Poljanians and Derevljanians, between the Kievans and the Novgorodians, and so on; one need only mention the remnants of old prayers in which some sort of tension between the Varangians and the Slavs is evident. In this period, no meaningful distinction between religious and secular literature can be made. Those few monuments or parts of monuments that could perhaps be called secular (parts of the *Chronicle*, Volodymyr Monomax’s “Instruction”) were subjected to some kind of church “censorship” during this period and an even harsher one in later centuries; as a result, any ideological differences that may have existed between the religious and secular works were removed. All the monuments of this period express the same official religious ideology. The antagonism between Christianity and paganism is even less evident; when pagans are referred to, they are placed outside of the Christian milieu, which is regarded as the only possible one. The ideological unity manifest in the monuments of this period stems from the overwhelmingly religious character of their authors and copiers, who were either clerics or monks.

## B. SERMONS

1. In comparison to the number of translated sermons known in the early Kievan period, original sermons form but a modest addendum to the treasury of Byzantine homiletics. Furthermore, since a large proportion of the original sermons do not bear a precise date, they can be identified as originating in the early Kievan period only from various elements of their language and content. With the exception of Theodosius and Hilarion, very little is known about the authors of sermons. This anonymity is further complicated by the fact that these old sermons were later attributed to saints, Fathers of the Church, and so on. Unfortunately, literary scholars have not devoted sufficient attention to the style of these old anonymous monuments.

2. Fifteen works are ascribed to St. Theodosius (d. 1074); among them are prayers, ten sermons, epistles to Prince Izjaslav and several fragments of "instructions," which Nestor included in his Life of Theodosius. Indications are that the epistles to Izjaslav were not written by Theodosius, since they are replies to questions of a canonical character probably addressed to some scholar. Their anti-Catholic orientation suggests that they were written by "Theodosius (Fedos) the Greek" to another Prince Izjaslav a hundred years later. Theodosius' epistles to Prince Svjatoslav have not been preserved; we only know that he addressed the Prince in a very abrupt tone, comparing him with Cain. Nestor makes reference to the numerous sermons that Theodosius delivered, both to the people and to his fellow monks; unfortunately, none of those addressed to a general audience are extant. The interesting "Sermon about God's Punishments" included in the *Chronicle* was not written by Theodosius. Of the sermons directed at monks, five can be attributed with certainty to Theodosius.

Theodosius' sermons have a moral character. They are devoted in large part to reminding the monks of their duties, beginning with such things as going to church and maintaining a dignified posture during divine service, and ending with the inner requirements of goodness, hard work, humility, and patience. Those dealing with external duties are always short, frequently containing some biblical quotations and occasionally even overflowing with them. The language is simple. Typical Church Slavonic words are few: *dobročinstvo* (orderly behavior), *blagonravije* (good conduct), *dobrolipnij* (comely), etc., but one also encounters elements of the vernacular: *svita* (cloak worn by Ukrainian peasants), *poslux* (obedience), *trivanie* (continuity), etc. However, it would be wrong to assume that Theodosius' sermons are devoid of purely literary qualities or values. On the contrary, Theodosius aptly describes such inner experiences as agitation, irritation, and elation: "the heart burns"; "the soul melts" ("*istaevaet*"); "to shake

off sadness"; "with tears in my eyes I speak these bitter words"; he speaks of the "glow" in the soul, the "death of sin." Frequently he clothes his thoughts in the form of simple comparisons. Such is the biblical comparison from the parable of the wise and foolish maidens where the girls' "lamps" are their souls and the oil needed by the foolish maidens is their "offering to the poor." Theodosius also refers to the biblical tale about the vineyard and describes monks as having been led out of "the Egypt of this world" into the "waterless desert." Other apt metaphors include the following: a censor is the Holy Ghost, martyrs "shine like stars," a "wreath" is the reward for suffering, monks are God's slaves and must stand in church "with their hands tied." While all of these images are traditional, there are also some that are both extended and striking: thus Theodosius calls himself merely an instrument of God "for a quill will not write alone if there is no one who wishes to write with it and an axe will not become renowned without the person who chops with it"; he describes the stance that should be taken toward work: "If someone works in his field or vineyards, then—when he sees its fruits—he forgets about his [previous] toil in his joy and prays to God that he may succeed in gathering the fruit." Antithesis is also employed: "If we are not given clothes or a coat or something else indispensable we grieve about it deeply, but when we waste time, we do not think about it and do not grieve about it." Theodosius compares the key that the doorkeeper at a monastery holds to the fire from the altar (compare the tale about the key as a juridical symbol—see Ch. I, pt. C, no. 3); very interesting is the following extended military metaphor: a gong summons the monks to work; "when the marching draws near and the trumpet blows, no one can sleep: but is it good for a soldier of Christ to be lazy? Even soldiers for a small and transitory fame forget their wives, children and property . . . and even place little value on their own heads in order to avoid shame. But as they themselves are mortal so does their fame end with their lives. But with us it is not so. If we succeed in our struggle with our enemies, then as victors we will be granted infinite fame and will be worthy of indescribable honor. . . ." However, Theodosius' artistic accomplishments are not limited to the field of oblique language; he is also adept at expressing his main ideas: "We must feed the poor and the wanderers by our labor and not remain idle, moving from one cell to another"; or, speaking of confession: "Let us reveal our sins here before one person [a priest] so that they will not be uncovered there [at the final judgment] before the entire world." (This is a good example of antithesis.) In addition, Theodosius draws on the resources of translated homiletic literature—the sermons of John Chrysostomos, Theodore of Studion, Basil the Great and the rules of monastic discipline.

While his sermons are basically quite simple, their simplicity does not



detract from their exemplary homiletic style nor their emotional and intellectual appeal.

3. Alongside Theodosius' simple sermons, there are the sermons in high style by Hilarion, who was Metropolitan during the reign of Jaroslav the Wise (beginning in 1051) and the first non-Greek to hold this position. By 1054, the year of the death of Jaroslav, he no longer held this position; it is not known whether he died in this year or merely resigned (some scholars argue that he retreated to the Kievan Caves Monastery). Careful studies have revealed that the "Sermon on Law and Grace" is in fact a *collection of works* written by Hilarion between the years 1037 and 1051. Two of the works of this collection are of a very elevated character: first, the sermon contrasting the religion of the Old Testament, which is based upon submission to the "law," to that of the New Testament, which urges submission to the "grace" of God; and, secondly, the panegyric sermon devoted to Prince Volodymyr, the Christianizer of Kievan Rus'. Also included in this collection were Hilarion's "Confession of Faith," a small number of quotations from the Bible, a prayer, and a short autobiography. The very fact of the existence of such a collection of works provides an interesting testimonial about the literary life of Kievan Rus'. Both of the main works reveal Hilarion's learnedness and eloquence.

Three other sermons not included in this collection are also ascribed to Hilarion; however, his authorship of these sermons has not been established with certainty. The theory that Hilarion later became a monk in the Kievan Caves Monastery under the name of Nikon and participated in the reworking of the *Chronicle* (in 1073) remains highly questionable.

4. Much more extensive than Theodosius' sermons, Hilarion's "Sermon on Law and Grace" is rhetorical but is based on the dogmatic contrast between the Old and New Testaments—the "submission to law" in pre-Christian times and the liberation through "grace" offered by Christ. This sermon is not totally original, as historical contrasts of this type are to be found in the sermons by the Church Fathers. On the other hand, neither is it merely an imitation of some specific work of Greek literature (there is some similarity with Ephrem Syrus' sermon on the Feast of the Transfiguration). Hilarion also draws on the Bible, various apocrypha and the *Hexaemeron*. Characteristic of this sermon are its clear structural pattern, a good evolution of thought and an extremely sophisticated use of the devices of Byzantine rhetoric.

After a short panegyric introduction—an expression of gratitude to God for the Christianization of Rus'—Hilarion begins his comparison of the condition of mankind before and after the coming of Christianity. Christianity is portrayed as entailing a complete reversal of the historical direction of mankind. Such a

comparison is both natural and apt. Detracting from this is the fact that Hilarion chooses to contrast Christianity not with Slavic paganism but with the religion of the Old Testament. Nonetheless, the contrast between the Old and New Testaments is striking and well developed. The contrast or antithesis is first briefly stated and then evolved through the use of metaphor: the Old Testament is a moon, a shadow, the coldness of night, while the New Testament is a sun, light, the warmth of the sun. Toward the end of the first part, this antithesis is stated in terms of the previous paganism and the present Christianity of Kievan Rus': hopelessness versus hope for eternal life, blindness and deafness versus the "opening of eyes and ears," the stammering of paganism versus the "clear language" of Christians, and so on: "Once we were wanderers, once we were God's enemies and now we can be called God's people, and now we can be called the children of God." The metaphors in this sermon already have the symbolic meaning characteristic of the sermons of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Hilarion develops his antithesis on the Old Testament models, in essence contrasting the "enslavement" of people under the law of the Old Testament with the "brotherhood" of man under the rule of "grace." In light of the fact that slavery was at that time a fact of life and a real threat to human life, this contrast must have been very striking indeed. Emerging from this antithesis is a good exposition of Christology as the union in Christ of two contrasting "natures"—divine and human. In seventeen antitheses Hilarion formulates a complete picture of the dogmatic teachings of the Church about Christ's two natures:

like a man He was swaddled,  
     as God, He led the Magi with a star,  
 like a man He lay in a crib,  
     as God, He received adoration and gifts from the  
     Magi,  
 like a man, He fled to Egypt,  
     and as to God, the man-made Egyptian [idols]  
     bowed down before You,  
 .....  
 like a man, You tasted vinegar  
 and gave up Your soul,  
     as God, You have held back the sun and shaken  
     the earth,  
 like a man, You were placed  
 in a grave,  
     and as God, You destroyed Hell and freed the spirit. . . .

A number of quotations from the Bible precede the panegyric to Prince Volodymyr. Each country glorifies its Apostle: Rome, Peter and Paul; Asia, John the Theologian; India, Thomas; Egypt, Mark; "All countries, cities, and peoples honor and praise their own teacher and Christianizer. To the extent that it is within our power, let us also praise with our feeble praises him who created the great and miraculous, our teacher and guardian, the great prince of our land, Volodymyr, grandson of Ihor, son of the celebrated Svjatoslav." After a delineation of Volodymyr's political significance as the "sole ruler" of the land of Rus', Hilarion moves on to describe Volodymyr's baptism and "how he lived, ruling his land justly, courageously and wisely thus becoming worthy of divine visitation." His conversion is ascribed not to the influence of the Greek sermon but to divine vocation: "God's all-merciful eye gazed upon him and implanted in his heart an understanding of the vanity of the pagan deception and a desire to discover the only true God. . . ." Only then does he turn to "Greece, the land of true faith" in order to be baptized: "Together with his clothing, the Prince cast off his old self, cast off all that was perishable, shook off the dust of disbelief and, having entered the holy water, he was reborn of the Spirit and the water, baptized in the name of Christ [and] clothed by Him. . . ."

Hilarion describes the land in the joy and light of the Christian faith and concludes with the following:

Christ has triumphed,  
Christ has conquered,  
Christ has ascended the throne  
Christ has become celebrated. . . .

He then proceeds to praise Prince Volodymyr as a Christian, depicting his virtuous conduct in the last years of his life and the later development of Christianity in the land of Rus'. This panegyric culminates in an emotional apostrophe to Volodymyr: "Arise from your grave, venerated Prince, and shake off your sleep; for you are not dead but only sleep until the day of universal resurrection. Arise! You are not dead for it is not right that death should be the lot of one who believed in Christ, the Sustainer of the whole world. . . ." Hilarion continues in this same declamatory style:

Behold your son George\*  
.....  
Behold the pious wife of your son, Irene . . .

---

\*George is the Christian name of Prince Jaroslav.

Behold your grandchildren and great grandchildren,  
How they live,  
How they are cared for by God,  
How they preserve devotion according to your testament,  
How frequently they go to church,  
How they glorify Christ,  
How they worship His name.

Behold the city radiant in its eternity,  
Behold the flourishing churches,  
Behold Christianity growing,  
Behold the city, illuminated with holy icons  
Fragrant with incense,  
Ringing with praises and divine songs.

The sermon ends with a number of antitheses that again return to the general theme of the work—the contrast between the pre-Christian and Christian epochs in Kievan Rus’:

Rejoice, Prince-Apostle,  
who resurrected us, whose souls were dead,  
from the malady of idolatry  
for thanks to you we  
were revived and came to know the life of Christ,  
hunched over as a result of the Devil’s  
temptation,  
thanks to you we have straightened our backs and  
have moved onto the path of life  
our eyes, being pitifully blind  
as a result of the Devil’s temptation, we were blinded  
by ignorance,  
thanks to you we saw  
the light of the triple-sunned Godhead,  
being mute,  
thanks to you we began to speak and today,  
both young and old, we glorify the one and only Trinity!

The sermon-panegyric concludes with a prayer in elevated style.

5. In the above discussion of the content of Hilarion’s works, the main structural and stylistic devices were also noted: antithesis, repetition, apostrophe

(the author even addresses the city of Kiev) and especially the use of rhythmical prose, notably in the panegyric part, the rhythmic quality being underscored by parallelism. Parallelism is frequently amplified by rhyme: "*jasno i veleglasno*" ("clearly and loudly"); "*Izyde jakože i vnide*" ("He came out as he had entered"); "*Vsi v molit'vax" priležat', vsi gotovi predstojat'*" ("All are praying zealously, all are ready to stand by"); "*Vižd' cerkvi cvětušči, vižd' xristianstvo rastuščē*" ("Behold the flourishing churches, behold Christianity growing"); "*Da sobljudet' . . . Bog" ot" vsjakoa rati i plěnenia, ot" glada i vsjakoa skorbi i s"tuždenija*" ("May God protect . . . from all war and from captivity, from hunger and from all kinds of sorrow and from oppression"); "*Vižd' grad" ikonami svjatix" osvěščaem" . . . i xvalami i božestvennymi pěsnmi oğlašāem"*" ("Behold the city, illuminated with holy icons . . . and ringing with praises and divine songs"). Occasionally the rhythm stems from the structure of the sentences:

*ratnyja progoni,  
mir utverdi,  
strany ukroti,  
glad ugobzi,  
boljary umudri,  
grady razseli,  
cerkov' tvoju v"zrasti,  
dostojanie tvoe sobljudi,  
muži i ženy i mladency spasi. . .*

("beat off [the enemy] troops, strengthen peace,  
pacify [the neighboring] countries, satisfy hunger,  
make the boyars wise, found cities, make your Church  
grow, protect your inheritance, save the men and the  
women and the children. . .")

Another example of this type of rhythm is provided in the following passage:

*nagyja oděvaja,  
žadnyja i alčnyja nasyščaja,  
boljaščim" utešenie posylaa,  
dolžnyja iskupaa,  
robotnaa svoboždaa. . .*

(“clothing those who are naked, satisfying those who are thirsty or hungry, consoling those who are ill, redeeming those in debt, freeing slaves. . . .”)

The main purpose of the panegyric is to praise the newly Christianized land of Kievan Rus' by means of praising her famous princes: since the deeds of Jaroslav's father are eulogized, Jaroslav himself also shares in the eulogy. The success of Hilarion's sermon-panegyric is assured both by its outstanding literary merits, which are not destroyed by the occasionally complex language employed [many compound words: *blagopriziranie* (salutary concern), *ravnoumnyj* (equally wise), *ravnokristoljubec'* (equally Christ-loving), *mnogoplodne* (rich in yield), etc.] and by its content. Hilarion's sermon-panegyric influenced many later works—not only Ukrainian ones (Clement Smoljatyč; the panegyric to Volodymyr Vasyľ'kovyč in the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* is modelled on Hilarion's panegyric; in his verses on the subject of Sahajdačnyj's burial in 1621, Kasijan Sakovyč includes a reworked version of the beginning of Hilarion's panegyric, drawing on both Hilarion's work and *Perestoroha* (*A Warning*, published in 1605) but also Muscovite and Novgorodian ones (Lives of Prince Dmitri Ivanovič of Moscow, Saint Leontius of Rostov, Constantine of Murom, Prokopius of Ustjug, Nyfont of Novgorod, Stephen of Perm', etc.) as well as works of Serbian literature (Lives of Simeon and Sava, written by the hieromonach Domentian).

6. As was mentioned above, several other works are also attributed to Hilarion. Of these, “In the Beginning Was the Word,” a short “instruction” containing features of the sermon, the prayer and the panegyric, is most likely to have actually been written by Hilarion; to the main text of this “instruction,” the author adds a commentary-panegyric and a prayer, the final part of which provides an effective conclusion to the work. While the seriousness of the content of another sermon, “On Spiritual Value,” suggests that it may have been written by Hilarion, the features characteristic of his style are lacking. And finally, it is also possible that the “Sermon to Those Who Have Abandoned This World” (also known as “Sermon to a Stylite”), where the author requires a more severe life from monks, is from Hilarion's pen; manuscripts originating in the southern parts of East Slavic territory do, in fact, attribute it to him. From the formal point of view, it is much simpler than the “Sermon on Law and Grace”; however, it is written in a good rhetorical style, with addresses to the reader, exclamations, antitheses and striking metaphors. Note the following comparison of the hermit's life amidst nature to the life of birds who offer praise to God in their songs:

In their ears there was no noise of the town,  
 no shouting of people,  
 the odious songs of a whore did not reach their ears,  
 they did not see how countries waged war against one  
 another,  
 . . . in their eyes there was only the swaying of trees,  
 [in their ears] the rustling of branches,  
 the songs of birds each singing their own song.  
 That is why they did not know grief  
 for they cast off grief when they abandoned the world. . . .

It is interesting to note that the author speaks ironically of orators who clothe their wise thoughts in very artificial language, for this is analogous to a doctor treating a wound "without removing the clothing which is covering it." An excerpt from this sermon (or letter?) is utilized in a later sermon ascribed on good evidence to Clement Smoljatyč (see Ch. IV, pt. B). Some scholars consider it improbable that such harsh attacks could have been directed at monastic life at a time when only those who felt a definite calling for the ascetic life entered monasteries. However, there are two factors that may account for this: first, the sermons written in Kievan Rus' followed in the already established tradition which included such criticism of the monastic way of life and, secondly, any kind of asceticism demands an exaggerated severity, making great moral flaws out of small ones or perceiving them where they do not exist at all. In any case, whoever the author may be, this sermon remains an interesting monument of Kievan literature.

7. A certain number of other sermons can also be ascribed to the eleventh century. Among them must be included the original form of the "Sermon of One Who Loves Christ" in which the author attacks the pagan faith and customs of his contemporaries. References to the gods "Perun, Xors, Syma-Rehl, Mokoš" and to customs associated with the cult of "Rod, Rožanyci" are linked with quotations from the Bible. This sermon was greatly altered in later times. In addition to the "Sermon of One Who Loves Christ" other sermons with the name "One Who Loves Christ" are also extant. Such are the "Sermon About Innocence" and the sermon about the necessity to submit to one's spiritual father, where we also encounter many references to old customs: "*rožaničnu trapezu*" ("harvest feast"), "*molenie korovajnoe*" (perhaps a reference to the *korovaj*—wedding bread included in the wedding ceremony), "*želenija i karanija*" ("grief for the passing of the dead person"). It is possible that "One Who Loves Christ" (*xristoljubec*) meant a lay Christian.

Undoubtedly very ancient are the two homilies by Gregory (referred to in manuscripts as “the Theologian” but in reality Bishop of Bilhorod) directed against drunkenness. They combine relatively graphic descriptions of drunkenness with exhortations towards a Christian life: “Let us nourish ourselves on holy books, [let us quench our thirst] with the teachings and tales of the holy fathers and not with drink. This is considered holy by God! This makes the saints rejoice! This is salvation for the soul! This brings health to the body! This represents [the acceptance of] the ever-present watch of the guardian angel! This is the rejection of demons!” There are yet two more “instructions” for monks, which may have also been written by Gregory. Other extant “instructions,” whose content and language are also ancient, are directed against social oppression and slavery which occasionally even prompted people to take their own lives by “throwing themselves into water and destroying themselves with their own hands,” against interest payments (on land) which “devour the poor like a dragon,” against the hypocrisy of the rich who fast when it is required but continue to “consume the flesh of their brothers,” and against the princes who appear not to know what their administrators are doing. These attacks are perhaps linked with the social reforms brought in by Volodymyr Monomax toward the end of the eleventh century.

The description of the life of the rich in one sermon\* is reminiscent of some of those in the later epistles written by Ivan Vyšens'kyj. The rich man

lived in luxury on this earth,  
 was clothed in purple and silk,  
 his horses are well-fed pacers,  
 are proud of their golden attire,  
 his saddles are gilded,  
 walking in front of him are numerous slaves  
 clad in silk and golden necklaces,  
 while those behind him [wear] beads and bracelets,  
 .....  
 at dinner there are many servants,  
 the plates are chased in gold and silver,  
 the dishes [served] are many and varied,  
 grouses, geese, cranes, hazel-hens, pigeons,  
 chickens, rabbits, wild-boars, game animals and birds,

(There follow the names of some dishes still unexplained:  
*“čam”ri, tr”tove, pečeni, kr”panija, šem”lizi.”*)

---

\*This sermon is an adaptation of two Greek sermons attributed to John Chrysostomos.



.....  
 the cups are of silver and large,  
 the tankards and bowls are gilded,  
 there is much to drink—mead, kvas, wine,  
 pure mead and mead with pepper,  
 revelry continues throughout the night with  
 psalteries and pipes.

As some sermons refer to contemporary events, the approximate date of their writing can be established. When mention is made of the transfer of the relics of Saint Nicholas or the “newly Christianized” land of Rus’ as in the rhythmically structured sermon in honor of the Mother of God, then such a work can be ascribed to the eleventh century with a high degree of certainty.

Thus, the sermons dating from the eleventh century are varied both in content and form. Alongside the relatively simple ones dedicated to Lent, we encounter panegyrics that celebrate some deed or person (the resplendent sermon by St. Theodosius which was later included in the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*—see Ch. IV, pt. D).

Eleventh century homiletics still offer ample scope for research both in the areas of the collection of materials and their elucidation. Studies of their stylistic aspects are all but absent.

### C. THE TALE

1. While the genre of the secular narrative either did not evolve in the old Kievan period or else all individual examples of it were lost, tales which are basically religious in character have been preserved in the *Chronicle* and occasionally also in separate copies.\* Tales of this type oscillate between the official, rhetorical style on the one hand, and a refined narrative style on the other. Characteristically, a religious tale contains a clearly stated “moral.” The *Chronicle* tales are not arranged within the chronological order of the *Chronicle* but are merely entered haphazardly under a particular year; however, each tale is complete in itself, with its own unique beginning and end, and occasionally even its own unique moral. The narrative about Borys and Hlib and a number of other shorter tales about miracles, relics (the discovery of the relics of St. Theodosius, the transference of the relics of Borys and Hlib), the building and consecration

---

\*It is likely that some of the *Chronicle* tales existed as individual works but it is difficult to establish this with certainty. The “Tale about the Blinding of Vasyľko” is the only one which is clearly an independent work, as the author speaks from his own person.

of churches (Desjatylna Church in 996, St. George's Church, and the Cathedral of St. Sophia) and the foundation of the Kievan Caves Monastery also belong to this category. Some of these tales were included in the *Chronicle* as well as in various other works (*Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, *Prologue*).

2. There are two accounts about the murder of Borys and Hlib—the narrative in the *Chronicle* and the so-called “*Skazanie*” (“Tale” or “Legend”) both of which are not hagiographic works; as a result, Nestor considered it necessary to rework them in hagiographic style (see Ch. III, pt. D). It is difficult to identify the beginning of the narrative about Borys and Hlib included in the *Chronicle*. In any case, the events after the death of Volodymyr (1015) are narrated in the same unique style. The “Tale” is broader and more polished in form than this shorter narrative. Both stories either had a common source or the author of the “Tale” broadened and revised the shorter narrative from the *Chronicle* (that some monk called Jacob was the author of the “Tale” has not been conclusively demonstrated). Neither of these works depict the early life of Borys and Hlib and, therefore, do not follow the traditional hagiographic format. After a short account of the death of Volodymyr, the murder of Borys, on the orders of his brother, Svjatopolk, and then that of Hlib, are described. Both works conclude with panegyrics to the two saints.

The “Tale” begins with a quotation from the Bible—“Blessed are the families of the righteous”—which indicates that the celebration of the two saints is meant to be extended to include the entire princely family. There follows an account of the death of Volodymyr. Then Borys is assigned a stylized lament close in spirit to its oral counterpart:

Woe is me, the light of my eyes,  
the radiance and star of my face,  
the support of my youth,  
the enlightenment of my ignorance!  
Woe is me, my father and lord!  
To whom can I turn?  
to whom shall I look?  
Where can I delight in such good education  
and instruction as derives from your wisdom?  
Woe is me; woe is me!

Already aware of the threat to him from Svjatopolk, Borys consoles himself with texts from the Bible urging submissiveness and love and reflects on the transitoriness of all things of this earth:

everything ceases to exist even more rapidly  
than a spider's web . . .  
What did my father's brothers and my father gain?  
Where is their earthly life and fame,  
and their purples and silks,  
silver and gold,  
wine and mead,  
tasty dishes and swift horses,  
and the beautiful and great buildings,  
and numerous estates  
and the countless tributes and honors,  
and their pride in their boyars?  
For them it is as if none of this ever existed,  
all of it died with them. . . .

Reflecting upon his fate, Borys wavers between self-pity—regrets about dying at such an early age—and pious thoughts about becoming “a martyr for the Lord.” The scene shifts to Svjatopolk, who sends emissaries bearing greetings as well as assassins, to Borys. The scene changes again: Borys has halted at the river Alta; his retainers have abandoned him, having discovered that he refuses to do battle with Svjatopolk. The murderers, who have surrounded his tent, hear Borys reading morning-service. From the Psalms normally read at this service, the author of the “Tale” has selected those parts which are most appropriate to the situation: “O Lord! How numerous are my enemies! How numerous are those who are against me.” Borys hears footsteps (or whispering) outside of his tent; his priest and servant see the glitter of armor and hear the clatter of swords. The murderers break into the tent and fall upon Borys. Mortally wounded, Borys prays for the salvation of his own soul and those of his enemies, while the few retainers that had remained with him reflect upon these events in the form of stylized laments. A new scene then shows Svjatopolk thinking that he ought to eliminate all of his brothers, otherwise, having joined forces, they

. . . will chase me away,  
and I will be far away from the throne of  
my father,  
and longing for my native land will torment me,  
and shame will fall upon me,  
and another will take my principedom  
and my courts will be deserted. . . .

He sends for Hlib, who sets sail for Kiev from Smolensk along the Dnieper. During this journey he receives news of the death of Volodymyr and the murder of Borys from Jaroslav. Hlib "laments" the deaths of his father and brother (again the lament follows the style of the oral *plač*). When Hlib's boats meet those of Svjatopolk's emissaries, the assassins jump into Hlib's boat with swords in their hands and "the oars fell from everybody's hands and everyone grew numb with terror." Hlib, who is still almost a child, begins to implore the murderers to spare him:

Take pity on my youth, my brothers and lords!  
 You will be my masters and I your slave.  
 Do not cut down a life which has not yet  
     reached maturity!  
 Do not cut off an ear still unripe but full of  
     the milk of good will!  
 Do not cut off a branch which is still green but  
     already bears fruit!

His plea is of no avail, neither is his moving prayer for Svjatopolk and his kinsmen. The horror of the scene is further strengthened by the fact that Hlib is slain "like an innocent lamb" by his own cook, Torčyn. The description of Jaroslav's defeat of Svjatopolk, of the semi-insane flight of Svjatopolk "who was not pursued by anyone" and of his death in the wilderness between Poland and Bohemia are quite brief. The "Tale" ends with a lofty panegyric to the two saints.

The narrative included in the *Chronicle* is shorter. It begins with Borys being informed of the death of his father. Following the narration of the events of the murder of Borys and Hlib (the lyrical passages are much shorter and Svjatopolk's thoughts are not given), is an elevated panegyric. Svjatopolk's fate is recounted in greater detail but is much more tightly woven into the framework of the *Chronicle*.

From the literary point of view both works are remarkable: the lyrical monologues are rhythmical and frequently stylized in the form of laments; the materials included in the morning prayers read by Borys are appropriate to his situation; the folk lament is employed; quotations from the Bible are used repeatedly throughout the work; traditional motifs referring to the deceptiveness and transitoriness of the things of this earth, are used; and the experiences and thoughts of Borys, Hlib and Svjatopolk are presented in a way that makes them appear true to life. Each character has his own peculiarities: Hlib is youthful and loves his older brother; Svjatopolk is attached to the "goods of this earth," etc.

Furthermore, the characterization is not presented in block form when the character is first introduced, but is dispersed throughout the narrative. Also interesting is the use of alliteration, especially frequent in the first half of the *Chronicle* account. The author also drew on the translated literature available in his time; he even mentions some of these works, such as the Lives of Nicetas, Wenceslas of Bohemia, Demetrius of Salonica, and the legend of Julian the Apostate. However, no close parallel exists between the translated works referred to and these two tales: such parallels are to be found in the tradition of hagiography. The subsequent popularity of the "Tale"—perhaps the most widespread work of early Kievan literature—is fully justified. Later it was translated into Belorussian and Ukrainian (beginning with the *Menaea* of 1489).

3. Another interesting example of a religious tale is the story about the first monks of the Kievan Caves Monastery (known both as "The Tale of the Four Monks of the Kievan Caves Monastery" and as "The Tale of Isaac") inscribed in the *Chronicle* under the year 1074 and later included in the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*. In spite of the overall unity of this tale, it was frequently divided into four separate tales about four different monks. The content of the work is not complex. The tale begins by informing the reader that Theodosius selected only the most exemplary monks for his monastery, those "who shine in the land of Rus' like lamps" and then moves on to depict them as one in spirit, each filled with love and ready to help his fellow monks. Finally it focuses on a few individuals: Damian, who cares for sick children and adults, praying for them and rubbing them with oil; Jeremiah, to whom "God gave the ability" to foresee the future and read the thoughts of others; Matthew, who had visions which revealed the souls of others to him. (He saw the Devil in the form of a Pole walking around the Church and throwing flowers at the monks during the performance of divine service. The flowers stuck to them and the Devil left the Church never to return again. In another instance he sees a group of demons who tell him that they have come for Michael Tol'bekovyč. It is later revealed that his Michael is a monk who had just fled from the Monastery.) Isaac is presented in greater detail and, as a result, this part of the tale forms its focal point. A rich merchant from Toropec, Isaac decided to enter a monastery, gave his properties to the poor and to monasteries and came to Antonius of the Kievan Caves Monastery, who gave him the name "Isaac" and "clothed him in a monk's garments." Then Isaac began a hard and severe life—he donned a hair shirt, put a uncured goat's skin which dried out on his body over it, locked himself in a small cell and devoted himself to saving his soul for seven years, eating only one piece of consecrated bread each day and drinking only a little water, both of which were brought to him by Antonius. One night a light

began to shine in his cell and two young men appeared to him, saying: "We are angels and Christ walks behind us. Bow down before Him." Isaac bowed down before the figure he believed to be Christ and thereby fell under the power of the demons, for everything which he had seen and heard was but a deception. Isaac's cell is then filled with demons, who amuse themselves at his expense by making him dance for them. The following morning Antonius does not receive a reply from Isaac and, having opened the door to the cell, he finds Isaac only barely alive. He lay almost motionless for three years, only gradually learning how to walk and eat. Now he no longer locked himself in his cell but walked about the Monastery grounds, worked as a cook and assumed a posture of naive simplicity,\* both in the Monastery and outside of it, being rewarded with harsh words and even beatings. The tale gives a brief account of several other of his trials: his endurance of the extreme cold of winter, his stamping out of a fire in his cell with his bare feet and his act of taking a crow in his bare hands. Then he again retreats to his cell and the demons again try to deceive him or "scare him out of his senses,"\*\* but this time they are not successful and are forced to admit: "You have defeated us, Isaac!" After a brief description of Isaac's death, the author ends his work with a eulogy of the monks of the Kievan Caves Monastery.

If we examine this tale closely we will see that it is not merely four separate stories. Rather, it forms an integral whole, united by several main ideas. The basic concern of the tale is with "the gifts of the Spirit," such as the ability to heal, to read the thoughts of others, to foresee the future and to perceive the nature of other people's souls, which are described in the stories of Damian, Jeremiah, and Matthew. The central story of Isaac deals with one of the most important gifts of the spirit—"the ability to distinguish between spirits," the ability to be able to recognize the true nature of the visions which appear to us. Old Patericons frequently mention this particular gift. Isaac obviously did not possess this ability initially as he failed to perceive the true identity of the figures which appeared before him. The Devil's ability to transform himself into "the angel of light" is mentioned in the Bible (Corinthians), and in the apocrypha (The Confession of Eve) as well as in "In Memory and Praise of Prince Volodymyr" (see Ch. III, pt. D, no. 6). This tale demonstrates that this gift cannot be acquired even by the severest asceticism. Furthermore, asceticism

---

\*Assuming this kind of a posture is a special form of asceticism: willful eccentric behavior which results in scorn and disrespect; however, this kind of ascetic may have a great influence, as he can speak openly about things which sane people would not dare do and so on.

\*\*The aim of the devils is to destroy a person's mental balance, thereby making him unable to think pious thoughts.

does not play a major role in the lives of the other three monks (only a few words are said about Damian's asceticism). The gifts of the spirit cannot be acquired "by force": the severe ascetic, Isaac, was not mature enough in spirit to be given this gift. Later, he says to the demons: "You overcame me in the image of Christ when I was yet unworthy to discern your deception." This brings us to another main thread running throughout the tale—the polemics with extreme asceticism, opposed by Theodosius. This tale about Kiev's first monks was in the spiritual tradition of the Kievan Caves Monastery.

Written in very simple language, this didactic tale is not rhythmical and does not contain affected figures or even quotations from the Bible. However, individual motifs are frequently reminiscent of ancient Lives, either the shorter ones contained in Patericons or the longer separate ones, both of which were already known in Kiev.

4. Still simpler and more secular in character are the tales about the "sorcerers" and about Prince Vasyľko. The story of the sorcerers contains three separate stories with a common theme. Inscribed together in the *Chronicle* under the year 1071, these three stories are unrelated to the historical events of this particular year. The sorcerers who praise their own omniscience and make prophecies about the future, do not foresee their own fates. Little is said about the first sorcerer who appears in Kiev: he prophesies that in five years "the Dnieper will flow backwards and countries will change their positions" but one night he himself disappears.

The second episode—about the sorcerers in the northern lands of the Finns—is told in more detail. Indications are that this tale, as well as a great deal of other information, was given to the chronicler by the retainer, Jan Vyšatyč. In the Rostov region during a famine, two sorcerers told the people that many women were hiding food with the help of sorcery; cutting the flesh on the backs of these women, the magicians made it appear that they were extracting the bread or fish magically hidden there by the women; they then killed the "guilty" women and took their possessions for themselves. Jan, who was then in the process of collecting taxes, detained the sorcerers and turned them over to the murdered women's relatives, who then hanged them on an oak tree: "Thus, both of them died as a result of their devilish skills; able to predict the death of others, they did not foresee their own. . . ." There follows an interesting account of the pagan beliefs of the Finns (*čudi*). The entire series of tales is completed by a short story depicting a pagan uprising in Novgorod (perhaps in about 1070) led by a sorcerer; only the retinue remains loyal to Prince Hlib and the Bishop. Then the Prince, hiding an axe under his coat, approached the sorcerer and asked him if he could predict the future. "Of course," replied the sorcerer. "And what will

happen today?" asks the Prince. "I will perform great miracles," replies the sorcerer. Then the Prince struck the sorcerer with his axe and killed him. Seeing this the people dispersed. This tale is narrated in a very straightforward manner, embellished with only occasional references to the sorcerers mentioned in the Bible. In this tale, Jan's actual experiences and the account of the pagan faith of the Finns stands together with the migratory anecdote which is associated in this case with Prince Hlib and the Kievan sorcerer. Thus, what we have here is a small collection of varied material linked by its common theme.

5. "The Blinding of Vasył'ko" (entered in the *Chronicle* under the year 1097), is also presented in a very simple manner. Narrated by an eyewitness, Basil (probably a priest\* in Prince Vasył'ko's house), this tale acquires a high degree of plasticity as a result of the dramatic nature of the events themselves and the author's ability to handle more extensive materials. After a relatively short annalistic account of the Princely Diet of Ljubeč where all the princes swore not to take up arms against one another (by kissing the cross), the tale about Vasył'ko opens with the following words: "And Svjatopolk [of Kiev] and David [of Volodymyr] came to Kiev and all the people rejoiced; only the Devil was troubled by this show of love." Attributed to the Devil, the feuds among the princes are described in the form of a striking antithesis. "And Satan entered into the hearts of some people and they began to speak to David, son of Ihor, in the following words. . . ." The thoughts which lead David and later, Svjatopolk, to decide that Vasył'ko is a threat to them and must be deprived of his political power are presented in dialogue form. The description of how Svjatopolk persuades Vasył'ko to come to his castle is also narrated by means of dialogue: Svjatopolk invites Vasył'ko to visit him on his name day; having just arrived at the Vydubec'kyj Monastery, Vasył'ko refuses and then Svjatopolk suggests that he come at a more convenient time: "If you do not wish to wait until my name day, then come today. You can greet me and you, I and David can have a chat." In spite of the fact that he is being watched, Vasył'ko goes to visit his brother as he cannot believe that any harm will come to him: "It cannot be that they wish to seize me. For not so long ago we kissed the cross and swore that if any of us should attack another, then the cross should stand against that person." Some time after Vasył'ko has arrived, Svjatopolk leaves the room and Vasył'ko talks to David. But David "does not speak and does not listen for in his heart there is terror and betrayal." Finally, he too leaves. Vasył'ko is put in irons. There is a brief description of Svjatopolk's consultation with the boyars, his vacillations and David's successful attempt to convince Svjatopolk of the necessity to blind

---

\*Some scholars believe that the author was a retainer. However, there is no evidence to support such a conclusion.



Vasyl'ko. At night, Vasyl'ko is transported to Zvynohorodka. The horrible scene of the blinding of Vasyl'ko is described in great detail. Vasyl'ko sees them sharpening a knife and understands their intentions. Two men enter the room where he is being kept, spread a rug on the floor and try to force Vasyl'ko down onto it but are not successful because Vasyl'ko fights back; then several others enter, force him to the ground and press a board against his chest; however, even when two men sit on this board, they are unable to hold Vasyl'ko down and they place yet another board on him, which they take from the stove, pressing down on his chest with such force that his ribs begin to crack. Now one of Svjatopolk's shepherds approaches Vasyl'ko with a knife in his hand, but his first blow misses Vasyl'ko's eyes, cutting his face instead; "then he struck him in one eye and removed it, then in the other and removed it." Vasyl'ko lay "as if dead." "And they raised him, put him on the rug as if he were dead, and carried him off to Volodymyr . . . and having crossed the bridge at the town of Zdvyzhen', they halted at a marketplace, removed his shirt and gave it to a priest's wife to wash; after she had washed the shirt, the priest's wife put it on him [Vasyl'ko] while the others were eating and began to cry for he was as if dead. And he heard her weeping and asked: 'Where am I?' and she replied: 'In the town of Zdvyzhen,' and he asked for water and he took a drink and full consciousness returned to him and he remembered all that had happened and touched his shirt and said: 'Why did you take it off of me? I would prefer to meet my death and stand before God in this bloody shirt! . . .'" After a description of the rage of the other princes and the beginning of their campaign against Svjatopolk and David—all of which may have been added by the chronicler—the author's account of Vasyl'ko's further fate continues: "One night when I was here, in Volodymyr, Prince David sent for me. And I went to him and his retainers sat around him and he asked me to be seated and said to me: 'I heard that Vasyl'ko said [the following]: "If David were to follow my advice, then I would send one of my men to [Prince] Volodymyr [Monomax] to urge him to return [that is, to stop his campaign against Svjatopolk and David].'" Therefore, I send you, Basil, to Vasyl'ko with this message: If you wish to send one of your men to make Volodymyr return, then I will give you any town you wish—Vsevolozh or Šepol' or Peremyl.'" While nothing comes of his mission, the author gives an account of his conversation with Vasyl'ko; Vasyl'ko blames his misfortune on his pride, on his grandiose plans, directed not against other princes but against the Poles and the Polovci: "I will either bring glory to myself or I will give up my life for the land of Rus'." Indications are that the following part of the narrative, which describes the war between Volodymyr and David, the freeing of Vasyl'ko and the final defeat of Svjatopolk, who had enlisted the

help of the Hungarians, was penned by the chronicler and not by Basil, the author of the tale proper.

Extant only in the adapted version included in the *Chronicle*, this tale provides evidence of the high level of literary development attained in eleventh century Kievan Rus'. The quotations given above reveal a developed skill in handling dialogue and in depicting the psychological conditions of the characters—their thoughts, emotions, vacillations, and so on. The literary technique of the work testifies to the author's artistic maturity and indicates that he had the ability to write more significant works.

6. Stories about the miracles performed by saints, a type of tale that remained popular in Ukraine until the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (later works of this type were written by such people as Petro Mohyla, I. Galjatos'kyj and St. Dmytro Tuptalo of Rostov), also belong to the category of "Tales." There is a collection of such tales about the miracles performed by Borys and Hlib. Frequently tacked onto the "Tale" ("Skazanie") about Borys and Hlib, these short pieces originated as independent descriptions of such things as miraculous cures or releases from prison and are linked with the historical accounts of the transfer of the relics of these saints to Kiev and the building of the church named for them.

A later collection is devoted to the miracles of St. Nicholas and includes some translations as well as four original stories, dating from the middle of the eleventh to the beginning of the twelfth centuries. The events described occur either in Constantinople (in two of the stories) or in Kiev (in the remaining two stories).

The works mentioned above do not exhaust the narrative literature of the eleventh century. Of historical importance, the so-called "Korsun' Legend" describes Volodymyr's baptism in Korsun' (facts indicate that Volodymyr was baptized either in Kiev or in Vasyl'kiv before his expedition). However, this tale is extant only in the *Chronicle* version, which has been modified to such an extent by the inclusion of material from some epic tale that it is difficult to identify its original form.

The isolation of separate works included in the *Chronicle* still remains a potentially fruitful area for further research.

7. As we have seen above, eleventh century Kievan literature provides interesting examples of various types of tales. In all cases, these tales are concerned with depicting what was believed to be historical fact. But they are not merely short, dry accounts. All of the authors reveal their concern for the literary aspects of their works, attempting to make their tales interesting and dramatic. The most outstanding of these tales is that of Borys and Hlib

("Skazanie") with its rhythmical prose and complex literary devices, borrowed in part from the Bible and other books used for Christian worship. However, other authors also demonstrated a high degree of talent, especially in the use of monologs to communicate their thoughts and messages. In most instances, the manner in which the events are presented is quite simple and, as a result, embellishments are few; the main emphasis is on the action. But they present their material in a considerable amount of detail, emphasizing certain important moments and increasing the emotional intensity of others by retardation, as in the tale about Vasyľko (the scene describing the blinding!). All the tales extant from this period are didactic but this didacticism did not lead to a neglect of purely formal matters. The tales of the eleventh century are among the best works of Kievan literature.

## D. HAGIOGRAPHIC LITERATURE

1. Hagiographic works are clearly distinct in character from religious tales—they were written only about *saints*, that is, about historical personages whose saintliness had already been demonstrated by some well-established facts. The Christianization of the land of Rus' was believed to have occurred "in the eleventh hour." The numerous hagiographic works which were translated either in Bulgaria or Kiev, were sufficient to satisfy the needs of the time, especially as the oldest translated Lives included many that were interesting for their hagiographic content, for their form, or for their theological ideas (e.g., hagiographic works which touch upon the question of the end of the world, such as that of Andrew the Simple). Lives of Slavic saints were also known in Kiev: the Lives of Cyril and Methodius and the Lives of the Czech saints—Wenceslas and Ludmila. It was probably these Slavic Lives which provided the stimulus for the first original East Slavic Lives—those of Saints Borys and Hlib and St. Theodosius, in which one can detect echoes from the Life of St. Wenceslas.

To write Lives of the Saints of Kievan Rus' required considerable boldness as it entailed equating the new East Slavic saints with their great predecessors. Thus, in the early stages of its development, the hagiographic literature of Kievan Rus' was extremely humble in tone: there were few accounts of miracles; the saints were not praised to a very great degree; and there was a significant dependence on translated Lives and on those of West Slavic origin. However, this dependence was not slavish. Rather than merely recopying foreign Lives, the early Kievan hagiographic works attempted to present well-substantiated facts. Unfortunately, the information about the saints selected for inclusion in these Lives corresponded to that employed in the older foreign models. Kievan

authors undoubtedly followed this standardized pattern because it *was* standardized and represented an accepted norm of saintly behavior. On the other hand, if information about saints was lacking, their Lives were not written. This fact alone provides an acceptable explanation for the absence of hagiographic works about Ol'ha, Volodymyr, and even Antonius of the Kievan Caves Monastery. About such saints, there are only works akin to Lives but different in style—works of a type that do not require factual information. Nestor's Lives are classic examples of hagiographic literature.

2. A comparison of Nestor's Life of Borys and Hlib—the so-called *Čtenie*, with the "Tale" ("*Skazanie*") will clearly reveal the differences between these two genres. The Life begins with a prayer, an exhortation for God's help in the work which the author is undertaking in spite of "the coarseness and foolishness of his heart." He goes on to state that he is merely recounting the tales of the *Xristoljubci* ("Those Who Love God") and asks the reader to pardon his ignorance. This is followed by a lengthy introduction, expounding the history of the human race from the Creation through to the spread of Christianity; in the "last days," God in his beneficence decided to bring Rus' into the Christian community. Nestor also refers to the biblical tale of the vineyard, whose owner was looking for workers. The first part of the main body of the Life gives an account of Volodymyr's baptism—but makes no reference to the role of the Greeks in the Christianization of Rus'. Having mentioned Volodymyr's sons, Nestor then focuses on Borys, describing his youth, his love of books and prayers, his desire to follow in the footsteps of the saints. Hlib is a "child in body but a man in wisdom," a true friend to Borys and an almoner, extending his help to "beggars, widows and orphans." The characterization of Borys and Hlib concludes with a comparison of these two princes to the Saints whose names they had received at their baptism (Borys—Roman; Hlib—David). After noting the fact that Borys had already received his own principedom while Hlib was still living with his father (the "Tale" contradicts this), Nestor mentions that Volodymyr had sent Borys on a campaign against their enemies. Only at this point does the story of the murder of the two brothers begin in Nestor's Life. The "Tale," on the other hand, *begins* at this point. The events culminating in the murder of Borys are presented by Nestor in the same way as in the "Tale"; the only exceptions are that Borys says prayers instead of uttering laments and no detailed account of Svjatopolk's actions is given. To an even greater degree than in the "Tale," Borys' words, prayers and actions emphasize his desire to remain loyal and submissive to his older brother. Nestor's version of the story of Hlib's murder differs from that of the "Tale" in that Hlib is caught at the Dnieper River—not while he is on his way to Kiev but rather as he is fleeing from

it. While Hlib does not give vent to his grief in a lament, he does utter a plea for his life that is very similar to the one in the "Tale" but does not include the images of the unripe ear and the green twig. In place of a description of the emotions experienced by Hlib's friends when he is attacked, Nestor merely makes the following simple statement: "Having put down their oars, they sat motionlessly." Little is said about Svjatopolk and the Kievan throne: Svjatopolk "fled not only from the city but also from his native land and lived out the rest of his life in a foreign country"; his "horrible death," an expected end for a "sinner," is presented only in the form of a rumor. After the death of the "accursed one," "power is assumed by Jaroslav, the brother of the blessed" Borys, whom Nestor mistakenly believed to be Volodymyr's true successor. This is all that Nestor feels compelled to say about the political ramification of the tragic fates of Borys and Hlib. However, in the tradition of hagiography, his work also contains a final section describing the miracles performed by these saints, the transference of their relics and the construction of churches named in their honor. In the oldest manuscript, the first part of the Life of Borys and Hlib occupies over six pages, the second (describing the murder of the two saints)—about eight pages, and this final one—thirteen pages. Included in the latter are ten separate stories which are said not to exhaust the entire complex of miracles performed by these saints. Following some reflections about the meaning of submissiveness, Nestor concludes his work with a eulogy to Borys and Hlib. He also refers to himself—"the sinner, Nestor"—as the author of this Life and the compiler of the required factual information.

3. From the stylistic point of view Nestor's Life is much simpler than the "Tale." Nestor's work is not written in rhythmical prose nor does it employ emotional laments or a large number of images. On the other hand, his selection and arrangement of materials is skillful and results in a well-structured work. His style of presentation is different because his purpose is different: he does not discuss the political aspects of the story of Borys and Hlib and replaces the laments and lyrical monologues found in the "Tale" with prayers; his heroes are saints who are always close to God. The most characteristic trait of Nestor's work is its lack of concrete details. Unlike in the "Tale," the names of the assassins are not given—they are simply "unrestrainable men"; the names of Volodymyr's other sons are not mentioned, while Jaroslav is only referred to in passing toward the end of the work; Borys' principedom and the Pečenegs are also not named [they are simply *ratnye* (warriors) or *pogani* (pagans)]. Cities such as Vyšhorod or Kiev are mentioned by name only once and thereafter referred to as "the above-mentioned cities" or "the celebrated cities" ("*naročityj grad*""). Other cities are not specified. Nestor also employs devices borrowed from

sermons (e.g., apostrophe to the reader). Many of the prayers in this work are skillfully formulated and the stories about the miracles are masterful syntheses of a variety of material. Nestor also employs comparisons: "The Prophet David did battle with foreigners and defeated them. . . . Saint David [Hlib] did battle with the enemy and defeated him. . . ." Antithesis is another favorite device: "The blessed [Borys] was going to his brother, not thinking of anything evil in his heart; but the accursed [Svjatopolk] was not only planning evil against him, but had already sent evil in order to destroy him. The blessed [Borys] was rejoicing on his way that his elder brother would ascend the throne of his father, while the accursed one grieved when he heard that his brother was coming to see him." Nestor frequently compares Borys, Hlib and Volodymyr to various saints and these comparisons reveal his sources. Volodymyr is compared to Eustaphius Placidus and Constantine the Great, Borys and Hlib—to Roman and David or Joseph and Benjamin, and Svjatopolk—to Cain; Judas, Zachariah and Demetrius of Salonica are also mentioned. But echoes from the Life of St. Wenceslas are perhaps the strongest. With the possible exception of that of St. Eudoxius, Byzantium did not have Lives of saints that were princes. Both in its Latin original and in its Slavic translation, the Gumbold Life of Wenceslas provided an excellent model of how the life of a prince was to be depicted. While Nestor did not adopt anything from the actual story of Wenceslas's martyrdom, he did borrow some images from Gumbold's work.

As was mentioned above, it must be assumed that when selecting facts for inclusion in his Life of Borys and Hlib (love of reading, interest in Lives of martyrs, the giving of alms, the fact that Borys agreed to marry only because of the wishes of the boyars and his parents, Borys' refusal to believe the rumors about Svjatopolk's evil intentions, etc.), Nestor followed the example set by the Life of Wenceslas, an earlier work about a "venerable" saint of the same type (a prince and a martyr) as Borys and Hlib.

The schematism and lack of individual color in Nestor's Life undoubtedly stems from the traditions of his genre. Hagiographic works strove to eliminate individual peculiarities as a means of universalizing their content and appeal: Lives were addressed to the entire Christian community and attempted to be works of universal Christian literature. Nestor's Life of Borys and Hlib could have become one of these universal works: as early as 1095, Borys and Hlib were among the saints in whose honor altars in the Sazava Monastery in Bohemia were consecrated (mention is made of this under the year 1095 by the monk from this monastery who completed the *Chronicle of Cosmas of Prague*). Nestor has been reproached both for his lack of interest in realistic detail and for including various invented facts. It is hardly possible that a pious writer such as

Nestor, who assures his reader that he is recounting only what he has heard from the *Xristoljubci*, would falsify facts. By Nestor's time many facts about Borys and Hlib had already been forgotten while some incidents in their lives were presented in various ways. At this point in time, it is not possible to explain why Nestor chose to follow a particular variant. Similarly unjust are the criticisms in regard to the lack of color and individuality in Nestor's work; as was mentioned above, this is one of the features required by the genre.

The ideology of the Life of Borys and Hlib is also interesting. The orientation of this work is even more evident than that of the "Tale." Borys and Hlib are warriors for peace in the land of Rus', a peace that can be attained only if the relations between princes are built on definite moral and legal foundations. Nestor sees these foundations in Christian morality. From this point of view, the Life of Borys and Hlib is an interesting politico-ideological monument.

4. Nestor also wrote a second Life—that of St. Theodosius of the Kievan Caves Monastery. Structurally, it is weaker than the Life of Borys and Hlib, perhaps because there were no earlier works upon which Nestor could draw in this instance; as a result, he was forced to collect, select, and arrange all the materials himself. Since Theodosius had died in 1073 and Nestor was writing his Life around 1100, this task was not an extremely difficult one. He acquired some of the factual material about Theodosius' life from the monks at the Kievan Caves Monastery, who had known Theodosius personally (Nestor did not come to the monastery until after Theodosius' death). Information about his childhood was indirectly provided by his mother (her stories about her son were recounted to Nestor by one of the monks), who was a nun in one of the Kievan convents.

This Life also begins with a prayer of thanks to God for considering him worthy to be the biographer of saints. He refers to his Life of Borys and Hlib and begs the reader to pardon his lack of education and his ignorance. The main body of the work is divided into two parts: the first deals with Theodosius' life up to the time he entered the monastery, the second—with his life in the monastery (in the oldest manuscript these parts occupy approximately seven and thirty-three pages, respectively). There follows a short account of Theodosius' miracles (three in all) which is three pages in length, and a short conclusion.

Each part consists of a number of separate episodes. The first one (fourteen episodes) depicts Theodosius' development from his childhood up to the time that he entered the monastery. The narrative combines a clear psychological characterization of Theodosius and his mother with external motivation for their actions, that is, God is said to have led Theodosius along the path that brought him to the monastery and made him its spiritual leader. Both of

Theodosius' parents were pious Christians. His father appears to have been an official at the court of the prince for a time but later moved with his family to the large town of Kursk, where he died, leaving Theodosius an orphan in his childhood. It was in Kursk that Theodosius began his education. As a child he exhibited love of knowledge and a deep Christian piety which manifested itself in his attempt to flee to the Holy Land—he was prevented from reaching his destination and was returned to his home. Nestor attributes this turn of events to God's intervention, as it later made it possible for Theodosius to come to Kiev. The narrative then moves on to describe Theodosius' attempts to imitate Christ's submissiveness and humility; he wears modest clothing, works in the field, bakes the Host for the Eucharist (Theodosius chose this task, which was below the dignity of his position, in order to be "a co-worker on the body of Christ") and even wears chains on his body. All these things are continually opposed by his mother. Finally, he flees to Kiev where he unsuccessfully seeks admittance to various monasteries and is ultimately taken in by Antonius of the Kievan Caves Monastery. His mother discovers where he is but cannot convince him to return to his home and, following her son's example, she enters one of the Kievan convents. The second and longer part of Nestor's *Life of Theodosius* is weaker than the first; it consists of a large number of separate episodes (over forty) which merely follow one another in a haphazard way. While they contain a great deal of historical and ethnographic detail and serve to reveal Theodosius' personality, the episodes of the second part of this *Life* do not form the same kind of integral whole as those that recount the events of his youth. These forty some odd episodes can be divided into three groups: 1) those that delineate Theodosius' characteristics as an ascetic, priest and abbot; 2) those that describe his attitude toward the world; and 3) those that depict various miracles and miraculous occurrences, that is, various manifestations of God's grace toward the monastery. Nestor is very successful in describing Theodosius' life in the monastery, especially his type of asceticism; he is not a representative of extreme asceticism—the type that advocates escape from this world (Egyptian monasticism); his ascetic ideals are more closely aligned with those of the Palestinian tradition, which unites a relatively moderate self-denial with productive labor and an active concern for the betterment of the outside world. There is but one incident that can be labelled as mortification of the flesh: reminiscent of stories about Egyptian monks (Macarius), this episode depicts an instance in which Theodosius allows his body to be attacked by mosquitoes while he is working and praying. Neither is he an advocate of isolation: not only did he retreat to a cave for but a short period of time once a year, but also transferred the entire Monastery to the surface of the earth. On the other hand, much is said



about his physical labor: he cuts wood, weaves, carries water and helps to bind books; even more is told of the work of the monks as a whole. In addition, Nestor gives numerous accounts of Theodosius' spiritual practices, especially his praying and his struggle with his demon. Theodosius sleeps little and wears simple clothing, a fact that resulted in comical misunderstandings on more than one occasion. His most characteristic trait is his leniency towards the monks and the world; he does not reproach his monks for their sins or insist that they repent. Instead, he merely "laments" for those who flee from the monastery and gladly takes them back even if they have left it on more than one occasion. In a similar fashion, he releases thieves who have tried to rob the monastery. The monastery is not closed off from the world: a shelter for "beggars, the blind, the crippled [and] the ailing" is being constructed on its grounds. Nor is it wealthy, as Theodosius is more than once in straitened circumstances, without bread for the monks, without oil for the icon lamps, without wine for divine service. In spite of this, he still distributes whatever remains in the monastery: one of the monastery's friends or supporters always comes to the rescue. While Nestor categorizes this kind of unexpected and unsolicited aid as a miracle, it is in reality simply a concrete manifestation of the high esteem in which the Kievan Caves Monastery was held in the outside world. The only truly supernatural event is the appearance of the "luminous youth" who brings Theodosius three gold coins in a moment of dire need. Furthermore, he does not allow the monks to acquire any unnecessary possessions, be they clothing or food; he orders all superfluous items ("repugnant shares") to be burned or thrown into the Dnieper, but he does not punish those who are guilty of such acts. Only in political matters is Theodosius severe and adamant. Since the Kievan Caves Monastery had a considerable influence with the higher strata of Kievan society and with Prince Izjaslav, Theodosius could intercede on behalf of those who had suffered an injustice: "He defended many people before judges and princes." After Svjatoslav and Vsevolod had forced their older brother, Izjaslav, to flee from Kiev, Theodosius refuses to visit the victors: "I shall not go to Beelzebub's feast, and I shall not take part in a banquet full of blood and slaughter." Instead, he writes letters to Svjatoslav and, in one instance, even compares him to Cain, while the monks in the monastery continue to mention Izjaslav in their prayers. Rumors to the effect that the princes wish to have him removed as abbot merely stimulate further attacks against Svjatoslav on Theodosius' part. He is even eager to suffer for truth's sake [*"Žadaše vel'mi, eže potočenu byti"* ("He desired greatly to be exiled")]. However, even those princes whom he severely criticized, abstained from serious attacks against the monastery, for it was regarded as holy by the outside world; Nestor describes several miracles testifying to the

holiness of Theodosius and the monastery (various people see a light or a glow above the monastery) and the dreams of those who hold him in high esteem.

While Nestor was not always successful in structuring the wealth of material that he included in this work, the main ideas still emerge clearly: the years of Theodosius' youth are but a preparation for his life in the monastery and his pattern of behavior in both stages of his life is similar. His gentleness, kindness and submissiveness do not prevent him from being severe with the outside world (his mother, the princes), which he succeeds in overcoming. In addition, Theodosius' main views about monastic life are given (Nestor even includes short excerpts from his discourses to the monks). These features account for the great popularity of this work and for its strong influence on a great number of East Slavic hagiographic monuments.

5. In style, Nestor's *Life of Theodosius* is very complex. The language is simple and smooth, sentences are short, stylistic embellishments are few. However, there are quite a number of literary influences. In addition to the frequent quotations from the Bible, Nestor also includes passages from the *Life of Antonius* and from various *Patericons*; one can also detect the influence of the *Lives of Sabbas of Palestine* and *Wenceslas of Bohemia*. From the very beginning, he employs numerous formulaic expressions which are frequently without concrete meaning; however, only in the passages describing the significance of Theodosius' name, his lack of interest in games when he is a child, and his arrival at the monastery do we encounter borrowed *factual* material. The incident of the baking of the Host for the Eucharist is reminiscent of a passage from the *Life of Wenceslas*; however, it is not likely that this represents a direct borrowing from the *Life of the Czech saint*. More probably, the *Life of Wenceslas* merely served to direct Nestor's attention to the similar activity engaged in by Theodosius—a type of activity not documented in Greek *Lives*. There are also parallels between the *Life of Theodosius* and several Greek *Lives*, but here again, it must be assumed that these similarities derive from similarities in the actual lives of these saints. Furthermore, Nestor employs expressions derived from the hagiographic tradition. Such, for example, is his description of Theodosius as an "earthly angel and a heavenly man." Echoes of military tales are also present: ascetics are "mighty heroes" ("xrabri sil'ni"); the cross is "a weapon," "the shield of salvation," etc. (In a few instances the expressions employed have parallels in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*.) Among the other similes encountered in this work, is the comparison of Theodosius to "a shepherd of a spiritual flock" and the description of a boyar's son, who has decided to enter a monastery, as breaking away from his home like a bird or a gazelle from a snare. At important points in the narrative striking antitheses are employed: "While

Theodosius may have left us in body, he will always remain with us in spirit"; or it is said that Theodosius was respected not for his distinguished apparel or his great wealth but for the moral purity of his life, his luminous soul and his sincere teachings. Here also the narrative is written in the "impersonal" hagiographic style; no mention is made of the city in which Theodosius was born, the names of personages encountered in the work and so on.

6. As was mentioned above, there are no extant Lives of some of the saints which were most prominent in the spiritual history of the Eastern Slavs. Such is the case in respect to Ol'ha and Volodymyr the Great. While it is possible that tales about their baptisms did exist, those dealing with Volodymyr—the previously mentioned "Korsun' Legend" (see Ch. III, pt. C, no. 6) and others referred to in the *Chronicle*—are divergent.

Evidence of the existence of Lives of Ol'ha and Volodymyr is provided by one Kievan monument—"In Memory and Praise of Prince St. Volodymyr" ascribed to the monk Jacob. An important historical source, this work appears to be composed of three separate items—a eulogy to Volodymyr and the Lives of Ol'ha and Volodymyr; while there are extant copies of the Life of Volodymyr, they date back only to the sixteenth century. The traces of very old elements found in this work appear to be insufficient to allow definite conclusions to be drawn about the date of origin either of the work as a whole or of its separate parts.

There is also reason to assume that two other Lives also existed. The first of these is a short Life of two Varangian martyrs—a father and a son. According to the *Chronicle*, they were killed by a pagan mob, apparently because they refused to allow the son to be sacrificed to the pagan gods; the father's name appears to have been Tury or Tur. However, it is not known whether this Life, preserved in part in the *Chronicle*, was written in Slavic or Greek. The Life of Antonius of the Kievan Caves Monastery also has not been preserved but mention of it is made in the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*. Indications are that this work gave a considerable amount of information about monks other than Antonius. Some scholars believe that it was not preserved because of its Greco-philic overtones. Only a few of its factual details, which were incorporated into the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, have come down to us.

Several very short old Lives (Borys and Hlib, Ol'ha, Volodymyr) were included in miscellanies. These "miniature" monuments have little literary significance.

## E. THE COLLECTION OF 1076

1. A collection of numerous short works, the *Collection* of 1076 is a unique monument of Kievan literature. It includes three different "precepts" by

parents for children ("Instruction of a Father to a Son" and the instructions of Xenophon and St. Theodore); "Athanasius' Replies," which explain difficult passages from the Scriptures, excerpts from some uncanonical books of the Bible ("The Book of Wisdom" and "Sirach"); a story—"the Charitable Sozomenus," and finally, quotations, phrases and proverbs, grouped by theme—the type of material most characteristic of the *Collection* of 1076. The entire work is intended for the layman; the most frequently recurring theme is compassion for the poor. Much of the advice given is of the secular variety; for example, suggestions about how people ought to behave towards "the powerful of this world" ["*Ne svarisja s' "člověk"m' sil'nym'*" ("Do not quarrel with a powerful man")]. Some of the works included in the *Collection* were widespread even in later periods (up to the eighteenth century).

The *Collection* of 1076 follows a definite structural pattern. It begins with an introduction devoted to the benefits of reading: "The reading of books, brothers, is a good thing." Succeeding this are the "instructions" by fathers to children and collections of quotations, among them "Advice to the Wealthy" and *One Hundred Maxims*. Excerpts from sermons come next and the work ends with "The Charitable Sozomenus," a story which seeks to demonstrate that God rewards those who show compassion for the poor a hundredfold.

2. While it is known that the *Collection* of 1073 is a translation from Bulgarian and is composed solely of foreign materials, the origin of the *Collection* has not been completely explicated. The hypothesis which suggests that various parts of this monument originated in Kiev and can be attributed in part to Hilarion must be rejected, as Ihor Ševčenko has succeeded in discovering the Greek originals of almost all of its parts. However, the question of whether the translation was made in Kiev or Bulgaria still remains unresolved. The many East Slavic elements in its style and language suggest that it is at least in part of Kievan origin. We encounter word forms ["*vered*" ("caprice"), "*norov*" ("custom")] and words [e.g., "*lar*" ("chest"—borrowed from the Scandinavian)] which are characteristic of East Slavic languages. An important feature of East Slavic texts in general and Ukrainian texts in particular is the substitution of the endings—'*m*' or '*-m*' in the instrumental case of masculine and neuter singular for the '*-om*' and '*-em*' of Old Church Slavonic and South Slavic. In the *Collection* of 1076, East Slavic forms occur the most frequently. Since "the philosopher, Cyril" is mentioned in the introductory piece, "About the Reading of Books," it is clear that this part of the *Collection* must belong to the original literature of Kievan Rus'. But the translated parts also contain features which compel us to discuss them in conjunction with original East Slavic monuments.

3. A large part of the material included in the *Collection* of 1076 consists

of quotations or proverbs—short phrases, usually composed of two antithetical or parallel sections which are often linked by rhyme and written in rhythmical prose. Individual words are frequently repeated and, on occasion, the type of alliteration found in the *Chronicle* is also employed. The following are some examples of such phrases:

*iže v" krotosti požiša* i-v  
*i v dobroslov"i usta svoi učiniša . . .* i-v-u-u

("Those who lived in gentleness and allowed their lips  
 to speak only good words. . . .")

*kyim" put'm' idoša* k-i  
*i koeju st'ezju tekoša . . .* i-k

("By what road they advanced and which way they  
 ran. . . .")

*starčišaago den'mi poč'stiti ne lēnisja,* s-p  
*i pokoiti starost' ego pot'ščisja.* p-s-p

("Do not be slow to show respect to an old man and  
 try to bring peace to his old age.")

*na st'zju podviga s"stupaeši,* s-s  
*dušju že ot"raslablenija svoboždaeši . . .* s

("When you enter upon a great enterprise, free your  
 soul from weakness. . . .")

*iže slabo živet',* s  
*to togo ne privodi na s"vět".* t-t-n-n-s

("Do not bring a man who lives poorly into the council.")

*prěd" star'ci m"lčjanie,* p-m  
*prěd" mudrymi poslušanie . . .* p-m-p

("Before age—silence; before wisdom—attention. . . .")

*i ne naviděnie\* člověkom" tvoriti,* i-n-n-t  
*n" t"kmo ot" boga xvaly i milosti*  
*prositi . . .* n-t-i

("And to act not so that men can see but only to ask  
 for praise and compassion from God. . . .")

At prayers:

*Ne směšai sloves" svoix" s" prostymi*  
*slovesy,* s-s-s-s-s  
*vědy, jako bogu s" běsed'nik" esi.* s-s

("Do not mix your words with common words,  
 knowing that you are God's interlocutor.")

Or another example with imperfect rhyme:

*Egda že v" z'riši nošč'ju na nebo i na*  
*zvězd'nuju krasotu,* v-n-n-n-n  
*molisja vladycě bogu, dobruumu*  
*xytr'cu.* v-d  
*Zautra že osvěštaem" pripadi k" tvor'cju*  
*svoemu,* p-t-s  
*dav" šuumu ti c' den' na priloženie* d-t-s-d-n  
*životu.*

("When at night you look at the sky and the beauty of  
 the stars, pray to God, the wise craftsman. In the morn-  
 ing, in the light of the day, bow down before your  
 Creator who gave you this day to lengthen your life.")

There are also examples without alliteration:

*dnes' bo rastem"*  
*a utro gnies'.*

("For we grow up today and perish tomorrow.")

---

\**Naviděnie* is interpreted as two words: *na viděnie* (trans.).

*dažd' moknuštjumu suxotu,  
zimnomu teplotu.*

("Give a dry shelter to him who is wet and warmth to him who is cold.")

*xranisja ot pitija,  
oskv'rnjaet' bo molitvy tvoja*

("Beware of drunkenness, for it profanes your prayers.")

In some cases entire fragments are syntactically rhythmical:

*alč'naago nak''rmi . . .  
žad'naago napoi,  
stran'na v''vedi,  
bol'na prisěti,  
k'' t'm'nici doidi,  
vižd' bědu ix''  
i v''zd''xni.*

("Feed the hungry, give water to the thirsty, receive the wanderer, visit the sick, enter the prison, look at their unhappiness and sigh.")

In other cases, the repetition of words gives a rhythmical quality to a passage:

A boat cannot be made without nails,  
or a virtuous man without the reading of books;  
just as the heart of a captive is with his family,  
so [the heart] of a virtuous man is with his books;  
a warrior's beauty is in his armour, a boat's—in its sails,  
and that of a virtuous man—in the reading of books.

Frequently, the first words of sentences begin with the same sounds (anaphora):

one soul is given to man,  
one life does he have to live,  
one death—to endure. . . .

Or:            meekly treading,  
                 meekly sitting,  
                 meekly gazing,  
                 meek in speech. . . .

There are also instances in which parallelism is employed without alliteration or rhyme:

Stand up like a publican,  
 run, like a street-walker,  
 be moved, like Ahab,  
 cry, like Peter  
 call out, like the Canaanite woman . . .

Or:            grieve over sins,  
                 sigh over temptations,  
                 bemoan falling from grace.

4. One should also note the selection of sayings with beautiful and vivid imagery: "Avoid flattering words as you would avoid crows which peck out the eyes of your soul"; "If the inhabitants who live closer to the source of a river do not fill their containers with water or do not allow their cattle to drink, saying: 'Let us leave the water for those who live further down stream and take little for ourselves'—then, this is false; rather, they should use as much water as they need and not be concerned about those who live down stream for the same river also flows past them. This is also the case with respect to wealth: do not worry about your descendants . . ."; "A dark cloud hides the beauty and light of the sun, an angry thought destroys the beauty of a prayer"; "Do not linger in the slime of sin until you suddenly disappear in it." There are a number of effective antitheses: "Keep your head low but raise your spirit up high"; "With your feet step slowly but with your spirit run quickly to the gates of heaven"; "The joy of this world ends in tears as can be seen by comparing two neighbors: in one household there is a wedding, in the other—laments for a dead person"; "Fulfill [God's] will in little things and He will fulfill yours for eternity."

There are also graphic descriptions: "If you walk down the stairs cheerfully after an audience with a prince, see that those in your own home do not walk sadly but with the same joy as you"; "When quenching your thirst with a sweet drink, remember the person who drinks water warmed by the sun"; "When you are resting in a well-protected room and hear the sound of heavy rain, think of



the poor who now lie beneath the falling drops as under falling arrows"; "When in winter you sit in a warm room . . . sigh and think of the poor who are bent over a small fire—their eyes are sore from the smoke, only their hands are warm, while their backs and their bodies are exposed to the frost." The description of Paradise in the story about Sozomenus is striking: "And he saw other trees, abounding in fragrant and beautiful fruits, with branches bent down to the earth, each one better than the other. And various kinds of birds were perched on their upper branches, leaning towards one another and singing sweetly and unceasingly. . . . And the orchards swayed to and fro, radiant in their beauty. Springs flowed from beneath the earth and a beautiful rainbow graced the sky. . . ." (Compare with the passage describing the beauty of the starlit sky quoted above.) The following depiction of a drunk is taken from a fragment mistakenly attributed to the prophet Joel: wine "transforms a daring person into a coward, a morally pure person into a debaucher, knows not the truth, deprives man of his senses and, just as water poured into fire, the unlimited [drinking] of mead extinguishes reason. . . . For [a drunk], the earth appears to be shaking and hills running around in circles. . . . His head does not remain erect but sways to and fro on his shoulders. . . . He has bad dreams. . . . They doze and sigh. . . . His vision is foggy."

5. While the works from which the quotations cited above were taken are translated monuments, it is clear that a great deal of artistry went into their making: their translator did not ignore the purely literary aspects of the original and succeeded in capturing its most striking sections by means of his skillful use of the resources of the East Slavic language. From the point of view of form, the translated works of the *Collection* of 1076 are partly original.

There is little doubt that many of the expressions and proverbs in the *Collection* of 1076 became part of the oral tradition. In any case, this miscellany contains proverbs such as the following: "Laziness is the mother of a bad person"; "A fruit tree is recognized by the fruit it bears"; "Do not abandon an old friend, a new friend is not his equal"; or the later classic comparison of life to a rolling wheel; or: "The rich man is not the man who has a great deal but the one who does not require a great deal. . . . The poor man is not the man who does not have a great deal but the one who wants to have a great deal"—included in Skovoroda's works. Sayings and proverbs are also found in other works of Kievan literature (in Volodymyr Monomax's "Instruction," in Daniel's "Supplication," etc.). In addition, there are many interesting words and expressions.

It is possible to speak of a definite literary "school" or trend in the eleventh century. Representatives of this trend include Hilarion as well as the translator (or translators) and compilers of the *Collection* of 1076. The *Collection* exhibits

features common to various works of this period; such, for example, is its predilection for aphorisms also characteristic of the *Chronicle*.

## F. THE WORKS OF VOLODYMYR MONOMAX

1. Volodymyr Monomax (1053-1125) is another eleventh century writer whose collection of works has been preserved. They were entered in the *Chronicle* under the year 1096 but in imperfect form: portions of the beginning have been corrupted and a page from the middle appears to be missing. Monomax's works consist of his "Instruction," a letter to Prince Oleh and an autobiography. A prayer (or several shorter prayers) concludes the collection. Modelled on traditional prayers, this final work does not represent an original contribution by Volodymyr Monomax.

The clearly panegyric elements in the *Chronicle's* account of the life and political activity of Volodymyr Monomax, should not be allowed to obscure the fact that Monomax was unquestionably an eminent and popular prince, who wished harmony to be established among the various princes and a common front against the enemy—the Polovci. And he did succeed to a certain extent in attaining this goal. The *Chronicle* is not alone in its idealization of Volodymyr: Metropolitan Nicephorus' letter to Monomax begins with a eulogy, undoubtedly only partly motivated by the requirements of courtesy. Writing during Lent, Nicephorus does not find it necessary to explain the meaning of this time of the year to Monomax nor to rebuke him for his sins, as Monomax had a pious upbringing and his prudence is visible to all: he sleeps on the damp earth, does not require a shelter, does not wear "lustrous apparel," walks through the forests dressed like an orphan, wearing clothes appropriate to his position only in the city. Nicephorus praises Volodymyr for his hospitality and kindness and asks only one thing of him—that he forgive those that he has punished. While the image of Volodymyr Monomax that emerges here is clearly idealized, it also corresponds to the prince's own ideals.

The "Instruction" was definitely written before 1125 and possibly even before 1118 as it may have been included in the redaction of the *Chronicle* attributed to Silvester; however, it is more probable that it was incorporated into the *Chronicle* at a later date. The text of the work itself suggests that Volodymyr is preparing for his death—he is writing his "Instruction" "sitting on a sleigh" and he thanks God for "bringing him to these days." In Kievan Rus', the dead were carried on sleighs during the funeral ceremonies be they in summer or winter—a custom that was preserved in Ukraine up to the nineteenth century and in the mountainous areas—even into the twentieth.

2. The overall structure of the "Instruction" stands out in bold relief. It consists of an introduction and three distinct subsections. The first is of a religious and moral character, containing an abundance of quotations from the Bible and other religious texts. The second is more secular in nature, as advice concerned primarily with political morality is given: Volodymyr describes the duties of a prince (at home, during military exercises, during the inspection of his lands) and the obligations common to all men. In the final part he gives an account of his own life as an illustration of the percepts presented in the previous section. As we can see, the structure of this work follows a logical pattern. In the introduction, Monomax speaks of his age and asks his children and other readers of his work ("anyone else, who hears this 'Instruction' ") to read it attentively and to excuse him if they are displeased for he is an old man and may have "uttered some nonsense towards the end of my long journey, when I am already seated on my sleigh." The first part begins with quotations from the Psalter selected from among the portions meant to be read during the first week of Lent. Unpleasant news about the eruption of internal dissension leads Volodymyr to open his Psalter\* and catch sight of the following words: "Why do you grieve, O soul of mine? Why do you trouble me?" (Psalter, 41.12). Then he selects passages from it, the main theme being the damnation of sinners and the salvation of the righteous (36.1; 36.9-36.17; 36.21-36.27; 55.11-55.12; 58.1-58.4; 62.4-62.5; 63.33, 32.2). Monomax then includes the moral advice to the young from the "Instruction" by Basil the Great (perhaps taken from the *Collection* of 1076—see above) as well as some of his own. This advice is concerned in large part with discipline: "Mastery of one's own eyes, reticence of tongue, humility of spirit, the subordination of the flesh to the spirit, suppression of anger, purity of thoughts, the endeavour to perform good deeds." "If you are deprived of something, do not take revenge; if you are hated or persecuted, suffer in silence; if you are pursued, beg [for forgiveness] . . ." Among the obligations towards others, Volodymyr includes the following: "Release those who have been unjustly imprisoned, judge orphans [fairly], defend widows." This part concludes with a prayer in which Monomax pays tribute to God, primarily because He demands so little of man: "seclusion, monkhood, fasting" are not required; "three minor acts" are sufficient—"repentance, tears and prayer." He goes on to praise the wisdom of God as manifested in His creation. And finally, he asks his reader to fulfill at least half of these demands, especially that of prayer and urges that "Lord, have mercy"

---

\*Some scholars regard this as an act of "fortune telling with a Psalter" (see Ch. II, pt. B, sec. a). What we have here is not fortune telling but rather an attempt to find spiritual strength in a favorite book.

be repeated "continuously, silently" during processions (this is reminiscent of the later "continuous prayer" of the Hesychasts).

Secular advice is sustained in the spirit of Christian humility. Monomax begins by urging that assistance be given to the poor, to orphans, and to widows and then moves on to discuss justice in general, advocating mild sentences (he is opposed to the death sentence) and the fulfillment of promises: he believes that a person should only swear to keep a promise by kissing the cross, if he is certain that he can do so. Required also are respect for the clergy and for the aged, care for the sick, the absence of pride, awareness of death and an attitude towards material values that is appropriate to this awareness: "Do not bury [your wealth] in the earth [for] this is a great sin"—rather curious advice for such turbulent times. These are followed by entirely secular counsels: prudence, personal attention on the prince's part to all princely and domestic duties, hospitality and friendliness and defense of the people against despotism. A man should love his wife but not allow her to dominate him and he should work continuously, especially at acquiring knowledge (Volodymyr's father, Vsevolod, who was married to a Byzantine princess, knew five languages): "Laziness is the mother of all [evil]." All these counsels are motivated in part by religious considerations, by "fear of God"; in part by ethical ones—all people are equal because all are mortal; and in part by practical ones—the victims of injustice will accuse the perpetrators of this injustice and a lack of prudence in a war may result in death; if a prince is hospitable and knows several languages, he acquires a good reputation. The passage presenting these secular counsels is concluded by a program of the prince's day: he should rise before daybreak, be the first to go to church, then take counsel ("think") with his retinue, perform his judicial duties, participate in a hunt, take a nap at noon, and so on.

3. The final part of the "Instruction" is Monomax's autobiography, his reminiscences of his numerous (he says there were eighty-three) campaigns which led him all the way to the German town of Glogau; the fact that only seventy campaigns are mentioned in the text that has come down to us suggests that one page may have been lost. Monomax takes care to list all the Polovcian princes that were either captured or killed. And finally, he speaks of his "labours" in hunting and the dangers connected with them: "Two bisons attacked my horse and me with their horns, a stag butted me, two elks attacked me—one trampled on me with his feet, the other charged at me with its horns, a wild boar tore my sword from my thigh, a bear ripped some horsecloth off from around my knee, a wild beast leaped up onto my thigh while I was mounted, gashed my leg and wounded my horse." Hunting was not merely an interest peculiar to Volodymyr Monomax; in both real and symbolic terms, it repre-

sented the conquest and cultivation of the land (compare the role of doing battle with beasts in the myth of Hercules and in the East Slavic "spiritual songs" about St. George). Volodymyr only gives brief examples from his own life: "I was never concerned for myself, for my own head. What should really have been done by a servant, I did myself . . . ; I did not rely on mayors and [other] capable persons but did what had to be done myself; I arranged everything in my own home myself; neither did I allow any poor bondsman or destitute widow to be mistreated; I even looked after matters pertaining to the Church and divine service myself. . . ." Then he states that he is not praising himself by recounting these things: "I praise God and glorify His benevolence for it was He who saved me, a sinner and an evil man, from death on so many occasions and it was He, who did not make me, an evil man, lazy by nature and unconcerned with all necessary human matters." In the brief conclusion, Volodymyr again mentions the importance of doing good deeds, "praising God and His saints."

4. In addition to the "Instruction" with its appended autobiography, Volodymyr's letter to Prince Oleh Svjatoslavyč, written after the battle in which Volodymyr's son, Izjaslav, was killed, has also been preserved. The beginning and end of this letter have been somewhat corrupted. As in the "Instruction," Volodymyr commences by speaking of his own spiritual struggle: his soul overcame his heart, having reminded him that all men are mortal (Volodymyr wrote these words in 1096 when he was only forty-three years old) and he and his family will be forced to face the final judgment as people who were unable to maintain good relations. He quotes passages that are concerned with love among brothers and reminds Oleh of the fact that he, Volodymyr, and his son, Izjaslav, attempted to put an end to the hostilities that plagued their family. Even immediately after the death of Izjaslav, Volodymyr still agrees to end the disagreements peacefully. In addition to these more general requests, Volodymyr also begs Oleh to release Izjaslav's widow. Volodymyr probably kept a copy of this letter for himself because in it were expressed his ideas about the necessity of peaceful cooperation among the princes of Kievan Rus' and his plea for the elimination of revenge.

In the manuscript copy, this letter ends with a prayer (or several short prayers) addressed to Christ, the Virgin Mary, and St. Andrew of Crete. This prayer is clearly a compilation of Church prayers, for it is maintained in a style that is much closer to that of religious monuments than the main body of the letter. Intertwined in it are personal pleas and pleas for the country ("*grad*" ).

5. Monomax's works should not be regarded as occasional and extra-literary. The "Instruction" even makes reference to potential readers, to those other than Volodymyr's children who will "listen" to it being read. Instructions

for children were one of the favorite forms of Byzantine literature. It is even likely that Volodymyr read the instructions included in the *Collection* of 1076 (see Ch. III, pt. E), as he quotes from the sermon of Basil the Great. Volodymyr could also have been familiar with the instruction of Jaroslav the Wise, recorded in the *Chronicle* under the year 1054, and the apocryphal "Commandments of the Twelve Patriarchs." However, not all instructions were of such an elevated ethical and religious character as Monomax's. In Byzantine literature, we find instructions that are Machiavellian in character. On the other hand, it is possible that Volodymyr was also acquainted with Western works of this category: his wife, Gyda, was the daughter of Harold II (Kiev's ties with England date back to the times of Jaroslav the Wise when the son of King Edmund found sanctuary in Kiev), a Saxon princess, who fled to Denmark with her family via Exeter and Ireland and there married Volodymyr in 1074 or 1075. There is an English instruction dedicated to King Harold's family, which originated in Exeter and was written by Bishop Leofric, a cleric who was concerned with the upbringing of Harold's children.

As was frequently the case with old epistolary works, Monomax's letter to Oleh has a marked literary coloration and is meant not only for Oleh; it is really a kind of political pamphlet directed at a broader audience.

The content of Volodymyr's works provides indications of the nature of his creative process. As a person with a deep interest in books, he probably copied out passages from his reading which appealed to him: the "Instruction" reveals his knowledge of the Bible (possibly from the *Paroemenarium*), the *Collection* of 1076, *Hexaameron of Basil the Great*, *Physiologus* and other works, such as the apocrypha. From this collection of quotations he would then select material appropriate to his purpose. Furthermore, there is little doubt that other passages of the "Instruction," such as the formulaic expressions quoted above, were also derived in part from literary sources. In addition to his collection of quotations, Volodymyr probably also drew on his own diary in which he recorded information about his campaigns or at least their dates. While not followed absolutely, a definite structural pattern is discernible in the "Instruction."

The most outstanding features of Monomax's works are his psychological characterizations and imagery. Both the "Instruction" and the letter to Prince Oleh begin in the same way—with a reference to Volodymyr's own inner experiences. Before presenting his own thoughts, he introduces quotations, such as: "God's concern for a man is more important than the concern of one man for another." On the other hand, he expresses his thoughts about the beauty and harmony of the universe in his own words: "By thy skill, O Lord, the various animals and birds and fish are adorned! We marvel at the miracle of Man's

creation from dust and of the variety of human countenances which are so distinct that if the whole world were brought together, none of them would look the same but each one—thanks to God's wisdom—would have his own likeness. . . .\*

And we must also marvel at the fact that celestial birds come from particular warm regions . . . and do not remain in one country but . . . disperse over all countries, according to God's command, so that they will fill the woods and fields. . . . [And] Thou, O Lord, hast taught these heavenly birds—at Thy command they sing . . . [and] at Thy command, though they have voices, they become silent." Volodymyr finds picturesque and vivid expressions for the simplest thoughts: one should rise early "so that the sun does not find you in bed"; about his march to the burned down town of Berestia he says—to ride "to a firestick"; describing a journey along the Dnieper on the banks of which hostile Polovcians stood, he writes: "They licked their chops like wolves . . . as they stood by the ferry and in the hills"; imagining how Oleh looked at his dead son, he says: "And you saw his blood and his body, wilted like a young flower . . . like unto a slaughtered lamb"; advising the princes to remain in their own principalities, he employs the image "to eat one's forefather's bread"; his plea for the release of Izjaslav's widow is expressed as follows: "You must send my daughter-in-law to me . . . so that I may embrace her and lament the death of her husband with her . . . instead of singing wedding songs, for, because of my sins, I have seen neither her happiness nor her wedding\*\*; and the mourning over, I shall settle her here and she will sit and grieve like a turtle-dove on a withered tree." The passages quoted above reveal traces of folk and literary imagery and testify to Volodymyr Monomax's own poetic gifts.

The language is also interesting. With the exception of the prayers, Monomax's works contain both Church Slavonic vocabulary and elements from the vernacular, certain traces of which remain to this day in Ukrainian: *vyrij* (warm regions to which birds migrate in winter), *paropci* [*parubky* (young men)], *lahodyty* (to prepare), *varyty* [*varuvaty* (to guard)], *horlycja* (turtle-dove), etc.

And finally, the works of Volodymyr Monomax present a striking portrait of an educated person from the secular domain of the land of Rus'; they not only reveal his reading habits and his literary talent but also provide an example of the Christian piety and the Christian political ideology of the day.

---

\*This section is reminiscent of a passage from the work by a Byzantine voivode, Cecaumenus.

\*\*Perhaps "happiness" refers to the wedding celebrations as distinct from the wedding ceremony performed in church.

## G. "THE PILGRIMAGE OF ABBOT DANIEL"

1. "The Pilgrimage of Abbot Daniel," one of the most popular works of Kievan literature (about one hundred copies from the fifteenth to the nineteenth century have been preserved), only borders on *belles-lettres*. This work is primarily concerned with presenting a very detailed picture of Palestine and its holy places. While it is very valuable for its topographical details about the Holy Land, "The Pilgrimage of Abbot Daniel" is narrated in a religiously motivated emotional style. As a result, it does not fall into the category of a work about geography but rather into the genre of memoirs. Daniel's work also includes much information of value to the literary historian.

Daniel's pilgrimage was not an isolated phenomenon; evidence suggests that pilgrimages were a common fact of life in the eleventh and twelfth centuries: Antonius of the Kievan Caves Monastery made a pilgrimage to Mount Athos, while the young Theodosius, enthralled by the tales of those who had been to the Holy Land, even tried to run away from home in order to make such a trip himself; in 1062 Barlaam of the Kievan Caves Monastery went to the Holy Land; at the Holy Sepulchre, Daniel himself met inhabitants of Kiev, and Novgorod who had also been there. The question of whether people should travel to the Holy Land is asked in "Kirik's Questions" (see Ch. IV, pt. J, no. 2), and in the *stariny* (epic songs) performed by legendary "cripples." Daniel, abbot of some monastery, organizes his pilgrimage on a broad scale; he takes his entire "retinue," acquires guides, and has divine services performed. Furthermore, even Baldwin, King of the Crusaders, took Daniel along with him and had him placed by his side during the Easter service; Daniel was granted access to any place he wished to enter.

Daniel was probably from the principality of Černihiv—he compares the Jordan River with the Snov' (it is true that there is also a river by this name in the district of Voroniž) and when praying for the princes, only mentions those from the southern principalities. The reason for his pilgrimage is the same as that of any pilgrim: he wants to visit the places where "Christ, our Lord, once walked." He must have decided to record his impressions of the Holy Land before he actually undertook the journey. As he says in his introduction, he did not want to be like "an idle slave" and decided to describe his journey for the faithful so that they would develop a longing for the holy places. He asks his readers to pardon his lack of skill. However, this introduction alone demonstrates that Daniel was a diligent and talented man of letters. During the course of his journey he must have kept a diary in which he recorded precise measurements, and distances, place-names and so on. Moreover, his descriptions were



well served by his familiarity with the Bible and apocryphal works. His pilgrimage to the Holy Land was made between 1106 and 1108.

2. It is impossible to summarize briefly a work so broad in scope. Daniel does not limit himself to a description of Jerusalem, but also gives his impressions of all of Palestine. However, his main interest is in the holy places, associated with the mortal life of Christ or with the events of the Old Testament and in churches and monasteries. In his descriptions of these places he occasionally also refers to countries, plants, animals, farming and rarely also to certain people—his guide, from the St. Sabbas Monastery in Jerusalem, his retinue, King Baldwin, the Arabs, Western Europeans, and so on. Such references are very brief as the following example indicates: “The Jordan River flows swiftly; its far bank is winding, while this one is straight. The water is muddy and very sweet to the palate so that one never tires of drinking this holy water and people do not get sick from it and it does no harm. The Jordan River is very much like our own Snov’ in width and depth as well as in the swiftness and unevenness of its flow. Its meadows are exactly like those near the Snov’.” “In width, the Jordan is exactly like the River Snov’ at its estuary. And on this side of the River, there is a small wood and there are many very tall trees along the shores of the Jordan and there are willows but not like our willows . . . there are many reeds. And here a multitude of animals lives; there are wild boars, a countless number of them, and many leopards. And there are lions on the other side of the Jordan in the rocky hills and many lions are born there. . . .” Another good example is his description of the environs of Bethlehem: “And this hilly land near Bethlehem is very beautiful and a great many fruit trees grow on the slopes, beautiful olive trees and fig trees and various others and there are many vineyards and in the valley there are fields—all this is found near Bethlehem.” Daniel also describes the wilderness and the wild mountainous landscapes, such as those along the road between Jericho and Jerusalem: “All the way it is flat, all is sand, the road is very difficult, many people cannot breathe from the heat and die of thirst. For not far from the road is Sodom (the Dead Sea) and from this Sea, stench and hot air emanate as from a burning stove and scorch the earth with this vile-smelling heat.” His descriptions of structures are less colorful. Such, for example, is the picture of the Church of the Resurrection of Christ in Jerusalem: “Its structure is amazing and it is very well built and its beauty is inexpressible; it creates an impression of roundness and awesomeness and its exterior, which is decorated with a mosaic, is amazingly and inexpressibly beautiful; and its walls are covered by slabs of marble cut from the most expensive stone and it is very beautiful. . . .” In addition to such inexpressive words as “amazing, beautiful, inexpressible, awesome,” Daniel occasionally also includes detailed enumerations of the

measurements of buildings, the number of pillars and so on. His descriptions of farm life are more successful. He depicts the acquisition of incense or the economy of Hebron area in the following words: "And today this land surely possesses all of God's blessings: grain and wine and oil and is rich in all raw materials and cattle and a great multitude of sheep and good calves are born twice a year and there are many bees in those rocks, in those beautiful hills; and there are many good vineyards on the slopes and numerous fruit trees—olive trees, fig trees, apple trees and cherry trees. Grapes and other fruits grow well and are better than those that grow anywhere else on the face of this earth—and neither are there comparable grapes anywhere and the fruit is like heavenly fruit."

People are mentioned only in passing. Even King Baldwin is not described in detail. Of all the people that Daniel comes across, only his guide is considered worthy of a few brief comments for he is a "holy man, old in years and very learned." The objective descriptive style is occasionally broken by passages in an emotional or elevated style; for a long time Daniel walks "lovingly" along the shores of the Jordan; "with love in their hearts and tears in their eyes," he and his retinue kiss the "holy spot" where Christ was transfigured; they are overcome with joy when they first catch a glimpse of Jerusalem—"no one can hold back his tears when he looks longingly upon this land and these holy places where Christ walked to grant us salvation." The concluding section of the work, which follows a separate part devoted to the appearance of the holy fire on Christ's grave, is equally joyous: "Enriched by God's grace, carrying gifts in my hands and a token from the holy grave, illuminating with them all places, we walked along joyfully, with a very great joy in our hearts, as if we had found some valuable treasure." The reactions of others are also recorded: during Easter service "Prince Baldwin stands in awe and in great humility and tears flow from his eyes as if from a spring" and all the people at His gravesite rejoice. "And he who did not see this joy on this day, will not believe the narrator."

Daniel's patriotism is revealed in his prayers for the princes, whose names he records in the commemorative book, and for the land of Rus'. The icon lamp which he places at the Holy Sepulchre on Easter is from "the entire land of Rus'" (by which he means Ukraine—see above, no. 1).

3. However, all these descriptions of landscapes, people and emotional reactions are merely embellishments; the main purpose of the work is the depiction of religious monuments. As many of the events of the Old and New Testaments were associated in Palestine with specific localities, they gave rise to the so-called "local legends" or tales. The admixture of historical and legendary in them was undoubtedly a product both of religious fantasy and a practical

desire to have something worthy to show the traveller in every area. Daniel visited many such places and refers to the biblical and apocryphal stories linked with them. His numerous allusions to apocrypha provide an indication of the wealth of such material already known in Kievan Rus' by this time. Thus, describing Golgotha, he mentions that beneath Christ's tomb lies "Adam's head"—at the time of Christ's death, the earth beneath it "cracked . . . and through this crack blood and water from Christ's ribs dripped on Adam's head and washed away the sins of the entire human race" (from the apocrypha, "The Tree of the Cross"—see Ch. II, pt. C, sec. b). Daniel also visited the cave where the Magi bowed down before Christ; the well, near which the Archangel Gabriel first appeared to the Virgin Mary (both tales are from the "Gospel of Jacob"); the place where Christ was tempted by the Devil; the tower in which David wrote the Psalms; the mountain on which Elizabeth hid with John the Baptist; ate fish from the Sea of Galilee, which Christ had particularly esteemed, etc. Daniel's work provides a wealth of material for the study of apocrypha as well as local legends.

"The Pilgrimage of Abbot Daniel" occupies an important place in eleventh century Kievan literature. While it only borders on *belles-lettres*, it, nonetheless, remains a work of literature—by eleventh century standards, "The Pilgrimage of Abbot Daniel" is not a purely "scholarly," geographic work. Its language is quite simple and bears traces of the vernacular. Especially striking is the use of the embryonic article: "*Grad*" *mal*" *stoit*" . . . *v' gorax tĕx*" . . . *posred'že grada togo cerkov' velika*. . . *Vlĕžuči—ž' v' cerkov' tu* . . . *est' pečera* . . . , *slĕsti po stup-nem*" *v pečeru tu*" ("A small city stands in those hills . . . in the middle of the town there is a large church. . . As you enter this church . . . , there is a cave, . . . one reaches this cave by going down some stairs") and so on.\* Unfortunately, the later redactions of this work (and only later copies—from the fifteenth century—have come down to us) did not preserve its linguistic peculiarities. The broad scope of "The Pilgrimage of Abbot Daniel," its emotional quality and the graphic nature of its descriptions, link it with the Kievan tradition. One need only compare Daniel's work with similar later works of Novgorodian origin (e.g., that of Antonius-Dobrynja of Novgorod to Constantinople around 1200) to notice the marked difference between them: written in a dry, official style, the later accounts of pilgrimages are more akin to catalogs than memoirs.

---

\*Comp. Ševčenko's "*krovaviji tiji lita*" ("those blood-thirsty times") and "*xryščenoji toji movy*" ("that baptised language"). Technically, this embryonic article is referred to as the nominal determinant. In old Kievan literature, clear examples of such constructions are to be found in the Lives written by Nestor.

## H. CHRONICLES

1. Kievan chronicles are interesting not only as historical monuments but also as literary works of high artistic value. Their annalistic structure is merely a formal device and a formal device which is rarely adhered to at that. A collection of the most diverse literary materials, which would otherwise not have been preserved, chronicles are, in fact, akin to encyclopedias. Furthermore, since they encompass several centuries, they could not have been written by one person: as the authors changed, so too did the style and perhaps even the content of these monuments, making the question of authorship very important. On the other hand, individual stylistic peculiarities were limited by the established tradition.

The oldest part of the *Chronicle* covers the period from the middle of the ninth century to the second decade of the twelfth century and concentrates on events in the Kievan principality. As was mentioned above, the *Chronicle* follows the strict annalistic form only rarely. In most cases, events are narrated as complete stories, only infrequently being divided up on the basis of their chronology and included as separate entries.

The oldest chronicle of Kievan Rus' has been preserved in varying manuscripts: the *Laurentian Chronicle* (in various copies from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries) which ends with the year 1110 and includes a note by Silvester, abbot of the Vydubec'kyj Monastery near Kiev, who worked in 1116, and the *Hypatian Chronicle* (five copies, the earliest dating from the fifteenth century) where the text extends to the year 1117.

The narrative begins with the story of the scattering of mankind over the face of the earth after the Flood, special attention being given to the Slavs. Also included as part of this early history of the Slavs is the account of the Apostle Andrew's trip along the Dnieper. While the years are counted from the Creation, i.e., 5508 B.C., the historical narrative of the land of Rus' begins in 862 when the Varangian princes were summoned to Novgorod. There follows quite a detailed account of the history of Rus' until the reign of Volodymyr: the focus of attention is on the Kievan principality and there are occasional omissions of considerable spans of years (for instance, 867-878, 888-897, etc.). Under the year 898, the mission of Cyril and Methodius and the creation of the Slavonic alphabet is described, while the texts of treaties with the Greeks are inserted in a section composed of individual legends. A rather large amount of space is occupied by the account of Volodymyr's baptism which includes the stories of the Greek missionary and philosopher, of the "trying of various religions" by Volodymyr's messengers, of Volodymyr's baptism and march against Korsun'. Then again there is a yearly narrative, devoted in large part to the Kievan

princes. As in the earlier section, omissions are also encountered here: between the years 998 and 1013 only the deaths of various members of the princely family are recorded. Entered under 1015 is the story of the murders of Borys and Hlib. The entries for several years after 1037, which include a eulogy of Jaroslav the Wise, are quite brief. Beginning with 1043, the accounts are again more detailed: under 1051 there is a description of the founding of the Kievan Caves Monastery, under 1071—the tale about the sorcerers mentioned above, under 1074—the story of the death of St. Theodosius and the story of Isaac, under 1091—the transfer of St. Theodosius' relics, under 1096 (in the *Laurentian Chronicle*)—the “collected works” of Volodymyr Monomax and under 1097—the “Tale about the Blinding of Vasyľko.”

2. Thus, the *Chronicle* is composed of a great variety of materials: not only does it include other monuments, both written and oral, but also draws upon many other sources—the *Novgorod Chronicles*, and perhaps even written accounts from the Černihiv region, as well as oral tales from Tmutorokan' (on the Azov Sea), the stories from the history of the Kievan Caves Monastery and various documents (the treaties with the Greeks, the commemorative book of the Kievan princes, the testament of Jaroslav the Wise, etc.). Furthermore, foreign sources were also employed: Moravian (the story of the creation of the alphabet and one other historical work), Bulgarian (e.g., the baptism of King Boris), translated Byzantine works (the *Chronicles* of Hamartolos, Malalas, etc.), sermons (“Sermon about God's Punishments,” some by John Chrysostomos, etc.), and apocrypha (“The Revelations of Methodius of Patara” and the Life of Basil the New). The mere collection of all this material was a huge task. To isolate those elements in the *Chronicle* that were derived from the oral tradition (perhaps from epic songs) is much more difficult. However, in some cases, these borrowed elements can also be identified (see below, pt. I).

3. As the *Chronicle* is composed of a great variety of materials, a diversity of styles is to be expected, especially as many of these materials were merely copied verbatim from other sources. However, those sections which were actually written by the old Kievan chroniclers reveal a series of common features and testify to the great literary abilities of their authors.

When tales which may have been borrowed from the oral tradition (Scandinavian?) were discussed earlier, their rhythmical quality and predilection for alliteration were mentioned. In the later sections of the *Chronicle* this rhythmical quality is still encountered quite frequently: the simple syntax employed is a significant contributing factor. Such is the case in the following excerpt taken from the account of the battle of 1097 between the Polovcians, allies of Prince David of Volodymyr in Volhynia, and the Magyars, allies of Prince

Svjatopolk; it describes the manner in which the Polovcian khan, Bonjak, divines the outcome of the battle that is to take place on the following day:

<i>i jako bist' polunošči,</i>	i-b-p
<i>i vstav'' Bonjak''</i>	i-v-b
<i>ot'čxa ot voj,</i>	v
<i>i poča vyti volč'sky,</i>	i-p-v-v
<i>i volk'' ot'vysja emu,</i>	i-v
<i>i načša volci vyti mnozi;</i>	i-v-v
<i>Bonjak'' že pričxav''</i>	p
<i>pověda Davydovi,</i>	p
<i>jako poběda ny est' na Ugry . . .</i>	p

(“And when midnight came, Bonjak rose, rode away from the troops and started to howl like a wolf and a wolf answered him and many wolves began to howl; when he returned, Bonjak told David that they would be victorious over the Hungarians. . . .”)

Such excerpts, always brief, are quite frequent.

Aphorisms and adages, put into the mouths of the characters acting in the historical events, are frequently encountered. The Novgorodians inform Svjatopolk, who wants to send his son to reign over them: “If your son has two heads, then go ahead and send him” (1102). Preceding the battle, the princes say: “We shall either die or live.” After the victory over the Volga Bulgars, Dobrynja advises Volodymyr the Great: “They all wear boots, they will not pay us tribute; let us rather go and look for those who wear bast shoes.” This is the style of annalistic anecdotes of all periods and these anecdotes are probably derived from the oral tradition. Furthermore, there is a predilection for beginning accounts of political events either with sentences of this type or with a short exchange between two or more characters; summaries of events are frequently given in this fashion as well. In reference to an epidemic in Polock “people said: the dead (“*nav'e*”) are attacking the inhabitants of Polock”; at an assembly at Ljubeč the princes “say to themselves: ‘Why do we ruin the land of Rus’ by fighting among ourselves?’”; at a meeting of princes near Lake Dolobsk, Volodymyr Monomax delivers a speech: “‘I see . . . that you can feel pity for the horses . . .; but why do you not wish to remember that a peasant will start to plough and a Polovcian will come, shoot him with an arrow, take his horse and then move on to the village where he will seize his [the peasant’s] wife and children and his entire property; thus, you show pity for the horse but not for him [the peasant].’”

Such a speech—really merely an extended aphorism—was a favorite device of the chroniclers. Be they in the form of a dialogue, a speech or an interior monologue, these extended aphorisms give a dramatic quality to the *Chronicle* accounts, on the one hand, and serve to increase the dramatic tension by retarding the action on the other.

The use of fixed expressions in the description of set situations is another characteristic feature of the *Chronicle* and a feature that links it with the tradition of the epic narrative. Thus, the beginning of a battle is usually marked with the words “to hoist the flag” or “to break the spear”; troops or casualties are “countless”; the battle (*bran’* or *seča*) is either “ferocious” or such “as was never before seen”; princes gather “many and brave soldiers” (“*voi mnogi i xrabry*”), return from a campaign “with victory” or “with glory and great victory,” “wipe away sweat” after their return or “wipe away their tears” of grief for those who died; “to throw a knife between them” signifies provoking enmity in the camp of the enemy. Even some phrases which occur only once in the *Chronicle* are of this type; for example, the Greeks are characterized as follows: “The Greeks are deceivers [*l’stivi*] even to this day.”

Similes are frequently encountered: the army is “like a forest” (“*aki borove*”); the sun during an eclipse is “like the moon”; arrows fall “like rain”; Prince Svjatoslav “walked softly, like a panther [*bars*]”; attacking the Hungarians from three sides, Bonjak “flung them down as if they were balls, in the same manner as a falcon attacks a jackdaw.” Epithets are much rarer, consisting mainly of the names of princes or other personages.

Although they are rare and possibly borrowed from some poetic works not known to us, such as the epos, individual descriptive scenes are also of interest. Such is the account of the battle in 1024 between Jaroslav and Mstyslav of Tmutorokan’: “And during the night there was darkness, lightning, thunder and rain. And there was a ferocious battle and when the lightning lighted up the sky, weapons glittered and there was a tremendous storm and a fierce and terrible battle. . . .” Or the destruction of 1093: “We must suffer the consequences of our actions: all the cities are de-populated; when crossing the fields on which many horses, sheep and oxen once grazed, all we see today is emptiness—fields overgrown with weeds, which have become the home for wild animals”; the captives were kept in the tents of the Polovcians: “suffering, sad, tormented, numb with cold, hungry, thirsty and in misery, with thin faces, blackened bodies, in a foreign land, with parched tongues, they walk about naked and barefoot, their feet pricked by thorns, saying to one another with tears in their eyes ‘I was from such-and-such a town’ and being told by others ‘and I—from such-and-such a town.’ They questioned each other in this way, told of their

own families and groaned, lifting their eyes to Him who is in the heavens, to Him who knows all." Reminiscent of the Cossack chronicles and *dumy*, which deal with the destruction of the seventeenth century, sections such as this are not infrequent.

4. The language of the *Chronicle* should also be noted: the Church Slavonic elements of old monuments have been altered in the direction of the vernacular to such an extent as to be all but unrecognizable: the number of words which are interesting from the cultural point of view is striking: *grivna* ("necklace"—later a monetary unit), *gridnicja* (hall), *skot* (in the sense of "treasure"), *meduša* (wine cellar), *pavoloki* (silk), *komoni* (horses), *kotori* (wars between the princes), *tuten* (noise), etc. Only a portion of these words are to be found in other monuments of this early period, while some of them still exist in the Ukrainian language or its dialects: *samovydec*' (eye witness), *triska* (splinter), *rin*' (gravel), *svita* (retinue), *ženut*' (they drive), *strixa* (thatched roof), *žerelo* (spring). Similarly, there are certain grammatical forms which have also survived, such as the future tense of *iměti* ("to have"; today written *pysatymu*—"I will write," etc.) and forms which are used only in the Carpathian Ukraine—*ses*' (this one) or the future tense: *budu uhodyl* (I will agree), *budu prijal* (I will accept),\*

5. As was mentioned above, the *Chronicle* could not have been written by one author. A close examination of the text allows us to identify the individual parts of the *Chronicle* on which various authors worked.

In the Kievan period (thirteenth century), Nestor, a monk of the Kievan Caves Monastery, was regarded as the author of the *Chronicle* and there is no evidence today that would contradict this belief. Nestor was probably the author and compiler of the version which ends with the year 1113 and which was copied by Silvester. The text itself contains various indications of changes in authorship. Under the year 1044, the *Chronicle* gives an account of the transfer of the bodies of Princes Jaropolk and Oleh Svjatoslavyč to Kiev, while under 977 it is said that Oleh's grave "is still" near Ovruch. Therefore, the author who made the entry for 977 continued to record events only up to 1044. Similarly, Prince Vsevolod is referred to as "still" living under 1044, while the entry for 1101 records his death; as a result, it can be assumed that the author who wrote of the events of 1044 completed his work on the *Chronicle* prior to 1101. On the basis of these and other breaks in the text, the dates bounding the participation of

---

\*Older scholars, especially those of Russian origin and including even Buslaev, assumed that all forms shared by Ukrainian dialects and the Polish language were Polonisms. The examples given above reveal the erroneous nature of this assumption. In fact, this form is encountered in old Kievan texts as well as in other Slavic languages.



various authors in the writing of the *Chronicle* can be established: 1) up to 1044, 2) from 1044 to the eighties of the eleventh century, 3) from the eighties to 1101 and 4) from 1101 to 1113. Obviously, even the author of the portion extending up to 1044 could not have been an eye-witness to the events he recorded; however, it is more difficult to establish any dividing lines in this earlier section. The matter is further complicated by the fact that the following author did not only continue the *Chronicle* but appears also to have made some additions to or deletions from the earlier section. However, even in this case some conclusions can be drawn.

By studying the diversities in the style or character of the entries, scholars, such as Šaxmatov, were able to isolate additional dividing lines. With the year 1044, a new segment of the *Chronicle* begins. The narrative is broader up to the entry for 1037, where the building of a new castle and new churches (especially St. Sophia's) in Kiev by Jaroslav the Wise is described and the eulogy of Jaroslav is recorded. It is possible that on this momentous occasion, the establishment of the Kievan metropolitanate, the *Chronicle* was recompiled or reworked. From 1038 to 1043, the entries are short and supplementary in character.

The narrative again becomes more detailed in 1044; for several years after 1061, important events are carefully dated whereas beginning in 1073 the accounts become more fragmentary—the death of Antonius of the Kievan Caves Monastery is not recorded but other events occurring at the Monastery are described. The entries under the years 1066-67 create the impression that they were made not in Kiev but in distant Tmutorokan'. This fact suggests that the author of the section of the *Chronicle* from 1044 to 1073 may have been the abbot Nikon who was forced to flee from Kiev to Tmutorokan' in 1061 because he had angered Izjaslav and did not return until 1068. In 1073, the Kievan Caves Monastery opposed Prince Svjatoslav, regarding him as responsible for the war among the princes, and it is possible that Nikon was once again forced to flee from Kiev. Thus, Nikon (or perhaps one of the monks who accompanied him on his flights from Kiev) may have been the author of the portion of the *Chronicle* between the years 1044 and 1073 and could have been responsible for the insertion of materials from the Tmutorokan' area into the early parts of the work.

The next section can be said to end in the year 1093, as one extant manuscript contains an introduction which appears to belong under this date. This redaction also originated in the Kievan Caves Monastery but it is difficult to say anything definite about its author.

Nestor was almost certainly responsible for the version extending to 1113. Furthermore, it is probable that Silvester also did not limit himself to merely

recopying the text but made his own changes and additions, as did each of the subsequent chroniclers.

Fortunately, some fragments of the older redactions of the *Chronicle* have been preserved. In the *Novgorodian Chronicle* the exposition of events at the beginning is simpler and briefer than that in Silvester's version; furthermore, there are changes which cannot be attributed to condensation of the earlier text. Other fragments of old chronicles are to be found in various old monuments (such as "In Memory and Praise of Prince St. Volodymyr"—see Ch. III, pt. D, no. 6—or the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*—see Ch. IV, pt. D). The Polish historian Dlugosz, who wrote in the fifteenth century, used a chronicle unknown to us. A comparison of these various fragments allows definite conclusions to be drawn about the chronicles which have not survived.

6. Information about the authors of the *Chronicle* can be extrapolated from the text itself. The author of the first section wrote in 1037, probably in order to strengthen the argument for the establishment of the Kievan metropolitanate, and, as a result, directed his attention towards the history of the Christianization of Rus'. He utilized ancient oral tales and epics and possibly also various old historical monuments but his most important source was Church literature—Lives of Varangian princes killed in Kiev by the pagans, a work about the baptism of Ol'ha and Church records. While political events are recounted briefly, the accounts of the baptisms of Ol'ha and especially Volodymyr are presented in much greater detail, making ample use of folk tales. Thus, Volodymyr apparently did not accept the Islamic faith because it forbade the drinking of wine: "The inhabitants of Rus' love their swill, without it they cannot dwell" (obviously a folk saying). Only after the detailed exposition of the Christian faith by the missionary does the narrative begin to rely on memory as the source of information. The conclusion of this portion of the *Chronicle* includes references to the construction of churches in Kiev and a eulogy of Prince Jaroslav the Wise, who contributed significantly to the development of culture and the Church. The perspective from which events are viewed is frequently Greek: the history of the Kievan Church before the establishment of the Greek hierarchy is completely ignored. It is clear that an attempt was made to create the impression that Christianity in Kievan Rus' was solely of Greek origin.

On the other hand, the views of the author who extended the *Chronicle* up to 1073 are completely different. He criticizes the Greek hierarchy, recounts the story of the founding of the Kievan Caves Monastery and speaks of the fight it conducted against paganism (the tale about the sorcerers) without the help of the Greeks. It was perhaps this author who supplemented the older section of the *Chronicle* with details of the victories of Oleh and Svjatoslav over the

Greeks. Furthermore, he expresses definite ideas about the internal politics of Rus': he favors peaceful coexistence among the princes and, for this reason, even attacks Prince Svjatoslav Jaroslavyč, who was actively sympathetic towards the Kievan Caves Monastery. In addition, he sides with the urban population, stressing the injustice of the punishments ordered by the princes, etc. The increased information about Tmutorokan', possibly partly derived from Tmutorokan' epic songs, is also of note.

The ideology expressed in the introduction to the version of 1093 is quite similar to that of its predecessor, except that here there is a greater concern with social questions. The princes are accused of an "insatiability" that leads to the destruction of the population and the victories of the Polovci are interpreted as "God's punishment" for this. Furthermore, the role of the princely dynasty is elevated to an even greater extent than in the earlier versions: the author regards the princes as the legitimate rulers of all of Rus' (not merely Kiev but Novgorod as well) and the leaders in the struggle against the nomads of the steppe. It should also be noted that, like his predecessors, he also probably supplemented the older portions of the *Chronicle* and, on the basis of these additions, certain fairly well-founded hypotheses can be made.

The next person to re-work the *Chronicle* was Nestor, known to us from his other works (the Lives of Theodosius and of Borys and Hlib) as one of the most talented authors of the early period of Kievan literature. Nestor brought the *Chronicle* up to 1113 and made significant alterations in the preceding sections. In addition to the *Chronicle of Georgius Hamartolos*, he also drew on a great many other sources—Moravian monuments, oral tales, other written sources and perhaps even the epos. His contribution in part consists of the broadening of the scope of the narrative and he does not hesitate to move from Church to secular history. His text also indicates that he had a deeper interest in the general questions of the historical evolution of Rus' than the earlier chroniclers. Furthermore, those sections which identify the princely dynasty as of Varangian origin, theorize about the origin of Rus' and describe the treaties with the Greeks can be attributed to Nestor. From these treaties Nestor discovered that Oleh was a prince and not merely one of Ihor's voivodes as was indicated in the Novgorodian redaction and made the required corrections. To the introduction he added the story of the dispersion of mankind after the Flood and was probably also responsible for the stylistic re-working of some of the earlier portions of the text.

The last version of the *Chronicle* was compiled by Silvester, abbot of the Vydubec'kyj Monastery. The *Chronicle* found its way to this monastery when Volodymyr Monomax became grand prince; built by Vsevolod, Volodymyr

Monomax's father, the Vydubec'kyj Monastery was always closely associated with the Monomax family. This new version excludes all material which is sympathetic to Volodymyr's enemies, notably Prince Svyatopolk. It is also possible that Silvester was responsible for the inclusion of the story of the blinding of Vasyľ'ko, who was defended by Volodymyr Monomax, and of the Apostle Andrew's journey to Rus'. The latter story cannot logically be attributed to Nestor because Nestor rejects the idea that Rus' was visited by an Apostle in his Life of Borys and Hlib. At the same time, Monomax particularly revered Andrew and built churches in his honor. For similar reasons, it is also likely that Silvester incorporated Volodymyr Monomax's "collected works" into the *Chronicle*.

Silvester's version does not exhaust the various redactions of the *Chronicle* (the *Hypatian Chronicle* which ends with the years 1110-1118). With the same bias in favor of Monomax as Silvester's, this version further extends the *Chronicle* by adding material about Volodymyr's father, Vsevolod, and his family and about the deeds of Volodymyr's son, Mstyslav, in Novgorod. In addition to several minor corrections, there are a few entries which were either the product of the pen of Mstyslav himself or a transcription of his words. Similar to that of the versions of 1073 and 1093, the ideology of the *Hypatian Chronicle* also includes the idea of peaceful coexistence advocated by Volodymyr.

7. Also of interest is the question of the literary sources employed in the writing of the *Chronicle*. Some of these have already been discussed above. Especially important are the fragments of old Ukrainian monuments preserved in the *Chronicle*; for example, the Černihiv and Western Ukrainian Chronicles. The tales and sagas dealing with pre-Christian times or Tmutorokan' could have been derived from either written or oral sources (see Ch. I, pt. C, nos. 1-5). Furthermore, it is possible that the chroniclers employed the resources of the epic tales and songs (see below, pt. I).

Even more interesting is the fact that the deletions made by later chroniclers can still be identified in some instances. There are indications that details of the existence of Varangian and Slavic dynasties (e.g., among the Derevljanians, in Polock) other than that of Rjurik were eliminated: there are allusions to the existence of such dynasties in the old Novgorodian redaction of the *Chronicle* as well as in some of the later ones. Another area to suffer this fate was that of Christianity in Rus' before Volodymyr and those aspects of it which were not associated with Greece. Only from Western sources do we learn of Ol'ha's relations with Rome (a Catholic bishop even came to visit her), of the emissaries sent by the Pope to Volodymyr, and of the Catholic bishop who visited

Svjatopolk the Accursed. There is evidence that Volodymyr the Great's brothers, Oleh and Jaropolk, who ruled before him, were either Christians or were sympathetic to Christianity. In fact, the *Chronicle* itself hints at the existence of Christians in Kiev before the reign of Volodymyr: Kievans are said to have gone willingly to be baptized as "they had been taught earlier," etc. After the Christianization of Rus' in 988, Kiev did not have a Greek hierarchy until the period of Jaroslav; however, a hierarchy did exist and church literature of *Slavic* not Greek origin came to Rus'. Some sources suggest that between 988 and 1037, the Church hierarchy was Bulgarian but the *Chronicle* completely ignores this question as well!

Various other types of material, which did not correspond with the views or biases of later chroniclers, were probably also excluded. Hypotheses about some of the other sections eliminated from the older text could also be made but we need not do so here.

8. We have already examined the literary aspects of the *Chronicle*. An evaluation of the wealth of factual information contained in it would be beyond the scope of this work; historians can only frequently lament the fact that they are not elaborated upon. However, the ideology of the *Chronicle* is extremely interesting, for it presents the first concept of the historical evolution of Rus' even though it is primitive in character. In spite of the obvious Grecophile tendencies and dynastic biases, this conception is based on the conviction that Rus' is capable of having an independent political and historical existence. One need only compare this with Byzantine historiography, which regarded all other nations as dependent parts of the Byzantine world. In addition, most of the authors who worked on the *Chronicle* advocated ideas that were quite advanced for their time and a positive achievement in the realm of political consciousness—ideas of peaceful coexistence among the princes and social justice for the urban, and in part also for the peasant population, which was responsible for the material well-being of the country. On the other hand, these ideas are not always expressed forcefully and are accompanied by many historically limited and politically narrow views. Nonetheless, the *Chronicle* remains a valuable work on political ideology as well as an outstanding literary monument of the early Kievan period of Ukrainian history.

## I. THE EPOS

1. Unfortunately, a large number of the works of the old period have not been preserved, among them the old epos. However, it is possible to describe the nature of the works of this genre of Kievan literature, even though it be in very

general terms. Definite conclusions can be drawn about the content of the epos—its subject matter and its themes—but little can be said about its style, language, artistry or authors.

The themes of the old epos can be established with the help of several types of sources. The first of these are the chronicles, which contain many tales linked with the old epos; the later Russian chronicles (sixteenth century) such as the so-called *Nicon Chronicle*, are also useful in this respect. But the most important source are the Russian *byliny* (this name was created in the nineteenth century, the popular name being *stariny*). These are epic songs, discovered by scholars in the north of Russia in the nineteenth century; they have even survived up to the present in almost all areas of Russia. The heroes of the *stariny*, *bogatyri*, are associated in large part with Kiev and Prince “Volodymyr, the beautiful sun.” Several copies of *stariny* recorded in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries have been preserved but they are unfortunately in prose. It is interesting to note that some elements of the East Slavic epos even found their way into the Western European epics.

2. The references to Kievan Rus’ found in the *stariny* also pose an interesting problem. At present there are no *stariny* either in Ukraine or in Belorussia. However, there is evidence indicating that their themes are very old and that they did not die out in Ukraine, the country of their origin, until the sixteenth or seventeenth century, being replaced at this time by a new type of epos—the *dumy*.

Testifying to the antiquity of the epos are the numerous details referring to the old period—personal names, place names, descriptions of settings (steppe landscapes) and customs. Consequently, the East Slavic oral tradition, like that of other peoples, must have preserved these details over the centuries and one of our tasks is to identify the historical events to which they refer. The greatest contribution in this area was made by Vsevolod Miller and his school, while M. Hruševs’kyj must be credited with the most thorough study of Ukrainian materials. An identification of the historical event referred to in a *starina* occasionally also makes it possible to establish the approximate date of its origin, for frequently the event or some of the details of the story are such as would not have been retained for a long period of time in the memory of the folk. On the other hand, the form of the old epos underwent many significant changes over the centuries.

The existence of the epos in the Kievan period is attested by various references to “singers.” Such references are numerous but fragmentary and not always convincing. *The Tale of Ihor’s Campaign* mentions the poet (“*pěsnotvorec*”), Bojan, and even lists the names of the princes whom he celebrated in

his songs. The *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* speaks of the "famous singer" Mytusa and recounts how after one successful campaign against the Jatvingians, "a famous song was sung" ("pěsn' slawnu pojaxu ima") for Daniel and Vasył'ko. Długosz also mentions such songs. Moreover, the epos also existed among other peoples, culturally linked with Kiev: in Byzantium (the theme of one of them being the adventures of Digenis—see Ch. II, sec. b), in Scandinavia (two of their poets, *skalds*, were at Jaroslav's court). References to Kiev and Western Europe in general are found in the epic tales of the Polovci, mentioned in the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* (the poet, Or, and the tale about the magic herb *jevšan-zillja*), and in those of the Goths who remained in the Crimea (mentioned in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*). Traces of the epic tradition are also to be found in ecclesiastical literature.

Allusions to "singers" in translated works cannot be weighted too heavily. However, those made by Cyril of Turiv (twelfth century) are worthy of note: contrasting "chroniclers" and "singers," he states that the latter "observe the warriors and the battles between princes in order to embellish that which they have seen and celebrate those who fought bravely [*xrabrovavšaja*] for their prince. . . , and having celebrated them, to crown them with wreaths of praises." That this was merely copied from the Greek original is highly unlikely, for Cyril is known to have excluded material which he believed would be alien to his listeners. In addition, the words "*xrabrovati*" or "*xrabr*" are characteristically used in reference to *bogatyri*—epic heroes (such is the case in Nestor's Life of Theodosius).

For our purposes the most significant fact is that these tales about the *bogatyri* continued to exist in Ukraine until the sixteenth or perhaps even the eighteenth century. The *Menaea* of 1489, which contains a great many vernacular elements in its language (see Ch. V), refers to these epic heroes ("*xrabri*"), while at the beginning of the fifteenth century, the Belorussian Skoryna described Samson as a *bogatyř*. Furthermore, the Polish author Sarnicki mentions the *bogatyri* (bohatrios) buried in the Kievan Caves in his *Descriptio veteris et novae Poloniae* . . . (1585), as does his fellow countryman, Marcin Bielski. Later, yet another Pole, Johann Herbinus, refers to these underground caves in his book, *Religiosae Kijovienses cryptae, sive Kijovia subterranea* . . . (1675), noting that he read of them in *Flos Polonicus* (Nuremberg, 1666). Similar information is also to be found in Russian sources (sixteenth century). But what is most important is that these sources mention the same *bogatyri* as the *stariny*. The Polish author M. Rej speaks of the Kievan "charlatan Čurylo" (*Zwierzyniec*, 1562), and this same Čurylo is mentioned by Klonowicz (*Worek Judaszów*, II, 1600). In a letter to the Belorussian Volovyč dated 1574, a Kievan, Kmita

Čornobyl's'kyj, laments the fate of Poland: "The time will come when an Il'ja Muravlenin and a Solovej Budimirovič will be needed." Erik Lassota, an emissary from Austria, visited the cathedral of St. Sophia in 1594 and saw the grave of "Il'ja Muravlin," who is called a *bogatyř* (bogater) and about whom many tales are told; "his friend" also is buried here. In the Kievan Caves Monastery he saw the relics of "the *bogatyř* and giant" Čobotko (Czobotko). Kalnofoisky (1638) mentions that St. Il'ja, who is buried in the caves and regarded as a giant in the oral tradition, is frequently referred to as Čobotko. Il'ja's relics were also seen by the Moscow priest Luk'janov in 1701. In addition, there were also images of Il'ja (engravings prepared for the *Patericon of 1650*), as well as other references.

Indications are that the old epos died out only in the seventeenth century, having been replaced by a new type of epos—the *dumy* (see Ch. VI).

3. It is unclear whether the old epos was initially linked with the traditions of the court (the singers that are mentioned were all court poets) or the folk. Analogies with Western and certain Eastern developments suggest that the epos arose in the upper circles and slowly filtered downward, first to the *skomoroxy* and then to the folk, where it is found in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In our time, the remains of the old epos are encountered only among the peasantry, preserved in large part by fishermen, village craftsmen and even beggars.

The contemporary *stariny* can be divided into a number of thematic cycles. Let us examine each of these separately.

4. Vestiges of the pre-Christian epos are few and vague in character. Among its heroes we encounter Vol'ga or Volx Vseslavič. We are told 1) of his miraculous birth without a father, 2) of his adeptness at sorcery which allows him to transform himself into various animals, 3) of his skill in hunting, 4) of his magical conquest of the "Indian kingdom" and 5) of his meeting with the peasant *bogatyř*, Mikula. The very name "Vol'ga" suggests a link with Oleh and Ol'ha. According to the *Chronicle*, Oleh has the power of prophecy and is therefore a sorcerer; because of this belief about him, Oleh could have been the impetus behind the development of the second, fourth and perhaps even the first motif mentioned above. (It will be remembered that Oleh is said to have succeeded in taking Constantinople because he had his boats placed on wheels.) The motif about Vol'ga's skill in hunting would more probably have been associated with Ol'ha, for it is about her that the *Chronicle* speaks in this regard (eleventh century). Although there are ancient elements in it (the prince collects taxes himself), the fifth motif given above is probably of later origin. Recent attempts to identify Volx Vseslavič with Vseslav, prince of Polock, sorcerer and werewolf, are not convincing.



5. The largest single group of *stariny* are devoted to a Kievan prince named Vladimir (Volodymyr). In some instances this "Vladimir" actually refers to Volodymyr the Great. He is portrayed as a passive person who merely entertains the *bogatyri*. Significantly, Volodymyr's feasts are also mentioned in Nestor's *Chronicle*, by Hilarion and in later chronicles, even that of the German Thietmar of Merseburg.

Among heroes bearing historical names, one must note the uncle of Prince Volodymyr, Dobrynja, known to us from the *Chronicle*. In the *stariny* Dobrynja is credited with several actions: 1) he slays a dragon, 2) frees Volodymyr's niece, Zabava Putjatyčna, from it, 3) bathes in the Počajna River, 4) finds a wife for Volodymyr, and 5) brings water to his nephew. Motifs 1, 2, 3, and 5 are undoubtedly linked with the fact that Dobrynja and Putjata participated in the baptism of the inhabitants of Novgorod. Bathing and the acquisition of water are symbols of baptism while the dragon symbolizes paganism (note the dragon-slaying saints). Furthermore, the Kievans were baptized in the Počajna River (motif 3). Motif 4 has parallels in various tales and in the later chronicles. The motif of Dobrynja as matchmaker appears to belong to the tradition of Indo-European oral tales ("Nibelungen-Lied").

One of the tales of the cycle dealing with Volodymyr has been preserved in the *Chronicle* and in contemporary tales; it tells of the victory of a tanner (*Kožumjaka*) over a hostile giant, a theme which is widespread among various peoples (e.g., the story of David and Goliath). The *Chronicle* version, which contains numerous alliterations, could have originated among the urban population, for the prince's retinue is said to have been unsuccessful in its attempt to destroy the giant.

6. In other instances the "Vladimir" of the *stariny* is more likely Volodymyr Monomax, who became completely identified with "Volodymyr, the Beautiful Sun," only later. The most frequent theme of this cycle is that of Al'oša (Oleksandr) Popovič's battle with Tugarin Zmejevič, who had become friendly with Prince Volodymyr's wife, Opraksija, and spent a great deal of time at the court of the prince. It is easy to recognize in Tugarin the historical Polovcian prince, Tuhor-khan, whose daughter was married to Prince Svjatopolk. In 1096 Tuhor-khan waged a war against the princes of Rus' but was defeated and killed by Volodymyr Monomax. There are also some later references (from the thirteenth century and probably legendary in character) to Al'oša as a Rjazan' *bogatyř*. Consequently, we have in this instance a fusion of several historical events and personages.

In a little known *starina* about Gleb Volodevič, who frees the boats captured by Prince Marinka Kajdalovna, the actual historical events underlying

its theme have been well preserved. What we have here is an echo of the victory of the young Volodymyr and Prince Hlib over Korsun' in 1077. "Marinka" is Maryna Mnišek, the wife of Dimitri the Pretender, whose name was probably incorporated into this *starina* in the seventeenth century.

Also historical in character is the theme of the *starina* about Stavro Godinovič who was detained by Monomax and set free by his wife who is said to have come to Kiev disguised in men's clothing. While the *Chronicle* speaks of this arrest of Stavro (1118), some of the elements of this epic are legendary.

The subject matter of other *stariny* linked with Monomax seem to lack a historical base: one of these deals with Kozarin (a historical personage—see the *Chronicle* entry for 1106), who is said to have freed a captive girl and another with a horse race in which the horse owned by a Černihiv merchant, Ivan, beats Volodymyr's best animal. (A wanderer named Petreev was told of Monomax's famous horses in Moscow as late as the sixteenth or seventeenth century. Furthermore, Monomax himself referred to his love for horses.) In both of these *stariny*, Monomax is treated somewhat ironically: as a result, it is possible that neither of them is of Kievan origin (the first is perhaps Novgorodian, the second from Černihiv).

7. The *stariny* about Il'ja Muromec', one of the favorite heroes of this genre, appear to have originated in Černihiv. He is even mentioned in Western sources (the German poem *Ortnit* and the Norwegian *Tidrekssaga*). Il'ja was probably not from Murom—in the eleventh century an isolated provincial town in the northeast. In old sources, especially foreign ones, he is alternately referred to as Murovlin, Murovec', Muravic', and Muravlenin (by Kmita Čornobyl's'kyj—see above, no. 2). These and other geographical names in the *stariny* about Il'ja suggest that he was rather from the Černihiv towns of Muravs'k or Morovij's'k. While his name also suggests Murmansk, it is far less likely that he hailed from a region located in the far north. The following are the deeds linked with his name: 1) the liberation of the town of Černihiv from the Tatars, who have here replaced other steppe nomads, 2) a victory over the Brigand Solovej who sits on twelve oaks, 3) his transfer to Kiev where he is either killed or set free by Il'ja, and 4) the liberation of Kiev from the "Idol of the Heathen." Motifs 1 and 2 are associated with the Černihiv area (here there was even a village named Devjat' Dubiv—Nine Oaks). A famous brigand of the time of Volodymyr the Great, Mohuta, is mentioned in the later chronicles. But it is difficult to discover the historical event to which motif 4 is related; in later times Il'ja's name was linked with several legendary motifs such as that of the contest between father and son (see Ch. I, pt. D., no. 3).

The later Russian folk tradition transformed Il'ja into an old peasant, a Cossack, and so on.

8. Of the remaining heroes of the old epos, mention must be made of Solovej Budimirovič—a poet from beyond the sea, who comes to Kiev and builds a palace which arouses the interest of Volodymyr's niece, Zabava (see above, no. 5). The resolution of this story varies: having come to Kiev, Zabava either marries Solovej directly or else Solovej returns to Kiev after a lengthy absence just at the moment when Zabava is about to be engaged to another man. Some scholars see in this echoes of the engagement of Jaroslav the Wise's daughter, Elizabeth, to Harold the Bold, to whom a European legend attributes a verse (Solovej is also a poet) about an unsuccessful courtship. However, Harold the Bold did marry Elizabeth. The *stariny* about Solovej have several interesting features: Solovej's boat is similar to Scandinavian boats; Solovej is a merchant and a symbolic function is assigned to the merchant in wedding ceremonies. Individual geographical names are Baltic and so on. Nonetheless, there is no hard evidence indicating that Solovej should be identified with Harold the Bold.

The themes of certain local legends have been preserved either in the *Chronicle* or in contemporary oral tales. Particularly interesting is the *Chronicle* tale about the contest between the Tmutorokan' Prince, Mstyslav, and the giant Rededja in 1022 (a migratory theme) for it contains numerous alliterations. The *Chronicle* tale describing the war between Jaroslav and Svjatopolk (1016-1019) also contains ancient features which allow us to assume that it was based on epic works (songs?). Alliteration is frequent here as well. Epic elements are to be found in the *Chronicle* tales (e.g., about the war between Jaroslav and Mstyslav in 1024 and the war of 1097) up to the end of the eleventh century (see above, pt. H, no. 3).

9. Jaroslav the Wise, whose Christian name was George, may be the hero of one of the *stariny* preserved by the oral tradition. In addition to the secular epics discussed above (some of which may have been created by ecclesiastical authors—e.g., the tale of Dobrynja), there are the so-called spiritual songs: in one of these, the "long epic song" about St. George, St. George is Prince Jaroslav. The short version of this same epic has parallels among almost all European peoples: it describes St. George's victory over a dragon from whom he wishes to liberate a captive girl. Some aspects of the longer version are most unusual: 1) St. George is either from Jerusalem or Kiev; a successful campaign is waged against him by the enemies of Christianity and he finds himself in a dungeon; 2) after a considerable length of time, he manages to escape and begins his battle against his enemies; 3) he frees the other captives, among which are his sisters; 4) he clears a path to the Dnieper by stopping the movement of the ambulating cliffs; 5) he frees Rus' of the dragons and wolves which had infested it; and 6) he ascends the throne of Kiev. While these motifs are legendary in character they

can all be linked with events in Jaroslav's life. First, after Volodymyr's death, the Kievan throne was occupied by Svjatopolk who did not allow his brother, Jaroslav, Prince of Novgorod, to enter Kiev; Jaroslav (= George) fled and did not again appear in Kiev until four years later (this part of Jaroslav's life corresponds to that of George's imprisonment). Secondly, the rule of Jaroslav-George commenced with the freeing of those who were captured by the Poles, among them Jaroslav's sisters (a historical fact). Thirdly, the Dnieper trade route from Scandinavia to Constantinople was opened during the reign of Jaroslav. Fourthly, the motif of the ambulating cliffs which hinder the passage of ships is from Greek mythology: these cliffs are the so-called Symplegades, which in this instance symbolize the constricted relations between Kiev and its northern neighbors. Fifthly, the battle against wild animals refers to cultural work. As was mentioned above, Volodymyr's autobiography emphasizes his skill in hunting and, at that time, hunting was considered to be part of the cultural sphere. And finally, the outcome of the spiritual song is a happy one: Jaroslav-George ascends the throne of Kiev. Thus, since this spiritual song reflects the events of Jaroslav's life, we can be assured that it was initially an epic about Prince Jaroslav.

10. The existence of epic songs in the Kievan period is also testified to by *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*, which refers to the ancient poet, Bojan, and gives the themes of his songs: he sang of the contest between Mstyslav and Rededja, of Jaroslav (see above, no. 8), of "the beautiful Roman Svjatoslavyč," to whom only a brief section is devoted in the *Chronicle*. To depict the inspired character of his songs, *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* compares Bojan with a nightingale, an eagle and a wolf; says that the strings of his instrument appear to move of their own accord, and employs one of Bojan's proverbs ("It is difficult for a head without shoulders; it is difficult for a body without a head") in reference to Svjatoslav who had gone on a campaign that took him far from his native land. This fact also explains the following reference to Svjatoslav in the *Chronicle*: "He searched for foreign lands and neglected his own." And finally, *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* employs phrases akin to those of Bojan:

It was not a storm that carried the falcons across  
the wide fields,  
crows speed to the great Don. . . .

Horses neigh beyond the Sula,  
glory reverberates in Kiev,  
bugles blare in Novgorod.

These passages provide examples of some of the features of Bojan's style: he employs negative parallelism ("It was not a storm that carried the falcons . . ."), metaphors (the falcons refer to the Ukrainians, the crows—to the nomads of the steppe), epithets ("wide fields"), alliteration ("bugles blare") and syntactical parallelism, which gives his works a rhythmical quality (the second passage quoted above). If it could be established that the section of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* dealing with Vseslav was also either a quotation from Bojan or a paraphrase of one of his songs, much more could be said about his style.

11. In Western Europe, ecclesiastics are known to have participated in the composition of epic songs. The possibility that old Ukrainian epics (such as that about Dobrynja—see above, no. 5) had a more religious coloration in the earlier stages of their evolution, must not be ignored. Contemporary spiritual verses exhibit certain features characteristic of the style and rhythmical structure of the seventeenth century. Furthermore, it is possible that the verse about St. George discussed above was written in honor of Jaroslav, for Jaroslav was responsible for elevating the cultural level of Rus', opening a route from Kiev to Novgorod, uniting these two princedoms and freeing his sisters from Polish captivity.

12. Very little can be said about the form of the old epos. Even the very basic problem of whether these old epic songs were poetic in form cannot be settled conclusively, although some scholars (N. Trubeckoj) contend that their rhythmical structure links them with the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* is the only epic from the twelfth century that has been preserved and, in its written form, it is not divided into verse lines. In any case, old Ukrainian references and Indo-European parallels indicate that ancient epics were "sung" and any kind of "singing" would require that the lines possess some sort of rhythm. The language employed in these works was undoubtedly closer to the vernacular than that of written works. Furthermore, the language of the epos frequently contains archaisms. Such is also the case with respect to contemporary *stariny*, where words that have long since been dropped from current usage, especially in the Russian language, are still to be found: *grudnja* or *gridnicja*, (the dwellings of the retinue, of Scandinavian origin), *iskopyt'* (hoof-mark), *polenica* (heroine), *stol'nyj grad* (capital), *napoli* (half), *ribnyj zub* (a walrus' tusk, also encountered in the *Hypatian Chronicle* of 1160). There are also many ethnographic details: the feudal division of the land and villages, the collection of taxes (*poljudie*) by the prince himself, the type of weapons used (bows, arrows, spears, etc.), the steppe landscape (hills and a kind of prairie grass not found in the north) and so on.

A few of the stylistic features encountered in the *stariny* were probably

shared by the old epos; these same features are also found in the epics of various other Indo-European peoples, in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* and in the epic portions of the *Chronicle*. Among them are the abundant use of epithets, repetitions of phrases and words (in the *stariny*—repetitions of a group of lines as many as ten or more times), alliteration (not frequent in the *stariny*), numerous comparisons, parallelism of imagery (the new moon refers to the birth of Vol'ga; clouds, to an enemy host), hyperbole, numerous fixed phrases (to be expected in the oral tradition where they serve to aid the listener in retaining the important aspects of longer works) such as those referring to mounting a horse, saddling a horse, shooting from a bow, hunting, extending greetings, the galloping of a horse, etc. On the other hand, most of the fixed expressions used in the "military tales" included in the *Chronicle* are not found in the *stariny* (for example, the frequent comparison of arrows to rain or the designation of the beginning of a battle with the phrase "izlomiti kop'e"—"to break a lance"); there are but a few exceptions to this general rule (e.g., the heroes of the *stariny* "strike the earth" when they are in combat, that is, they throw their foes to the ground just as Mstyslav does with Rededja). In addition, a certain number of these fixed expressions were undoubtedly borrowed from oral tales ("morning is wiser than evening," etc.). Occasionally the *stariny* employ a broad symbolism: at the birth of Vol'ga, who was to become a skillful hunter, all animals try to hide in places that are the farthest away from him; while still in the cradle, Vol'ga is surrounded by weapons (also found in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* in reference to the soldiers of Kursk). The best evidence of the southern origin of both the ancient and contemporary epos is provided by the expressions used to describe the southern steppe land: wide steppe, clear field, hills, hunting of the type that is characteristic of this area and steppe fauna. (The northern bear is never present.) However, such obviously ancient references are few. Furthermore, all the stylistic features listed above are to be found in *various* genres of the Ukrainian and Russian oral traditions as well as in those of other Indo-European peoples. As a result, very little can be said about the peculiarities of the old Ukrainian epos.

The problem of the nature of the changes sustained by the old epos still awaits a thorough investigation, but before this can be done, careful studies of the remains of epic themes and epic stylistic features in various old Kievan monuments must be made.

## J. LITERATURE OF A PRACTICAL CHARACTER

1. In later periods literature of a purely practical character will not concern us. However, all the eleventh century monuments are of interest, even if they are

without a purely literary value, as they will provide valuable information about the literary attainments of Kievan Rus'. Furthermore, the division between *belles-lettres* and practical literature was obviously not the same in the Kievan period as it is today and we cannot assume that monuments of a practical nature will be devoid of artistry. For example, alliteration is employed in the ancient Oscan-Umbrian Inscriptions and in the Frisian Laws. Let us briefly examine the main monuments that fall into the category of practical literature.

2. First of all there are the religious texts—prayers, liturgical books and so on. All liturgical books belong in part to the category of *belles-lettres* for they are in fact collections of religious poetry. While it is true that the original Kievan liturgical books followed Greek models (in translation) quite closely, they were frequently extremely successful from the literary point of view. However, the most important religious works are the prayers. In addition to the prayer by Volodymyr Monomax, included in the eulogy of him, there are two others, ascribed without total justification to Theodosius. A number of prayers entered into the composition of other works: one is included in the collection of works by Volodymyr Monomax and several in various sermons. A monk of the Kievan Caves Monastery, Gregory, is credited with the authorship of services for saints. Unfortunately, his authorship of the oldest of these—those to Volodymyr and Theodosius and those on the occasion of the transfer of the relics of Borys and Hlib and of St. Nicholas—cannot be established with certainty. To Metropolitan John I (beginning of the eleventh century), who was either Bulgarian or Greek, are attributed services in honor of Sts. Borys and Hlib. Another work that belongs to this category is a eulogy of St. Theodosius; written shortly after 1096 (the attack of the Polovcians is mentioned) and preserved in the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, this work blends the style of the sermon with that of the prayer. Eulogies are also to be found in the *Chronicle* narrative about Borys and Hlib as well as in the "Tale" ("Skazanie").

The available material (i.e., the texts themselves; studies of their literary aspects are mostly superficial) allows us to draw certain conclusions about the stylistic peculiarities of these religious monuments: in all cases there is a heavy reliance upon liturgical and hagiographic works; the language employed is close to the Church Slavonic norm, and, because it is modelled on that of the services in honor of Christ, the Virgin or saints, it is strongly rhythmical and occasionally even contains consonances. The first example quoted below refers to Borys and Hlib, the second to Theodosius:

*daeta icēlen'e:*  
*xromym" xoditi,*  
*slěpym" prozrěn'e,*

*boljaščim" cělby,  
 okovannym" razrěšen'e,  
 temnicam" otverzen'e,  
 pečal'nym" utěxu,  
 napastnym" izbavlen'e . . .*

("[You both] are healers: you made the lame walk, the blind see; you heal the sick, free the chained, open the prisons; you give comfort to the sorrowful; you grant freedom to those in peril. . . .")

*apostol" i propovednik",  
 syj nam" pastyr' i učitel',  
 syj nam" vožd'i pravitel',  
 syj nam" stěna i ograždienie,  
 poxvala naša velikaja j dr"znovenie . . .*

("[He] is an apostle and a preacher; he is our shepherd and teacher; he is our leader and ruler; he is our wall and protection, our great glory and courage. . . .")

All of the numerous and striking images in these works are borrowed: God and Christ are the sun; grace is the light of the sun or a river; saints are stars, streams, shepherds of spiritual flocks, laborers in God's vineyards. In spite of the derivative nature of liturgical literature, it reveals the great artistic abilities of its authors-compilers.

3. Of less interest are the epistles of the Greek hierarchs—Metropolitan Leon (a questionable work dating from before 1004), George (died in 1072), John II (from about 1089) and Metropolitan Nicephorus (1104-1120, directed against the Latin Church). These epistles are in large part merely enumerations of often very insignificant differences between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. Probably translations from the Greek, these works do not testify to the empty formalism of Kievan Christianity but to the decline of Greek theology.

4. Much more significant is Metropolitan Nicephorus' (1104-1120) letter to Volodymyr Monomax. In addition to a brief eulogy of the prince, the letter contains an exposition of the then current science of psychology (of ancient origin). The soul possesses three main faculties—reason, passion and will. Just as a prince rules his country with the help of his subordinates, so too does the soul control the body through the five senses—sight, hearing, taste, smell and touch.



On the practical level, the letter appears to have been motivated by the need to defend the Church hierarchy or some other personages from attacks launched against them, for the letter pauses to point out the unreliability of the sense of hearing, through which "an arrow enters" into the prince's body and "causes harm to his soul" and then goes on to ask that the people concerned be pardoned. In any case, the clarity of the exposition and the appropriateness of the imagery, in which the abstract thoughts are clothed, are a clear demonstration of the skill of this author and translator.\*

5. The so-called chronographs, surveys of universal history, must also be mentioned. Very early in the history of Christian Rus', the available translated chronicles were not sufficient to meet the needs of the times. As early as the eleventh century a chronograph based on the *Chronicle of Georgius Hamartolos* (see Ch. II, pt. D, sec. a) and supplemented by Kievan materials had been compiled (*Chronograph According to the Long Text*). This monument has not been preserved but fragments from it were included in later works. In the entry under 1114, the *Chronicle* states that its information here is derived from a chronograph which synthesized the "Chronicles" of Hamartolos and Malalas. Similar compilations of historical material were made in the following centuries.

Legislative monuments have no purely literary significance. The most important of these, *Rus' Law* is a collection of the laws enacted by Jaroslav and his successors as well as the Church statutes attributed with a certain amount of justification to Volodymyr the Great and with very little justification, to Jaroslav the Wise. For the literary historian the value of *Rus' Law* lies in its language which is very pure East Slavic, almost totally free of Church Slavonic elements; the sentences are very simple and clearly constructed; and the vocabulary is quite unique, containing words whose meaning is no longer entirely clear. *Rus' Law* is the kind of work that can be used to measure the amount of vernacular elements contained in other monuments. However, the primary significance of legislative monuments is not literary but cultural and historical.

---

\*It is possible that the works of the hierarchs were either written or translated by their Slavic secretaries. Therefore, even though they followed the Byzantine tradition very closely, these epistles should not be completely excluded from the realm of original Kievan literature. It must be remembered that their authors were not the Greek hierarchs whose names appear on them, but some anonymous local clerks.

## IV.

# THE PERIOD OF ORNAMENTAL STYLE

### A. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. The new period of Kievan literature that emerged in the first decades of the twelfth century has much more distinctive features than the period of monumental style. Kiev retained its position of cultural leadership and, in spite of the decline and devastation of Kiev, as well as the disappearance of the very idea of a unified land of Rus', the new literature continues to draw on Kievan literary traditions. But, in addition to Kiev and Novgorod, new centers rise, first to political and then to cultural prominence—Suzdal in the northeast and Halyč in the west. However, a literary period cannot be defined by political factors alone. Far more important is the fact of the emergence of a different literary style and ideology.

2. To a certain extent, the style of the twelfth century can be described in a negative manner—that is, by isolating those features of the eleventh century style which are no longer present in the twelfth. While the literature of the eleventh and twelfth centuries shared certain stylistic traits, the latter added some new ones of its own. The single-minded monumentality of the eleventh century is replaced by variety in ornamentation; in extreme cases, the maze of embellishments obscures the main idea of the work completely, thereby changing its character. In other cases, no thematic unity of any sort is present as the content itself ceases to be as uniform as it was in the eleventh century: twelfth century authors collect old materials and use them as a source of embellishment for their own works (the collection of proverbs in Daniel's "Supplication," various references to the princes of earlier times, the utilization

of the style of Bojan in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*). In still other instances, the main idea is not developed in a straightforward fashion; instead it is expressed in numerous individual motifs (compare especially the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery* or *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*). Occasionally, a work may even have a mosaic-like structure, being composed of very distinct elements. Such, for example, is the case in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*, where events from the contemporary scene alternate with references to the past—both literary (Bojan) and historical; also alluded to are the *Kievan Chronicle* and *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, in which the literary tradition is felt at almost every step. It is interesting to note that this alternation in themes, this tendency to stray from the main theme of the work, does not create an impression of disorder as it did in eleventh century monuments: the reader feels that this intricate and complex structure, with all its deviations and digression from the main theme, constitutes the essence of the style of the work, a style which may be compared to a multi-colored patchwork quilt.

3. Underlying this structural complexity is the fact that the world view expressed in the monuments of this period contains the basic feature of all medieval perceptions of the world (including the Byzantine); that is, this world is viewed “symbolically,” all objects of the real world are also signs of something else, something higher which man can not have or of which he is not allowed to have direct knowledge. Employed by the literature of all periods, even the “most realistic,” symbolism as a literary device acquires special significance in certain periods (the Baroque and Romantic as well as the Medieval)—in those periods when the predominant world view is not founded on the concretely perceptible reality alone but strives to see something beyond it, a deeper and “more real” reality. This symbolic world view unquestionably underlies all the literature of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It was this world view which led to the evolution of the “symbolic style” of this literary epoch.

Simple similes are replaced by complex symbolic scenes: a battle is either a feast or a wedding, spring is a symbol of resurrection. Even Hilarion's works, in which symbolism already plays a very significant role, seem quite primitive when their numerous, but essentially straightforward, comparisons are compared with the symbolic images employed by a writer such as Cyril of Turiv. In the monuments of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, reality is quite often no longer described but merely hinted at by means of a variety of images. The use of symbols is more than a literary device; it is to some extent also an end in itself.

4. Other literary devices are also treated in this way—rather than being subordinated to the content, they become important in themselves: one need

only compare Hilarion's works—in which the number of embellishments is above average for the eleventh century—with those of Cyril of Turiv; in the latter, the embellishments develop into a large network which periodically obscures the content. Similarly, the historical “embellishments” in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* veil the purpose of Svjatoslav's “golden word” and Daniel's “Supplication” is but a stylistic game, lacking any concrete narrative purpose (lacking a “communicative” function).

That the stylistic devices employed are ends in themselves is supported by the fact that the works of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries are devoted to less historically important subjects. The purpose of the numerous embellishments in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* is the glorification of a relatively insignificant and unsuccessful campaign led by princes of secondary importance; chroniclers give ornate descriptions of unmomentous and everyday events and so on. The explanation of this development does not lie solely in the political decline during this period but also in the fact of the predominance of stylistic ornamentation over content.

But the accumulation of embellishments is not the only trait characteristic of the style of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Examples of such accumulations, also found in earlier works, are the extended alliterations in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*, the accumulations of similes in the works of Cyril of Turiv or the detailed descriptions of the realm of the demons in the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*—in the Life of Theodosius, little attention is devoted to the “temptations” of this saint. The excessive use of exaggeration or hyperbole is also characteristic of this new style. Furthermore, it is possible to isolate various groups of recurrent epithets. While fixed epithets reminiscent of folk poetry can really only be discussed in relation to *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*, recurrent epithets (the most typical of the spirit of the time being the epithet “golden”) are frequent in various works of this period, as is a complex and often involved syntax. The twelfth and thirteenth centuries valued originality in literary works—the stylistically new and unusual.

5. A change in ideological content is also clearly perceptible. In the first place, there is a distinct change in the nature of the Christian ideal, which is now truly ascetic. But asceticism goes hand in hand with the feeling of the great power of the forces and temptations of this earth. In the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, worldly waves drown even the monastery itself. From a quiet battle that occurs within the confines of underground caves, asceticism is transformed into a war with all that surrounds the ascetic, even the monks in the monastery. Equally as important as these concrete changes in monasticism is the way in which the unchanged aspects are presented in the literary works of the

period. In the literature of the eleventh century, the tale about Isaac was concerned with describing the monastic way of life but its purpose in doing so was to issue a warning against extremism. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, asceticism is depicted as the highest ideal. The earlier Christian optimism is replaced by a pessimistic view of life to the point where Serapion can describe the earth as wanting to shake from her body every last sin-stained representative of mankind.

It is interesting that the definite decline in the material standards of life in this period did not prevent the "world" from remaining conscious of itself and even arrogant. An important feature of the ideology of this period is the world's *self-awareness*. Thus, literary reality clearly does not always correspond to the reality of the concrete world. In the twelfth century, the Kievan state, a major European power, was replaced by several small principalities, which were themselves already beginning to lose their significance within Eastern Europe (with the exception of the Galician-Volhynian principality, which, however, could not hope to rule over the north and the northeast as Kiev had) and whose sovereignty was actively beginning to be violated by the nomadic Polovcians. Nonetheless, much more luxury, glitter and "gold" is described in the monuments of this period than in those of the previous century. The "world" had not even become stronger in relation to the Church. In fact, it was being progressively Christianized (that is, in the realm of law). On the other hand, the secular realm did consider itself to be largely independent of the Church and the preeminent power; the Church reacted by considering it more dangerous and threatening than it had previously. This ideological change may best be characterized as the destruction of that harmony between the "world" and the Church which had seemed capable of realization in the eleventh century. The destruction of this harmony increased the self-confidence of both parties: in the religious sphere opposition to the world grew; in the secular, indifference to the ideals of Christianity became more pronounced.

6. This literary development (and in part also the ideological one) may be regarded as resulting from the strengthening of those Byzantine influences which were already present in the eleventh century. These influences were (initially) limited but increased in strength throughout the century. Furthermore, new Byzantine literary and cultural influences made their appearance in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The literature of the twelfth century developed on the basis of the same Byzantine tradition as that of the eleventh but acquired a deeper knowledge of it and followed its patterns more closely. However, the most important fact is that the Byzantine tradition gave further sustenance to the new style and partly also to the new ideology discussed above.

## B. SERMONS

1. In comparison with translated sermons, which were numerous and dealt with quite a broad range of subject matter, the original ones form but an insignificant group. By and large, they are ornamental in style. A few of the anonymous ones can be ascribed to the twelfth century but there are also several others whose authors are known and whose literary value is high.

2. The most talented authors of sermons and perhaps the most talented of all old Ukrainian writers is Cyril of Turiv, bishop of the city of Turiv in the second half of the twelfth century. His parents were well-to-do inhabitants of the city of Turiv, capital of the small principality of the same name. He was born between 1130 and 1140.\* His life testifies to his knowledge of theology (it has recently been established that he read theological works in the Greek original) and to his asceticism. Although very young when he became a monk, he was already a well-known writer. On the wishes of the prince and "the people" he was consecrated bishop of Turiv, and it is to this period of his life that some of his works belong. Among these are his letters to Prince Andrew Bogoljubskij (which have not been preserved), sermons, prayers and theological works. His sermons are included in various collections together with the great sermons of the Greek Church.

3. Eight sermons which were unquestionably written by Cyril of Turiv are devoted to the eight holy Sundays during the Easter season, beginning with Palm Sunday. Describing Christ's triumphal entry into Jerusalem, Cyril calls upon his listeners to prepare themselves spiritually to greet Christ. Christ's entry into Jerusalem symbolizes the spiritual acceptance of Christ into the "chamber of the soul." The "Sermon on the First Sunday After Easter" (the Feast of Thomas) employs both an extended comparison of spring and Easter as well as dialogue between Christ and Thomas. Another sermon begins with a moving "lament" uttered by Mary under the cross. Joseph of Arimathaea comes to her assistance and succeeds in acquiring from Pilate the body of Christ, over which he also laments. Then there is a description of the women anointing Christ's body with myrrh and the appearance to them of an angel. The sermon ends with a eulogy-acathistus to Joseph. Yet another of Cyril's sermons describes the healing of the sick man in the bath house in Siloah. The narrative is in the form of a dialogue—Christ speaks with the sick man, the sick man with the scholars. The

---

\*Since he was an inhabitant of Turiv which is located on the Ukrainian-Belorussian border, both by birth and because of the style of his writing, Cyril unquestionably belongs to Kiev. However, the Belorussians also have grounds for claiming him as their own. *Where* he actually gave his sermons is not known.

remaining sermons, also based on biblical tales, clarify the symbolic meaning of these tales and focus attention on the Church's teaching about Christ—on "Christology." The final sermon is devoted to the anti-Arian Council, that is, also to Christology; the participants of the Council are compared to warriors. The sermon ends with an extended eulogy to these ecclesiastics.

The fact that the general ideas expressed in Cyril's sermons are reminiscent of those contained in the classics of Greek homiletics was pointed out many years ago. However, it has just recently been established that Cyril's sermons are actually *modelled* on them. For each of his first seven sermons, Cyril derived his main ideas and sometimes even his main images from a group of two or three Greek sermons (translated). For the final sermon discussed above (about the Church council) he drew on some Greek historical work (in the Greek original). However, Cyril was not merely a compiler; he reworked his material into a new literary whole, lengthening or shortening passages and embellishing his works with those kinds of rhetorical devices which would better speak to the minds and hearts of his listeners. While this lack of originality may decrease our interest in Cyril as a theologian, it can only increase our interest in him as a writer and orator—he does battle in the literary arena with his great predecessors and emerges victorious. For many centuries the artistic excellence of his works gave them a place among the best examples of homiletic literature (such as, in the collection, *Toržestvennik*). His style warrants closer examination.

4. The symbolic character of Cyril's sermons has already been noted above. The explication of religious symbols lies at their core. Easter and resurrection, for example, are compared to spring:

Today the heavens grew light, threw off their dark  
clouds, like a veil, and the bright skies proclaim  
the glory of God,—

I speak not of these visible heavens, but  
of the spiritual ones; of the Apostles  
who, when they came to know God,  
forgot all their sorrows. . . . Enveloped  
by the holy spirit, then confidently  
prophesy Christ's resurrection.

Today the sun, radiant in its beauty, is rising into the  
heights, rejoicing and warming the earth,

for Christ is the sun of truth, which  
has risen from the grave and will  
save all who believe in it. . . .

Today the spring, radiant in its beauty, brings  
life to the  
earth and the turbulent winds blow gently, multiplying  
the harvests and the earth, giving nourishment to the  
seeds, giving life to the grass,—

spring is the beautiful faith in Christ,  
which renews man's nature through  
baptism; turbulent winds are sinful  
thoughts which through penance are  
transformed into good deeds and give  
nourishment to spiritually useful fruits;  
and the earth of our nature which  
accepted the word of God, like a family, . . .  
gives birth to the spirit of salvation.

Today, the newborn lambs and calves run and  
jump about  
friskily and, returning in short order to their mothers,  
bound about joyously; the shepherds likewise,  
playing on their reeds, praise Christ joyously:

the lambs, I say, are those gentle people from  
among the pagans, and the calves—the idolaters  
of the unbelieving countries, . . . who having turned  
to the Holy Church, suck the milk of its  
teachings while the teachers of Christ's flock . . .  
praise Christ the Lord.

Today the trees send forth buds and fragrant flowers  
bloom,  
and behold, the gardens already emit a sweet fragrance,  
and people work in the fields with hope, acclaiming  
Christ as the source of all fruit,—



for earlier we were like the trees in a forest  
which bear no fruit but today Christ's faith  
has been grafted onto our unbelief, and . . .  
we await the dawn of a new paradise;  
so also do the bishops and abbots who  
have worked for the Church, await their  
reward from Christ.

Today the industrious bees, like monks, reveal their  
wisdom  
and amaze everyone; for like those monks who live  
in the  
wilderness, they provide for themselves and cause both  
men and angels to wonder, so also do they [the bees]  
fly to flowers, fill honeycombs with honey and furnish  
sweetness for man and what is required by the Church.

Today all the song-birds of the Church choirs rejoice, for  
they are building their nests, that is, the Church Laws:  
bishops and abbots, priests and deacons and cantors,  
all sing their own song and in so doing praise the Lord.

Cyril compares clergymen, bishops, "all the teachers of the Church" to architects; Peter and John as they stand by Christ's grave—to the Old and New Testaments; Christ after His resurrection—to a shepherd who, upon awakening from a nap, finds that his sheep have wandered off in all directions and then proceeds to gather them together again, or with a father who has just returned home from a long journey and is joyously greeted by his wife and children. In addition to such extended comparisons, Cyril also employs comparisons which are so brief as to be little more than hints.

5. Another characteristic feature of Cyril's sermons is their dramatic quality; the biblical characters in his works speak to one another. Requiring great oratorical skill, such speeches and dialogues understandably gave an immediacy to the sermons and increased their emotional impact.

The laments uttered by Mary at the cross and by Joseph of Arimathea over Christ's grave number among the most dramatic moments in Cyril's sermons:

"All of creation responds to my grief, my son, seeing how unjust was your death! I am overcome by grief, my child, my world . . ., my creative creation. What is it that I should now lament: perhaps the

fact that you were ridiculed? Or perhaps those slaps which you endured, or those beatings that you suffered? Or perhaps, the fact that your holy face was spat upon? —All this that you endured at the hands of the unbelievers, as payment for your goodness. . . . —O woe is me! You who were innocent, were dishonored and suffered death on the cross! . . . I see you, my beloved child, hanging from the cross sightless and deprived of your soul. . . . And my soul is deeply wounded: I wish that I could have died with you. . . . Today I see you as a thief; for you died among thieves, as a corpse with your ribs pierced by lances. . . . I do not wish to live; it would have been far better had I preceded you to Hell. Listen to my words, O, heavens, earth and seas, hear the sobbing of my tears! For your Creator is at this moment accepting death at the hands of priests—the only saintly man is dying for the sinners and unbelievers! O woe is me! Whom can I call upon to join me in my lament, with whom can I share my flood of tears? All have abandoned you, all your family and friends. . . . Where are your seventy pupils today? Where are your apostles? . . . O woe is me, Jesus! . . . How can the earth remain undisturbed while you hang from the cross. . . . Come, and behold the mystery of the divine prophecy: come and behold how He who gave life to all creation has himself suffered a cursed death!”

Joseph of Arimathaea’s lament over Christ’s body is similar:

“O Lord, sun which never sets, creator of all and Lord of all creation! How can I dare even to brush against your body, that is purity itself when even the heavenly powers which serve you with awe dare not do so? With what kind of muslin can I veil your body when you veil the earth in mists and the sky in clouds? Or what kind of fragrances can I pour upon your holy body when Persian princes brought gifts of fragrances to you? What kind of funeral songs can I sing on the occasion of your death, when seraphims sing to you unceasingly?”

Joseph delivers a speech to Pilate in which he begs for the return of Christ’s body; Christ talks with the sceptical Thomas; an angel addresses the women who came to anoint Christ’s body. Furthermore, the sermon about the sick man is in the form of a dialogue. Christ asks him, as he does in the Bible, if he wishes to be well and he replies:

“I pray to God, but he does not hear me for my sins  
are so numerous that they extend above my head;  
All my property has gone to pay for doctors but I  
have received no help from them;  
There are no herbs that can negate God’s punishment;  
My acquaintances scorn me, because my stench has  
deprived me of all happiness;  
Even my family scorns me;  
I have become a stranger to my friends because of  
my suffering;  
Everyone curses me and I can find no one who can  
lighten my spirits.”

There follows a description of the sick man’s condition:

“Can I call myself a dead man when my stomach  
craves food and my tongue becomes dry from thirst?  
Can I consider myself alive when I not only cannot  
raise myself up from my bed but neither can I  
even move; my legs cannot walk and my hands  
not only cannot work but I cannot even touch myself  
with them:  
In my opinion, I am a corpse which has not yet  
been buried:  
my bed is my coffin,  
I am a dead man among the living and a living  
man among the dead,  
for I take sustenance, like a living man, but like  
a dead man, I do no work. . . .

Hunger tortures me more than my illness;  
for even if I am given food, I cannot raise it to  
my lips,  
I beg everyone to feed me,  
and share my poor repast with those who feed me.  
I moan, and sob, tortured by the pain and no one  
comes to visit me.

And if the scraps from the tables of God-fearing  
 people are brought to me, then the servants from  
 the sheep bath immediately descend upon me and  
 devour my alms more quickly than the dogs devoured  
 Lazarus' scabs.

I have neither property from which I could get money  
 in order to pay someone to look after me . . .

Nor do I have anyone who would care for me without  
 scorning me.

I have no one who would give me a bath!"

Christ responds to this speech with a speech of his own: All of religious history,  
 He says, is the history of God's service to man; from the creation of the world to  
 the manifestation of God in the flesh:

"Why do you say that you have no one?

I became a man for your sake, I am munificent  
 and benevolent and have not betrayed the  
 solemn promise of my revelation in the flesh. . . .

For you I abandoned the sceptre of the heavenly  
 kingdom and am wandering about the earthly one  
 and serving mankind:

I did not descend in order that others should serve  
 me, but in order that I myself may serve.

I, who am non-corporeal, have manifested myself  
 to you in the flesh so that I may cure  
 all mankind of their spiritual and physical  
 ailments.

I, who am hidden even to the eyes of angels, have  
 manifested myself to all mankind. . . .

. . . I became a man, in order that man may become God. . . .

Who could serve you more faithfully?

It is for you that I created all of creation.

The heavens and the earth serve you: one by providing moisture, the other—fruit.

The sun provides you with light and warmth, while the moon and the stars illuminate the night.

The clouds water the earth with their rains.

And the earth nourishes all sorts of plants which produce seeds, and fruit-bearing trees for your benefit.

Rivers carry fish for your benefit while the wilderness nurtures wild animals.

And you say that you have no one!

Who can be more just than I, for I have not betrayed the solemn promise of my revelation in the flesh!"

Scholars discuss the healing of the sick man. . . . In another sermon, the man whose sight has been restored praises Christ and in still others, angels, prophets and saints speak of the ascension of Christ.

Thus, dramatization is one of the most important of Cyril's devices. While these monologues and dialogues are rhetorical in character, they nonetheless succeed in bringing some warm, human and intimate notes into the sermons.

6. Another of Cyril's favorite devices is the extended antithesis or contrast, which helps the reader to better follow the flow of ideas. Like Hilarion, he frequently contrasts the human and the divine natures of Christ.

"Our Lord Jesus Christ  
was crucified like a man,—

but, like God, He darkened  
the sky and made the moon  
bloody and it was dark every-  
where on the face of the  
earth.

Like a man He cried  
out and gave up His  
soul,—

but, like God, He shook the  
earth and the rocks  
crumbled.

Like an earthly king  
He was guarded by a  
guard and lay enclosed  
in a grave,—

but, like God, with armies  
of angels He punished the  
demonic forces in the  
fortress of Hell. . . ."

Another good example of Cyril's use of extended antitheses is provided by the angel's speech to the women who come to anoint Christ's body:

“He descended from the  
heavens and revealed  
Himself in the flesh,—

so that the putrid would  
be regenerated and raised  
up into heaven.

He was innocent but He  
was led to his death,—

so that those who are  
covered with sin may be  
released from the power  
of the Devil.

He tasted vinegar and bile  
on a sponge held by a  
reed,—

in order to remove all  
record of man’s sins.

His ribs were pierced  
by spears,—

in order that the fiery  
weapons that prevent man  
from entering paradise may  
be turned aside.

He shed His own blood,—

and cleansed man of his  
physical blemishes and  
sanctified the human soul.

He was bound and a  
wreath of thorns was  
placed upon His head,—

so that man would be  
freed from the chains of  
the Devil and the thorn of  
demonic deception would  
be destroyed forever.

He darkened the sun and  
shook the earth and caused  
all of creation to weep,—

in order to destroy the  
storehouse of Hell (. . . and  
lead the souls who inhabi-  
ted this region into the  
light and transform Eve’s  
lament into joy).

He was placed in a grave  
like a mortal,—

so that He would bestow  
life upon all those who had  
died from the beginning of  
creation.

His grave was closed up  
with rocks and sealed,—

so that He could com-  
pletely destroy the gates  
and the hinges of Hell.

All could see that He was  
watched,—

but, unseen, He descended  
into Hell and bound Satan. . . .”

The eulogy of Joseph of Arimathaea and the acathistus on the resurrection of Christ, to mention but a few more examples, are also built on antitheses. Antitheses are also frequent in the laments and monologues quoted above.

The examples of laments, speeches, and antitheses given above fall into rhythmical units; if Cyril's sermons are read carefully, the oratorical rhythm and rhetorical stresses can be felt. This rhythmical quality becomes even more apparent in those passages where parallelism is extensively used, where sentences are similar in structure and content. As a translation would obscure this rhythm, we will present our examples in the original. Easter is—

*udivlenie na nebesi,  
i ustrašenie preispodnim”,  
i obnovenie tvari,  
i izbavlenie miru,  
razrušenie adovo,  
i popranie smerti,  
v”skresenie mertvym”,  
i pogublenie prelesnyja vlasti diavolja,  
spasenie že čelověčeskomu rodu  
xristovym” voskreseniem”,  
obnišćanie vetxomu zakonu,  
i porabošćenie subotě,  
obogašćenie Xristovyja cerkvi,  
vocarenie neděli . . .*

(“Wonder in the heavens, and fear to those under the earth and regeneration of creation, and the salvation of the world, the destruction of Hell, and the trampling down of death, the resurrection of the dead, and the destruction of the seductive power of the Devil, the salvation of mankind through Christ's resurrection, the impoverishment of the Old Testament and the enslavement of the old Sabbath, the enrichment of the Church of Christ, the enthronement of the new Sabbath. . . .”)

Or the account of the charity exhibited by Christ, who

*bliz'' k'' sebě privede,  
i vsego čelověka zdrava s''tvoriv'',  
razslablenago v''stavi,  
xromyja ubystri  
prokažennya očisti,  
slukyja ispravi,  
gluxia i němya dobrě slyšašča i glagolivy s''tvori,  
suxorukya ukrěpi,  
běsy ot'' čelověk'' progna,  
slěpya prosvěti . . .''*

("brought us close to Himself, made all men healthy again, made the paralyzed stand up, quickened the lame, made the lepers clean, straightened the crooked, made the deaf and the dumb hear and speak well, strengthened the withered arms of the paralyzed, freed man from the demons, gave sight to the blind. . . .")

This rhythmical quality is also present in the eulogies, especially in those which are in the style of the acathistus, and even in the attacks on Arianism:

*slyši, Arie,  
nečistiva duše,  
bezglavnyj zvěrju  
okajannyj čelověče,  
novyj Kaine,  
vtoryj Ijuda,  
plotjanyj dēmone . . .*

("Listen, Arius, unclean soul, headless beast, cursed man, new Cain, second Judas, corporeal demon. . . .")

Cyril continues in the same fashion for sixteen more phrases. The rhythmical units sometimes also accidentally rhyme [*obxožu–poslužu* (walk around–serve)]. There is no alliteration.

Some scholars have tried to link certain features of Cyril's sermons with the oral tradition but with little apparent success. Such is the case with the opening lines of the story of the sick man:



*Neizměrna nebesnaja vysota,  
ne ispytanna preispodnjaja glubina,  
nižě svědomo Božia smotrenia tainstvo.*

("Just as immeasurable as the heights of the sky, just as unknown as the bottom of the deep, so unfathomable also is the mystery of God's care.")

While some of the phrases are reminiscent of the formulaic expressions of folklore, especially of some variants of the *starina* about Solovej Budimirovič, they are really taken from the Bible.

In his sermon on the anti-Arian Church Council, Cyril refers to "song-writers" who sing about military exploits, compares the Church Fathers to soldiers and their campaign against Arius to a battle, but this is hardly sufficient justification for claiming that Cyril was influenced by the military epos. It is, in fact, much more plausible that Church rhetoric influenced the later oral tradition than vice versa.

Cyril's language is simple and, while it does not deviate significantly from the Church Slavonic norm, it also includes words from the vernacular. However, the rhetorical structuring of his sermons derives from the tradition of high style employed in Greek homiletics. Because of the obvious similarities between the two, one could be led to think that the laments in Cyril's sermons were influenced by the folk lament, but their origin is literary—they stem from the apocryphal "Gospel of Jacob." One also finds traces of the "Gospel of Nicodemus"; the references to "Adam's manuscript" describing "Eve's lament" after the expulsion from Paradise may have been derived from the apocryphal "Life of Adam" and "Eve's Lament" and so on. The rhythmical quality of Cyril's sermons is very similar to that of Church songs and prayers.

However, Cyril modifies his images to correspond more closely to his own environment. Thus, for example, he employs the comparison of Easter and spring, which is borrowed from a sermon by Gregory the Theologian, and extends the images of cultivation of the land but excludes those referring to the sea which would be alien to most of his listeners.

7. There are a number of sermons, Cyril's authorship of which is questionable. As it is possible that Cyril's homiletic style was not tied exclusively to the Greek tradition of high style, we will discuss these sermons here. Among them are such simple sermons as that on Whitsuntide which clearly and briefly describes God's desire to save the sinful by delivering a sermon or points out the importance of theology, concluding with the following effective passage:

"If each day I distributed gold or silver, or honey or wine, would you not come voluntarily and urge others to do the same? And today I am distributing the words of God, which are unmeasurably more valuable than gold and precious stones and sweeter than honey and honeycombs. . . ."

As there is no necessary reason that all the sermons by one author be in the same style, these sermons could quite possibly have been written by Cyril. It should also be noted that those of his sermons which are on themes from Christology were preserved as a separate whole, as a separate "edition" in manuscript form. Along with the collected works of Hilarion and Volodymyr Monomax, Cyril's "edition" of sermons testifies to the high cultural level attained by old Ukraine.

Their lack of originality in content notwithstanding, Cyril's sermons became very popular among other Slavs—they found their way as far as the Balkans and were included among the most authoritative works of the Church Fathers. In later centuries (seventeenth and eighteenth), they appeared in printed form in anthologies of sermons. Petro Mohyla refers to Cyril as one of the outstanding writers of sermons in Rus' while Kyrylo Trankvilion Stavrovec'kyj imitates Cyril's style in his *Učytel'noje 'jevanhelije* (*Instructional Gospel*). Borrowings from Cyril's works are also encountered in seventeenth century Russian literature.

8. More outstanding as a thinker than the poet, Cyril, and an older contemporary of his, Clement (Klym) Smoljatyč was a monk of the Zarub Monastery near Kiev.\* Undoubtedly because of his fame as a sermonizer and "philosopher" who, according to the *Chronicle*, had no equal in the land of Rus', he was consecrated as metropolitan of Kiev in 1146 but without the "blessing" of the Patriarch of Constantinople; as a result, until 1164 Clement was both metropolitan and pretender to the metropolitanate. We know that he was famous for his knowledge of theology and that he was an adherent of the symbolic approach to the interpretation of the Bible (see pt. J, no. 2). Unfortunately, no sermons which could be ascribed to him with certainty have been preserved.

A sermon eulogizing the Holy Fathers, which is similar to prayers in praise of individual saints, may have been written by Clement, as it contains a reference to the slaying in Kiev in 1147 of the prince and monk, Ihor. The general

---

\*The hypothesis that Clement was a Belorussian from Smolensk is groundless: "*Smol-jatyc*" does not refer to Smolensk as the town which he came from, but more probably is a name derived from a profession (*Smoljar*—pitch burner) or from his father's first name, "*Smola*."

characteristics of the Holy Fathers, monastic life and "scorn for the worthy" life "in the world" are presented in rhythmical prose. Some passages are reminiscent of the sermon on monastic life attributed to Hilarion (see Ch. III, pt. B, no. 6). However, as was mentioned above, Clement's authorship of this sermon cannot be established with certainty. Another sermon "about love" is shorter and simpler. Built around quotations from the Bible, mainly from the Gospel of John, it employs paradox to emphasize the meaning of Christian love: "In the absence of love neither baptism nor penance will save us," for love is

Protection from the heat of sin  
the tower and wall against enemies  
treatment for the sick  
the key to the kingdom . . .  
the doors to heaven  
which lead into eternal life. . . .

And the sermonizer calls upon his listeners:

*Tu v"zljubim",  
toju priblizimsja k" Bogu,  
toju serdca svoja s"pletem",  
toju dušu svoju s"tvorim,  
ta bo vraždu vsjaku razorjaet',  
ta privodit ny k" Bogu . . .*

("If we love this, through this we shall be brought closer to God, through this we shall intertwine our hearts, through this we shall create our souls, for this will destroy all hostility and bring us closer to God. . . .")

While these sermons may not have been written by Clement (the second is reminiscent of his epistle in certain respects—see pt. J, no. 2), they nonetheless demonstrate that some of the characteristic features of the sermons of Cyril of Turiv, such as their rhythmical quality, and their use of syntactical parallelism, are also generally characteristic of the style of this period.

9. Also of this period is the anonymous sermon known as the "Sermon on Princes," which is related to the feast-day of the transference of the relics of Borys and Hlib and calls upon the princes to abandon their "quarrels." This sermon probably originated in the Černihiv region as a result of the events of 1175. Borys and Hlib are portrayed as models of submissiveness and true lovers

of peace. In addition to eulogizing these princes, the author presents his own sharply critical views of the political situation:

"Listen to my words, you princes who stand opposed to your older brothers, make war and lead the pagans against your brothers! Do you think that God will not condemn this on the Day of Judgment? What have the holy Borys and Hlib suffered at the hands of their brother? Not only were they deprived of power but also of their lives! You are unable to endure the words which your brothers utter, engage in death-dealing hostilities and enlist the support of the pagans against your own brothers all because of some small affront."

The author supports his ideas with examples from the Bible as well as from the lives of Volodymyr, Borys and Hlib and from that of a prince "from his own land" (the Černihiv region)—David Svjatoslavyč (d. 1123). He gives accounts of the miracles which occurred after the death of David—the attic of his palace dissolved (as in Svjatoslav's dream in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*), a white dove flew into his room and sat on his chest. During his funeral a star appeared in the sky and the sun did not rise until the prince had been buried for he

"had no quarrels with anyone. When someone took up arms against him, he survived this war by his submissiveness; . . . when one of his brothers did him an injustice, he simply endured it. Once he kissed the cross, he never during his life violated the vow he had made to anyone in this way; when someone violated the vow which had been made to him, he still continued to live up to his. He never committed an injustice or an evil deed. . . ."

Even though he lived in the outside world and had a wife and children (Nicholas Svjatoša, a monk in the Kievan Caves Monastery, was one of his sons—see Ch. IV, pt. D, no. 4), David was a saintly man. From the example of David, the author concludes that it is also possible to attain salvation in the outside world—"You who take up arms against your brothers and people of your own faith ought to be overcome by shame! Fear God and fall down before Him in tears lest you lose your good name [in heaven] solely because of your vindictiveness."

This structurally and stylistically simple but moving sermon is also interesting for its advocacy of peace among the princes. In this respect it is somewhat reminiscent of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*.

10. One "Epistle" by George of Zarub, a monk in the same monastery as Clement Smoljatyč, has been preserved. Probably written not later than the

middle of the thirteenth century, this epistle is ascetic in nature, urging people not to search out wise teachers, for the author himself can tell them what is necessary for their salvation in spite of his "lack of learning." George not only gives instruction in the Christian virtues but advises that worldly culture be spurned, that is, "buffoons, . . . fiddlers and players of reeds," which people listen to "for their own pleasure"; "this is the beauty and joy of frenzied youths," but Christian music, the Christian "psalter is the beautiful, sweet-sounding Book of Psalms by means of which one should make merry before Our Lord, Jesus Christ." But the advocacy of "simplicity" and the desire to introduce asceticism into the outside world expressed in this sermon are characteristic of the increasingly manifested ascetic ideology which was later to find an outstanding supporter in Ivan Vyšens'kyj.

11. A sermon by Moses, abbot of the Vydubec'kyj Monastery, is preserved in the *Chronicle* under the year 1199. It is an expression of gratitude to Prince Rjurik Rostyslavych who had a wall built near the monastery in order to protect the buildings on its grounds from any damage they might suffer as a result of a possible landslide (the monastery was located on the bank of the Dnieper). Solemn, lofty and salutary, this sermon employs a wide range of devices of the lofty oratorical style: the voice of self-abasement (he speaks not only of his own "lack of learning" but also about the "poverty of the mind") and the exuberant comparison of "the honorable words, the deeds inspired by true love of God and the autocratic state" of Rjurik, which are known not only "in the far reaches of the land of Rus'" but also far beyond the sea, with "the light from the sun, the waxing of the moon, the beauty of the stars and time which does not alter the laws of the Creator." This comparison is even given a philosophical base: Rjurik's generosity can be compared with the universe, for "the soul of the man who has been inspired by the wisdom of God is like a small sky," that is, it is like a "microcosm." Rjurik's generosity is meant as an example for others, an example which would lead them out of "the enslavement resulting from a lack of generosity and the darkness of miserliness." The sermon abounds in biblical quotations: "As you are standing not upon a river bank but upon a wall which you yourself have created, I sing to you the same song of defeat as once I did to Miriam" (from the Old Testament). There are also references to the folk legends which provide their own explanation of the fact that the church on the monastery grounds was not destroyed in spite of the landslides along the bank of the Dnieper: some say that the church moves back from the bank of the river, others—that it is supported by a single golden hair, lowered from the heavens (like St. Sophia's in Constantinople). This entire arsenal of symbols, rhetoric and learnedness is employed to describe a local event of limited significance.

A panegyric sermon of this same type, but devoted to a nonsecular topic has also been preserved. It is a eulogy of St. Clement, whose relics were kept in the old Desjatynna Church, and of the prince (perhaps the same Prince Rjurik) who "restored" it. It is modelled on an older panegyric sermon (eleventh century?), the text of which has not survived in its full form, thereby making a stylistic comparison of the two works impossible. The later sermon possesses a rhythm which stems from the rhetoric employed in it. Recalling the deeds and miracles performed by St. Clement, the author speaks of the significance that St. Clement's relics had for Kiev in the past and asks for this saint's protection in the future. Just as he had protected "the child in the sea" from "beasts who never see the sun" (the tale about Clement's miracle in an underwater church, was known even in the eleventh century), so too will he protect those who love him from the "invisible beasts" of the earth, and so on. The conclusion focuses on the idea of the "seniority" of Kiev, at that time already in political and economic decline. The author plays on the word "*starejšenstvovati*" which means seniority both in age and in political power:

"Entreat God, Clement, to grant our Christ-loving and just prince not only a good life here on this earth, but also eternal blessedness, for he continued the tradition of benevolence of his forefathers and restored your Church. . . . Let him now rejoice as the elder among the princes. . . .

May he [the Metropolitan] also rejoice who, being the elder among the bishops, is fortunate enough to touch your sacred objects and consecrate the faithful! May the citizens of our city, the eldest among cities, rejoice in your protection and remain with you always.

May the light celebrate your fortunate clergy, the eldest among all the clergy [of Rus'].

May all who value your memory by their faith and love celebrate handsomely."

12. The atmosphere in the sermons of Serapion, bishop of Vladimir (in the principality of Suzdal) is completely different—it is one of moral severity. Serapion and his listeners had experienced Tatar raids, the destruction of Kiev and the principality of Suzdal, which were suffering political and administrative decline, and the subjugation of the Christian princes by their pagan counterparts. The sole theme, running through all of Serapion's sermons like a leitmotif, is "God's punishment" of Rus'.

Little is known about Serapion: in 1274, at which time he was the archimandrite of the Kievan Caves Monastery, he was consecrated bishop of

Vladimir but died in the following year. That his activity as a preacher was not limited to the five sermons that have come down to us is supported by the words of Serapion himself: "I have told you many times," "I always sow heavenly seeds in the fields of your hearts," "I, who am a sinner, always instruct you," and so on. Serapion's sermons can be dated on the basis of various references he makes in them to specific "heavenly retributions": earthquakes, heavenly signs, an epidemic (1230), a Tatar invasion (1237), and finally the flood in Durazzo (1273). One of them definitely belongs to Serapion's Kievan period. A second can also be ascribed to this period on the basis of the fact that Serapion addresses his listeners as "brothers." Both the content and the form of the address employed [*ŷada* (children)], indicate that the remaining three sermons belong to the final years of his life when he was already bishop of Vladimir.

Serapion's first Kievan sermon deals with evil signs—darkenings of the sky and misfortunes—the earthquake, the epidemic and war. The second of the Kievan sermons and one of the later three are devoted to the Tatar invasion. Serapion interprets these misfortunes as "God's punishment" for man's sins, and it is upon these sins that he focuses his attention. In the remaining two, he attacks various superstitions—the persecution of witches and sorcerers, disinterment of the bodies of those who died an unnatural death by drowning or suffocation; believers in these superstitions will be punished by God. All of Serapion's sermons portray the present reality as a movement towards its final end. This gives rise to their moral severity and solemn tone.

The new ascetic ideology does not result in a lack of concern for the purely literary aspects of the work. Serapion's sermons are at least as refined in this respect as those of Cyril of Turiv, except that their content is real rather than symbolic. The dominant literary device in Serapion's sermons is their rhythmical structuring, the impact of which is further strengthened by the accumulation of images of the "punishments of God" and the "sins of man." When he employs repetition as a means of making his ideas more easily perceptible, it can be concluded that he is directing his words not at his fellow-monks or the upper classes of society, but rather at the "common" people. The following passage is a good example:

We did not harken to the Gospels,  
did not harken to the Apostle,  
did not harken to the Prophets,  
did not harken to the glorious saints. . . .

Or: Many times have I instructed you, wishing to turn you  
away from your evil practices; but I see that you  
have not changed in the least:

He who was a bandit has not abandoned his banditry,  
he who was a thief has not stopped stealing,  
he who hated his friends has not given up his  
hostility,  
he who oppressed and plundered has not been satiated,  
he who collected interest has not stopped collecting  
interest,  
he who was a debaucher has not given up his debauchery,  
he who cursed and drank has not forsaken these practices.

Elsewhere: There is no punishment which we have been spared  
and [God]  
punishes us unceasingly today, but

we have not turned to the Lord,  
have not repented of our lawlessness,  
have not forsaken our evil practices,  
have not cleansed ourselves of the filth of sin,  
. . . . Therefore the misfortune that tortures us does  
not cease. . . .

Or: You have abandoned truth,  
you are deprived of love,  
envy and deception feast in your midst,  
and your soul has become arrogant.  
You subscribe to pagan customs:  
you believe in sorcerers  
you burn innocent people.

Serapion enumerates God's punishments—heavenly signs, epidemics and diseases,  
the pagan onslaught and all the misfortunes connected with it, in the same way:

We saw the sun die,  
the moon darken,  
the stars move in the heavens,  
and today we see the earthquake with our own eyes. . . .



a cruel people have descended upon us,  
conquered our cities,  
destroyed our holy churches,  
killed our fathers and brothers,  
dishonored our mothers and sisters. . . .

It is terrifying for a person to suffer God's wrath.  
What have we not endured in this life?  
What have we not brought upon ourselves?  
What kinds of divine punishments have we not endured?  
Is our country not in bondage?  
Have our cities not been seized?  
Have our fathers and brothers not been slaughtered?  
Have our wives and children not been taken as captives?  
Have they not been made slaves by these foreigners?  
We have endured this affliction and torment for almost  
    forty years,  
and the heavy taxes are not lightened,  
hunger and epidemics plague our land,  
and we cannot enjoy eating our daily bread,  
and our bodies are being wasted away by our suffering  
    and grief.  
Who brought us to this?

Our own lawlessness,  
our own sins,  
our own disobedience,  
our own refusal to repent. . . .

God—     willed upon us these cruel people,  
            these fierce people,  
            these people, who show no mercy for youthful beauty,  
            the sickness of the old,  
            the youth of children. . . .

God's churches have been destroyed,  
holy vessels have been defiled,

sacred places trampled under foot,  
 bishops have been devoured by the sword,  
 the blood of our fathers and brothers has watered  
     the earth,  
 the might of our princes and voivodes has vanished,  
 overcome by fear, our heroes have fled,  
 most of our brothers and children have been taken captive,  
 our villages have been overgrown by weeds,  
 and our greatness has been humbled,  
 our beauty has been destroyed,  
 our riches have been taken as booty,  
 the products of our labor have been taken by the pagans,  
 our land has become the property of foreigners,  
 we were disgraced in the eyes of our neighbors,  
 we were held in contempt by our enemies. . . .

The rhythmical quality of Serapion's sermons, which is almost completely lost in translation, is strengthened by the use of repetition [*naše, naš* (our); *viděxom* (we saw); *ašče* (if); etc.]. Alliteration is all but absent. Occasionally, the final words of adjacent phrases or clauses rhyme:

*zemlju naša pustu stvorīša,*  
*i gradi naši plētnīša,*  
*i cerkvi svjatija rozoriša,*  
*otca i bratiju naša izbiša . . .*

("They transformed our land into a wilderness, and  
 captured our cities, and destroyed our churches, killed  
 our fathers and brothers. . . .")

Rhetorical devices are few but suited to the overall style, consisting mainly of various types of addresses to the listener. The frequency with which rhetorical questions are posed creates the impression that the preacher not only *expects* his listeners to fulfill God's commandments, but wishes to obtain a personal promise from them. Exclamations are rare ("O, evil insanity!"; "O, you who have little faith!"; "Is this your penance?"). The predominant tone is that of a conversation with the listener. They kill witches: "One man is motivated by hatred, another by the vile benefits that may accrue to him and yet another, who is not sound of mind, merely wants to kill and rob but knows not whom to kill or why he wishes to do so. . . ." Antithesis is encountered infrequently:

I *always* sow divine seeds in the field of your hearts,  
I have *never* seen them grow to fruition.

When the Lord created us we were *great*,  
but because of our disobedience we have become *small*. . . .

Now that we are *small*,  
we fancy ourselves *great*. . . .

On the other hand, Serapion is fond of comparisons:

“A mother does not grieve so deeply when her children *suffer* from bodily ailments as do I, your sinful father, when you *suffer* from lawless deeds”; “I always *sow* divine seeds in the field of your hearts”; “Just as the *wild animal* craves to gorge itself on flesh, we are driven continuously by the urge to destroy everyone. . . . The *wild animal* can eventually satiate its appetite, but *we* cannot satiate ours”; “Do not be like the *bulrush*, which is bent by the wind”; “If the *shepherd* cannot be gladdened when he sees his sheep being carried off by a *wolf*, how can I be gladdened when I see the evil wolf-like *Devil* doing harm to any one of you?”

Serapion’s images grow into horrifying visions of the Last Judgment. He senses the approach of the final days of mankind and his planet and speaks of them; “God’s punishments” are occasionally portrayed as being the final ones:

“The earth was created as a stable and immovable object but today God has commanded it to move, and it quakes under the impact of our sins, no longer able to sustain our lawlessness”; “Today [God] is shaking the earth and causing it to tremble: his aim is to shake our numerous sins from the face of the earth like leaves from a tree.”

But this tone of impending doom is not all pervasive; Serapion also tries to instill hope into the hearts of his listeners:

“Look honestly upon your deeds, learn to hate them and then reject them and repent. God’s anger will abate, his benevolence will rain down upon us and we will live joyously on this earth”; “If we obey God’s laws, we will be able to live out our lives in peace. . . .”

In addition to the five sermons mentioned above, there are two others which are very similar in style and content but cannot be ascribed to Serapion with certainty. It is possible that they were written by another author who used Serapion's sermons as a model.

13. The remaining extant sermons which definitely or probably belong to this second Kievan period will not be discussed here, as the works discussed above provide sufficient evidence of the high level of literary artistry attained in this genre.

However, the great variety manifested even in the small number of sermons which have been preserved is worthy of note. Ukrainian authors did not uniformly choose to model their sermons on but one of the several types known in early Christian literature. By so doing they were apparently attempting to satisfy the spiritual needs of various social groups and it is precisely this fact which critics of the old socio-political school failed to appreciate. For them the significance of the old Ukrainian sermon was not unquestionable and the refined style of Cyril of Turiv nothing more than an unnecessary game, "an exercise in rhetoric." In the rationalistic and positivistic spirit that was prevalent in their time (the end of the nineteenth century), they recognized as significant only those sermons that were moralistic in character and, as we have seen above, these were not lacking in old Ukrainian literature. Such an evaluation is clearly ahistorical in nature. In addition to moral instruction, the sermon also attempted to explain the basic doctrines of the Christian faith. That these doctrines can be elucidated in various ways is self-evident. Cyril of Turiv chose to employ images, metaphors and symbols. That this technique has been validated by history is also self-evident, as representatives from various epochs repeatedly return to it. Furthermore, from the point of view of cultural history, there can be little doubt that the explication of theological ideas is at least as important as the onslaughts against drunkenness, exploitation and other moral defects. Highly successful from the literary point of view, the sermons of Cyril of Turiv and his "school" (or trend) occupy an important position not only in the history of Ukrainian literature but also in Ukrainian spiritual history.

### C. THE TALE

1. In contrast to the trend in all other literary genres, the number of original tales written in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries did not increase but decreased. It is possible that some of the original tales included in *Prologue* were written or re-worked in Kiev but this cannot be proven.

2. Two of Cyril of Turiv's symbolic tales have been preserved. The content of both is not original; one of them employs a subject encountered both in the East and the West, while the second draws on *Barlaam and Josaphat*.

The first tells of a wise husbandman who entrusts the task of guarding his vineyard to a lame man and a blind man, who together could see and hear everything but individually would be unable to steal anything from their master. But the lame man climbs upon the shoulders of his blind companion and together they are able to reach the vineyard. The symbolic meaning of the story is described in considerable detail; the husbandman is God, the lame man—the body, the blind man—the soul.\*

The second tale, which is based on *Barlaam and Josaphat*, is about a foolish king who "feared neither God nor man." Having been driven out of the city, he wanders about and stumbles upon a cave full of armaments; also in the cave is a man who is rejoicing. The explication of the symbolism is more extensive than the narrative: the city is man's body, the king—his soul, the cave—a monastery with its spiritual armaments and so on. The work is concluded by a eulogy of monastic life. Cyril does not apply embellishments as generously in his tales as in his sermons but they are still numerous. As in his sermons, passages are frequently rhythmically structured or given a rhythmical quality by the use of short clauses.

The symbolism is extremely broad and intricate; thus, having compared the city with man's body, Cyril pauses to discuss the significance of all of man's senses as sources of temptation—these are the inhabitants of the city; having pointed out that the armaments in the cave are spiritual weapons, he goes on to describe the kinds of weapons. Cyril expands on the borrowed material quite extensively (for example, there is no mention of weapons in *Barlaam and Josaphat*), especially in the realm of symbolism.

3. The remaining tales are those contained in the *Chronicle*. As was the case with the tale about Borys and Hlib, these narratives are a kind of rough draft for future Lives. However, the Church did not always find it necessary or possible to canonize all the heroes of these tales.

A tale about the death of Ihor is included in the *Hypatian Chronicle* (under the year 1147). Unfortunately, it is fused with another account of the same

---

\*The similarity of this tale to a section in the Talmud has been pointed out. However, there was also a Greek text (the apocryphal "Book of Ezekiel") from which Cyril of Turiv could have borrowed; the complete Greek text has not been preserved but quotations from it are employed by the Church Fathers. Cyril could have drawn on the Greek original. On the other hand, it is also possible that a Slavonic translation of the work existed at that time.

events which focuses on Izjaslav. The tale about Ihor can be isolated from the surrounding material only on the basis of its hagiographic style, its hostile stance towards Kievans and the absence of features characteristic of the *Chronicle* accounts proper—dialogues, around which the tales are built.

During the war between the Kievan prince Izjaslav and the princes of Černihiv, Ihor Olehovyč was captured by Izjaslav and became a monk. Recalling the unpleasant events associated with the captive Prince Vseslav, the Kievans decide to kill Ihor. The author places various pious thoughts in Ihor's mind, individual phrases of which are reminiscent of the story of the murder of Borys and Hlib. The conclusion of the work is very much in the style of hagiography: "He gave up his soul in the hand of God and, throwing off his corporeal attire, he drew on Christ's attire of suffering for which he was crowned with a martyr's wreath."

4. The tale of the murder of Andrew Bogoljubskij (1175) has been more adequately preserved. A powerful enemy of southern Rus', a brave warrior and an astute politician, Andrew Bogoljubskij transferred his capital from Kiev to Vladimir in Suzdal in imitation of the Kievan princes who maintained a residence close to their capital city (Vyšhorod); he lived not in Vladimir but in the village of Bogoljubovo. He was killed by his own boyars who feared his autocratic approach to government and his persecution of the boyar opposition. The account of his death was written by someone from Kiev or Perejaslav who had been close to him (possibly in the hope that he would be canonized). This tale is even recognized as a discrete work in the *Chronicle* where it appears under a separate heading.

The narrative begins with a broad description of the churches funded by Andrew Bogoljubskij; the ornate style is characteristic of the times. The prince

decorated it with multicolored icons,  
gold and precious stones,  
and huge priceless pearls,  
and decorated it with various tablets,  
and decorated it with slate tablets,  
and clothed it beautifully in various ornaments,  
and it was so dazzling that you could not look upon it,  
for the entire Church was of gold. . . .

His goodness and his stance toward the Church are described by the use of biblical quotations:

... his good deeds were numerous,  
and all his practices were good. . . .

he loved the non-corporeal more than the corporeal,  
and the heavenly more than the temporal,  
and the holy kingdom . . . more than this  
transitory kingdom.

This eulogy is concluded by a comparison of Andrew Bogoljubskij and Borys and Hlib. Unable to link the death of this prince with his virtuous deeds, the author still says the following: "This God-fearing Prince . . . laid down his life not for a friend but for the Creator himself." He addresses Andrew Bogoljubskij as a martyr and asks for his prayers. Quotations from the Bible and formulas from hagiographic works are scattered throughout the realistic narrative. The prince is compared to martyrs, several prayers and devout thoughts are placed in his mouth. A description of his funeral and the later transferal of his body to Vladimir conclude the tale.

5. The older variant of the tale about the murder of Prince Michael of Černihiv by the Tatars, which is mentioned in the *Chronicle* under the year 1245, has not been preserved. Broader accounts—the later northern falsifications, are attributed to Michael's priest.

The tale of the severely punished bishop of Suzdal, Theodore ("Fedorec") is also undoubtedly but an addition to the *Chronicle* (1172). It is not of the ecclesiastical or even of the Christian type (for example, "He who is cursed by the people, will be accursed" and so on). Furthermore, there are several tales about the transferal of relics, the building of churches, etc.

A simple tale about the healing of the monk, Martin, by the relics of Borys and Hlib has been preserved in *Prologue* and other such collections. Originating from Turiv, it is interesting as an evidence of the existence of literary activity in such a small center.

#### **D. THE PATERICON OF THE KIEVAN CAVES MONASTERY**

1. The *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, the work of two thirteenth century monks, bishops Simon and Polycarp, is one of the most extensive monuments of old Kievan literature and one of the most valuable sources of

cultural-historical information. The prehistory of this monument is known in considerable detail—an unusual phenomenon in old literature. It appeared in printed form on numerous occasions, beginning with the 1661 edition of Inokentij Gizel' and Sylvestr Kosiv. Two redactions of the *Patericon* have been preserved—the older Arsenian redaction of 1406, which arose on the initiative of Arsenius, bishop of Tver, and the Cassianian redaction of 1462, which was reworked in the Kievan Caves Monastery.

The kernel of the *Patericon* consists of the correspondence of the Kievan monks. Simon, who was bishop of the Suzdal city of Vladimir from 1215 to 1226, wrote a letter to Polycarp in which he attempts to dissuade Polycarp from giving in to the sin of ambition and becoming a bishop. Simon writes that he himself would gladly return to the Kievan Caves Monastery: "I would regard all fame and honor as dirt and even if I were to become the refuse which is thrown into the Caves Monastery and trampled under foot or one of the beggars who stand by the gates of our honorable monastery, all this would still be better than this fleeting honor."\* In addition to the letter he has sent nine tales dealing with the lives of eleven monks of the Kievan Caves Monastery; these tales had been written long ago and have been altered only by the addition of certain instructional passages. Following Simon's example, Polycarp wrote eleven tales of his own about thirteen monks also in epistolary form and addressed to the abbot of the Kievan Caves Monastery, Acindynus (1214-1231). As Polycarp and Acindynus lived in the same monastery and Polycarp himself admits that he has already described some of the events from the history of the monastery to him, it is obvious that the epistolary form is merely a literary device. Later these two groups of tales were grouped together and supplemented by various works dealing with the history of the Monastery, such as the tale about Isaac, the Life of Theodosius, etc.

In its original form the *Patericon* was not a collection of Lives. Rather it was a typical Patericon, that is, a collection of tales about separate episodes in the lives of monks, episodes which provide ample scope for moral instruction but are not necessarily laudatory in character. In fact, the tales typically deal with the temptations of the monks. The heroes are not portrayed as saints and it was not until 1643 that they were canonized by Petro Mohyla.

Both of the authors consciously modelled their works on older Patericons—see Ch. II, pt. C, no. 2, and employed various written materials which have not

---

\*One cannot help but be amused when certain Russian scholars argue that Simon was the first "Suzdalian" writer and that the entire *Patericon*, which was written mainly in Kiev, belongs to the literary heritage of the northeast.



been preserved—the *Rostov Chronicle*, the *Chronicle of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, the *Life of Antonius*, etc.

2. The content of the tales is quite varied. One group describes events that offer scope for moral instruction, another—those that will bring credit to the monastery, events from the lives of saintly monks and even martyrs and miracle workers. Most of the tales are legendary in character, having been preserved in oral form within the monastery. In fact, only two of those written by Simon are eye-witness accounts. Most of the tales belong to the end of the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth centuries.

Simon begins with the story of Onicephorus, a monk who could see each person's sins or their amelioration. Two others are devoted to two martyrs, Eustathius and Nikon, respectively, who were able to convert their tormentors to Christianity. The account of Poemen "the faster" occupies only a few lines; his spiritual powers enable him to learn of the death of the saintly Kukša, a missionary among the Vjatičians, at the hands of the pagans. This section clearly reveals how little the Patericon tales have in common with works of hagiography. Of all the tales included in this collection, that about the Prince of Černihiv, Michael Svjatoša, most closely resembles this genre. Another four of Simon's tales are similar to the account of the monks who fall into sin: the monk Erasmus admitted that he was "a sinner but has not repented even to this day" but God gave him credit for his assistance to the Church, for his interest in its welfare; the "miserly and unmerciful" monk, Aretas, is similarly forgiven by God after all of his gold is stolen. Two monks—the priest, Titus, and the deacon, Evagrius, always quarrel; an example of a monk who is spiritually dead, Evagrius will not even make peace with Titus when Titus is on his death bed. The tale about Athanasius the Hermit is a tale about the fall of the entire monastery; when Athanasius dies his fellow monks do not even care to bury him "as he was very poor and had no worldly possessions and was scorned because of this." However, two days later Athanasius rises from the dead and lives for another twelve years.

The tales written by Polycarp are equally varied. Laurentius the Hermit drives out demons; Agapitus is a kind doctor, more skilled than his worldly counterparts; Gregory the Miracle Worker has the power to perceive hidden thoughts and foresee the future—he is murdered by order of the young prince, Rostyslav, who later dies by drowning in the Stuhna (the *Chronicle* and *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* also refer to this incident), according to Gregory's prophecy. Moses the Hungarian and John the Hermit do battle with the temptations of the flesh for many years; in times of famine, Prochorus made bread from pigweed and salt from ashes; Spiridion, the baker of the Host, put out a fire with water

that he brought in his cloak; angels painted icons for the icon-painter, Alipius; Mark, who was responsible for burying the dead, could forestall the death of those monks whose graves were not ready, make the dead anoint their own bodies if their cells were too small to allow him to do this, and so on.

Included among the tales of successful temptation is that of Nicetas the Hermit. Having been tempted by a demon who appeared in the form of "an angel of light" and endowed him with wisdom, eloquence and even the power of prophecy, Nicetas would teach only from the Old Testament and did not even wish to read the Gospels; his fellow monks succeed in freeing him from the Devil by their prayers. The monk Theodore also at first succumbed to the temptation of the Devil who led him to a Varangian treasure and enticed him to flee from the monastery with his newly found wealth. However, he is saved by his friend Basil who is able to make him completely forget the location of the treasure. Later, both Theodore and Basil are tortured to death by the son of the Kievan prince, who wanted to acquire the treasure for himself.

The introductory tale, which describes the founding of the Kievan Caves Monastery Church, is interesting for its depiction of the alien cultural forces with which the monks were confronted: the Varangian—the funds for the building of the Church were donated by the Varangian "Prince" Šimon; and the Greek—the Church was constructed by Greek masters, who were miraculously invited to come to Kiev either by the already deceased saints, Antonius and Theodosius, or by angels.

3. From the point of view of cultural history, these varied tales are of tremendous importance: they provide outstanding pictures of monastic and secular life and convey the atmosphere of the late princely era when the monastery was isolated from the secular world and evaluated it negatively. However, even all that is said about the monastery is not positive, for in addition to those monks who remained true to the traditions of Theodosius—the traditions of work and charity—we also encounter self-seeking, egoistic and malicious monks. And it is for this reason that an asceticism more severe than that described in the Life of Theodosius comes to the fore. However, it must be noted that a few warnings against the dangers of such a severe form of asceticism do appear in the tales.

Several tales of both authors are linked to the tale about Isaac, which appears as the progenitor of the *Patericon*, as it contains many of the motifs employed by Simon and Polycarp—temptation by the Devil who has assumed the form of an "angel of light" (Nicetas, Theodore) and the notion of the "gifts of the spirit": Onicephorus, Poemen and others are able to foresee the future, Agapitus has the power of healing, Laurentius drives out demons, Spiridion

cope with fire in much the same way as Isaac. Of course, materials were also drawn from other *Patericons* but apparently only those which were already sanctioned by tradition (see Ch. III, pt. D, no. 1).

4. The style of the two authors of these tales is different. Simon's is simpler, having many features in common with that of the chronicles: he favors the use of dialogue—a device which allows for the broadening of the scope of the narrative, lingers over individual actions, thoughts, reflections and decisions of the characters. Occasionally passages are very reminiscent of the *Chronicle* or the tale about the murders of Borys and Hlib, many quotations from the Bible are employed and the language is frequently rhythmical. In some of his tales Simon builds dramatic tension by withholding the most interesting pieces of information until the end (compare the technique employed in the tale about the death of Oleh). The material is well-chosen and effectively ordered; there are no unnecessary digressions.

Polycarp's tales are artistically much more accomplished. They contain subjective overtones, employ general statements as starting points, make use not only of simple dialogue but also prayers, and include many apt comparisons: "He was struck by the arrow of envy," "Temptations are spiritual beasts." His comparisons are frequently traditional: "In the world man stands on the edge of an abyss, in a monastery—far away from it," "on firm ground"; asceticism "cleanses" a person "as gold does fire"; the Devil is a hunter who shoots arrows into the hearts of men, etc. However, such traditional images give rise to vivid and occasionally even well-rounded portraits of the monks; such is the case in respect to Prochorus who "walked lightly along his path," living "like some bird," and even carried his pigweed "as if he were propelled by wings." In addition to quotations from authoritative religious sources, Polycarp occasionally employs proverbs: "That which you sow also shall you reap." On the other hand, he also sometimes reveals himself as an educated man who is not willing to lower himself to the level of the common man's language and milieu; for example, instead of employing the "vulgar" form *loboda* (pigweed) he writes: "*zeliže, jako že prežde řex*" ("the weed mentioned earlier"), etc. Certain exclamations also belong to this learned style; for example: "This deed performed by the Lord testifies to His glory."

Polycarp does not limit himself solely to material directly related to his stories. Scattered throughout his tales are references to historical, legendary and various other types of events. For a *Patericon* tale, the stories of Theodore and Basil (see above) would have themselves sufficed; however, Polycarp also weaves the migratory legend about the demons who help the saint to build a church into the fabric of his narrative. Theodore forces the demons, who were interfering

with his building of a cell, to help him by carrying and piling up the wood prepared on the bank of the Dnieper for the construction of church buildings; the "servants" and drivers whose work had been done by the demons and who were therefore deprived of their pay, demand payment from Theodore; "an unjust judge" hands down the following decision: "Let the demons who helped you with the work also help you to pay." The tale about Theophilus, a monk who kept his tears of repentance in a dish, is highly successful; while he is on his death bed an angel appears to him and brings an earthen pot full of fragrant "myrrh"—these were those tears which Theophilus had not collected but had let fall onto the earth or wiped away with a towel. In these and other tales folk legends of a religious character occupy the most prominent position. The first one of these mentioned above (about demons giving aid to a saint) is encountered in all parts of the world, even among non-Christian peoples.

Polycarp's tales number among the best examples of psychological characterization in old Ukrainian literature. In most cases the inner lives of characters are revealed through dialog, monolog, prayers or first person narration, on the one hand, and realistic narration in which metaphors and comparisons become reality, on the other: for example, John, who is possessed by licentious thoughts, feels flames rising upward from his legs and making his bones crackle.

The stories of Theodore and Basil can truly be described as novels, as can the tale of the adventures of Moses the Hungarian, the brother of one of Prince Borys' servants. Having been taken prisoner by the Poles during the war between Jaroslav and Svjatopolk (1015-1019), Moses becomes the object of the erotic feelings of some rich and influential Polish woman. Moses secretly becomes a monk. His debates with the Polish noblewoman, her passionate love, his ultimate release from captivity and his life in the Kievan Caves Monastery are described in considerable detail and presented dramatically—not merely as a series of adventures but also as a psychological conflict. The tale about Prince Michael Svjatoša (probably "Svjatoslav") of Černihiv is also quite detailed in nature. The inner makeup of this prince, who rejected the world and lived out his days in the Kievan Caves Monastery, emerges from his discussions with his doctor.

In comparison with the secular monuments and sermons of this period, the *Patericon* tales are quite simple in style, as their authors preferred to concentrate on the presentation of the story itself rather than on the embellishment of their language. On the ideological level, a wide gulf separated these tales from the monuments that inspired them—the tale about Isaac and the Life of Theodosius; the ideals of limited asceticism and productive labor, the ideals of the complete fusion of the material and spiritual lives of the monks in the Kievan Caves Monastery, are replaced by a severe asceticism. Personal salvation overrides all

else, pushing the ideals of service to the world and communal life into the background. However, it must be remembered that the *Patericon* belongs to the dark period in the history of Kievan Rus'. As if sensing the impending demise of the culture of the princely era, the authors of the *Patericon* produced a work which was later to have perhaps a more profound impact on the spiritual life of Ukraine than any other old Ukrainian monument—an impact that was to endure at least until the general awakening of interest in the past, that arose in the Baroque period when the *Patericon* was reprinted, and even into the nineteenth century.

## E. CHRONICLES

1. Five redactions of the *Kievan Chronicle* containing supplementary Galician-Volhynian entries have been preserved. The best known of these is the so-called *Hypatian Chronicle*, which includes the old *Chronicle*, the *Kievan Chronicle* from the twelfth century, and the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* (1205-1289); in the latter, most of the material does not appear in the form of yearly entries but is woven into one complete narrative (in some of the later manuscripts this narrative is ineptly divided into yearly entries, the final one being mistakenly dated 1292).

The *Kievan Chronicle* is composed of a number of elements whose relationship has not yet been satisfactorily explained (the most significant attempts were made by Kostomarov, Hrušev's'kyj and Priselkov). Since its final editor (perhaps Moses, abbot of the Vydubec'kyj Monastery) and his predecessors significantly altered the original text, it is difficult to isolate its constituent elements. Information about other principalities from other sources was incorporated into it. Only in three or four instances can fragments be identified as probably belonging to individual works of a different character (see above, pt. C, nos. 3-5).

The situation with respect to the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* is quite different—up to the entry for 1260, it consists of a unified narrative by one author.

2. One of the most outstanding features of the *Kievan Chronicle* is its ample use of the dialogue form as a means of recounting the events of a story. This device is encountered even in the earliest longer narratives (1128). The characters converse and in their dialogue they provide information about their plans, intentions, relationships and also in part, about events. Most importantly, the princes speak to each other (directly or through emissaries), to their retainers, to the people, etc. Conversely, direct discourse is also employed by

their retainers, their enemies and the people. Long speeches are rare, most of the dialogue being limited to short statements introduced by phrases such as “he said” or “they said” (“*řex*,” “*rekořa*,” “*naća molyti*,” “*naćařa povědati*,” etc.). It is not unusual to find four to six of them on one page as in the following example:

News was brought [to Prince Izjaslav] from his friends in Černihiv: “Prince, do not leave your present place of abode, . . . [for] they want to kill you. . . .” After he had heard this, he sent emissaries to Černihiv with the following message: “We have made plans for a great expedition and have . . . kissed the cross; therefore, let us reassure [one another] once again. . . .” But they replied: “Why should we kiss the cross again? It is not necessary. . . .”—and they refused to kiss the cross. Izjaslav Mstyslavych’s emissary said to them: “Can it be a sin to kiss the cross as a sign of mutual love? . . .” Izjaslav had said to his emissary: “If they refuse to kiss the cross . . . tell them what we have heard.” And Izjaslav’s emissary said to them: “I have been informed that you are deceiving me. . . . Is this true, or not, brothers?” They could say nothing in reply. . . .

Frequently, an introductory phrase does not accompany the characters’ direct speech:

They complained that he has a pact not with the Mstyslavyches but with *our* enemies . . . .

And he kissed the cross: I am going to Suzdal now. . . .

And a warrior from the city overtook him: “Do not come to the city, prince, [for] the common council has been called. They are beating your retinue, and wish to seize you [also]. . . .”

While these varied forms of dialogue themselves lend a vitality to the narrative, the authors of the *Kievan Chronicle* attempted to further emulate the traditions of the old *Chronicle* by including apt expressions modelled on proverbs and quotations from literary sources in the statements made by their characters. Unfortunately, they were not as successful as their predecessors. Note the following examples of such statements from the *Kievan Chronicle*: Prince Andrew Volodymyrovych refuses to accept the throne of the principality of Kursk: “I prefer death with my retinue in my homeland . . . , to the principality of Kursk”; Prince Izjaslav says to Prince George, who had betrayed the oath he had made by kissing the cross: “One cannot play games with one’s soul”; the

same Izjaslav tries to comfort his retinue which is disturbed by the appearance of numerous enemy troops on the far bank of the Dnieper: "God willing, we will be able to defend ourselves; unlike birds, they do not have wings and are unable to fly over the Dnieper and land on our side. . . ."; thirty years later Prince Ihor's retinue says much the same thing: "Prince you cannot fly across like a bird. . . ."; the Galician Prince Volodymyrko, having been accused by an emissary from Izjaslav of violating the oath he pledged by kissing the cross, says: "It was only a small cross!"; Prince Ihor (hero of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*), at first refuses to try to escape from his captors: "It was in order to preserve my honor that I did not flee from my retinue and neither will I follow an inglorious path today. . . ." On other occasions, genuine proverbs are employed: "Peace exists prior to war and war prior to peace"; "The city does not come to its mayor but the mayor to the city"; "We must take care of ourselves lest others take care of us"; "Today he has punished someone else, tomorrow it will be our turn." The proverb "Ratša destroyed Kiev, Tudor-Vyšhorod" is associated with events in Kiev.

Maxims of a religious character are not as frequent. A number of them are derived from the Bible but a much larger proportion are simply general statements sustained in the style of religious monuments: "How good and how pleasant is it when brothers live in harmony" (from the *Psalter*); "The evil man will die an evil death"; "They came with ambitious ideas but returned home in humility."

The theme of misfortune as "God's punishment" encountered in the old *Chronicle* is also to be found in the final sections of the *Kievan Chronicle*. This theme is occasionally expressed through aphorisms: "This is God's whip and we have been lashed so that we may become humble and turn away from the path of evil." There are also aphorisms relating to God's punishment of the proud.

3. There are few expressions of a religious character in the *Kievan Chronicle*, because it is in essence a "military tale," a tale about military events from the point of view of Kievan "chivalry." The style of these tales is constant and polished. The same expressions and phrases are encountered repeatedly. Descriptions of preparations for a campaign begin with the phrases: "They collected their warriors," "They made ready for the campaign," "He mounted his horse." The prince gathers a "great multitude" (*mnogoe množestvo*) of warriors, "a tremendous force" "from all corners of the land" "the like of which has never before been seen"; later these forces are "like forests." There is a great unity among the princes: "We are all for one"; hearts "are aflame"; the prince "exhorts his retinue" or "his warriors into battle." On occasion, the prince even makes a short speech. The battle is signalled by certain phrases: "The trumpets

sounded," "the drum roll began and the trumpets sounded," "the drums' roll began," etc. Infrequently, the military "call" to arms is mentioned. The actual beginning of the fighting is indicated by expressions such as "they took up the banner," "they raised the banner," "they brought forth the banner"; then they "strike the enemy" and the prince is first to "break the lance" ("*kop'e izlomi*"). The description of the battle frequently includes various specific details, also expressed in fixed phrases: initially, "arrows are shot" and the prince sends "his bowmen against them"—the Polovcians; "when they meet the opposing forces, arrows are shot from both sides." In other cases, the description is much more limited: "They fought valiantly," "they advanced valiantly from the city" (or castle), the battle is "a fierce contest," a "valiant contest," "a ferocious struggle" ("*bran'*"), "rocks fall from the castle like rain," "and many men fall on both sides," "much blood was spilled and many lay dying," "and the wounded [*jazvenyx*]" were numerous." The following are typical of the descriptions of battles found in the *Kievan Chronicle*:

And the fighting was very fierce on both sides and many fell on both sides and it was as horrifying to behold as the end of the world [the Second Coming].

And there was great confusion and much moaning and a huge uproar and unknown voices; lances were breaking, and armor clashing and such a cloud of dust aroused that neither the calvary nor the infantry could be seen. And so they fought fiercely. . . .

The enemy has been defeated, "trampled under foot" and "having been put to shame," the opposing forces scatter and flee or retreat in an organized fashion ("the regiments retreat"). Then the rewards of victory are described: the destruction of their enemies' property or the taking of their lives, the acquisition of captives (*opolonišisja*, *ispolomšisja*) and other possessions which the chronicler occasionally enumerates in exuberant language, and less frequently, the release of the captives taken by the enemy (*otpoloniša*). In some cases, the campaigns described are unsuccessful: the prince either "dismounts" even before the beginning of the battle or "returns to his kinsmen" after certain events have occurred on the field of battle, "having accomplished nothing." The dead are also occasionally mentioned: "We cannot raise them from the dead." The heroes "wipe away their tears," "wipe away beads of perspiration" and return home "to great honor and acclaim," "with great honor and to great acclaim," "with great honor," "with great fame and honor," etc.

Formulaic expressions are also used in explaining the causes of these wars.



Among the most important of these is a prince's desire to revenge himself for "an affront"\* he had suffered, an affront "which can be atoned for only by death" and therefore the "affront must be avenged," the "dishonor wiped away." The "dishonor must be eliminated" because "dishonor is worse than death": "it is better to die, brothers, than to live without honor." A second important cause of hostilities is the quest for "honor": "We will acquire honor," "I will find my honor and the aspiration of my thoughts." This idea is even expressed in general form: "Brothers and retainers! The land of Rus' and her children were not created by God for dishonor, honor was acquired in all corners of the land. Grant us honor today, O Lord, in our battle with the foreign invaders. . . ." This quest for honor also takes on egoistical overtones: Princes are concerned about their personal "share" of "the land of Rus'" and are not hesitant to wage war to acquire their "fair share": "I will go in quest of Novgorod by good or evil means." Defense of seniority is a further variation of this theme. The prince's goal is always described in the same way—"to sit upon the throne of his fathers and forefathers."

The population is also given a role to play in the events of the first half of the century. Hostile postures toward its princes are described variously, but favorable ones are always portrayed with the help of formulaic expressions: "We will stand with you, wherever your banner flies"; "If it is your desire, we will follow you with our children"; "Even with our children at our sides, we will gladly fight for you"; "We wish to lay down our lives in order that the honor of your father be preserved." Generalized motivation for actions is frequently presented as a choice between two alternatives (either . . . or): "Either misfortune or good-fortune awaits us all"; "We must either deliver our wives, children and retainers into captivity or lay down our lives"; "I will either lay down my life or take revenge for the dishonor I have suffered."

The chivalrous world view expressed by the chroniclers and their heroes is also Christian in character but in the same unique way as that of the Christian knight in Europe. God is always seen as the final cause. Formulas such as "and so we will see" or "this is the right moment" (formulas referring to the propitiousness or unpropitiousness of the moment) are rare. In most cases "they place their faith in God"—things will be "as God wills them to be." God is called upon to judge the claim of disputants: "Let God judge between us" (also "the Saviour" and the "holy cross"); "O, Lord, grant that we may regain our honor"; and even "God used his power to grant victory to our enemies but honor and

---

\*The word employed in the original text is "*obida*." While it may occasionally be translated as "injustice" it lacks the moral overtone implicit in the word "injustice."

glory to us" for "God and the power of the cross is the cause of all things." Furthermore, the *Kievan Chronicle* frequently views entire episodes from this same point of view, especially from about the year 1170 (the work of Abbot Moses?): God, "the holy cross" and the Virgin Mary give aid to one side and punish the other; quarrels and rivalry are the work of the Devil.

Even while they are in reality waging wars for some trivial "affront" they have suffered, or for their "share" of the country, the heroes of the *Kievan Chronicle* view themselves as defenders of the "land of Rus'" (which refers only to Ukraine) and the "Christian people." However, they are occasionally really called upon to defend their country from its main enemy at that time—the Polovcians. The following is a typical example of the views of the chroniclers and their heroes: "I will struggle for the sake of the land of Rus'"; peace is preserved "for the sake of Rus' and the faithful"; "O, Lord, grant that we may lay down our lives for the faithful and the land of Rus' and be numbered among your martyrs."

The ideal of Christian chivalry that inspired the princes of the twelfth century emerges more clearly in the sections of the *Kievan Chronicle* (the entries under the years 1188 and 1190) devoted to the crusades led by Frederick Barbarossa:

In the same year, the German King set out to do battle for the grave of our Lord, for God commanded him to do so through an angel. And when they reached [the Holy Land], they fought fiercely with those ungodly Turks. . . . Like saintly martyrs, these Germans and their princes gave up their lives for Christ. And our Lord revealed his approval of their action through a sign: When one of them was killed in battle with these foreigners, then after three days their bodies were removed from their coffins by an angel; the others beheld this and longed to suffer for Christ. God's will was manifested and they were included among the chosen, among the martyrs [for the faith].

The use of numerous formulaic expressions creates two differing impressions—extreme resplendence, on the one hand, and a definite monotony, on the other. The monotony of what seems to be endless repetition is relieved only by individual interesting episodes or unusual events, which are painted in brighter colors and employ more dazzling images.

On the other hand, the other types of ornamentation frequently employed in other monuments of this period are all but absent. Only rarely do we encounter rhythmical passages so common in both religious and secular works.

The passage which describes Prince Ihor's (hero of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*) thoughts about his "sins" is one of them:

Then innocent Christians endured much misfortune,  
 children were torn away from their parents,  
 brother from brother,  
 friend from friend,  
 wives from their husbands,  
 daughters from their mothers,  
 women from their women friends,  
 and tranquility was destroyed by enslavement,  
 and grief existed then,  
 the living were jealous of the dead,  
 and the dead rejoiced. . . .

And now the Lord has given me my reward:  
 where is my beloved brother today?  
 where are my brother's sons today?  
 where is the child which I fathered?  
 where are the boyars who gave me counsel?  
 where are the brave warriors?  
 where are the regiments?  
 where are the horses and the valuable arms?  
 I lost all of this  
 and the Lord gave me into the hands of the heathens. . . .

Alliteration is rare:

<i>tako umre Jaroslav" edin",</i>	t-u-e
<i>u tolitě silě voi,</i>	u-t-v
<i>za velikuju gordost' ego,</i>	v-e
<i>poneže ne imějaše na Boga nadeži,</i>	n-n-n
<i>no nadějaset'sja na množestvo voi.</i>	n-n-n-v

("So from among so great a number of warriors,  
 Jaroslav alone died because of his immense pride; for  
 he did not place his faith in God but in the vastness  
 of his army.")

<i>i tako ustroi Bog'' m'glu,</i>	i
<i>jakože ne viděti nikamo že,</i>	n-v-n
<i>toliko do konec' kop'ja viděti,</i>	k-k-v
<i>i postiže dožt',</i>	i-p
<i>i v tom'' priprošasja ko ozeru oboi,</i>	i-p-o-o
<i>i razide ě ozero,</i>	i-o
<i>i tako nělžě by ni oněm'' oněx'';</i>	i-o-o
<i>m'gla že pod''jasja v'' pol''dni</i>	p-p
<i>i ujasnisja nebo,</i>	i-u
<i>uzrěša polki oba poly ozero,</i>	u-o-p-o
<i>i tako b'jaxutsja na krilěx'' polkom''</i>	
<i>ot'' oboix''*</i>	i-p-o-o

(“And so God caused a fog to form, a fog so dense that no one could see beyond the tip of his lance and then it began to rain and it was under these circumstances that both sides approach the lake and the lake separated them and neither one could reach the other; at midday the fog lifted and the sky grew bright and when the regiments saw both shores of the lake, the wings of both regiments fought against each other.”)

On occasion there is a complete parallelism between two events—mostly in connection with the condition of the two opposing forces (is this perhaps unintentional, the natural result of the use of formulas?):

When day began to dawn, it was in George's regiment that drum rolls were first heard, trumpets were first blown, and preparation for battle begun—and then in the regiments of Vjačeslav, and Izjaslav and Rostyslav, drum rolls were heard, trumpets blown and preparations for battle begun. . . .

In another section, four visits made by Prince David while he was in Kiev in 1195 are described on one page using exactly the same words.

The monotony of the narrative tone is relieved by the insertion of passages in a different style, predominantly that of religious literature. There are prayers which are written in the elevated religious style and frequently structured

---

\*There are some corrupted sections in this passage.

rhythmically. In the later section of the *Kievan Chronicle*, there is a necrology of the princes which provides interesting examples of literary portraiture. And there are individual tales—about the death of Prince Ihor at the hands of the Kievans (1147), about the murder of Andrew Bogoljubskij (entered under the year 1175—compare Ch. IV, pt. C).

The tale about the death of Rostyslav (1168) is also an insertion. Written in the style of hagiography, it is embellished with the prince's discussions of spiritual matters, his prayers and the following closing passage:

And he looked at an icon of the Creator Himself and began to speak in a low voice and tears flowed from his eyes: "Today, O Lord, You will dispatch Your servant from this world in accordance with your word." And tears lay on his face like seeds of pearl. And thus did he die while wiping away his tears with a handkerchief. . . .

The laments included in the *Kievan Chronicle* are also interesting.

These inserted tales and passages which are in a style other than that of the military tale contain a great many interesting stylistic features. In addition to quotations from the Bible, there are formulaic expressions of a non-military character; for example, compound words which are common in religious monuments [*blagoumnij* (noble-minded), *visokoumie* (high-mindedness), *pagoubouijstvennij* (homicidal), etc.].

4. The *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* is quite different in style. Its complex content, which describes events in the principalities of Galicia and Volhynia from the year 1205, was well characterized by the author himself in one of his subtitles: "*Bezčislennyja rati i velikyja trudi, i častyja vojny i mnogija kramoly, i častaja vostanija, i mnogija mjateži*. . . ." ("Numerous armies and great feats, and frequent wars and many insurrections, and many uprisings and many disturbances"). The period of Daniel, which appears to extend to the year 1260, is narrated as a complete whole, that is, it is not divided into yearly entries. This is followed by a section written by different authors whose style was partly influenced by that of their predecessor. The final portion (1287-1289), or at least that part of it which relates to Volodymyr Vasyľ'kovyč, is again the product of a single author, and is stylistically quite different from the preceding parts of the work.

5. The style of the first part of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*—the account of the reign of Daniel—unlike that of the *Kievan Chronicle*, is "bookish" in character. Its author was undoubtedly a learned man (hence his references to the scholar Timothy and the poet Mytusa—his fellow men of letters—and to Cyril, a scribe in the prince's chancellery). Complexly structured sentences,

archaic language, rare words, striking images and comparisons, unique situations—all this is characteristic of his “biography” of Daniel.

Perhaps the most typical feature of his style is his use of participial constructions, especially the so-called dative absolute. The following example describes the omens seen during an expedition:

*Ne došedšim že voem' rěki Sjanu,  
sošedšim že na poli voružit'sja,  
i byvšu znameniju sice nad" polkom";  
prišedšim" orlom" i mnogim" voronom",  
jako obloku veliku,  
igrajuščim" ze pticam",  
orlom" že klek ščuščim"  
i plavajuščim krilomy svoimi,  
i vospromětajuščim" sja na vozdušě,  
jako že inogda i nikoli že ne bě . . .*

(“Before the troops had reached the Sjan River, they dismounted in a field to ready their weapons and many eagles and ravens appeared in the sky like an immense cloud and the birds flew about playfully, the eagles searched, glided on their wings and floated through the air in an unheard of fashion.”)

As in the *Kievan Chronicle*, dialogue is used to lend a dramatic quality to the narrative. However, in Daniel’s “biography” it is occasionally employed with such persistence that the narrative disintegrates into individual dialogues. Not surprisingly, this learned author embellishes his text with various phrases, historical aphorisms and proverbs; for example: “It is better to die in one’s homeland than to win fame in a foreign country.” At the end of the account of Mstyslav’s unsuccessful campaign against Halyč, the boyar Elias (Il’ja) Stepanovyč takes Mstyslav up mound Halyč and “scornfully says to him: You have sat upon mound Halyč, Prince, and have therefore been prince of Halyč!” Or Daniel says: “Christians draw their strength from vast expanses, Tatars—from confined quarters.” Real proverbs are also used: “One stone can break many earthen pots”; “You must kill the bees before you can eat their honey”; “Evil which is more malicious than evil.” In addition, there are quotations from the Bible, from translated works and so on. And finally, descriptive words are linked to names: “Benedict the Torturer,” “the arrogant Filja,” or “the great Filja”

(Magyar voivodes). Semjunko, a Galician boyar is "unrestrained, fierce . . . [and] similar to a fox because he has red hair."

The fixed phrases found in abundance in the *Kievan Chronicle* are also used here, but much more sparingly. The author of this first part of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* prefers to offer more original scenes and images: within the walls of Volodymyr of Volhynia's castle "armed warriors stood in ranks, their shields and arms glittering in the sun"; in Daniel's army "the horses were clothed in masks and leather trappers and the men—in armor and his regiments gleamed in the sun because their armor glittered. And he himself rode alone . . . as was the custom in Rus': his horse was a marvel to behold and his saddle was gilded and his arrows and sword were adorned with gold . . . and his purple cloak was made of Greek cloth and embroidered in smooth patterns of gold and gold also decorated his boots of green morocco leather." The following descriptions of battle scenes are also characteristic:

and when the lances were broken it was as if a peal of thunder  
had resounded through the sky and on both sides many were  
falling from their horses and dying and others were wounded. . . .

lances and fire-sticks flew through the air like flashes of  
lightning and rocks fell like rain from the heavens . . .  
and others fell from the bridge into the ditch like sheaves  
of wheat;  
the ditches were very deep but they were completely  
filled with bodies so that it was possible to walk over  
the bodies like a bridge.

Individual heroes are given much more attention than in the *Kievan Chronicle* where they are referred to only rarely. The following passage describes Daniel's performance in the battle with the Magyars:

Prince Daniel rode up from the rear and began to pierce them with his sword. . . . Daniel struck a warrior with his lance and when his lance broke, he drew his sword; when he looked around in all directions and saw that Vasyl'ko's banner was still standing and that he was fighting well and pursuing the Magyars, Daniel drew his sword and went to his brother's aid, wounding a great many of the enemy and killing others. . . . When he reached his brother's position, he did not see one warrior but only the servants who were

watching the horses; they did not recognize him and lunged at him with their swords but God in his infinite mercy saw fit to bring him through this incident without a scratch.

The *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* is also richer in linguistic embellishments. Rhythmical passages, such as the following famous description of Roman, are encountered quite frequently:

*prispomajtnago samoderž'ca vseja Rusi,  
odolěvša vsim'' pogan'skym'' jazykom'',  
uma mudrost'ju xodjašča po zapovědem'' Božiim'':  
ustremil bo sja bjaše na poganyja jako i lev'',  
serdit'' že byst' jako i rys',  
i gubjaše jako i krokodil'',  
i prexožaše zemlju ix'' jako i orel'',  
xrabor'' bě jako i tur''. . .*

(“an autocrat of all Rus', whose memory will live in eternity, his mind, in its wisdom, observing the commandments of God; for he had attacked the pagans like a lion, he was as enraged as a lynx, and he destroyed as a crocodile; he moved over their lands like an eagle and was as audacious as an aurochs. . . .”)

The passage quoted above is one of many which are reminiscent of the epos. There is also the reference to Volodymyr Monomax “drinking water from the Don from his golden helmet” (compare *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*), the legend about the magic herb *jevšan-zillja*, which was probably derived from the Polovcian epos, the story about the Polovcian khan Končak who “drained the Sula manually with only a pot” (such hyperboles are characteristic of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*). However, let us return to the topic of rhythmical language. The following is the speech made by Ihor's supporters to the people of Peremyšl:

*Brat'e! počto smuščaetesja?  
ne cii li izbiša otci vaši i brat'ju vašju?  
a inči iměnie vaše razgrabiša?  
i dščeri vaš daša za raby vašja?  
a ot č'stvii vašimi vladěša inii prišelci?  
to za tex'' li xočete dušju svoju položiti?*



(“Brothers! Why are you confused? Were not these the ones who killed your fathers and brothers? While others pillaged your estates and married your daughters to your slaves? While other strangers have control of your patri-monies? And is it for these people that you wish to sacrifice your souls?”)

In most instances, however, such rhythmical passages do not resemble those of the old *Chronicle* or even the *Kievan Chronicle*; rather than the simple sentence structure of its predecessors, the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* prefers rhetorical complexity.

Plays on words also belong to the category of rhetorical embellishments: “*Dněstr zlu igru sygra Ugrom*” (“The Dniester played a malicious trick on the Magyars”); “*Bojarin bojarina plěnivše, smerd smerda, grad grada*” (“One boyar was captured by another, one peasant by another, one city by another”). The source of the first is Malalas, while the second is modelled on a type of repetition employed in the Bible and in sermons.

The author reveals an even greater tendency to use the type of language characteristic of rhetorical prose. He prefers complexly structured sentences and will use abstract words to describe very concrete phenomena; for example, instead of saying “They were driven out,” he says “*Nyně že izgnanie byst’ na nix*” (“Today expulsion was their lot”); instead of “They were wounded by lances”—“*Ujazveni byša ot krěposti udarenija kopějnogo*” (“They were wounded by the forceful impact of a lance”); instead of “He was slashed by a sword”—“*Ot kon’ca ostroty mečevyi . . . peretjatě byvši*” (“He was slashed by the blade’s sharpness”); and so on.

Synonyms and obscure words are also favored. In some cases, a translation accompanies difficult words: “*riks*”, *rekomyj korol’ ugars’kyj*” (“the Magyar king”), “*vsja okresnaja vesi, rekomaja okolnaja*” (“all the surrounding villages”).

6. The final portion of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* is much simpler in style. Devoted in large part to Volodymyr Vasyl’kovyč, an intellectual, scholar, amateur scribe and man-of-letters, this narrative provides quite a moving account of this prince’s illness (cancer of the lip) and death. The fact that Volodymyr Vasyl’kovyč was also a hunter and warrior is referred to only in the past tense.

The sentence structure (dialogs, participles) employed here is much the same as that in Daniel’s “biography.”\* However, many of Volodymyr

---

\*The dative absolute does not appear as frequently.

Vasyl'kovyč's monologs are presented in the form of letters and some of his decrees or parts of them are included in the text. The events described are of a more peaceful nature. The prince's monologs contain references and symbolic statements characteristic of a learned person. His entire conversation with the Bishop of Peremyśl, who came to ask that Berestia be given to Prince Lev, is carried on in enigmatic language: the Bishop asks that "the candles [on the grave of Daniel's uncle in Xolm] not be extinguished" for Berestia "could be your candle"; the prince, who "understands aphorisms and the hidden meaning of words" because "he was a learned man and a philosopher the likes of which the land of Rus' has not known before and will never know again," refuses the request in the same enigmatic style.

In the many passages devoted to eulogizing Volodymyr Vasyl'kovyč, the elevated religious style is used to describe secular opulence and the wealth of the Church. These passages simply glitter with gold, silver, marble, enamel, etc.:

And the holy vessels which he had placed before the holy Virgin were made of gold and decorated with precious stones. . . . For his own monastery he himself copied out the liturgical text of the Bible and the books of the Apostles. He also gave a liturgical text of the Bible which was bound in silver and inlaid with pearls and which he himself had copied out to the bishopric of Peremyśl, while to the bishop of Černihiv he sent a copy of this same text written in gold, bound in silver, inlaid with pearls with an image of the Saviour in enamel, in the center. . . . He also had many churches built: he had the Church of St. George built in Ljuboml; it was constructed of stone, decorated with forged images and liturgical vessels, embellished with velvet coverings embroidered in gold and pearls and with cherubim and seraphim while the muslin covering the altar was embroidered and gold and other coverings were of white silk. . . .

And it is because of his tremendous contributions to the Church that the author's eulogy of the deceased prince employs the devices of the lament and is in the form of an acathistus.

The language as well as the style of this part of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* is frequently modelled on that of the religious monuments. Furthermore, it is perhaps more consistently sustained on this level than is the language of any of the other old Ukrainian chronicles. We encounter words such as *mnogocinnnyj* (very valuable), *blagopoxval'nyj* (worthy of praise), *dobrovonnyj* (fragrant), *dobropreliubnyj* (most beloved), *mnogoderznovenie* (great courage), etc.

7. Literary sources also had an impact on the Ukrainian chronicles of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In the *Kievan Chronicle*, these influences were simpler in nature, consisting of the usual formulae of the military tale, either actually borrowed from translated monuments (from Flavius, the *Alexandreis*, the Bible, and *The Deeds of Digenis*) or formulated under their influence. As was demonstrated above, they contribute to the stylistic unity of the work.

The author of Daniel's "biography" uses such literary sources in a different way. First, he reworks some of the best passages from various historical monuments. The speech of the emissary of the Magyar King Bela, for example, is borrowed from the Bible (Isaiah 26). However, Daniel's "biographer" was also influenced by the old Chronicles—Malalas, Hamartolos, Flavius' *History of the Judaic War*, the *Alexandreis*. Indications are that he did not employ these works *per se*, but was rather in possession of a chronograph compiled on the basis of them. Certain passages are almost totally composed of borrowings from these historical monuments: the characterization of Roman parallels that of Hercules in Malalas and Alexander of Macedon in the *Alexandreis*. The phrase "zlu igru sygra Dnĕstr" was derived from Malalas where it was used in connection with the Scyrtus River, while the quotation from Homer was probably taken from some collection. The description of the Galician army is reminiscent of descriptions in Flavius and Hamartolos; one of Daniel's speeches—of a speech made by Darius in the *Alexandreis*; the battle scenes—of those in Flavius' *History*; and so on.

From the stylistic point of view, Daniel's "biography" is one of the most outstanding works of old Ukrainian literature, the borrowings referred to above notwithstanding. Characteristic of the literature of the Middle Ages, such borrowings constitute but a small fraction of the work as a whole and are stylistically reworked. Furthermore, by his choice of imagery, the author succeeded in creating many original, vivid scenes.

The narrative about the death of Volodymyr is also a highly accomplished work of art. While the style of this portion of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* is much more in the tradition of religious literature, the images employed to describe Volodymyr's last days are frequently very realistic.

8. Changes in style indicate changes in authorship. In the *Kievan Chronicle* narration in the "military" style begins in approximately the year 1146. The subsequent portions are always linked with the person of one prince. The most original and stylistically accomplished of these individual narratives is the tale about Izjaslav. It is possible that its original author was a layman and that his work was later rewritten by a cleric who was responsible for the few extraneous remarks and for the broader passages. The following entries appear to have been made by a variety of authors but at the end of the century the entire chronicle

was reworked for Prince Rjurik probably by Moses, abbot of the Vydubec'kyj Monastery, who was also the author of the eulogistic sermon which concludes the work.

Two of the various sections of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* are clearly distinct. (We are here concerned with that part of this text which has been preserved as a unified whole. The fragments of some Galician Chronicle included in the *Kievan Chronicle* suggest that this text is not complete.) The first of these is the "biography" of Daniel. Spanning the years 1205 to 1260, this account of Daniel's life is not organized in the form of yearly entries and appears to have been written after the events it describes. The style of the narrative identifies its author as a learned layman with a great deal of literary talent. This, coupled with the fact that his sympathies lie with the prince rather than his boyars, suggests that he may have been a clerk in Daniel's chancellery, while his description of Galicians as "godless" indicates that he was a Volhynian. The second discrete section of this chronicle is devoted to Volodymyr Vasyľ'kovyč (according to the Hypatian manuscript, it encompasses the years 1287 to 1288) and is undoubtedly also the work of a clerk, perhaps the prince's chief scribe (excerpts from Volodymyr Vasyľ'kovyč's decrees are given in the text). It has even been suggested that the author was the same Xodorec' or Xodorok Jurijovyč who copied the prince's testament (also cited in this text). Very little of a definite nature can be said of the various other authors.

9. In the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, wholesale borrowings are few; all material borrowed from other sources is completely reworked. On the other hand, the *Kievan Chronicle* employs material derived from chronicles which have not been preserved and provides us with information about the literary life of the time which would otherwise be unavailable. Under the year 1172 as well as elsewhere in the work, a wealth of information about Rjurik II's family is provided, notably in the necrology which appears to be the remains of some sort of family chronicle kept by the Rostyslavych dynasty.

The fragments of the *Černihiv Chronicle* which were preserved in the *Kievan Chronicle* are of greater interest. Given over quite an extensive period of time (from 1146), accounts of events in the principality of Černihiv focus on Ihor (prince of Černihiv from 1198 and hero of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*) and his family. The dominant role assigned to Ihor suggests that the *Černihiv Chronicle* may have been written under his auspices. In addition, the *Kievan Chronicle* also occasionally records events occurring in the principality of Perejaslav. While it is possible that information about this neighboring principality filtered through to Kiev directly, proof of the existence of local Perejaslavian annals is provided by Suzdalian chronicles which themselves include references to local events in this

principality up to the year 1228. That Suzdalian chronicles employed Perejaslavian sources is not surprising as Perejaslav became a Suzdalian protectorate at the end of the twelfth century. Northern chronicles also testify to the fact that the recording of events in Kiev did not stop at the end of the twelfth century—the *Suzdalian Chronicle* includes extensive narratives about events in the principality of Kiev during the years 1203-1205, which are sustained in the style of the *Kievan Chronicle*. The Polish historian Długosz (compare his eleventh century sources—see Ch. III, pt. H, no. 7) is believed to have drawn on northern sources for his information on the period beginning with the twelfth century. It is impossible to establish whether his copy of the *Perejaslav Chronicle* recorded events beyond the year 1128. On the other hand, there is positive evidence of the existence of the *Galician Chronicle* prior to the thirteenth century: the form in which information about events occurring in Galicia in the twelfth century is presented in the *Hypatian Chronicle* (references to passages not included in the *Hypatian Chronicle*), indicates that this information was drawn from some other monument which has not been preserved.

## F. THE EPOS

1. It is possible to draw some definite conclusions about the nature of the themes of the twelfth and in part also of the thirteenth century epos, considered to be the forerunner of the northern *stariny* (see Ch. III, pt. I). In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, there are lamentably few parallels between the epos and the chronicles. Isolated from the other principalities, Kiev had already begun to decline in the twelfth century, especially in the political arena: the new trade routes from Europe to the Orient and to Constantinople deprived Kiev of its importance within Europe. As a result, in this period there are few epic themes of Kievan origin and Kiev is scarcely remembered in the north: thus, for example, the *Novgorod Chronicle* does not even mention the destruction of Kiev by the Tatars. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, it was the rise of western Ukraine and the Tatar onslaught that provided fertile ground for the germination of epic themes.

2. The *starina* about Djuk Stepanovič is of Galician-Volhynian origin. It describes the hero's journey from India to Halyč (sometimes "*Galič-Volincja*") and from Halyč to Kiev; the characterization of Djuk Stepanovič is limited to a description of his wealth, given initially by the hero himself and later, when doubts arise, by emissaries dispatched by Prince Volodymyr. However, these dispassionate observers feel that they must decline to write such a description of

Djuk because they would have to sell Kiev, to purchase the required amount of paper, and Černihiv, for the necessary quantity of ink. In Kiev Djuk occasionally engages in rivalry with Čurylo, another hero of the same type; their competition involves jumping over the Dnieper on horseback or changing clothing at appointed times during the day and Djuk is the victor. The very name "Djuk" indicates the western origin of this hero. In fact, the descriptions of Djuk's riches are borrowed from the "Story of the Indian Kingdom" (see Ch. II, pt. D, no. 8), which probably came to Galicia during the period of Jaroslav Osmomysl. Evidence of the luxurious life style of Jaroslav and his boyars is provided in the *Chronicle*. The name "Djuk" (Byzantine—*dukas*) and the patronymic "Stepanovič" (Stephen is a favorite Magyar name) could be of Magyar origin as is Djuk's legendary horse (compare the tales about Magyar horses in Kiev in 1150). It is interesting to note that some of the details about the clothing worn by Djuk or Čurylo are derived from the original text of the "Story of the Indian Kingdom," not from the Slavonic translation, a fact which provides further proof of the Galician origin of this epic work.

Legends about Čurylo undoubtedly existed in Galicia, for his name is preserved in Galician folksongs and in the works of the Polish writers, Rej and Klonowicz (sixteenth and seventeenth centuries). Čurylo is the same type of cavalier as Djuk but less noble in character—he is a charlatan. "Čuryliv" or "Džuryliv" was the surname of a western Ukrainian boyar family after whom the city of Čuryliv (later Džuryn) in Podillia was named. In those contemporary *stariny* which are akin to very short stories, Čurylo appears at Volodymyr's court with his retainers, becomes Volodymyr's "drinking companion" and drives Volodymyr's wife to suicide (his beauty so overwhelms her that she slashes her wrists). Ultimately, his love affair with the wife of the boyar, Bermjata, costs him his life. His rivalry with Djuk has already been mentioned above. One Podillian song portrays him as the leader of "an army of girls." However, these contemporary *stariny* appear to have been considerably reworked in later periods (in Moscow?). As a result, it is difficult to specify the nature of the themes about Djuk employed in the old epos; one can only say that he was a character of the same type as Don Juan.

3. The third Galician-Volhynian epic is about the dragon-slayer Michael Potok. Evidence of the Galician origin of this work is provided by the song about the girl who "looks at Džurilo with one eye and at Potok with the other." The name "Potok" is otherwise unknown among the eastern Slavs and is probably based on the life of the Bulgarian dragon-slaying saint, Michael of Potok. The chain of events narrated in this epic is quite complex. Mixail (Michael) marries but his wife dies soon after their marriage and Mixail requests

to be buried with her. When a dragon appears in the burial vault, Myxail forces it to bring him some "living water" with which he then revives his wife. The motifs in this work are clearly of a legendary character and may have been based on some Bulgarian legend about Michael of Potok. In any case, references to Podillia and Lithuania testify to its western origin. The impetus for this epic may have come from the transfer of St. Michael's relics to Trnovo in 1206. News of this event could easily have spread to Galicia, which was close to Bulgaria (located on the lower Danube) and had cultural ties with it.

4. The *starina* about Dunaj may also be of Galician-Volhynian origin. Dunaj (1) succeeds in acquiring for Volodymyr the hand of the Polish princess, (2) meets the daughter of a cavalier in the field and marries her and finally, (3) having accidentally killed his wife in a shooting match, he takes his own life; from their bodies flowed the waters of the Danube and Dnieper ("*Nipro*," etc.). The first motif may perhaps be linked with one of Volodymyr Vasyľ'kovyč's voivodes; the *Chronicle* mentions that a voivode named Dunaj was sent as an emissary to the Mazovian prince Konrad in 1280. However, such an association remains tenuous. Even more tenuous is the association of the various "Romans" mentioned in *stariny* with Roman of Galicia. On the other hand, the content of these *stariny* can be broken down into various legendary motifs.

5. The themes of another group of *stariny* can be linked with the Tatar invasions. Older epic themes are modified in the light of the new historical conditions, the Tatars replacing the earlier enemies of Rus'. However, the Tatars seem to have been an integral part of the *stariny* about tsar Kalin, Vasilij Ignatovič (or Pjatnycja) and the battle on the River Kama from the time of their first appearance.

The content of these *stariny* is as follows: the death of all the heroes in the battle on the Kama River, the attack on Kiev led by Kalin and repelled by Il'ja, and the attack launched by Batiga who is killed by Vasilij Ignatovič. The happy endings in the last two of these were obviously later additions. The *starina* about Vasilij Ignatovič begins with the Virgin Mary's lament over the imminent destruction of Kiev. The form of this lament—the Virgin Mary talks with aurochs—is puzzling. In the *stariny* about the battle on the Kama River and about Kalin, the Tatars appear on two separate occasions, a fact which corresponds with historical reality (the battle near the Kalka River in 1223 and Batu's campaign of 1237-1241); the names Kama and Kalin probably derived from *Kalka* or *Kalec'* (the name of a little known river on which the battle of 1223 was fought), the name Batiga—from *Batu*; the death of heroes may refer to the death of many princes in the battle on the Kalka River or to the death of Al'oša Popovič and others mentioned in the northeastern Chronicles. However, it

is not known whether these first epic songs on the theme of the Tatar invasion actually arose in Kiev or were only linked with it in later times.

6. There were undoubtedly also many epic works in Kiev and Galicia which were not transmitted to the north and preserved in the form of *stariny* but became the basis for some Ukrainian prose legends. As in the case of the epos, it is only possible to draw some general conclusions about the nature of the themes of these legends. One such epic theme describes the deeds of Demjan Kudenevyč, recorded in *Nicon's Chronicle* (a later Muscovite work) under the year 1180. It is of Perejaslavian origin (there is a village named Kudniv near Perejaslav). According to *Nicon's Chronicle*, Demjan first defends Perejaslav against the forces of Hlib, prince of Novgorod-Siversk; in a truly epic fashion, Demjan and his servant Taras alone vanquish Hlib's entire army. Then the Polovcians appear on the scene and Demjan faces them alone and without any weapons. Other legends are devoted to Roman of Galicia, who is mentioned both in Ukrainian and Polish Chronicles; Długosz quotes some proverbs mentioning Romans which were used by the Polovcians to frighten their children into obedience. Other sayings were: Roman plows the "Lithuanian people"; "You must kill the bees before you can eat their honey." Later sources have also preserved an account of an encounter between Roman and the emissaries sent to him by the Pope and Leszek. Refusing to meet with either the Pope or Leszek, Roman's reply to the Pope has a distinctly epic flavor; drawing his sword, Roman asks: "Does the Pope have a sword the likes of this sword of Peter?" A further epic tale which has been preserved only in the form of Ukrainian prose legends is that of Myxajlyk; the details of the various versions of this legend differ considerably but all are linked with the fall of Kiev: Myxajlyk, a young cavalier, leaves Kiev carrying the Golden Gates with him on his lance. While *stariny* based on this legend and on the legend of Ivan and his father, Danylo Lovčanyň do exist, they are of much later origin. In any case, later written and oral sources provide evidence of the existence of epic works in old Kiev and in Galicia.

In the *Chronicle* under the year 1151, there is a reference to two mounds known at that time as the "Perepet" hills (now Perepjat or Perepjatyxa). In a contemporary legend, Perepjat departs with his army and, after several years, his wife begins to search for him but when she finds him she fails to recognize him, kills him, and then herself.

Thus (as in Ch. III, pt. I), while the existence in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries of epic works on the above-mentioned themes can be established, nothing definite can be said about their form. Even *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* is of little help, for the extent of its stylistic peculiarity cannot be determined with certainty.



## G. THE TALE OF IHOR'S CAMPAIGN

1. *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* is the one monument of old Ukrainian literature that is familiar to a wide range of readers. However, its popularity arises from an entire complex of erroneous notions about its significance and its literary character. The first of these is the belief that *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* occupies a unique position in old Ukrainian literature as it differs markedly from all other monuments. In reality, this work is tightly bound by the conventions of its time and the traditions of the past. The second erroneous notion is that *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* is a typical example of the extinct epic genre of the oral tradition. However, in reality, only a few indefinite conclusions about the form of the old epos can be drawn on the basis of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*. As a poetic masterpiece, *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* is unique and cannot be used to draw conclusions about other lost monuments which could not have attained the same level of poetic excellence and therefore cannot be said to have had a similar form.

*The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* was discovered toward the end of the eighteenth century in a collection of works which were predominantly of a secular nature (for example, *The Deeds of Digenis* was also included in the collection). Fortunately, *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* was recopied and published before the collection in which it appeared was destroyed by fire in 1812. As a result of the relatively recent character of this manuscript and the inexperience of its publishers, certain passages of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* are obscure. In spite of the fact that the manuscript was lost, doubts as to the authenticity of this epic steadily decreased over time. The discovery of numerous parallels to the obscure passages, the fact that the language does not deviate from what are now believed to have been the norms of the twelfth century (because of their more limited knowledge, the eighteenth and early nineteenth century publishers of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* had entirely different conceptions), the numerous historical facts included in the work, the quotations from it in other old monuments and the fact that *Zadonščina* (*Tale of Events Beyond the Don*—a Muscovite work from the fourteenth or fifteenth century) was clearly modelled on it—all this serves to prove that *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* is an authentic work of the twelfth century. The doubts raised in recent times do not stand up under scrutiny.

2. The content of this relatively short monument will be familiar to most of my readers. *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* tells the story of the unsuccessful campaign against the Polovcians led by Ihor of Novgorod-Siversk and his brother, Vsevolod. After an initial victory, their army is overwhelmed by the

Polovcians and Ihor is captured but succeeds in escaping with the help of one of the Polovcians. A year later his son, who had married the daughter of the Polovcian khan Končak also returns from captivity. However, the content of the work is certainly not limited to its *fabula*. Following the description of Ihor's defeat, there is the Kievan prince Svjatoslav's "golden word" to the other princes, accounts of earlier historical events and the lament uttered by Ihor's wife, Jaroslavna. In fact, the entire work is laced with literary and historical digressions and, as a result, its content is unusually complex.

The composition of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* is easily discernible. After the short prelude in which the author expresses his intention of not deviating from the historical truth—of not "singing" in the style of Bojan—the description of Ihor's campaign and its unsuccessful outcome begins. In the second part, set in Svjatoslav's "golden-roofed" palace in Kiev, Svjatoslav has a somber dream, receives the no less somber news of Ihor's defeat and utters the "golden word" to the other princes whom he would like to persuade to join together in a campaign against the Polovcians. Furthermore, the "golden word" does not have a discrete ending—Svjatoslav's words imperceptibly give way to those of the author who plunges into reminiscences of the past. Jaroslavna's lament forms the third part, while the conclusion consists of but the final few lines—the eulogy of the princes and warriors.

While the work as a whole is divided into distinct parts, the same cannot be said of the structure of these individual parts themselves. Only in Jaroslavna's lament does a pattern emerge: there are four "strophes," three of which begin with the same words—"Jaroslavna laments early in the morning." The structure of parts one, four, and especially that of part two, is occasionally extremely intricate. One feels that the author has deliberately clouded the structure of his work—he refers to the eclipse on two separate occasions but skirts over the most important moments: for example, Ovlur's ("Lavor" in the *Chronicle*, the Polovcian who helps Ihor to escape) actions are not motivated; it is not always clear where the characters' speech ends and the narrator's begins—that Svjatoslav's "golden word" has ended and the narrator is again speaking can only be concluded from the fact that the princes are addressed as "my lords," a phrase that would be used only by a subject; descriptions of events occurring in Ihor's time are interwoven with reminiscences of the past. Furthermore, comments pertaining to literary matters are also scattered throughout the text: the characterization of Bojan's style, the quotation from his work and the imitation of his style are almost an attempt at parody. In light of the structure of Jaroslavna's lament, the intricacy of the remaining sections can only be regarded as deliberate.

Some scholars have suggested that this apparently obscure structure resulted from the ineptitude of the scribes who, in recopying this work over the centuries, altered the original order of sentences and pages. However, an analysis of the text demonstrates that this theory is both superfluous and erroneous: for example, the eclipse of the sun, which actually occurred while the campaign was already in progress, is presented as an omen of what is to happen before Ihor sets out with his troops. Such a violation of historical fact can be linked with the heroic tradition where a somber tone frequently dominates from the very beginning of the work (*The Iliad*, *Nibelungenlied*); furthermore, this unfavorable omen does not deter Ihor, thereby underscoring his courageousness and decisiveness. Similar structural arguments can be applied to other apparently misplaced passages.

3. The style of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* is equally complex. The language is highly figurative; almost every word has a second level of meaning, performs a function in the poetic structure of the work. Perhaps the most characteristic feature of this epic is its intricate symbolism. While some events are described realistically, others are presented solely in symbolic form. Thus, even Ihor's defeat is described only in the following words: "Ihor's banners fell. . . . The supply of bloody wine ran dry and the wedding feast of the courageous warriors of Rus' came to an end: they fed their guests and laid down their lives for the land of Rus'. The grass wilts in sorrow and the tree bends to the ground in grief." The boyars inform Svjatoslav about all the events of the campaign: "Two falcons have flown from their paternal throne of gold and seek to find the town of Tmutorokan' or to drink of the Don with their helmets. The wings of both falcons have already been clipped by pagan swords and they themselves have been fettered in iron chains. On the third day it grew dark, both suns were eclipsed, both scarlet pillars were extinguished. On the banks of the Kajala darkness obscured the light. . . . And infamy prevailed over glory, freedom was struck by misfortune and Dyv swooped down upon the earth." This passage is laden with symbolism: "bloody wine" = blood, "wedding feast" = battle, "suns" and "scarlet pillars" = princes, "eclipses" = defeats. This passage is not metaphorical but symbolic, for the normal words used to describe particular objects or actions are not employed. Such symbolic passages are encountered frequently throughout the text.

In some cases, the symbolism employed in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* is reminiscent of that of Scandinavian poetry (*kenningar*—see Ch. I, pt. C, no. 4); for example, "young moons" = the young princes, "a slave's saddle" = captivity, etc.

Simple comparisons are rare. Reality almost completely disappears behind

the veil of symbolism. Prince Vseslav "jumps like a ferocious beast" or "like a wolf" (the instrumental case used in the original has a double meaning; it can be interpreted as both a simile and a metaphor); he "jumped into the bulrushes like an ermine, and into the water like a white duck"; "He jumped from his horse like a wolf with white paws (or "like a gray wolf") . . . and flew through the mists like a falcon." The battle is described as a "wedding feast," or as the sowing or harvesting of a field: "The black earth was sown with bones, watered by blood and grief sprung up throughout the land of Rus' "; "No good was sown on the bloody banks of the Nemyha, for they were sown with the bones of the sons of Rus' "; "On the Nemyha they strew heads like sheaves, threshed them with iron flails, scattered lives on the threshing floor and winnowed soul from body."

The many devices of foreshadowing employed in the work—dreams, forebodings and unfavorable omens—are also a type of symbolism. Such, for example, is Svjatoslav's dream in which various traditional omens of misfortune are used: "the black quilt" (the color black symbolizes misfortune); "blue wine mixed with grief" (cloudy wine also signifies misfortune); "pearls"—an indication that tears will flow; the screech of rooks, the sleigh (a symbol of death—see Ch. I, pt. C, no. 2 and Ch. III, pt. F, no. 4); the falling of the tip of the "golden-domed" roof of the palace in Svjatoslav's dream (an omen of death). The eclipse of the sun is also a device for foreshadowing. In fact, all of nature responds to the lot of the heroes: "On the second day blood red gleams of dawn announce the beginning of a new day. Black clouds move inland from the sea in an attempt to veil the four suns and emit blue flashes of lightning. . . . The earth moans, rivers become cloudy and dust covers the fields"; "the leaves fall ominously from the tree"; "the grass wilts in grief" (see above).

The images in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* are all symbolic, even the many types of birds which appear throughout the text (the author may have been an inhabitant of the forested zone of the steppe in which a great variety of birds are found): the nightingale = Bojan or a joyous herald of the approach of dawn; sinister black rooks foreshadow misfortune and symbolize the pagan Polovcians; heroic falcons and gyrfalcons symbolize the "courageous sons of Rus' " who are always prepared for battle ("to battle the birds"); the eagle is a symbol of poetic inspiration or a harbinger of victory which invites the animal kingdom to come and feast "on the bones of the Polovcians." The animals which appear in the work, the sun, the moon, the fog, the redness of the sky at dawn and dusk also have similar symbolic meanings.

Reality is almost completely veiled by this complex web of poetic images; and it is precisely in this striking interplay of the two levels of meaning (realistic

and symbolic) that the originality of this epic lies. Both levels of meaning have an equally forceful impact on the reader. To assure that this balance is sustained, poetic devices other than symbolism are employed. The numerous hyperboles transport the reader into a semi-fantastic realm, thereby sharpening his perception of reality. After his victory over the Polovcians, Svjatoslav is not an ordinary mortal but an elemental cosmic force: he "descends on the land of the Polovcians, crushes hills and destroys ravines, muddies rivers and lakes, causes streams and marshes to dry up and, like a whirlwind, sweeps the pagan Kobjak from the midst of his numerous invincible regiments and casts him into one of Svjatoslav's chambers in Kiev." Jaroslav Osmomysl of Galicia is described in a similar fashion: "Sitting high up on your throne of gold, bracing Magyar crests with your iron regiments, barring the Magyar king's advance, and locking the Danube's gates, you fling your heavy shafts beyond the clouds and send your judges to the Danube." Rjurik and David Rostyslavych "in their gilded helmets floated on seas of blood." Vsevolod's soldiers from Kursk were "swaddled by military trumpets, grew up in helmets, were nursed by the point of a spear; they are familiar with every trail and know every ravine; their bows are held in readiness, their quivers are open, their swords are sharp and, like unto wolves, they bound across fields seeking honor for themselves and glory for their prince." Vsevolod of Suzdal is described as follows:

O, exalted Vsevolod! In your great wisdom you will not hesitate to rush from afar in order to defend the throne of your fathers. For you alone can empty the Volga with your oars and drain the vast Don with helmets. If you were present today, female slaves would sell for a song and bondsmen for a farthing for you could launch the courageous sons of Hlib over the dry land. . . .

4. Mythological images are another characteristic form of ornamentation employed in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*. By the twelfth century, Christianity was well established in Kievan Rus' so that the numerous references to pagan gods in this work may seem unusual. However, mythological images are traditionally employed in epic works: the gods of antiquity survived in the epos until the end of the era of Classicism, while more pious authors occasionally replaced these "pagan" figures with Christian ones; rejecting the heritage of Classicism, the Romantics turned to their own national mythology. There is little doubt that the pagan mythological figures which appear in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* also belong to this category. The poet Bojan is the "grandson of Veles"; the "inheritance of Dažboh's grandson" is destroyed by the quarrels among the

princes; and the winds are "Stryboh's grandchildren." The description of Vseslav of Polock, who is portrayed as a sorcerer and werewolf, takes us into the past (eleventh century, perhaps modelled on the works of Bojan): "Prince Vseslav passed judgment on all his people and put other princes' cities in order but at night like a wolf he ran all the way to Tmutorokan' by dawn and as a wolf he crossed the path of the great Xors [probably refers to the sun]." It is interesting to note that Vseslav is also endowed with certain supernatural powers in the *Chronicle*.

In addition to the pagan gods, there is the figure of Diva Obyda, who "rose among Dažboh's grandchildren, entered the land of Trojan like a maiden, fluttered her swan-like wings over the blue sea near the Don and frightened away the days of prosperity." When Ihor rides into the steppe with his army, "the darkness moans threateningly, the birds are aroused by the howling of beasts and from atop a tree Dyv calls out a warning to the alien land"; after his defeat—"Dyv has already swooped down upon the land."

Trojan is the most obscure of the mythological figures which appear in this work. There are references to "Trojan's trail," "the land of Trojan" (the land of Rus' or the "meadow land" near Tmutorokan?), "the seventh age of Trojan" (the period of Vseslav who died in 1101) and the past "ages of Trojan." At present nothing definite can be said about this mysterious figure. On the other hand, the pagan gods can be identified much more easily as they are mentioned in Christian monuments of Western, Byzantine and East Slavic origin—in the old *Menaеum* (the so-called *Codex Suprasliensis*) in Hamartolos' "Book of the Wisdom," in the *Chronicle of John Malalas* and so on. In some cases, the pagan gods are described as demons but more often they are said to be princes from the days of old, magicians or brigands who were deified by the superstitious masses. This type of explanation (the so-called "euhemerism,"—see above, Ch. II, pt. D, sec. a, no. 2; no thorough study of the mythological figures in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* has yet been made on the basis of this theory) was particularly suited to the task of eliminating the remnants of paganism as it reduced the pagan myths to the status of legends. Even the author of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* appears to adhere to this theory for he implies that Veles was the first poet of Rus' (Bojan is his "grandson") and that Dažboh was one of its princes (the princes of the Kievan period are his "grandchildren"). Xors, who was regarded as the god of the sun in the Romantic period (he is not characterized in any way in older works of literature), probably also became a legendary figure in the same way; however, he never grew to mythological proportions. Stryboh, on the other hand, was definitely a mythological figure and, because of this, it is more difficult to establish if he was still regarded as a

"god" or merely as a fantastic figure such as Diva Obyda (a sorceress), or Dyv, or even a human sorcerer. In any case, all these figures were derived from earlier myths of secondary importance and are but another form of ornamentation employed by the author.

5. Abounding in alliteration and other forms of euphony, the language of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* is unusually melodious. In most instances alliteration extends over only a small number of words: "*Se větri Striboži ynuci*" ("These winds are the grandchildren of Stryboh"); "*Porosi polja prikryvajut*" ("Dust is covering the fields"); "*uže bo Sula ne tečēt' srebrenimi strujami*" ("for the Sula no longer flows in silvery streams"); "*ta predi pēsn' pojaše*" ("and before this he would sing a song"); "*Knjazi šami na šebe kramolu kovaxu*" ("The princes forged dissension against one another"); "*Se li štvoriste moej srebrenej ščdině?*" ("Why have you done this to my silvery hair?"); "*stojat' stjazi*" ("the banners stand"); "*t'ščimi tuly poganyn' t'l'kovin'*" ("empty quivers of the pagan nomads"); "*rišča v' tropu Trojanju*" ("rushing down Trojan's trail"); "*větre větrilo*" ("o wind, blustery wind"); "*molodaja mēšjaca*" ("young moon"). However, occasionally alliteration is sustained over lengthier passages of the text: "*Kamo Tur' poskočjaše svoim' zlatym' šelomom' posvēčivaja, tamo ležat' poganya golovy Poloveckyja, poskepany sabljami*" ("Wherever the Aurochs does battle with his golden helmet ablaze, there, clefted by sabres, lie the heads of the infidel Polovcians"); "*S' zaranija v' pjatok' potoptaša poganya pl'ki Poloveckyja i rassušjas' strělamy po polju, pomčša krasnyja dēvky Poloveckyja, a s nimi zlato i pavoloky*" ("Early on Friday morning they trampled down the Polovcian regiments and, scattering over the fields like arrows, they carried off fair Polovcian maidens as well as gold and silks").

Assonance and consonance are also frequent in short phrases or clauses: "*Oba esyě Svjat'slavlyčja!*" ("We are both the sons of Svjatoslav!"); "*Tugoju im' tuli zatče*" ("Their quivers were locked by grief"); "*Oleg' i Svjatoslav' t'moju šja povolokosta*" ("Oleh and Svjatoslav were obscured by darkness"); "*Svjatoslav' izroni zlato slovo slezami smēšeno*" ("Svjatoslav uttered a golden word mingled with tears"—s and z in combination with l and v); "*letjat' strěly kalenyja, grimljut' sabli o šelomy, treščat' kopia xaralužnyja*" ("tempered arrows fly, sabres crash against helmets, steel lances clash"—r and l); "*Edin' že izroni žemčjužnu dušu iz' xrabra tēla čres' zlato ožerelie*" ("You were alone when you dropped your soul from your brave body, like a precious pearl from your neckpiece"—ž and z). Jaroslavna's lament is built on the sound l. Occasionally, one sound dominates even in fairly lengthy sentences or passages: "*V polě Olgovo xorobroe gnězdo, . . . ne bylo ono obidě poroždeno*" ("Oleh's valiant

brood [slumbers] in a field, . . . not born for dishonor"); "*Rěka Stugna, xudu, struju iměja, pož'rši čuži ruč'i i strugy prostre na kustu, unošu, knjaziju Rostislavu zatvori na Dněpr*" ("The Stuhna is a shallow river, it devoured other brooks and streams, overflowed the bushes on its bank, and locked young Prince Rostyslav in the Dnieper"—*u* and *ju*). Such repetitions of sounds are not accidental for they are encountered at almost every turn.

Also quite common is the repetition in one word or in two neighboring words of the same syllable or a syllable similar in sound: "*Vsevolod*", *odin*" ("Vsevolod alone"), "*esvě Svjat*" *slavličja*" ("sons of Svjatoslav"), "*za zemlju*" ("for the land"), "*temno bo bě*" ("for it was dark"), "*oba bagrjanaja stl*" *pa pogašosta*" ("both scarlet pillars were extinguished"), "*s*" *nima molodaja*" ("and with them the young [moons]"), "*na krovati tisově*" ("on my bed of cedar"), "*ne mysliju ti preletěti*" ("it is not for you to fly in thought"), "*oběsisja sině m'glě*" ("when the blueness of the sky had grown dark"), "*strany radi, gradi veseli*" ("the land is happy, the cities rejoice"), *myčjuči* (rushing), *lelějuči* (glimmering), etc. In some cases, it even appears that the words were chosen solely because of their sound: "*Po loziju polzoša*" ("They climbed in the willows"), "*rozšibe slavu Jaroslavu*" ("shattered the glory of Jaroslav"), "*Gorjačuju svoju lučju . . . žaždeju im' luci s'prjaže*" ("Your burning rays . . . made their bows thirst"), "*Po unoši knjazi Rostislavě: Unyšja cvěty*" ["The flowers grieve . . . for the young Prince Rostyslav"—elsewhere "*Nečit' trava*" ("The grass wilts in grief")], "*na lono . . . na boloni*" ("upon my chest . . . in the lowlands"), "*Stugna . . . i drevo sja tugoju k' zemli překlonilo*" ("the Stuhna . . . and the tree bent to the ground in sorrow"). One also encounters a device characteristic of contemporary folklore—the coupling of words derived from the same root: "*truby trubljat*" ("trumpets are blown"—occurs on two occasions), "*svět' světlyj*" ("a bright light"), "*mosty mostiti*" ("to build bridges"), "*ni mysliju smysliti*" ("no longer can we imagine in our minds"), "*ni dumoju sdumati*" ("nor conjure up in our thoughts"), "*pěvsje pěsn*" ("having sung a song"), "*pěsn' pojaše*" ("sang a song").

On the other hand, rhyme is rare and its infrequent occurrences are accidental; for example:

*Vseslav*" *knjaz' ljudem*" *sudjaše,*  
*knjazem*" *grady rjadjaše* . . .

<i>togda po russkoj zemli</i>	г
<i>rětko rataevě kikaxut',</i>	г-г
<i>n" často vrani grajaxut',</i>	г



*trupia sebě děljače* s  
*a galici svoju reč' govorjaxut' . . .* g-s-r-g

*kotoryi dotečaše,*  
*ta predi pēsn' pojaše:*

*staromu Jaroslavu,*  
*xrabromu Mstislavu*

*tu sja kopiem'' prilamati*  
*tu sja sabljam'' potručjati . . .*

("Prince Vseslav passed judgment on all his people and put other princes' cities in order"; "then in the land of Rus' ploughmen rarely called to one another; ravens did not screech often for they shared the corpses, and the jackdaws babbled in their own jargon"; "whichever one he overtook, would sing a song: in praise of old Jaroslav and valiant Mstislav"; "here lances will be shattered, here sabres will be blunted. . . .")

Alliteration becomes prominent in those languages which do not have rhyme and vice versa. In fact, only in the nineteenth century are these two forms of euphony combined.

However, the language of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* is extremely rhythmical. This is achieved both by the use of simple parallelism and parallelism strengthened by repetition of words or sounds:

*čto mi šumit',*  
*čto mi zvenit'?*  
*uže snesesja xula na xvalu,*  
*uže tresnu nužda na volju,*  
*uže vr'žesja Div'' na zemlju.*

*ni mysliju smysliti*  
*ni dumoju sdumati,*  
*ni očima s''gljadati . . .*  
*zastupiv'' korolevi put',*  
*zatvoriv'' Dunaju vorota . . .*

("What is that din that I hear, what is that ringing that I hear?"; "now infamy prevails over honor, now

freedom has been struck by misfortune and Dyv has already swooped down upon the land"; "no longer can we imagine in our minds, nor conjure up in our own thoughts, nor with our eyes behold. . . ."; "barring the King's advance and locking the Danube's gates. . . .")

In addition to passages such as those quoted above (with repetitions), there are also many that employ simple parallel structuring:

*nastupi na zemlju Poloveckuju,  
pritopta xl''mi i jarugy,  
vzmuti řky i ozera,  
issuři potoky i bolota . . .*

*togda vrani ne graaxut',  
galici poml''koša,  
soroky ne troskotaša,  
po loziju polzoša tolko,  
djatlove tektom'' put' k'' řčč kažut',  
solovii veselymi pęsn'mi svęt'' povędajut' . . .*

(For translation of the first passage, see above, no. 3:  
"then the crows did not screech, the daws grew silent,  
the magpies ceased their clamor, only the woodpeckers  
climbing in the willows showed him the way to the  
river by their tapping, while nightingales gaily announce  
the approach of dawn. . . .")

There are very few rhythmical units that are extended over several sentences or clauses (for a translation of the following passage see above, no. 3):

*a moi ti Kurjane  
svędomi k''meti:  
pod'' trubami poviti,  
pod'' řelomy v''zleļjani,  
konec'' kopija v''skr''mleni,  
puti im' vędomi,  
jarugi im' znaemi,  
luci u nix'' naprjaženi,  
tuli otvoreni,  
sabli iz''ostreni . . .*

The very fact that there are only a few individual passages that rhyme indicates that *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* cannot be regarded as verses: all attempts to detect a consistent rhythmical pattern have been unsuccessful. However, there can be no doubt that the author himself regarded his work as a "song," although it may have been the type of song which is sung in recitative with musical accompaniment.

6. The language of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* is unique in yet another respect; in comparison with other old monuments, even the chronicles, there is a distinct weakening of Church Slavonic elements. However, this difference stems in part from the fact that this epic includes types of material not dealt with by other works—descriptions of nature, references to the animal and bird life of the steppes, etc. and it is because of this that the language creates an impression of unusual expressiveness. One need only note the wealth of sound imagery encountered in the work—people, animals, and nature all have their own voices. The author himself and Bojan "sing," the foreigners in Kiev "sing of the glory of Svjatoslav," the singing of the Gothic maidens in Crimea and the songs heard near the Danube ("Voices weave their way to Kiev from the sea") are mentioned; there are also the laments "of the women of Rus'" (Jaroslavna and Prince Rostyslav's mother) and the "shouts" of the "offspring of the Devil (the Polovcians) form a wall across the field," the shouts of Jaroslav of Černihiv's regiments "defeat the regiments" of the enemy; perhaps the "glory" which resounds prior to the campaign is also a reference to a military salvo; the wounded "bellow like aurochs," while near the town of Rym "the cries of people being slashed by Polovcian swords are heard." The sounds of battle are also described—"trumpets blow," "lances clash," "swords crash against helmets"; after the defeat "the trumpets of Horodno play a somber tune," "the banners speak" (perhaps a reference to the sound they make when fluttering in the wind), "horses neigh" as Oleh's troops gallop towards the land of the Polovcians, carts screech like frightened swans ("kričat' telěgi polunošcy, rci lebedi rozpuženi"); the author hears the Gothic maidens "jingling the gold of Rus' . . . on the shores of the blue sea"; there are also occasional references to the sounds of everyday life—the calls of the plowmen ("rataevě kixakut'"), "the bell of St. Sophia," calling the faithful to morning Mass.

The steppe is also full of sounds; the calls of various birds predominating: nightingales "trill," rooks "frolic gaily" ("grajaxut"), magpies "cackle" ("vstroskotaša"), jackdaws "call out in their own jargon" ("svoju řeč govorjaxut"), the cuckoo "whistles," eagles "shriek" ("klektom" na kosti zvěri zovut'), woodpeckers "tap" ("tektom" put' k' řečě kažut'), foxes "lie," wolves "call out threateningly(?)" ["v'srožat'"]—perhaps from *voroh* (enemy)]. Even nature has

a voice—"night moans menacingly" and awakens the birds, the earth resounds ("tutnet") or "thumps," the clouds which appear in the sky before Ihor's second battle with the Polovcians emit peals of thunder and flashes of lightning.

Sounds also play an important role on the symbolic level: Dyv calls out from atop a tree, Diva Obyda splashes in the sea like a swan, Karna laments Ihor's dead soldiers and the land of Rus' moans after the defeat. Some kind of "ringing" is heard in the distance before the second battle and Jaroslav hears the restless Oleh "Horyslavyč" when he sets his foot into the golden stirrup in Tmutorokan'. The references to the past are also almost echoes from some unknown land: the heroes of the work "ring the glory of their forefathers" and voices reach Kiev from the sea. Everything makes a sound of some sort—even "the lances sing" ("kopia pojut"). And the author asks: "What is that din that I hear, what is that ringing that I hear in the distance early in the morning before dawn?" What he hears, of course, is the defeat of Ihor's forces.

In some cases the alliterations and other forms of euphony are clearly intended to be onomatopoeic; for example, "*turby trubljat*" or the following attempt to imitate the sound of galloping horses: "*ś zaranija v" pjaťok" potoptaša poganyja pl"ki Poloveckyja*" (translation given above, no. 5; the Roman poets had used the sounds *p* and *t* to imitate the sound of galloping horses).

However, sound imagery does not occupy a dominant position, for colors are as abundant and varied as sounds. Epithets describing the color of various objects are numerous; all the descriptions in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* appear to be woven of multi-colored silks. "Gold" is one of the most favored colors: the princes' helmets, stirrups, thrones, saddles and arrows are gold as is the roof of Svjatoslav's palace in Kiev; true to the facts of history, red is the color of the shields, flags and standards ("čolka") of the army of Rus', while the epithet "bloody" endows the work with sinister overtones—bloody stars foreshadow disaster; wounds, wine (wine = blood) and grass are bloody; the epithets "crimson" (symbol of authority) and "fiery" also appear; black and blue are associated with sinister omens—rooks, clouds, the earth beneath the hoofs of the horses, the quilt in Svjatoslav's dream are black—while the sea, the flashes of lightning and wine are blue; the gentle banks of the Donec (unlike those of the Stuhna which are "dark"), streams, Svjatoslav's hair and a lance ("stružie") are silver; the trees are green, one banner is white, and the wolf and eagle are gray (variations "grayish blue" and "white-footed").

Other types of epithets are also employed: the princes of Rus' are "great," "handsome," and "brave"; there are "swift" horses, "living" strings, "tempered" arrows; the fields are "clear," "wide," and "vast"; the sun is said to be "bright,"

the Polovcians and their khans "horrible," wild animals "fierce," the dew "cold," the soul "pearly," etc. In its abundant use of epithets, *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* is reminiscent of folk poetry, especially as some of these epithets can still be found in the oral traditions of the Slavic peoples.

7. The epic's primary concern is the presentation of events and one does not therefore expect subtle psychological characterization. However, in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* there are some original attempts to describe the moods and inner lives of the characters. There are references not only to the "joy" and "songs" after a victory, to "laments," "moans" and "tears," and to the external appearance of the characters (by giving an indication of their inner make-up, these external descriptions produce rounded, living characters; for example, "like unto wolves, they bound through the fields seeking honor for themselves and glory for their Prince"), but also to inner conflicts (of moods, thoughts, and feelings). The reason that the eclipse did not deter Ihor from launching his campaign against the Polovcians was mentioned above: "His soul\* was ablaze with passion and his desire to taste the mighty Don overshadowed his fear of the evil omen"; furthermore, "purpose rendered his soul taut and sharpened his heart with courage" (a reference to the sharpening of swords before a battle). After Ihor's defeat, "the souls [of Svjatoslav's boyars] are held captive by grief." "Thought spurs the spirit [of the brave] into action." While in battle Vsevolod forgets his wounds, "forgets honor and life, the city of Černihiv, his paternal throne of gold and the love and caresses of his beloved wife, Hlib's beautiful daughter." Jaroslavna "tells" Ihor that she believes him to be dead and "early in the morning sends her tears down to the sea." "A martial spirit fills" the souls of the warriors. More often the inner life of the characters is portrayed by the use of symbols, such as the awe-inspiring Karna and Zelja who "sweep dryness upon the land from a fiery horn." Or: "Your heart is bound with strong chains of iron and tempered by courage." These few examples will suffice to demonstrate that psychological characterization was not unknown to the epic.

8. Another very interesting stylistic feature of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*, which is already familiar to us from other monuments, is its use of proverbs and aphorisms. They are of two types: firstly, refrains and compact epic formulae which are repeated from time to time—a device characteristic of the epic works of various peoples and eras. During the campaign the warriors "seek honor for themselves and glory for their Prince"; their goal is the Don—they wish "to drink of the Don from their helmets"; as they advance into

---

\*The old word *rozum*, which can mean mind or reason, is best translated as "spirit" (the Greek *nous* or *noos*).

the steppe, they sigh sadly: “‘O, land of Rus’, you are already beyond the hill” while during the battle “the warriors of Rus’ barred the vast fields with their red shields”; after Ihor’s defeat (or over the dead body of Rostyslav), “the grass wilts in grief and the tree bends to the ground in sorrow”; and Jaroslavna “laments early in the morning on the ramparts of the city of Putyvl, saying . . .” (three times). Ihor’s defeat makes Svjatoslav think about launching another campaign against the Polovcians because “Ihor’s valiant troops cannot be resurrected.” He calls upon the other princes to join in another campaign against the Polovcians “for the land of Rus’, for the wounds suffered by Ihor, the audacious son of Svjatoslav.” Formulaic expressions are also used in the flash-backs: “The princes forged their own misfortune” and “the pagans descended upon the land of Rus’ from all sides.” It must be noted that some of the formulae mentioned above occasionally appear in a slightly altered form. Aphoristic phrases and the quotations from Bojan are the second type of refrain used in *The Tale of Ihor’s Campaign*: “Neither the clever nor the lucky . . . can escape the judgment of God”; “It is difficult for a head to survive without shoulders, or a body without a head.” Similar expressions are encountered in other old monuments; for example, the second of those quoted above is used in “The Supplication of Daniel” (see pt. I, no. 1). In addition, *The Tale of Ihor’s Campaign* includes some phrases akin to proverbs which were either the product of the author’s own imagination or were borrowed from some monuments which have not been preserved, for example:

*koli sokol’ v’ mytex’ byvaet’  
vysoko ptic’ v’ zbivaet’*

(“When the falcon loses its feathers, it is attacking some  
other birds high up in the sky.”)

As in the *Chronicle* the text of this epic is also amply endowed with dialog. In their dialogs and monologs, the characters frequently assume the function of the narrator; Vsevolod greets his brother, Ihor, and then proceeds to characterize his warriors from Kursk, while Ihor says to his army that “it is far better to be dead than to be captured.” The princes speak to each other (“This is mine and so is that”); the women lament (“No longer can we see our beloved husbands even in our thoughts”), etc. Svjatoslav recounts his dream to the boyars, the boyars inform him of Ihor’s defeat and then Svjatoslav utters his “golden word,” in which the words of other princes are quoted: Jaroslavna laments the death of her husband, addressing the wind, the Dnieper and the sun; Ihor thanks the Donec for helping him make good his escape and the Donec

speaks to him; the Polovcian princes, Gza and Končak, discuss (in enigmatic, symbolic language) their plans for Ihor and his son. Even the author has a voice; he addresses his readers ["*bratie*" ("brothers")], poses rhetorical questions to himself ("*čto mi šumit?*") and speaks to the princes (in his continuation of the "golden word"). Thus, dramatization of the narrative is also a characteristic feature of this monument.

9. While at first glance *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* may appear to be a unique monument with little or no connection with the traditions of the past or the norms of its own time, this is not the case. Recent studies have demonstrated that in style, phraseology and vocabulary *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* is bound by the same traditions as other twelfth century monuments. The fact that it even shares features with works of different genres (sermons and Lives), further underscores its dependence on tradition.

Let us first examine the language used in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*. Firstly, there are a great number of words which are either unknown to us from other sources (other old monuments and the contemporary vernacular) or are used with a different meaning.

Some rare or borrowed words such as "*šereširi*" (some sort of weapon), "*ortma*" ("cover" or "shroud"), "*xaralužnij*" ("iron") and "*čaga*" ("female captive") are either found only in this work or are very rare; however, rare words are also used in other monuments, especially in descriptions of everyday life (compare the names of various types of food, Ch. III, pt. B, no. 7). Some of the other rare words are found in various Slavic languages, especially in the Ukrainian language and its dialects: compare "*potručjatysja*" ("to scuffle," "to fight") with the Ukrainian *vtručatysja* ("to interfere," "to meddle"); the word *žalošči* ("grief," "compassion") is still used in the Ukrainian language: *jaruha* ("ravine") and *smaha* ("dryness," "sunburn") are found both in Czech and Ukrainian [compare *smažyty* ("to fry")]; rare in old literature, the word *bolon'* ("field") is still used in certain Ukrainian dialects.

Some passages can be interpreted variously: screeching of wagons is compared to the cries of "frightened" swans. The hypothesis that, in the original, the word used was *rozpuženi* from *rozpuditi* ("to frighten off," "to disperse") seems legitimate. This word is also encountered in the Life of Theodosius ("dispersed that heavenly flock [the monks] like a wolf"), in the letters written in the sixteenth century by the inhabitants of Lviv who complain that Bishop Hedeon Balaban has "dispersed" the Lviv Brotherhood and in the Czech and Polish languages.

However, most of the words and phrases employed in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* can be found in other old Ukrainian monuments and frequently also

in the contemporary folk songs of the Slavic peoples. For example, the people of Rus' are referred to as "falcons" but this word is also used by Długosz to describe Mstyslav Mstyslavovyč and is frequently encountered in Ukrainian folk songs ["*Sokolen'ko na vyleti, kozačen'ko na vyjizdi*" ("A Cossack in a campaign is like a falcon in flight")]. *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* mentions falcons "who are losing feathers" ("v" *mytex*") in an attempt "to protect their nest from dishonor," while in an old sermon about saints we read the following: "They take to the air like hawks, escaping from grief by rising into the clouds" ("*Mytjatsja jako jastrebi . . . v" zvišajutsja v" oblaki bezpečalia*") and in the tale about Akir—"When a falcon is shedding its feathers, it will not allow itself to be taken from the nest" ("*Kogda bo sokol" trex" mytej byvaet", on" ne dast' sja s" gnězda svoego vzjati*"). "It is better to die than to suffer defeat"—a feeling expressed by the warriors in this epic—is also encountered in various military tales, in religious monuments and in the *Chronicle*. Symbolic scenes, such as the depiction of battle as a harvest or wedding feast, are quite frequent in old monuments, in folk songs and even in later works: in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* "beneath the horses' hoofs the black earth was strewn with bones and watered with blood" ("*čr'na zemlja pod" kopyty kost'mi byla pošějana a kroviju pol'jana*"), while in folk songs we encounter passages such as the following:

*čorna rillja zaorana,  
kuljamy zasijana,  
bilym tilom zvoločena,  
i krovju spološčena . . .*

("The black earth has been plowed, seeded with bullets,  
harrowed by white flesh and washed by blood.")

In another song, Xmel'nyč'kyj begins to "plow the earth with horses' hoofs and water it with Moldavian blood" ("*zemlju kins'kymy kopytamy oraty, /krovju moldavs'koju polyvaty*"). In *The Deeds of Digenis*, battle is compared to the mowing season; in the Bible, in Flavius' work, etc., to harvesting. In the Ukrainian song about Perebyjnis, the hero "seizes Poles as if they were sheaves and piles one on top of the other" ("*vzjav ljaxamy, jak snopamy, /po dva rjady klasty. . .*"). In *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* the battle is compared to a (wedding) feast: a similar comparison is used in Flavius' work ("They went into battle as if they were going to a wedding feast") and in Ukrainian folk songs:



*Dobre dbajte, barzo hadajte,  
iz ljaxamy pyvo varyty začynajte.  
Ljads'kyj solod, kozac'ka voda,  
Ljads'ki drova, kozac'ki truda . . .*

("Take heed and think quickly, begin to brew beer with the Poles. Polish wine is Cossack water, Polish firewood is Cossack labor.")

Similar parallels can be cited for almost every image and scene employed in this work.

10. Thus, *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* incorporates certain stylistic features of the old military tale, the Bible, and the Ukrainian folk song. However, it would be a mistake to assume that this work testifies to the existence in the twelfth century of folk songs employing the same images as are found in their contemporary counterparts. On the other hand, it is possible that these images, themes and devices were transmitted even over this long period of time; contemporary *stariny* have preserved the subject matter, themes and names of the epos of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, while in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*, there are echoes of the Gothic epos about Bus-Booz (seventh century), who lived several centuries earlier. All this notwithstanding, it remains impossible to assume that the author was influenced by the oral tradition of his time. His work undoubtedly belongs to the literature of the court, not the people. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the formal aspects of the Ukrainian folk song were greatly influenced by the contrived poetry of the Baroque; in fact, the poetry of the upper strata of all nations had an impact on that of the folk. Therefore, it is more logical to assume that *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* provides evidence of the influence of the poetry of the court on the oral tradition. However, on the basis of this sole surviving monument, we cannot conclude that all twelfth century epics were of the same type. Thus, *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* should be viewed in isolation from the general issues of the old epos and folk poetry—it should be viewed as merely an unusually interesting and masterful monument of the past.

Parallels with the Western epos provide further evidence that *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* was a product of court literature. However, such parallels are not numerous. In its briefness, unusual density of poetic material and accumulation of poetic ornamentation, *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* differs from its Western counterparts, which are broad in scope and frequently verbose. Of all these epics, *Beowulf* (an eighth century English work), French poems (devoted to Charlemagne's pilgrimage to Palestine), and the Celtic epos (especially in its

use of alliteration) bear the greatest similarity to *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*. The individual images shared by these monuments are too general to allow any meaningful parallels to be drawn (the heroes are compared to falcons, eagles hover over the battle field, there are descriptions of the rewards of victory, battle is compared to a feast, blood to wine, prophetic dreams and laments are used, there are references to the shaking off of dew and to the fact that death is preferred to defeat, etc.). While certain stylistic devices employed in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*—repetitions, refrains, the frequent cryptic passages, alliteration—have parallels in the Scandinavian sagas, there are also so many important differences that *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* remains a unique monument within the scope of both Kievan and European literature.

The author and date of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* can only be identified in general terms. It was probably written after Ihor's return from captivity, which could not have been later than 1187 because Jaroslav Osmomysl of Galicia died in that year (the work refers to him as being alive), but not prior to 1187 when Ihor's son Volodymyr returned from captivity. It is possible that the author of the chronicle account of this campaign used *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* as a source but the similarity between these two works is not great.

The numerous images pertaining to hunting and military life suggest that the author was both an avid hunter and a warrior, while his apparent familiarity with the old epos and the history of his country (from the epos or the chronicles?) reveal him to be a talented man of letters with a discriminating literary palate and an intense interest in literature. He is acquainted with both secular and religious literature. The clear images of the many princes that appear in his work indicate that he was closely associated with the court circle—most probably, he was a member of the retinue and perhaps even a participant in Ihor's campaign. It has also been suggested that he may have been of the princely family. His native city could have been either Černihiv or Kiev, as an unusually prominent position in the work is given to Svjatoslav, Prince of Kiev; on the other hand, the fact that he praises Jaroslav Osmomysl makes it equally possible that he was one of those Galicians who escorted Jaroslav Osmomysl's daughter to Ihor's court. Perhaps his most interesting characteristic is his patriotism, his love for the land of Rus' (which for him does not appear to include Novgorod and is associated with a loyalty to the dynasty of "old Volodymyr"). In any case, one can speculate that *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* attained its highest degree of success in the court circle—among the members of the princely family and their retinue.

The further fate of this epic is obscure. It was undoubtedly committed to paper shortly after it was composed, as such an unsuccessful campaign could not have been of interest many decades later, but whether this was done by the

author himself and is faithful to the original is not known.

*The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* somehow found its way to the principality of Pskov where certain passages from it were quoted in *The Apostle of 1307* and in the *Chronicle* under the year 1514; in fact, the manuscript which was destroyed in 1812 contains features peculiar to the Pskovian variant of the East Slavic language (the confusion of the letters "č" and "c") and its orthographic system. As a result, the sole manuscript to survive into the nineteenth century must have originated in the sixteenth century. However, *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* was also known in the northeast in the fourteenth century because it became the basis for the *Tale of Events Beyond the Don*—a tale of the victory of the Muscovite army over the Tatar khan Mamaj, probably written by someone from Rjazan' but preserved in a poor and corrupted copy.

In the Ukrainian lands the traditions of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* appear to have died quite quickly in the unfavorable literary climate of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Even the author of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, whose knowledge of literature in general and the military tale in particular is apparent, did not employ this work. On the other hand, the author of the panegyric to Prince Ostroz'kyj from the year 1515 does quote from *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*.

Preserved only by chance, this unique gem of old Ukrainian literature still remains partly enigmatic although the scholarship which has been devoted to it over the past one hundred years has contributed to our understanding of its close ties with the literature of the Kievan period as a whole.

## H. THE TATAR INVASION

1. The Tatar invasion—the initial defeat of Rus' on the Kalka River in 1223 and the attack on Kiev in 1240 following the devastation of the northeastern principalities—was reflected not only in sermons and chronicle entries but also in individual tales included in the chronicles. Such old Ukrainian tales are few in number and have been preserved only in a severely reworked form. The style of the tales in the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* has been altered to such an extent that only individual phrases from the original text remain.

2. The tale about the battle on the Kalka River appears in a less corrupted form in the *Suzdalian Chronicle*. In the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* it is abridged and includes information about Prince Daniel. However, the Suzdalian version which is written in the style of chronicle entries is clearly of Kievan origin as years are designated in relation to the period of rule of the Kievan prince Mstyslav Romanovyč. Furthermore, the striking details scattered

throughout the text are undoubtedly remnants of the original version. This tale tells the story of a campaign against the Tatars, which after an initial success, ends in overwhelming defeat. Hyperbole permeates the tale: while crossing the Dnieper the army of Rus' "appears to be walking on dry land" because the waters of the river are completely covered by boats: standing on wagons in the city, a few princes successfully battle the Tatars for three days; all the captured princes suffer a particularly horrible form of death by suffocation—the Tatars put boards on their chests and sit on them while they eat their meal. It is also interesting to note that cavaliers such as Dobrynja and Al'oša (who are referred to as inhabitants of Rjazan') are mentioned in the northern versions of this tale.

3. A tale about the destruction of Kiev is also found in various chronicles. As was the case with the tale about the battle on the Kalka River, this work has also been thoroughly incorporated into the stylistic fabric of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle* as a whole; the most striking passages do not appear to have been taken from the original text. The following is a general outline of the events of the story: Batu is overwhelmed by the size and beauty of Kiev; "and he besieged the city . . . and, because of the screeching of his wagons and the tremendous uproar raised by his camels and horses [no one in the town] could hear what was being said [to him]." The Tatars succeed in breaking through the wall that surrounded the city "and one could see lances being broken, shields being slashed and arrows darkened the sky." The fortifications around the Church of the Holy Mother behind which the Kievans had taken shelter give way and the city is taken by the Tatars. Because of his bravery, Demetrius, the voivode in charge of the city, is spared. From the point of view of style, this tale is reminiscent of the *Kievan Chronicle* from the twelfth century. The quoted passages echo various sections from Flavius or the Bible (the coming of Assur = the arrival of the Assyrians in Palestine, etc.).

It is interesting to note that there are echoes from these tales in the *stariny* about Kalin and that this fact testifies to the antiquity of this epic.

4. These two tales are important in that they represent an attempt to create a new literary genre. As discrete tales about military events and not merely chronicle entries, these tales are something new in Kievan literature. Earlier tales are either religious in character or present secular events from a religious point of view (for example, the tale about the murder of Borys and Hlib). "The Blinding of Vasyl'ko" is the sole exception to this rule but even it does not focus attention on historical events—the author is primarily interested in the persons of the two princes. Therefore, in spite of their briefness, these two tales are important as examples of a newly emerging genre.

However, this genre was not developed by subsequent authors—no other

tales of this type have been preserved. One can only cite the thirteenth century tale about the death of Batu, which originated in the northeast (included in the Chronicles under 1247).

## I. TWO WORKS OF QUESTIONABLE ORIGIN

1. There are several monuments which unquestionably belong to the Kievan period but whose time and place of origin is obscure. We will discuss only the two most original works of this type, the Kievan origin of which is relatively certain.

The first of these is the so-called "Supplication of Daniel the Exile" ("*Molenie Daniïla Zatočnika*")—the supplication of an unidentified monk to a prince whose name varies in various manuscripts. In any case, the prince in question appears to have been from Perejaslav but it is unclear if the Perejaslav referred to was that of the north (in Suzdal) or the south. The date of this monument is equally obscure. It has been variously placed anywhere between the eleventh and the thirteenth centuries but it is unlikely that such a stylistically intricate work originated as early as the eleventh century. All the manuscripts are from a much later period—sixteenth to eighteenth centuries.

While the work appears to be a petition, the author gives no indication of what it is that he is asking for and, instead of petitioning his prince, he praises him and "instructs" him in an unsystematic fashion. In the past a great deal of energy was expended on attempting to establish the object of Daniel's supplication (Daniel is still referred to as "*Zatočnik*")—the Exile, as if he had been exiled to some part of the north; however, the text itself gives no indication that this was actually the case), his identity and the social class to which he belonged. In fact, "The Supplication of Daniel" is a purely literary work, directed at a general audience and not at some specific prince. Furthermore, it appears to be a blend of several literary genres. Firstly, it is akin to the Byzantine petitions in verse form by Theodore Prodromos (several petitions in epistolary form) and Michael Glykas (one such letter to the Byzantine emperors). Secondly, it bears a certain similarity to collections of quotations and aphorisms, such as *The Bee* or the one section of the *Collection* of 1076, except that here this material is presented within the framework of a petition. Such collections are also to be found in the Bible (the proverbs of Solomon, Book of Sirach). Thirdly, this work is also an "instruction" [compare "*Tajemnycja tajemnyj*" ("The Mystery of Mysteries")—see Ch. V, no. 7]; to "improve" the ruler meant to improve society! The extensive use of aphorisms and quotations, especially when the authors are cited, makes the work appear more authoritative. One need only recall the role played

by quotations in the *Chronicle* and in the translated ideological novels (see Ch. II, pt. D, nos. 5-7).

Because of this particular aspect of its form, "The Supplication of Daniel" was frequently revised and expanded: some of these additions contained geographic and personal names and are responsible for the extremely varied but erroneous conclusions that have been drawn about the author as well as the time and place of origin of his work.

2. As a purely literary monument, "The Supplication of Daniel" emerges as an extremely varied work. It includes quotations from the Bible: "I thirst for your mercy as a deer for a spring of fresh water" ("*Žadaju milosti tvojeja, aki jelen' istočnika vodnogo*"); "Behold the heavenly birds which do not sow, do not reap, do not gather up the harvest into the barns, but rely solely on God's mercy" ("*Vozri na ptica nebesnija, jako ni sėjut', ni znut', ni v' žitnica sobirajut', no upovajut' na milost' Božiju*"); "Every man sees his neighbor's twigs but fails to see his own beam" ("*Vsjak' vidit u druga sućec' vo očiju, a u sebe ni brevna ne vidit*"). Furthermore, the authorities being quoted from are frequently named—Solomon ["*Solomon tako že reče*" ("this says Solomon")], the Book of Psalms (the Psalms of David), Hosea, Sirach, Isaiah, etc.; Ezekiel is mentioned and a passage from the "Song of Songs" is used to eulogize the prince in question. Other quotations are borrowed from the individual collections included in the *Collection* of 1076 (e.g., Gennadius' *One Hundred Maxims*), from *Physiologus*, perhaps also from "Akir the Wise" but most importantly from other collections of quotations and proverbs (the author does not, however, seem to be familiar with *The Bee*). It was probably from such sources that the author derived the rare quotations included in his work, such as that from Theophrastus, a pupil of Aristotle. It should be noted, however, that some of the quotations were probably added by the scribes who recopied this monument. In addition to such quotations, "The Supplication of Daniel" also includes material from the chronicles and from legends; the following phrases are attributed to Rostyslav: "I prefer death to the rule of Kursk" ("*Lučše bi mi smert', neželi kurskoe knjaženie*")—according to the *Chronicle* these words were uttered by Andrij Volodymyrovyč of Perejaslav and "Good men cannot be bought with gold but gold, silver and cities will be taken by good men" ("*Zlatom bo mužej dobryx' ne dobudeš', a muži zlato, i srebro, i gradov dobudeš'*"); in the *Chronicle*, Volodymyr the Great says that "silver and gold will not buy me a wife but a wife will bring me silver and gold"). Some versions of this work contain the phrase "Svjatoslav, son of Ol'ha" (tenth century), the origin of which is not known. While popular proverbs are also quite numerous, none of them are derived from the oral tradition of the folk although this may stem from

the fact that the language of the work is akin to that of religious monuments, for example: "It is not the boat that is the cause of a person's drowning but the wind"; "Rust corrodes steel and grief a person's soul"; "The sea cannot be drained with a ladle (*upolovneju*)"; "You should not have eaten butter that had been in the sand or drunk goat's milk" (the Greek proverb refers to milk from a bird or chicken); "A crab is not a fish, a porcupine is not a ferocious beast and whoever obeys his wife is not a man"—all these are secular aphorisms. Among the witticisms derived from the folk are those of a "geographical character": "Some may prefer Perejaslav but I'll take Horeslav' (*"komu Perejaslavl', a mně Goreslavl'"*)—compare Oleh Horyslavyč in *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*; the northern geographic names were probably added subsequently: "Some may prefer Bogoljubovo but I prefer overwhelming grief" (*"Komu Bogojubovo, a mně gore ljutoe"*); "Some may prefer Beloozero but I prefer black tar" (*"Komu Běloozero, a mně černěe smoly"*); "Some may prefer Lake Lače but I prefer a multitude of tears" (*"Komu Lače ozero, a mně mnogo plača ispolneno"*). Some of the aphorisms are also employed in later eras: the author of "The Supplication of Daniel" says that he prefers the prince's water to the boyars' mead while in the works of Skovoroda we encounter the following: "I prefer dry bread with water to sugar with misfortune" (*"Lučče mni suxar z vodoju, neželi saxar z bidoju"*). Furthermore, there is a reference to people who are constantly concerned about other people's misfortunes but do not consider their own, which is reminiscent of the moral of one of the chronicle tales about a sorcerer who does not foresee his own death (compare Ch. III, pt. C., no. 4); a variant of this ancient motif is also employed by Skovoroda—he speaks of a witch who knows about everything which occurs in other people's houses, but shows little concern for her own. The proverb which states that it is far better to smelt iron than to live with an ill-tempered woman is encountered in the poetry of Klymentij [seventeenth century, except that Klymentij writes "than to *teach* an ill-tempered woman" (*"niž ženu zlu učyty"*)], etc.

Aphorisms, gnomes and proverbs are frequently extracted from other individual works or legends. It is even possible that the aphorism about "smelting steel" is a reference to the legend of the young man with an axe. Furthermore, the introductory passage is reminiscent of the beginning of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*, for both are emotional in tone and apostrophize their "brothers"; "The Supplication of Daniel" begins as follows:

*Vostrubim ubo, bratie, aki v zlatokovannuju trubu,  
v" razum" uma svoego i načnem" biti v srebrennyja*

*argani—vo izvēstie mudrosti, i udarim v bubny  
uma svoego pojušče v bogodoxnovennyja svirěli, da  
vosplačjutsja o nas dušepoleznyja pomysly.*

“Let us blow our golden trumpets in praise of reason,  
let us beat our silver drums to proclaim the importance  
of wisdom, let us strike the drums of our minds and  
play upon our divinely inspired reeds so that thoughts  
beneficial to our soul may cry out in our minds.”)

The parallelism in this passage is striking: trumpet = “razum” *uma*”; “argani” = “izvēstie mudrosti”; “bubny” = “um’”; “svirěli” = “pomysly.” Most of the proverbs have a two-part structure; for example, the author uses the following proverb to describe the attitude of the rich: “Those who have colorful clothes, speak honorable words” (“*Ix že bo rizy světly, těx i reči čestny*”). In some cases the two parts of such formulaic expressions are rhymed:

*Dobru gospodinu služā, doslužitsja svobody,  
a zlu gospodinu služā, doslužitsja boľšie raboty.*

*Komu Perejaslavl’,  
a mně Goreslavl’ . . .*

*Obrati tuču milosti tvoeja  
na zemlju xudosti moeja . . .*

(“If you serve a good master you will earn your freedom, but if you serve a bad master you will only be given more work”; for a translation of the second aphorism, see above; “Turn the clouds of your compassion upon the land of my poverty. . . .”)

Perhaps the most interesting from the formal point of view are the alliterations which resemble those of *The Tale of Ihor’s Campaign*:

<i>Bogat muž’” vozglagolet</i>	m-voz
<i>vsi molčat i slovo ego do oblak</i>	
<i>voznēsut;</i>	v-m-voz
<i>a ubog muž’” vozglagolet,</i>	m-voz
<i>to vsi na nego voskliknut . . .</i>	v-n-n-vos



<i>ne zri na mja,</i>	n-z-n-m
<i>aki volk" na agneca,</i>	a-n-a
<i>no zri na mja,</i>	n-z-n-m
<i>jako mati na mladenca . . .</i>	m-n-m

("When a rich man speaks everyone is silent and praises his words to the skies; but when a poor man speaks, everyone shouts at him"; "do not look at me as a wolf looks upon a sheep but as a mother upon her child.")

"The Supplication of Daniel" makes no explicit requests; the author's supplications are of a general nature—he pleads for "compassion" and protection from misfortune, asks the prince to heed his words and remember him, etc. In addition he praises the prince and the state in the same gnomic style: "You, O prince, are to your people as gold to a woman" ("*Zlato krasa ženam*", *a ty, knjaže, ljudem*" *svoim*"); "You, O prince, are to your people as a captain is to his ship" ("*Korablju glava kormnik*", *a ty, knjaže, ljudem*" *svoim*"); "Psalteries are tuned by fingers, and our city by your rule" ("*Gusli strojatsja persty, a grad naš' tvoeju deržavuju*"), etc. The instructions given to the prince are not profoundly moral in character. The author emphasizes the need for "wise" advisers whom he appears to consider more valuable than an army; wisdom and learnedness ("*knížnoe počitanie*") are praised. In addition, he speaks about wicked women (the advice given in this case may have been borrowed or added at a later date) and monks who have entered a monastery without feeling a particular spiritual need to do so. Toward the end of the work there is a description of athletic and circus exercises (perhaps of Byzantine origin), and this is the only part of "The Supplication of Daniel" which is not sustained in the gnomic style.

As was mentioned above, the time and place of origin of this work are obscure but it unquestionably belongs to the Kievan period and is an interesting example of a secular monument in which a great variety of Byzantine influences are felt. It is interesting to note that one of the oldest copies of "The Supplication of Daniel" (the oldest ones date from the sixteenth century) originated either on Ukrainian or Belorussian territory (V. Peretc's manuscript) and contains certain Ukrainian orthographic and lexical features. In all probability the redaction entitled "Daniel's Sermon" is the oldest. However, the question of the identity of the author has not yet been satisfactorily resolved.

3. The second work whose time and place of origin is obscure is "Adam's Speech to Lazarus in Hell"—a highly original apocryphal work without any

known parallels in the literatures of other nations. In spite of the fact that it was preserved only in copies dating from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries, some scholars (Franko, Peretc) believe that it originated before the end of the twelfth or thirteenth century. Its subject matter is that of "The Gospel of Nicodemus"—Christ's descent into Hell—but the manner of presentation is original. Having heard the news of the birth of Christ and the approach of the moment when Hell will be destroyed, David sings a joyous song. There is a conversation between the Prophets and then, when the day of Lazarus' resurrection draws near, Adam asks Lazarus to convey his repentant supplication to Christ on earth. The end of the work—the account of Christ's descent into Hell—is extant only in a corrupted form.

4. The form of "Adam's Speech to Lazarus in Hell" is of particular interest—its language is strongly rhythmical and it abounds in poetic imagery. After a brief introductory passage (poorly preserved in all extant manuscripts) which is reminiscent of the beginning of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign*, David begins his song:

"O warriors, let us sing a joyous song today,  
let us abandon our lament and rejoice"—  
says David, sitting in the abyss of Hell  
laying many-eyed fingers [sic] on live strings,  
he strummed his psaltery and said:  
"The joyous hour has arrived  
the day of salvation has dawned!

For I hear the shepherds  
playing in the stable,  
their voices penetrate through the gates of Hell  
and reach my ears.  
I hear the stamping of the Persian horses  
which bear the Magi and their gifts  
from their kings to the King of Heaven,  
Who was born on earth this day. . . .

And Him, o warriors,  
we have awaited for many days. . . .

The Virgin Mother  
covers Him with swaddling clothes,

just as He Himself covers the sky with clouds,  
and the earth with fog. . . .”\*

The prophets complain:

But who can give Him  
a message from us?  
The gates are of brass,  
the columns of iron  
the locks of stone,  
tightly sealed. . . .

Adam also complains bitterly, for he and his descendants

have endured this grief  
and misery for many years. . . .

I beheld Thy divine light for but a short time,  
and have not beheld Thy brilliant sun  
for many years now,  
nor heard Thy stormy winds. . . .

O Lord, no longer do we see  
Thy luminous sun,  
nor Thy beneficial light,  
sorrow has enveloped us,  
we are overcome by grief. . . .

The image of the “singer,” who strums the “living” strings is reminiscent of *The Tale of Ihor’s Campaign* as is the beginning of the work as a whole: there are many similar phrases and clauses—“for a joyous time has come” (“*se bo vrem’ja veselo nasta*”); “for, my brothers, an unhappy hour has arrived” (“*uže bo, bratie, neveselaja godina v’stala*”); “sorrow has enveloped us” (“*tugoju oderžimy esmy*”); “sorrow has imprisoned the mind” (“*tuga um’ polonila*”); “O Lord, no longer do we see Thy luminous sun” (“*Uže, Gospodi, ne vidim’ světozarnogo tvoego solnca*”); “No longer can I behold the strong and wealthy rule . . . of my brother” (“*Uže ne vižu vlasti sil’nogo i bogatogo . . . brata moego*”); “we have endured this misery for many years” (“*mnogo lět’ v obidě esmy*”); “born for sorrow” (“*obidě poroždeno*”). However, even the general tone of individual

---

\*There is a similar passage in the works of Cyril of Turiv.

passages parallels that of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* and the epic tradition of the warrior class, which is occasionally encountered in the chronicles. "Adam's Speech to Lazarus in Hell" was known in the Ukrainian lands and appears even to have been echoed in the works of Kyrilo Trankvilion Stavrovec'kyj.

5. Other monuments that could be mentioned here are less interesting. At one time, certain scholars argued that the "Sermon on the Destruction of the Land of Rus'," a thirteenth century monument which is somewhat reminiscent of the introduction to the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*, was a monument of old Kievan literature. However, it can now be stated with a great degree of certainty, that this short work is merely the introduction to the secular biography of Alexander Nevskij, which originated in the north. Recent Soviet hypotheses to the effect that the author of this biography was the author of that of Daniel of Galicia (in the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*) are completely unfounded.

Another such monument, which undoubtedly belongs to this old period, is the "Sermon of Cyril the Philosopher" on the evils of intoxication, in which the allegorical figure "Intoxication" tells about drunkenness. This work is in no way linked with Cyril the Philosopher (the Slavic missionary). As the manuscripts in which this monument was preserved originated in later times and contain many Russian linguistic features, very little of a definite nature can be said about it.

## J. LITERATURE OF A PRACTICAL CHARACTER

1. Some of the twelfth and thirteenth century monuments of a practical character must also be discussed briefly here.

In addition to being the most outstanding homilist of the second period of Kievan literature, Cyril of Turiv was also the author of a number of stylistically masterful prayers, which were used by the Church for many centuries. There are three or four prayers for each day of the week and they are arranged chronologically (by the days of the week and the daily order of divine services). Those designated for Sunday are addressed to the Savior and the Trinity; those for Monday, to the angels; those for Tuesday, to John the Baptist; those for Wednesday, to the Virgin Mary; and so on. Each prayer includes a "eulogy" and ends with thoughts about death, the Last Judgment and the future life. Furthermore, Cyril is also thought to be the author of the "repentant canon." In general, the mood of the prayers is extremely pessimistic as they focus upon the complete unworthiness of man; in fact, in Cyril's eyes, man has become so morally corrupt that he can attain salvation only by means of God's mercifulness, to which Cyril addresses himself:

I do not dare to raise my eyes to the heavens: for  
my body has been pierced by malice,  
or stretch my arms out in supplication: for they are  
full of evil  
or move my lips in prayer: for they would be fused  
by the evil words that I would utter,  
self-aggrandizement plagues me unceasingly,  
I have weighed my heart down with vile food,  
clouded my soul with unmercifulness,  
weakened my body by my laziness,  
my feet crossed from the stone of love to that  
of pleasure,  
I gave ear to temporal earthly praise,  
covered my face with shamelessness,  
my nostrils smell the stench of my deeds,  
I am like unto a tree which bears no fruit,  
or clouds which do not bring rain . . .  
the thief of my soul is hidden in my own heart,  
biding its time,  
for it sees that I am not kneeling in prayer,  
and rushes to steal the small estate that is my faith. . . .

Cyril begs for God's mercy, divine aid in fighting off the Devil, and the strength to wash away his sins with his tears, to cure himself of his diseases, to regenerate and purify himself. An expression of Cyril's ascetic world view, these prayers are beautiful examples of the religious lyric.

In addition, Cyril may have been the author of the "canon" to St. Ol'ha which is extant from the twelfth century. Quite different in style and tone, this panegyric canon links eulogies to Ol'ha with eulogies to Christ and the Virgin Mary. The author brings Ol'ha "flowers of praise," Ol'ha is compared to a "wise bee," which flies up onto the palm ("*finik*"") of virtuous deeds on its wings, which have been silvered by baptism, etc. The tone of this work is festive and joyous.

Vivid imagery is characteristic of the panegyric canon, the prayers and the works of Cyril of Turiv in general; for example, "the day is already bowing out and the sun prophesies the approach of evening"; man's evil deeds are "evil tax collectors who sit by the heavenly gates," etc.

2. One monument of a purely theological character has also been preserved—it is an epistle to Thomas by another famous twelfth century author,

Clement Smoljatyč. According to the testimony of the epistle itself, it is but one of several such letters written by this author. Thomas accused Clement of considering himself a "philosopher" and drawing on the works of Homer, Aristotle and Plato in an attempt to achieve fame now that he has become metropolitan (therefore the epistle must have been written after 1147). Clement says that he has read this letter by Thomas, a fellow student of his many years ago in Smolensk, to Prince Izjaslav and others and then attempts to justify himself in the face of these accusations. He refers to an earlier letter that he had written to Rostyslav of Smolensk in which he defended his action of accepting the metropolitanate without having received the blessing of the patriarch of Constantinople. Thus, this epistle is interesting if only for the fact that it provides us with certain information about twelfth century literary life. It indicates that correspondence dealing with theological problems or matters of Church politics were of interest at least in court circles; furthermore, the fact that Clement employed the works of Homer, Aristotle and Plato (probably known to him from various collections of quotations and not from the original), testifies to the mild posture assumed towards "secular literature."

The theological content of this epistle is also interesting. Clement reveals himself to be an adherent of the symbolic approach to the Scriptures, which is later encountered in the works of Cyril of Turiv and forms the basis of Skovoroda's philosophy in the eighteenth century. Employing the form of question and answer, already used in certain sections of the *Collection* of 1073, Clement gives detailed explications of various passages from the Bible, which, in his opinion, has not only a "literal" but also a deeper, hidden meaning; for example, in the sentence "Wisdom built herself a temple on seven pillars," Wisdom = God, temple = a person, seven pillars = seven temples. For his explications Clement draws on similar works by Theodorus of Cyprus and Hippolytus, on apocryphal monuments, on literature such as *Physiologus* and the *Alexandreis*. Poetic descriptions of halcyons (kingfishers), echini (sea urchins, which can foretell the arrival of a storm), salamanders and so on embellish this work, which has unfortunately been preserved only in a version reworked by a monk named Athanasius. Indications are that the symbolic approach to the Bible was a peculiarity of the Kievan school, for it was not the dominant trend in Byzantine theology.

Clement's epistle is not the only work to employ the Byzantine form of question and answer, which later even influenced the oral tradition (the spiritual song). In fact, there are echoes of Clement's work in "Kirik's Questions," a Novgorodian monument which originated between 1130 and 1156. It consists of questions and answers pertaining to practical problems of ecclesiastical life; Kirik

poses the questions while the answers are given mainly by Nyfont, the bishop of Novgorod, but also by other people, among whom is Clement—perhaps Clement Smoljatyč.

Little can be said about the style of Clement's epistle and "Kirik's Questions" (those parts of it that bear traces of the influence of Clement's epistle) or about the literary achievements of Clement himself, for both of these monuments have been preserved only in reworked versions.

3. Another insight into the literary life of this period is provided by an epistle of one Izosima addressed to Anastasia. The publisher of this epistle, Sobolevskij, believed that "Izosima" was really "Siman" (Simon), one of the authors of the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, and that Anastasia is the same Princess Anastasia-Verxuslava with whom Simon himself stated that he corresponded. In this compilatory letter, the author first reminds his "spiritual daughter," who is a nun, of the saintly women (drawn from the *Menaea* and *Prologue*) whom she should emulate and then mentions the Last Judgment (based on a sermon by Simon of Mesopotamia). In any case, as the sole surviving example of a personal didactic correspondence, which plays such an important role in the history of spirituality, this epistle is an invaluable document.

4. Chronographs also continued to be compiled (see Ch. III, pt. J, no. 5) employing a variety of sources, or mainly Greek ones (the *Hellenic and Roman Chronograph*, the first redaction of which is of Kievan origin and the second—from the thirteenth century—of Suzdalian origin), or the Bible (the *Judaic Chronograph*). It is not known which chronograph was employed by the author of Daniel's "biography" (he mentions a chronograph and the fact that he has drawn on it for some of his information) but it must have been original in character.

The *Annotated Palea*—Old Testament stories up to the time of David, with commentaries and polemics against the Hebrew faith, which probably originated in the thirteenth century (some scholars argue that it is a much earlier work)—may also be regarded as a historical monument. "The Words of the Holy Prophets," which originated on Belorussian territory not earlier than the end of the thirteenth century, is similar in character but is based on the material of the prophetic books of the Old Testament.

5. Mention should also be made of the monuments of practical literature which consist mainly of the "Epistles of the Hierarchs." Among the oldest of these are the epistles of Theodosius (previously considered to be St. Theodosius but more likely "Fedos the Greek"), to Prince Izjaslav II (twelfth century), which attack Catholicism and discuss the question of fasts. Those dating from a later period were already written in Suzdal.

Juridical monuments, namely the “*gramoty*” (documents), provide a yardstick against which the language and certain other aspects of literary monuments can be measured.

## K. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LITERATURE OF THE KIEVAN PERIOD

1. The literature of this old period may appear to have little relevance for most of the subsequent developments in Ukrainian literature—neither for the contemporary period, nor for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and especially not for the epoch of national rebirth. While it is true that old literature is frequently cited in polemics directed against those poorly informed non-Ukrainians who doubt the existence of Ukrainian literary, cultural and national traditions, it is also true that some of those Ukrainians who employ this argument have a poor grasp of the literature of this period, their formal education notwithstanding. Histories of old Ukrainian literature are either too specialized (Hruševs’kyj, Voznjak) or too superficial, give little attention to the purely literary characteristics of the old monuments and, as a result, consist mainly of summaries of their contents. Therefore, even the “defenders” of Ukrainian literary traditions often assert that *The Tale of Ihor’s Campaign* (about which many misconceptions have been created by works of a popular or superficial character) alone merits the attention of the modern reader, a view which itself denies the existence of those selfsame traditions.

The importance of historical tradition must not be underestimated for it is an active force in our modern world even if we are scarcely aware of it and do not actively cultivate it. Political and cultural changes notwithstanding, the past continues to have an imperceptible impact on each individual. Fragments of the past have been preserved not only in the customs of the people and in their oral tradition, but also in the language of everyday life, through all ideological changes, and in the national character, which is formed by the impact of all historical epochs and all historical events. I am not one of those who believe that the nature of national character can be easily isolated and defined: on the contrary, I have fundamental doubts that this could be accomplished at any time and for any nation. But national character is that mysterious force which manifests itself in all aspects of the life of each nation, in all its accomplishments and misfortunes, in its periods of flowering and decline. However, it is obviously the great periods of flowering which have the most profound effect on the development of the character and the peculiar historical strengths of a nation.

2. The literature of the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries is precisely this



type of crucial period in the history of Ukrainian culture, perhaps the most crucial of all periods—for the cultural revival of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was significantly less impressive while the tremendous influence of the nineteenth century renaissance can be explained in part by its proximity in time.

The very fact of Christianization and the subsequent evolution of a literature that was broad in scope, profound and artistically accomplished revealed the hidden potential of the Eastern Slavs and their ability to absorb the most valuable aspects of a foreign cultural heritage. The cultural flowering during this period is of much greater historical significance than the temporary expansion of political and economic power. The Kievan period brought Ukraine into the European cultural arena.

By this point, the reader will be familiar with Kievan Rus's tremendous accomplishments in the realm of literature: the development of the language, the evolution of a literary style as well as the absorption of an entire complex of universal human themes. However, it should be stressed that the repertoire of literary works, both in its general character and occasionally in more concrete respects, parallels that of the early Middle Ages in the West. The relatively few monuments that have been preserved are sufficient to give us an indication of the tremendous scope and variety of this repertoire. This spiritual preparation, this initial flowering, could not be erased even by those centuries which were less favorable for literary development. In fact, it was precisely the traditions of old Kievan literature that made the later cultural revivals possible—both the unexpected, but less brilliant, renaissance of the Cossack era as well as that of the nineteenth century (on a different linguistic base).

An interest in the past does not necessitate that we distort or exaggerate the true value of a particular epoch; however, there can be little possibility of this happening in relation to the princely era, for the high literary value of many of its literary monuments is an unquestionable fact.

3. On the other hand, each epoch has its own peculiar weaknesses and deficiencies. In spite of its tremendous creative accomplishments, the princely era all but ignored at least one category of cultural activity which was at that time an integral part of literature—scholarly work. Only a few insignificant fragments of the initial stages of its now obscure beginnings have come down to us; for reasons which do not concern us here, neither theology (initiated by Clement Smoljatyč) nor the secular “sciences” evolved into full-fledged disciplines. This deficiency in old Kievan literature was to weigh heavily upon future centuries, when each step forward in this area came only after a great deal of intensive work, many errors and unnecessary digressions. Literature was predominantly concerned with expressing religious and aesthetic emotions rather

than ideas or thoughts. The repertoire of old Ukrainian literature is also deficient in works of a subjective character. Erotic themes are all but absent: only a very few monuments—*The Deeds of Digenis*, *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* (Jaroslavna's lament), *The Deeds of Troy*, and some *Patericon* stories (the story of Moses the Hungarian in the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*)—even *allude* to erotic experiences. It is possible that subjective motifs were employed only in oral monuments, whose existence is testified to by contemporary folklore: erotic motifs are encountered in the *stariny* about Čurylo and Solovej Budimirovič. On the other hand, written works of this type may have been lost as a result of a failure in understanding or the negative stance taken towards them by later scribes who were mainly monks. The works which have been preserved deal solely with subjective experiences of a religious and, occasionally, of a purely moral character (certain sections of Volodymyr Monomax's "Instruction," the tale about the blinding of Vasyl'ko, the chronicle account of Ihor's campaign, etc.). Thus, in this respect as well, old Ukrainian literature suffers in comparison with that of the West.

Furthermore, the merits of the adaption of an artificial Slavic literary language in this period can also be debated as, in fact, they were in the nineteenth century by both the Romantics (Kuliš) and the Realists (S. Jeffremov). However, the most convincing negative evaluation was given by A. Brückner who contrasted the development of East Slavic and West European literature. In the early centuries of the Christian era, the literary language of the European peoples was still predominantly Latin; Latin not only did not hinder the development of literatures employing the vernacular but greatly aided in the cultural development of the Western European nations by providing direct access to the masterpieces of Greek and Roman literature. In Ukraine, Latin would have been replaced by Greek. The potential impact of such a possibility need not be discussed here. Suffice it to say that the adoption of Greek as the literary language would have made much more of the cultural heritage of antiquity available to at least a small circle of people than Latin. However, even the numerous translations made throughout the entire period testify to the fact that the knowledge of Greek in Kievan Rus' was not as limited as it may seem. Greek remained the language of a few professions which decreased in number in the fourteenth century.

In the fourteenth century, isolated from the European cultural arena, Ukrainian literature begins its independent existence. Although the incipient stages of both chivalrous and courtly literature can be detected even as early as the twelfth century, neither of these categories of literature was developed in later times. For almost three centuries, Ukrainian literature not only remained

within the religious sphere but also did not even attempt to comprehend the deeper foundations of religious thought, for this would have been possible only in original works even if their originality were of a limited nature.

Thus, the fourteenth century saw the beginning of a period of decline which manifested itself even more strongly in the emerging Muscovite state. A new beginning was necessary, but it came only toward the end of the sixteenth century.

## V.

# THE LITERATURE OF THE FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES

1. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries most of the Ukrainian lands were incorporated into the Lithuanian and Polish kingdoms—a fact which is undoubtedly at least partially responsible for the cultural decline. The magnificent courts were no more, the wealth of Ukraine diminished and the metropolitanate was moved to Moscow, temporarily depriving the formerly powerful state of Kievan Rus' of even this vestige of authority. However, the cultural traditions of the past continued to be dominant, with new influences from Byzantium and the West filtering through only very slowly. Only a few literary works from this period have been preserved, perhaps as a result of extra-literary factors—attacks by the Tatars; the events of the seventeenth century; the relative underdevelopment of the art of printing; the fact that a large proportion of the patrons of the arts, i.e., the nobility, joined the Polish Catholic camp; and finally, the most important factor, the lack of interest in old literature manifested in later epochs. Also lost during this period were many works from the princely era, preserved for us only in manuscripts of northern origin.\* As a result, the renaissance of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries drew partly on the resources of the distant heritage of Kievan Rus'.

The literary style of the monuments of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is substantially the same as that of the twelfth and thirteenth. However,

---

\*The fact that a significant number of monuments of the princely era are extant only in northern redactions is frequently used as "proof" that the literature of this old period is exclusively Russian (that is, Great Russian). If such reasoning were to be applied uniformly, then the relatively large number of Bulgarian monuments also preserved only on Russian territory must be regarded as Russian, while those preserved solely in Ukraine (such as the *Tverian Chronicle*), as Ukrainian.

the literature of this period is stylistically "vague," lacking the vividness of the masterpieces of the princely era. Furthermore, its ideological posture is equally vague for, of all the new trends of thought that appeared, no single one succeeded in gaining widespread acceptance. Many ideas were explored but no established norms emerged.

2. The preservation of the heritage of the past is a significant aspect of the literary activity of any epoch. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, work in this area was unambitious in character and came to be limited to the copying and editing of old monuments. Prayerbooks, including prayers of local origin (such as those of Cyril of Turiv), were compiled and additional material added to the *Paroemaniarum* and various collections of sermons. In some cases, either the structure of the original text was significantly altered, or its language modified in the direction of the vernacular (e.g., the *Menaia* of 1489, which has been preserved in a manuscript of Belorussian origin). In addition, both the style and the structure were simplified (the same *Menaia*, the new redaction of the *Patericon of Skete*). Some old works, such as the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, were supplemented by totally new material which was partly of an ideological character. Extensive monuments were recopied: the *Chronicle*, the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, chronographs and, of course, liturgical literature.

3. The fifteenth century introduces a few quantitative changes into the literary arena: literature of a lighter character develops more rapidly, new embellishments are used and more South Slavic elements are assimilated into the orthographic system.

Far more important, however, was the influx of new religious monuments from the South Slavic lands: the *Areopagitika*, the works of Basil the Great, Isaac the Syrian, Abbot Dorotheus, Simeon the New Theologian, Gregory the Sinaiite, Gregory Palamas, Kabisilas, Maximus the Confessor, new redactions of previously known works ("Climax"), texts of the Bible with commentaries, new "Lives." While it is possible that some of these works were already known in Ukraine, there can be no doubt that this period saw the influx of a great variety of new monuments.

This new literature is largely a product of that Bulgarian literary movement associated with the name of Euthymios of Trnovo (patriarch from 1372), who introduced a new orthographic system, demanded accuracy in translation (translation that followed the original as closely as possible), had old translations checked and assembled a group of translators and scribes who followed his guidelines. While Euthymios intended that only the "purest and most pleasing language of Rus'" (Church Slavonic with East Slavic elements) be used, the

translations of this school understandably deviate significantly from the literary language of the late princely era which had already acquired a regional flavor. In addition, his orthographic system was alien to the eastern Slavs and his insistence on almost verbatim translations yielded works that were both stylistically heavy and difficult to understand. The tremendous impact of his reforms in the East is largely due to the decline of local literary activity.

4. The influence of this school was spread in Ukraine through the efforts of Metropolitan Cyprian (already in Kiev in 1373-74), whose activities in the areas of translation and copying have as yet not been adequately studied, and Gregory Camblak—the leading figure in this movement. On the request of Metropolitan Cyprian, Camblak travelled from Ukraine through Belorussia to Moscow (from 1407 to 1410 he was probably either in Ukraine or Belorussia); in 1415 he became the Orthodox Metropolitan of Poland and Lithuania but, having been accused of harboring Catholic sympathies, he fled to Volhynia in 1419 or 1420.

Cyprian's contributions were almost exclusively in the area of the acquisition and translation of new literary works of Bulgarian origin. Gregory, on the other hand, wrote several works of considerable literary value during his stay in Ukraine: sermons eulogizing Euthymios, Cyprian and St. Demetrius, five sermons on other themes, a confession of faith, and two speeches to be delivered in St. Constantine's Cathedral; his later works were probably also known in Ukraine. From the point of view of composition and style, they are reminiscent of the works of Cyril of Turiv. We encounter the same type of symbolism: Cyprian's tongue was a spring and, when it dried up after his death, the leaves on the trees of his spiritual flock withered from the lack of water. Cyprian is the "nightingale of the Church"; there are biblical comparisons (the lament over the body of Cyprian and the lament of Babylon), exclamations, laments (again the lament of the Virgin Mary!) and occasionally also descriptions of nature such as the following:

*Razrěšisja bezdoždie,  
Naskoro otveržošasja xljaby nebesnyja.  
Podvigošasja větri, oblaki nosjašče, jako měxy  
ispoln' vody  
i upoiša issoxšuju zemlju.  
Bystro sotvoriša i prozračen" s" gustivšijsja vozdux".  
Potekoša naglo issoxšii potoci i istočnici.*

("The drought ended and the abysses of the heavens opened up. The winds began to blow, bringing with

them clouds which were like sacks filled with water,  
and the parched earth was revived. It lasted but a short  
time and the sky was quickly clear again. The dried-up  
streams and springs began to flow again.”)

Rhythmical figures and repetitions are frequent, as in the following passage which describes a rich man’s worries:

At night he is consumed by anxiety—  
how to purchase much for a small sum,  
how to build two or three story buildings from the profits,  
how to distribute his wealth among his children,  
how to run his estates and villages,  
how to plant his vineyards,  
how to increase his herds and flocks,  
how to rig out a ship,  
how to load it with his purchases,  
how he will embark on a long sea voyage. . . .

At times, such passages are linked by rhyme (the rhyme which appears in the passage quoted above is lost in translation):

*Oružija opl’čajutsja,*  
*mečeve obnažajutsja,*  
*slugy podvižajutsja . . .*

(“Weapons are being prepared for the campaign, swords  
are being drawn, servants are hard at work. . . .”)

Like those of Cyril of Turiv, Gregory’s sermons aim not only to instruct but also to move the listener. However, the literary activity of this talented author is only territorially linked with Ukraine.

5. The school of Euthymios of Trnovo developed no peculiar ideology of its own. On the contrary, it adopted a Greek form of mysticism developed on Mount Athos at the turn of the thirteenth century—the so-called “Hesychasm,” the basic goal of which was union with God. Asceticism, then, was the means by which this mystical experience could be attained; however, for the Hesychasts, asceticism did not mean mortification of the flesh, but “intellectual activity” aided by certain specified external conditions—complete physical immobility, silence, unceasing repetition of “prayers to Jesus Christ” and the focusing of all

thought on the divine. In the realm of translated literature, the two main representatives of this current were Gregory the Sinaiite and Gregory Palamas.

But a few traces of the influence of Hesychasm on Ukrainian literary activity remain; for example, the short description of life on Mount Athos written by Dositheus (fourteenth–fifteenth centuries), abbot of the Kievan Caves Monastery, and preserved in Cyprian's redaction of the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery* (1462); and the work of the scribe, Athanasius of Rus', conducted on Mount Athos in 1431. There were no eminent representatives of Hesychasm (such as Nil Sorskij in the north) in Ukraine until the end of the sixteenth century when Ivan Vyšens'kyj belatedly raised its banner (see Ch. VI, pt. E, no. 8).

6. Only in later folk legends about the creation of the world are there any traces of Bogomilism, a Bulgarian dualistic heresy. However, Bogomilism could easily have come to Ukraine together with other late Bulgarian influences, for it was in the fourteenth century that this heresy began to make significant gains in Bulgaria. Certain Bogomil themes are encountered in Ukrainian legends—the creation of the world by both God and Satan, the emergence of sin from the sexual relationship of Adam and Eve. However, it is not known whether Bogomilism was ever well established in Ukraine or active in her literary arena.

7. More interesting are the Western spiritual influences, about which very little factual information is available. Perhaps the first of these to have an impact on the eastern Slavs in general was the heresy of the *strigol'niki*, a mysterious phenomenon known to us only vaguely from its manifestations in Novgorod and Pskov. However, traces of the influence of this sect in Ukraine are few and inconclusive.

Our knowledge of most of the remaining Western spiritual currents which came to the Ukrainian lands is equally vague, for information about them was preserved accidentally and is available only from later monuments.

The ideas of the European Flagellantes, prominent in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, also penetrated into Ukraine. Particularly large public displays of repentance—processions during which the participants flagellated themselves—erupted in Europe in 1261 and 1349, when they even spread to the Czech, Polish and Hungarian lands. The movement of the Flagellantes did not completely disappear in Europe until the beginning of the fifteenth century. Two translated monuments connected with this movement in Ukraine have been preserved: 1) "Letter from Heaven"—"Epistle About Sunday" ("*Epistolija o neděľě*")—the original dates from a much earlier period (sixth century), but it became popular only after 1261. This letter, which is said to have been written by God and cast down to the earth from heaven, is an appeal for repentance,



requiring the fulfillment of both spiritual and more strictly formal prescriptions (not to violate the holy days—Sunday, Wednesday, Friday) and employing threats of terrible punishments reminiscent of the biblical prophets; 2) “The Dream of the Virgin Mary” (“*Son Bogorodici*”) is an account of new torments to be endured by Christ. Christ promises salvation to those who will always carry this letter with them, read it and heed His words (again the requirements about the holy days). Both of these works were transcribed from a late fifteenth century manuscript by Jakym Jerlyč, a chronicler of the Baroque era. However, they have also been preserved in other manuscripts, in legends, and partly also in folk songs.

While Polish sources indicate that Hussitism had an impact in Ukraine, no traces of this impact can be found in the extant monuments of this period. However, it does appear to have influenced a sect later referred to as the Judaizers. Information about this sect comes primarily from Novgorod and Moscow but the heresy itself appears to have been brought to Novgorod from Kiev in 1470 by a Jew who was associated with the court of Prince Michael Olel’kovyč. A more important role in the spread of this heresy was undoubtedly played by the nobility from the prince’s court. Furthermore, it may have come to Moscow from the Hungarian and Wallachian Hussites. The description of the Hussites preserved in the works of their enemies is quite accurate: their main demand was that secular persons be allowed to receive communion in both kinds—not relevant in Orthodox countries where this had always been the case. On the other hand, other criticism directed at established religious practices and the Church by the Hussites did appear among the Eastern Slavs: demands that the cults surrounding icons depicting saints, relics and prayers for the dead be repudiated; criticisms of the condition of the Church; attacks against priests who took money for performing Church services (compare their attacks against simony); criticisms of the notion that prayers said in church have a unique legitimacy. The Judaizers are said to have demanded that all be allowed to preach the word of the Lord and stressed the importance of the Old Testament. References to the most radical assertions to emerge from the Hussite movement also appear—rejection of the idea of the Trinity, of prayers to saints and the Virgin Mary and scepticism about the divinity of Christ. Although all these are ideas advocated by the Judaizers, no written apology of their beliefs has been preserved.

The Judaizers also translated many of the books of the Old Testament from Hebrew, some of which were not previously available in translated Orthodox versions—the Pentateuch, Joshua, Ruth, Daniel, the Psalms, the “Song of Songs,” the “Books of Solomon.” Their work required that they seek

assistance from Jews. However, a larger proportion of their activity was devoted to the translation of "scientific" works and leads us to the Lithuanian Commonwealth. Among them is a group of philosophical works, including the "Logic" of the Jewish philosopher Moses Maimonides, used as a text book during the Renaissance, and "The Philosopher's Aims," an introduction to philosophy by the Arabian philosopher Algazali (1059-1111). By comparing the old Slavic translation of Algazali's work (which contains certain Ukrainian linguistic features) with a somewhat later Latin translation of the same text, the Russian scholar Vasilij Zubov has demonstrated that the translation made by the Judaizers was highly successful, for it enabled its readers to easily follow Algazali's reasoning. That this was the case is revealed by the fact that some reader added the parallel philosophical and mathematical terminology employed in the old translation of the *Hexaemeron* (see Ch. II, pt. D, sec. a, no. 4) to his copy of this translation. In addition to philosophical monuments, the Judaizers also translated works dealing with astronomy, one of the best known of which is the Lunar Table "The Six Wings" (*Šestokrīl*). Vasilij Zubov has also established that the original from which the fifteenth–sixteenth century "Cosmography" was translated was the English scholar Sacrobosco's *Spheres*, an introduction to astronomy used even in the seventeenth century. The language of this translation is similar to that of translations made in the western areas of Rus' and must therefore be ascribed to the Judaizers. The copy of this work made in the Xolm area is unfortunately not available. Also ascribed to the Judaizers is a translation of the "Secret of Secrets," preserved in what appears to be a Belorussian manuscript. One expanded version of a pseudo-Aristotelian physiognomy of Arabic origin (the original text dates from the tenth–eleventh century), the "Secret of Secrets," describes Aristotle's advice to Alexander of Macedon on matters pertaining to government and the activities of a monarch. The success of the translation made by the Judaizers derives from the clarity of its language and sentence structure. In addition to those mentioned above, there are but two or three other translations which can be attributed to this religious sect.

The works translated by the Judaizers are of Jewish origin and are a product of a developing interest in Jewish scholarship but do not contain any elements of the Hebrew faith. However, for the literary historian, they are interesting primarily from the point of view of language: by developing a philosophical and mathematical terminology at a relatively early stage (from the fifteenth century), these monuments contributed significantly to the extension of the base of the literary language. While the terminology employed is at least adequate, the sentence structure is not. Note the following examples of the terminology which appears in the translations made by the Judaizers:

<i>deržitel'</i> (subject)	<i>ujem</i> (denial)
<i>oderžanij</i> (predicate)	<i>vsjačnij</i> (general)
<i>osud</i> (court, statement)	<i>častnij</i> (partial)
<i>umisel'</i> (purpose)	<i>obritenije</i> (existence)
<i>privod</i> (cause)	<i>tvoriti</i> (activity)
<i>vina</i> (cause)	<i>stradati</i> (suffering)

Among these words are some for which there are no longer any corresponding forms: participles such as *oderžanij*, infinitives used substantively (*tvoriti*, *stradati*), etc. Similar new words were created to express mathematical terms:

*tička* (point)—*R. točka*  
*šnur* (line)  
*obraz sredotočij* (circle)  
*dalenie* (distance)  
*javlenie* (surface)  
*protijvenstvo* (parallelism)

The scholarly works translated by the Judaizers indicate that, while this heresy had its roots in Hussitism, it developed in a completely new direction, perhaps under the influence of the European Renaissance which demonstrated this same interest in works of Arabic origin (the Jewish philosopher Moses Maimonides also wrote in Arabic and the Judaizers translated his works as well as those of other Arabic philosophers). However, it should also be noted that these Arabic works were greatly influenced by the traditions of Greek philosophy (especially that of Plato and Aristotle).

Having devoted considerable attention to the translations of scholarly works (of a philosophical, mathematical, and astronomical character) made by the Judaizers, we cannot ignore their contributions in the field of religious literature. In addition to the translations mentioned above, an epistle, formally akin to that of the Letters of the Apostles—the “Laodicean Letter”—has also been preserved. This falsification has only begun to be studied in recent years and, as a result, the “theology” of the Judaizers still remains relatively obscure. In fact, the very name of this sect originated from their poorly informed enemies.

The general interest in western European religious currents is also testified to by the collection *Pritočnik* (1483) which was intended for private use and contains many echoes of European religious tales (= events).

8. However, all of this activity was limited to the absorption of foreign material, a situation which is later repeated in connection with the development of the tale (see Ch. VI-VII). In fact, even the contributions of a purely Ukrainian

origin lacked originality, as they consisted of the reworking and enlargement of earlier texts. The *Menaea* and the *Patericon of the Kievan Caves Monastery* have already been mentioned. The latter was supplemented with material based on the *Chronicle* (the discovery of the relics of St. Theodosius) or various other sources (Michael Svjatoša's entry into a monastery, the death of Polycarp, etc.) including the works of the Hesychasts.

Only the chronicles of this period—the so-called “chronicles of western Rus’”—have a claim to true originality. However, they cannot be included within the realm of literature for they are limited in large part to the presentation of dry factual information. Furthermore, some of the artistically composed passages must be regarded as separate monuments which were incorporated into the chronicles. All the chronicles of this period are narrow in scope and differ significantly in various redactions. The language employed extends all the way from the traditional variant with Church Slavonic elements that is encountered in the chronicles of the princely era to a very pure form of the bureaucratic language of this time (it contains only a few traces of the vernacular). We will discuss only the most important aspects of these chronicles here.

In part a compilation of older northern chronicles, the *Chronicle of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania* employs original sources, such as a eulogy of Prince Vytautas, for its account of the history of Lithuania, in particular, and of the later period (fourteenth century), in general. The author of a part of this monument (after 1382) was a Kievan. The *Short Kievan Chronicle*, which was not composed in Kiev, is a compilation of Novgorodian sources and only refers to events occurring in Ukraine in the final years of the fifteenth century (1480-1500) and to the victory of Prince Constantine of Ostrih over the Muscovite army at Orša in 1515. The narrative is occasionally quite lively: events are frequently presented in the form of dialogue (an old tradition in Ukrainian chronicles); in the account of the death of Bishop Macarius Čort, the author gives way to a religious reverie; and the story of the attack launched against Volhynia by the Tatars includes a prayer. However, it is the eulogy of Prince Constantine that is the most accomplished from the literary point of view: there are stylistic echoes of *The Tale of Ihor's Campaign* (which may have influenced this eulogy only indirectly—via *Tale of Events Beyond the Don*) and allusions to the Bible as well as to old monuments. (Prince Constantine is compared to King Porus from the *Alexandreis*.) The later *Lithuanian Chronicle* (it extends to 1507 and is extant in a manuscript from the end of the sixteenth century) is written from the perspective of the aristocratic circles of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and bears traces of the influence of the old Kievan chronicles.

9. The remaining works of this period are quite narrow in scope and not

purely literary in nature. The epistle of Metropolitan Michael to the pope (1470) is verbose and emotional but contains a number of interesting passages (the equal authority of eastern and western Christianity, the comparison of the pope to the good shepherd and the local Catholic clergymen to the evil people). The epistle from the Orthodox Council of 1490 to the pope is less verbose but employs the same pathetic style; the pastoral epistle of Metropolitan Joseph Soltan is devoted to the theme of the "multiplication of sins" (compare Serapion's sermons).

10. The literature of the fifteenth century is limited in scope and heterogeneous in content. All of its purely literary accomplishments are somehow linked with the stylistic traditions of the past. All the traces of the new European religious currents, either Orthodox (Hesychasts) or "heretical" are insignificant and of little interest for the student of literature. The Judaizers alone had a developed literature but those monuments of this literature which have been preserved are far from purely literary in character; they belong to the category of scholarly literature—not *belles-lettres*—and are peripheral to the religious interests of this sect, for their theological works (if such in fact did exist), with the sole exception of the rather obscure "Laodicean Letter," have all been lost. The other religious currents have left only a few traces (Bogomilism, the Flagellantes) or none at all (Hussitism in its pure form). The interest in these currents appears to have been short-lived and, at a time when literary activity was quite limited, they either failed to find literary expression or, more probably, their literary manifestations disappeared together with the currents themselves; the religious literature of the Judaizers was purposely destroyed.

The period extending from the end of the thirteenth to the end of the fifteenth centuries represents a distinct pause in the development of Ukrainian literature, but such pauses have occurred periodically in the spiritual, cultural and literary life of Ukraine. While the "wasted years" in the history of our people may evoke feelings of regret, we should bear in mind that periods of stagnation are always followed by epochs of vigorous blossoming.

## VI.

# RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION

### A. RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION IN LITERATURE

1. The Renaissance was a turning point in the spiritual history of Europe.\* This is how it was perceived by its participants and this is how it came to be regarded by future generations—it was the Renaissance that they used to date the end of the “Middle Ages” and the beginning of the “modern era.” However, when faced with the problem of specifying the new elements introduced by this revolutionary epoch, the problem becomes much more complex. A good knowledge of the literature and languages of antiquity—the so-called “humanism”—can hardly be used to characterize that tremendous change which is said to have brought about the “rebirth of Classical sciences and art.” The new content, even if it was a blend of elements from previous eras, had to consist of those things which excited the imagination of Renaissance Man. Both at the time and in later

---

\*Some of the passages quoted in the following chapters, primarily Chapters VI and VII, are given in modern orthography. As there are no established rules for the modernization of old Ukrainian orthography, I will limit myself to the few generally accepted ones. (The transliteration scheme employed will only make two of these visible—the replacement of “e” by “i” and the elimination of the back “jer.” *Trans.*) However, the rhymes employed in the poetry of this period indicate that the pronunciation of words had already deviated from their orthographic representations. For example, there are rhymes such as: *tovarišov-prijšol*, which suggests that in appropriate instances “l” was pronounced as “v”; *drevnee-mriet*’ apparently pronounced *drevnije-mrije*. (On the other hand, rhymes also demonstrate that in some cases the ending “i” in the third person singular of verbs of the first conjugation continued to be pronounced.) Therefore, the changes that I have made in the orthography employed in the monuments of this period do not always reflect all the changes that had occurred in the spoken language.

centuries, scholars isolated three of its constituent elements: the Renaissance reintroduced the Classical ideal of beauty as harmony and balance; the Renaissance “discovered” and “liberated” man; and finally, the Renaissance “re-discovered” nature. All this, obviously, provides sufficient grounds for regarding the Renaissance as initiating a new era in European cultural history. In fact, this definition of the Renaissance provides an excellent starting point for further analysis, for the three constituent elements listed above encompass almost all the accomplishments of this era. That there was a flowering of the arts in forms that do not create the impression of a complete break with the late Middle Ages nor an overly close link with Classical traditions is an unquestionable fact. However, in unqualified form, this statement can only be applied to the plastic arts; in music, a “return” to Classical traditions was impossible as no traces of them remained; in the literary arena, where there was an abundant supply of Classical models, the canons of Classical poetics (based on Horace’s *De arte poetica*, a work which does not fall into the mainstream of the Classical tradition) were revived, but literature *per se* was much too slavishly imitative in character and patterned after the more easily accessible materials (Roman rather than Greek), materials that were of later origin and therefore only tangentially related to the basic traditions of Classical literature as a whole. In the realm of philosophy where ties with antiquity already existed, the Aristotelian traditions that were dominant in the Middle Ages were replaced by those of Plato—also known in this earlier period but less widespread; in addition, there was an attempt to move from antiquity to the Eastern philosophies (medieval Arabian and Jewish philosophies, namely the mystical Hebrew system of theosophy and scriptural interpretation known as cabala). The question of the Renaissance’s “discovery” of man is more complex, for Christianity had always regarded man as its central concern. The “discovery” of man was rather a battle against the Church’s understanding of his essence and its authority over him. The Renaissance certainly did “liberate” man but it failed to ask the all-important question: did this “liberation” from the authority of the Church and frequently also from all moral and social authority really lead to the “discovery” of man’s essence, or was it merely a digression from the true path to this goal? In fact, in the Classical world, man was unusually tightly bound to society and the state—the intricate processes of struggle for the ideal of “inner freedom” in antiquity (from the Stoics to the Epicureans) was reinterpreted by the Renaissance from the point of view of its own ideals. The positive ideal of man as possessing a knowledge of and interest in all facets of human life (although examples of this ideal were perceived not only in tyrants but even in contemporary bandits—the *condottieri*) was that new feature of the Renaissance which was most reminiscent of

antiquity. However, the elucidation of this ideal was left to the future—to subsequent centuries of spiritual history. And finally, let us turn to the third constituent element of the Renaissance—“the discovery of nature.” This is perhaps the most questionable aspect of the traditional view of this epoch. A desire to return to nature, to conquer nature and the idealization of nature as the object of artistic endeavor—all this is certainly characteristic of the Renaissance. On the other hand, the scientific conquest of nature—the revival in physics and astronomy, the development of modern mechanics—was a product either of the late Middle Ages, as has been demonstrated by P. Duhem (that Copernicus’ ties with the spirit of the Renaissance were superficial—a fact that was known previously), or of the late Baroque, to which both Galileo and Kepler belong. For the Renaissance, there remained only dreams of contributions already made by those representatives of “late scholasticism” at the Sorbonne and elsewhere, towards whom the man of the Renaissance had to take a hostile stance, but which were later rediscovered by those who rejected a large portion of the “achievements” of the Renaissance and made an attempt to revitalize “the old,” i.e., many of the most important ideals of the Middle Ages; these were men of the Baroque period, whose contributions to science were far greater than those of the exalted Renaissance Man.

The Renaissance (or “rebirth”) touched on Ukraine only at the very end of its development, and that by way of Polish culture. In the West, in the sixteenth century, currents which on the one hand sought an actual “rebirth” of ancient spiritual ideals as they understood them, and on the other hand hoped to liberate man from those fetters with which the authoritarian Middle Ages had bound him, were already living out their last days. However, the accomplishments of the Renaissance were unable to satisfy even its sixteenth century followers. The Renaissance sought “enthusiasm,” but was able to cultivate only a rather cool rhetoric; it sought a superior, universally developed man, but egoism, amorality, and anarchy were the only results; the Renaissance set itself as a goal the exploration of nature, but natural science in the Renaissance remained in a kind of wonderland, patronizing magic, alchemy, and astrology. The Renaissance sharply criticized the superstitions and prejudices of earlier times, but itself remained under the influence of superstitions of a more modern variety. The cultural significance of the Renaissance, the great “secularization” of culture, i.e., its transformation from the purely religious to the “secular” sphere, the establishment of a relatively independent secular culture, cannot be questioned. But with the exception of the new ideal of beauty, the Renaissance lacked a distinctive new content. The new literature and art were based on this new ideal of beauty, which to a large degree aspired to repeat and reinstate that



of antiquity. In literature this resulted in a return to ancient forms. The contents which the "new" secular man inspired were somewhat new; subject matter was enriched by "secular" themes—e.g., erotic themes, the idealization of strength, and the "well rounded" and full life.

2. The world-view of the Renaissance underwent a severe crisis in the sixteenth century with the appearance of the currents of the Reformation, for while some of these proceeded along lines similar to those of the Renaissance, others threatened to undermine several major and very fundamental Renaissance ideals. The Reformation remained a staunch supporter of individualism. The nature of this religious individualism (the direct bond between man and God with the reduced role of the Church as a middleman), however, was quite distinct from the egocentric individualism of the Renaissance. The fate of Erasmus of Rotterdam is an excellent example of the dual relationship of the two trends. Although steeped in the ideals of the Renaissance, Erasmus was caught up in the excitement of the Reformation, but was never able to decide just what his final attitude to the movement should be. While the Renaissance sought a full life, and had as its prime goal the ideal of beauty, the Reformation longed for a life which would be completely and consistently built on a religious foundation. Ancient times were contrasted with the early Christianity to which the people of the Reformation sought to return, and which they tended to perceive in terms of the more severe forms of Old Testament religious devotion. Thus, the Renaissance and Reformation were left with but one common approach—criticism of the Middle Ages, which, for both, was symbolized by the Roman Catholic Church.

3. The Renaissance was rather late in coming to eastern Europe, and the Reformation followed quickly on its heels. In Poland the Renaissance had been instrumental in bringing about the first flourishing of literature (J. Kochanowski), but side by side with it stood the Reformation which also found an immediate literary response (M. Rej). The direct influences of both currents came to Ukraine primarily via Poland.

Ukraine entered the sixteenth century still closely tied to the Byzantine cultural sphere, and this despite the fact that from the end of the fourteenth century there had been no lack of various responses to Western currents which had brought about unrest and had resulted in a definite decline of the one-sided and once indivisible domination of old Byzantine traditions.

In Ukraine the influences of the Renaissance, as we shall see, were rather insignificant: they were restricted to the borrowing of certain literary themes, a process which survived even to Baroque times. The most difficult problem—the creation of a new literary style—was not resolved, primarily because familiarity

with the literature of the Renaissance presupposed a familiarity with ancient Latin literature, which would have necessitated the reading of the original texts. Translations were almost nonexistent. Numerous attempts were made by the Muscovite exile Prince Kurbskij, but his translations, even on the linguistic level, were influenced by his Lithuanian-Ruthenian surroundings. The attempts of Ukrainians themselves were still heavily influenced by the old Byzantine tradition, to which only certain and not very numerous stylistic elements of the Renaissance were added. The themes of the secular Renaissance found almost no receptive ground.

4. The influences of the literary Renaissance were further prevented from taking root in Ukraine by the religious unrest which enveloped the country in the second half of the sixteenth century, and which made it far more susceptible to the influences of the Reformation than to those of the Renaissance. The Protestant reformation movement had, in fact, spread even to Ukraine, although it had attracted almost exclusively the rather restricted circles of the gentry. However, the significance of the Reformation and, in Ukraine itself, of the influences on these circles of Anti-Trinitarianism (Socinianism or "Arianism") was immense. It was these very movements which brought their followers, both from among the Ukrainian gentry and from the merchant class, into a closer alliance with the intellectual culture of western Europe. But this same alliance caused the loss of the sense of national identity in the Ukrainian disciples of Anti-Trinitarianism. Its effects on literature were not numerous—Ukrainian Anti-Trinitarians wrote either in Latin or in Polish. Only a few echoes of the ideas of the Reformation succeeded in penetrating the broader circles of the Ukrainian people. The Reformation advocated some specific changes in religious traditions. The "Word of God," the Holy Scripture, was considered to be above the authority of the Church. In addition, the Reformation brought to the attention of individual representatives of Lithuanian-Ruthenian literature the problem of a literary language, which had to be the language of the people, since the Word of God was to be accessible to all peoples. But Catholic forces took a stand against the Reformation as they had already done against the Orthodox Church. In this most difficult situation, the Orthodox population revealed both its great devotion to the Orthodox Church, as well as its organizational abilities. However, this national religious movement which grew out of the problem of the "Union" resulted in the adoption of the literary traditions of neither the Reformation nor the Renaissance. When we encounter any influences of either of these two major movements in the Ukrainian literature of the sixteenth century, they are both weak and far from widespread; e.g., some elements of Renaissance poetics were adopted, but Renaissance themes were of little interest. Likewise, attempts were

made to take advantage of specific elements of the traditions of the Reformation but these were limited to the linguistic level, and to some of its negative features (polemics against the Catholic Church). For this reason, it is not surprising that the most outstanding phenomenon of Ukrainian sixteenth century literature is the polemical writing of the genius Ivan Vyšens'kyj, which was directed against both the Renaissance and the Reformation, and set as its goal a return to old Byzantine tradition. Without a doubt, the spirit of this polemical writing, through its language, and to some extent its content (Vyšens'kyj believed that religious individuality is no less significant than the Church), reveals the influence of the Reformation, but its style is that of the Renaissance (see below). Even more important, however, was the fact that this most brilliant writer did not turn Ukrainian literature back to the past, but pointed it in a new direction—toward the Baroque, which was in a sense the successor of the Renaissance. Therefore, the “spirit of the times” demanded not a return to the old, but progress towards something new, containing elements of both the Renaissance and the Reformation. But contemporary Ukraine did not accept and adopt this “something new” consciously; the process was somehow only semiconscious and at times hardly perceptible. There is no doubt that the influences of the Renaissance and Reformation in the Ukraine were more widespread and more deeply felt in day-to-day life, and especially in the lives of individual people, than in literature. Ukrainian literature of the sixteenth century not only manifested very few elements of the Renaissance and Reformation, but was also of limited significance as a whole. There is no need to conceal this fact, in view of the magnificent literature of the Kievan and Baroque periods. The single truly outstanding phenomenon of the century is Ivan Vyšens'kyj who was ahead of his time, standing apart from contemporary traditions and already visibly close to the Baroque. Ukrainian literature of the sixteenth century would be even less significant if its volume had not been enriched by the literary activity of the Belorussians, to whom Ukrainians of the sixteenth century were related culturally, and from whom they were not yet separated linguistically.

## B. THE TALE

1. Very rare are those new Ukrainian-Belorussian tales inspired by the quickening of interest in Western literatures which accompanied the Renaissance. Such tales had already begun to appear at the end of the fifteenth century and a large number of them originated in Belorussia. Their character is partly religious and partly secular. Probably only some of them were translated directly from the Latin originals—most from Polish and Czech. It should be noted that some of

the translations which possibly served as the sources for translators are still unknown to us.

2. To the religious tales belong: "*Muka Xrystova*" ("The Passion of Christ"), a compilation of various Latin works, some of which are still unknown. The tale served to satisfy the same interest as did the apocryphal writing in the old period; it supplemented biblical stories by various legends and sometimes with nonreligious themes, e.g., the biography of Pilate, the so-called "*Zolota legenda*" ("Golden Legend"), reworked from a Western collection of legends dating from the Middle Ages; stories about the three Magi who paid tribute to Christ; the life of St. Alexis (both from Latin originals, the former perhaps through a Polish intermediary, the latter from a Czech one); the "tale" about the "Illustrious Prophetess," ("*Svitla proročycja*" from the Czech); the tale about the knight Tundal who lived in the next world (perhaps from the Czech; its Latin original is of Irish origin). These are all old tales from the Middle Ages, and the role of the Renaissance in their adaptation is limited to the fact that the spirit of the Renaissance brought Western literature to the attention of the eastern Slavs and gave them enough spiritual independence from Byzantine tradition to allow them to turn to the religious tales of the West.

3. Some secular tales were already known in old Ukrainian literature, but now appear in new redactions of Serbo-Croatian origin. The first of them, the new redaction of the well-known *Alexandreis*, originates from a Serbian revised translation. It is even possible that a new redaction of *The Deeds of Troy* also appeared at this time. The famous tale of Tristan and Isolde from the end of the sixteenth century directs us to the Serbo-Croatian translation of the Italian original as well (cf. in Ukrainian literature, Lesja Ukrajinka); also from an Italian original was the chivalrous tale (not at all widespread) about Bova the prince—which came to Ukraine via a Serbo-Croatian translation. The tale about the "seven wise men," is of Eastern origin, and was transmitted to Ukraine through a Latin revision and a Polish translation: it is the story of a mute young prince who is slandered by his stepmother before his father, and who is subsequently saved by the seven wise men who tell the father a tale with the "moral" that one should not follow the advice of a woman; finally, the prince regains his power of speech and explains the situation to his father. This type of "moral" tale with shorter stories included within it was known in Ukraine from the oldest times. There are some secular tales which are tied to the Renaissance. But it is sufficient to note that none of these tales gained widespread popularity and many are known to us only from a single manuscript; furthermore, the themes of such works were frequently modified at a later date (*Alexandreis*). We see, then, that the influence of secular Renaissance was not very great.

4. Both religious strife and religious polemics provided material for some of the tales. This material was not vast—e.g., the story about the pope, Joan, who had supposedly been a Roman pope and had given birth to a child during a procession. This tale—of late origin—is sometimes found together with yet another which is also found separately, “*Petro Huhnyvyj*” (“Peter the Snuffler”), who, having been punished by the Roman emperor, cunningly destroys him. A shorter story retold by Vyšens’kyj, but also found earlier as a separate story, can be included in this group of tales. It concerns the miracle on Mount Athos when, during the attempts to establish a Union with Rome, a wall of the Church fell, crushing the supporters of the Union.

5. Thus the striking enrichment of themes in this period can be attributed to the influence of the Renaissance and the Reformation. Stylistically, however, only a scant few “modern” traits can be found in the new tales and the new redactions of the old ones. A particularly striking feature in *Alexandreis* is the large number of emotional elements. The “erotic” themes of Tristan and Bova are new, but they are not very well handled from the point of view of style.

### C. HOLY SCRIPTURE

1. Work on scriptural texts began as a result of the Reformation movements. Some work was stimulated by the Czech “pre-reformation” of Hus, some later by the sixteenth century Reformation. The most valuable work, however, was that which used as its basis the traditions of the Eastern Church.

The conditions under which the first printing house, belonging to the German Schweipolt Fiol in Cracow, worked have yet to be clarified. His publishing house also did work for Ukraine, and in 1491 had prepared the *Oktojix*, *Časoslovec*, both *Triodi* (*Pisna* and *Cvitna*) and, as it seems, the Psalter. There is no doubt that other sections of the Bible were to be printed in addition to the Psalter, but the publishing house was closed and its books confiscated. Fiol was himself no more than a printer-shopkeeper, and exactly what circles prompted the action—Lithuanian, Moldavian-Wallachian, or other—no one has yet been able to determine.

2. Those revisions of the text which profited from Czech translations and which used a “common” Ukrainian-Belorussian language most assuredly had ties with Lithuanian-Ruthenian literature and the Czech religious movements. Such translations exist in handwritten copies but, more important, in printed form as well. They were printed by Francisk Skoryna, a merchant from Polock who had studied in Padua, during the years 1517-1519 in Prague (parts of the Old Testament), and in 1525 in Vilnius (Acts of the Apostles). Very interesting are

Skoryna's prefaces which reveal the motives behind his work; they are in part national: "According to divine laws, all creatures have great love for the place where they were born and nurtured" (*"Ihdi zrodyly sja i uskormleni sut', po Bozi k tomu mistu velykuj lasku imajuť"*). Skoryna writes: "If we cannot be of great service to the simple people who speak the Ruthenian language, we bring them at least these little books, the fruit of our labor" (*"Ne možemo ly vo velykyx poslužyty pospolytomu ljudu Rus'koho jazyka—syji malyji knyžky praci našej prynosymo jim"*). Skoryna considered the Bible to be the encyclopedia of all human knowledge, a point of view held by the Catholics as well, but which was most typical of the Protestants. Likewise, typical of Protestantism was Skoryna's bent towards a simple language and the fact that he generally published books of the Old Testament. But Skoryna should not be considered as a representative of the Reformation. Evidence indicating that this was not the case is provided by his prefaces as well as by the character of his *"Mala podorožna knyžycja"* ("A Small Travelling Companion Book"), which consists of Orthodox prayers; the spirit of the Czech "pre-reformation" had only influenced him to a very limited extent. Skoryna's publications met with success, as is demonstrated by the number of copies printed.

3. Some attempts at translations of the Bible into the national language were definitely linked with the Reformation movement; this may have been the case with others as well. We must not view every translation as a product of Protestantism, but the idea itself was most probably prompted by the spirit of the Reformation. The Ukrainian version of the Gospel is the so-called *Peresopnyc'ka Evanhelija* (from 1556-1561, but we know it only from the 1571 and 1701 copies), which is, for the most part, a rather moderate "Ukrainianization" of the evangelical text. Let us consider the following text: *"Čolověku edinomu bohatomu zrodilo pole vel'mi, i movil sam" v sobě, rekuči: što maju činiti, ne maju gde byx" zobrał" žita moi [or pašnju]. I rekl": tak" učinju, rozmeču žitnicju moju [klunju or stodolu]. I boľšij pobuduju."* ("One rich man had an abundant harvest and said to himself the following words: What am I to do, I do not have anywhere to collect my grain [or feed]. And he said: This is what I will do, I will tear down my granary [barnyard or barn]. And I will build a larger one.") Valentine Nehalevskyj's translations of the Gospel (1581) with their Ukrainian and Belorussian elements were certainly influenced by the Protestant movement. Based on the Polish translation of M. Czechowicz' *Krexivs'kyj apostol*, the Ukrainian text also makes use of the Polish Bible of 1563, the Slavonic text and Skoryna's edition; a translation of the Polish Bible by Budny (1572) was also eventually printed, as was the Gospel translated by the Belorussian V. Tjapyns'kyj. Consider the following sample of the language of

the *Krexivs'kyj apostol*: "O bezrozumnyi Halati, xtož vas podmanul, iżby este pravdy ne byli poslušni, pered kotoryx očyma Xristos pered tym byl napysan i mežy vamy rozpjat. . . ." ("O foolish Galatians, who has led you astray from the truth—you, before whose eyes Christ was formerly portrayed, and crucified among you.") Generally speaking, translations of the Holy Scripture into the national language play a significant part in the development of a literary language. But not a single Ukrainian or Ukrainian-Belorussian translation reached a wide audience. Thus, these translations could not have similarly influenced the development of the literary language in Ukraine.

Several manuscripts which to a greater or lesser degree expand the text of the Gospel and contain some brief explanations have survived to the present day. They represent a transition to "didactic gospels," which were published later as well (e.g., Kiev, 1637, etc.). Consider these examples of the texts: from the *Volyns'ka evanhelija* (The Volhynian Gospel, 1571): "*Čelověk někotoryj byl bohattyj, kotoryj že to obolokovalsja v porfiru i visson (v šarlat i v dorohoe oděnie) i na každyj den byval velmi vesel. Byl tyž nikotoryj ubohyj, ktoromou to bylo imja Lazar, kotoryj to ležal u vorot eho, buduči trudovatym.*"\* ("A certain man was rich and he garbed himself in purple robes and fine cloth [in a cloak and expensive clothes] and was very happy every day. There was also a certain poor man, whose name was Lazarus, who (being a leper) used to lie at his gate"); or from a Gospel from the end of the sixteenth century: "*Čelověk" nekotoryj byl bahattyj i obolokalsja u krasnyi šaty i u porfiru i visson, toe u dorogii šaty, i veselilsja na každyi den' zavše krasno, byl že tyž tam ubohyj nekotoryi, ktoromou to bylo imja Lazar", a byl povr"ženyj pred dvermi eho, abo ležal u gnoju nemocnyj"* ("A certain man was rich and used to dress in beautiful cloaks, purple cloths and fine cloth that is expensive clothes, always enjoyed himself very much each day; there was also a poor man there, by the name of Lazarus, cast out at his door where, covered in sores, he would lie helpless"); or from 1604: "*Čelověk někotoryj bě bohat i odevalsja ustavične v" perfiru i visson i veseljaščejsja na usjak den' krasno. Byst že tam někij inšij imenem Lazar, kotoryj to ležal gnoen pred dvermi ego"* ("A certain man was rich and dressed himself in the latest fashion in purple robes and fine cloth and enjoyed himself well each day. There was also another one there by the name of Lazarus, who would lie, covered in sores, before his gates"). Thus, these translations clearly attempted to bring the language of the Holy Scripture closer to that of the vernacular, undoubtedly seeking to reach much broader circles than the Reformation had succeeded in doing.

---

\*Almost the same text is found in the *Peresopnyc'ka Evanhelija*.

4. The most frequently published biblical text and the one which was most widely distributed was the *Ostroz'ka biblija* (Ostrih Bible, from 1581). It employs Church Slavonic consistently throughout, and contains no elements of the Ukrainian vernacular. The initiator of the project was the Orthodox patron of learning, Prince K. Ostroz'kyj, who opened a well-known Orthodox school in Ostrih and set the teachers at the school, and other Ukrainians as well as foreigners, to work on the biblical text. The committee which worked on the text relied on various Slavic and Latin manuscripts, but most influential were the Greek texts. From the theological point of view, the text of the Ostrih Bible was a great success, but from the literary point of view, it succeeded only in cementing the rift between the Church (Slavonic) and literary (semi-vernacular) languages. But most important, this Church Slavonic text could never become the norm for the literary language of Ukraine. Of course, the return to the linguistic traditions of the Church can be explained in the first place as a protest against the Union which was turning away from "Orthodox tradition"; however, it was also a protest against the participation of the Orthodox people, together with Protestants of various inclinations, in the battle against Church Union. (On Ukrainian territory, as well as in areas adjacent to it, were the settlements of the dissident "Czech brethren," the Lutherans, and the almost "godless" Unitarians, the "Arians.") . . . Cooperation with the Protestants had still been possible in Ostrih where the political power of Prince Ostroz'kyj had stood firmly behind the Orthodox people. Some linguistic elements of the Ukrainian language do appear in one part in the Ostrih Bible: in "*Knyhy Makavejs'ki*" ("Books of the Maccabees"); not only the first, a semi-canonical book, was included in the Bible, but the second and even the third, which, the editors note, had not previously been translated into any other Slavic language. But elsewhere the translators simply followed the northern text, revising it here and there.

And so after this return to the tradition of the Church language, Church Slavonic became the norm for the Ukrainian literary language. No other authoritative basis for the Ukrainian language was established until the end of the eighteenth century.

#### D. POLEMICAL LITERATURE

1. The religious strife of the end of the sixteenth century constitutes some of the most interesting, as well as the best known, pages of Ukrainian cultural history. The Ukrainian townsmen—who had been generally abandoned by the nobility (the majority of whom had crossed over to the Catholic camp or followed Protestantism), supported by the influence of Prince Ostroz'kyj for



only a short time, betrayed by a large portion of the Orthodox hierarchy—were nevertheless able to resist the terrifying attacks of the Catholic Church (attacks condoned by official government authorities) by means of their own organizations (brotherhoods). But this illustrious page in Ukrainian cultural history is not equally illustrious in the area of literary output. However, although neither voluminous nor illustrious, the polemical literature of this period is very significant for the development of Ukrainian literature: slowly, new literary forms and literary values were taking shape. The brilliant representative of polemical literature, Ivan Vyšens'kyj, stands above the confines of his time.

2. The beginnings of polemical literature are linked with Ostrih, and that school which was established there through the efforts of Prince K. Ostroz'kyj. The circle of Ostroz'kyj's co-workers consisted not only of Ukrainians, but also of Greeks and Poles. Working toward a rebirth of the old Orthodox tradition (see above—references to the Bible), the Ostrih circle must have been influenced by the Renaissance in their introduction of secular learning into the academic curriculum. In fact, even the Reformation left its mark on the activities of the Ostrih circle, for in its struggle against Catholicism it employed Protestant co-workers, but even more significantly, drew on Protestant literature. The Ostroz'kyj academy disintegrated after the death of Prince Ostroz'kyj, whose heirs joined the Catholic camp. The publications of the Ostrih (and later Derman', L'viv, and other) publishing houses provided Ukrainian literature with a Bible, the occasional ecclesiastical-political work and some works of the fathers of the Church, but its main literary significance lies in the fact that it had begun to publish contemporary authors: namely, several works of polemical literature.

3. The first of these printed works is Herasym Smotryč'kyj's *Ključ carstva nebesnoho* (*Key to the Kingdom of Heaven*, 1587). The first part of this book is dedicated to the defense of Rus' from attacks (of the Jesuit, B. Herbest). The second part is a defense of the old (Julian) Calendar and other disputes between the Eastern and Western Church. There is little concrete argumentation: the major part consists of pathetic and sometimes lyrical or even witty exclamations, questions, reminders, attacks and sometimes even curses. The foreword is rhetorical; the language is at times slightly rhythmical and even rhymed: "*Povstante, počujte sja y podnosite očy duš vašyx, a obačte z pil'nist'ju, jak sprotyvnyk vaš, dijavol, ne spyt', i ne til'ko jak lev rykajučy šukajet' koho požerty, ale javne v paščeky jemu mnohyje . . . vpadajut'*" ("Arise, awaken your senses, raise the eyes of your souls and you will see most clearly that your adversary, the devil, is not asleep, and that he not only stalks around looking like a lion for someone to devour, but that many do actually fall between his jaws"). He speaks of the Church in the following way: "*Bolizno vas porodyvšy, vodoju*

*svjatoju xreščenija omyvšy, dary Duxa svjatoho prosvityvšy i xlibom žyvothym . . . vozkormyvšy . . . z vamy vično carstvovaty pevna byla*” (“Having given birth to you with much pain, having washed you with the Holy Water of Baptism, having illuminated you with the gifts of the Holy Ghost and having nurtured you with the living bread [the Church] was sure she would reign with you forever”). Of the popes he writes: “*Jedyny novyny ustavljajut’, a druhyje staryny popravljajut’, i jak odstupyly dorohy pravoju, zavždy sja mišajut’, da ynšyx do toho ž prymušajut’, i strašat’, že jim toho ž ne pomahajut’*” (“Some of [the popes] establish a new order while others correct the old, and if they leave the right path they always go astray and cause others to do the same, and in addition intimidate them into helping them”). Its author knows how to appeal to the common man. The rhythmical language is sometimes reminiscent of the rhythmic pattern of the *dumy* or some poems. In the text we also find a considerable number of proverbs.

4. The treatise by Vasyl “Ostroz’kyj” (1588)—broad in scope and generally of a theoretical theological content (relying on Maxim the Greek), is rather difficult as a piece of literature, but quite certainly intended for another type of reader than was Smotryč’kyj’s. L. Zyzanij (Vilnius, 1596) introduced a new thematic element into the polemics of the time—the Protestant belief that the pope was an anti-Christ. The style of the work is also close to that of scholarly works. A serious scholarly work is the anonymous *Apokryzys* (Apocrisis; Ostrih, 1598) by the Protestant Polish writer M. Bronski. The style of two works, written under the pseudonym Klyryk Ostroz’kyj (The Clerk of Ostrih, 1598-1599), is both emotional and ironical, and at times even pathetic: “*Perestupyly jeste otečeskije hranyci, narušyly jeste starožytnuju viru! . . . Poroskopyvaly jeste hroby predkiv, porušyly kosty otec!*” . . . *Zatoptaly jeste jix stežky, zatmyly jeste jix prisvitluju spravu!*” (“You have overstepped the boundaries of your fathers, you have violated the ancient faith! . . . You have dug up the graves of your forefathers, stirred the bones of your fathers. You have trampled their paths, you have beclouded their glorious cause!”). Written in basically the same style as Herasym Smotryč’kyj’s *Key to the Kingdom of Heaven*, this work possesses prayerful, pathetic and rhetorical overtones. Most important, however, the forewords to various editions acquaint us with one of Ostroz’kyj’s workers, Demjan Nalyvajko; as a writer his language is also rhetorical, only more heavily colored by Church Slavonic elements. Far simpler linguistically are the sermons (unpublished at that time) of Father Iov Zalizo of Počajiv. The rhetorical quality of the polemic writings is most striking: this is perhaps where the influence of both the style of the sermon of the religiously unsettled century of the Reformation, and the rhetorical school of Renaissance

style, had its greatest impact: perhaps even less familiar to us is the Ostrih "Ciceronian" style.

5. The last work of this literature—*Warning* (*Perestoroha*, written before 1605)—stands apart. Here we have an attempt to present the struggle of the Church as its battle against the Devil; many apocalyptic notes are sounded in the work. But here the rebirth of the Church is most closely tied to a rebirth of culture, the elevation of the level of learning (including the rejection of "pagan philosophy"). The style is very uneven and interesting only because of its rhetorical aspects, among which are the unusually talented speeches which the author puts in the mouths of Prince Ostroz'kyj and others. Even here there are ties both with the psychology of the Reformation (the cult of the Apocalypse, perhaps under the influence of the followers of Flacius)\* and the rhetorical style of the Renaissance. This work, perhaps the most interesting work of polemical literature, is so full of varied stylistic embellishments that it can be safely assumed that it was written by an entire committee of co-workers—by various authors from various cultural circles. It is very possible that such a group did work together on the *Warning*. If we reject this proposition, we must assume that there existed some person, unknown to us, who was well acquainted with the religious literature of various schools and of various scholarly characters. *Warning* reached a certain (though not very wide) circle of readers only in handwritten copies. Serious polemics, as soon became apparent, had little significance since the compulsory "reform" initiated by the Union was defeated by tradition, and a country faithful to these traditions upholding them from social motives.

6. Perhaps the most famous polemicist, the Ukrainian Adam Ipatij Potij, belonged to the Uniate camp. He was more productive than any of his Orthodox adversaries, and wrote both in Polish and in everyday Ukrainian. We have several of his works in a Ukraino-Slavic language ("*Unija* . . ."—"The Union . . .," 1695; "*Spravedlyvoje opisan'e . . . soboru berestejs'koho*"—"A Just Description . . . of the Council of Brest," 1596-1597; "*Antyryzys*"—"Antithesis," 1599; "*Rozмова berestjanyna z bratčikom*"—"A Conversation Between a Follower of the Union of Brest and a Monk," 1603; "*Oborona soboru florentijs'koho*"—"A Defense of the Council of Florence," 1604; "*Posel'stvo do papeža . . . Syksta IV*"—"A Letter to Pope Sixtus IV," 1605; "*Harmonija al'bo sohlasije viry*"—"Harmony, or Unity of Faith," 1608). His style is the same as that of the Orthodox polemicists, only in his works there is less lyricism, more pathos, rhetoric, wit,

---

\*I have in mind here the Protestant theologian Flacius Illyricus, a representative of radical German Protestantism of the sixteenth century.

and invective; his serious arguments are connected to the emotional ones in the same work, and even on the same page. His Ukrainian sermons have been lost.

In the Ukrainian works of Potij we can find all the typical rhetorical devices of that time: the accumulation of synonyms, strings of words: "*Pijanstvo, lakomstvo, svjatokupectvo, nepravda, nenavyst', potvary . . . , pyxa, i nadutost' . . . panujut', tut ves'ma*" ("Drunkenness, greediness, simony, falsehood, hatred, slander . . . , arrogance and pride . . . reign here [in the Greek Church]"); short sentences follow one after the other:

*"spil'nye duši, mysli, voly,  
spil'nyj Boh,  
spil'naja pobožnosty kuplja,  
spil'noe spasenije  
spil'nyj podvyh i pracja,  
spil'naja mzda i vinec'."*

("common souls, thought, wills; a common God;  
mutually bought devotion; a common salvation; mutual  
exploits and work; a common reward and wreath.")

He likes antitheses—in his opinion the following happened in the partnership between the Orthodox and the Protestants:

*starožytnoje z novotoju utverždenije  
i kamen' nedvyžymyj z lehkomyśl'nosty trostynuju  
šyrota z tisnotuju,  
plidnist' z neplodijem,  
svjatoblyvost' z prokljatijem,  
dobryj porjadok z pomišanijem, . . .  
myro blahouxannoje z hrjazju,  
svitlost' z temnostju,  
Xrystos z Veliarom . . .*

("ancient beliefs [combined] with new ones; an immovable rock with frivolous reed; broadness with narrowness; fertility with infertility; holiness with execration; good order with confusion, . . . ; fragrant myrrh with mud; light with darkness; Christ with Belial . . .")

Antitheses are also encountered in his exhortations:

*ne mišajte luds'kyx sprav z Božs'kymy,  
myrs'kyx z duxovnymy,  
zemnyx z nebesnymy,  
dočasnyx z vičnymy. . .*

("Do not confuse human issues with divine ones,  
secular with spiritual, earthly with heavenly, temporal  
with eternal. . .")

Potij's style is somewhat reminiscent of Vyšens'kyj's, only Potij's works possess neither the wealth nor the diversity of Vyšens'kyj's.

7. Some shorter and, in some cases, older handwritten monuments have also been preserved—polemics against both Catholics and the "evil ones," the Lutherans. Their style is slightly more straightforward, but even here we find in embryonic form new stylistic elements which appeared in the works of later polemicists (see Chapter VIII).

## E. SATIRE

1. There is no doubt that the limited satirical output of this period is in many ways indicative of the new times. Its spirit is reflected in the preferred forms: the bold plays on words, the parodied figure of the ancient "Castellan of Smolensk" who represents the ideals of antiquity while polemicizing against them, and puts into full view all their petty, provincial arrogance. However small as such a work might be, and frivolous in some of its witticisms, the very genre in itself demonstrated that a new kind of literature was beginning to develop.

The single satire which has come down to us from the sixteenth century is a short speech of "Castellan of Smolensk" Meleško, which was supposedly delivered before King Sigismund III at the diet (in 1589). That this work is a parody, for some strange reason, escaped detection even by scholars (the "speech" was first published as an historical monument). Its contents are quite straightforward: the speaker, "who had never been at such a gathering and had never sat down with His Majesty the King," ("*na hetakix z'žzdax njakoli ne byval i z korolem*" *eho milostiju nikoli ne zasědal*"), speaks about anything and everything that comes into his mind. But most importantly, he attacks modern times—from the Germans, who had recently fallen into great favor with the kings, to the "bare-bottomed chickens" ("*kury holohuzi*"), to the "stallions" ("*koni drygantovi*"), to the clock whose repair will cost almost as much as a new

clock, and so on. On the other hand, he does praise the old.

2. The literary technique of the "speech" reveals a lack of skill: it was apparently not difficult for the author to write in Belorussian (he uses words such as *hetakyj*, *heto*, *hetoho*, etc., *njakoli*, *nasmotryusja*, *moužkom*, and so on). The author is not averse to employing colloquialisms: the Germans serving the king, and his own countrymen who had given themselves over to the new way of life annoy Meleško. He expresses his feelings in very colloquial terms: "*Da koli ž" by ja hetoho čorta kulakom" v" mordu,*" . . . "*a koli b" hetakoho bėsa kulakom" v" mordu, zabyv" by druhyx mutyty*" ("If only I could give that devil a knock in the jaw," . . . "and if I were to rap that devil in the jaw, he would soon forget how to lead others astray"). The German or his wife "*dorohim pyžmom [bizamom] vonjaet*" ("smell sweetly of expensive musk [elder]"); and his countrymen, followers of the times—"*Xot' naša kostka, odnako sobačim mjasom obrosła i vonjaet*" ("Although their skeleton is like ours, it has grown over with canine flesh of which it also smells"). Finally we find here various word games, interpolations of foreign words ("*portuhale ili fortuhale*"). Occasionally there are even rhymes ("*korolevali, čto voevodami byvali*"). The cleverness of the work derives from the unsuitability of its "sententious" tone and the form it is given—that of a speech to the diet: Meleško's complaints are everyday and commonplace, whereas the form in which they are presented would tend to anticipate accusations of a political nature. Only one such political charge is levied—against the "Germans" in the king's service. The remainder—the keeping of "Polish servants," ("*sluhi-ljxi*"), "stallions," ("*koni-dryganti*"), "bare-bottomed chickens" ("*holohuzi kury*"), the purchase of the clock, the "expensive gowns" ("*dorohi sukni*") worn by the women—are the problems peculiar to the gentry. And Meleško, who complains about the horses and the Polish grooms, the clock, and the expensive gowns, only demonstrates that he himself had likewise yielded to the fashion of the time by accepting all these things as part of his way of life and is, therefore, in fact, accusing himself as well.

The past which Meleško praises has a dual nature—in the first place, it is a "primitive" time when "they danced without trousers like the Bernardines" ("*bez nohavic, jak Bernardini, huljali*"), and wore shirts "to the ankles." The old way of life was also more satisfying than the new one—it knew nothing about "seasonings" ("*prismaky*"); however, the dishes which "Pan Castellan" enumerates are hardly plain: goose with mushrooms, kasha with pepper, liver with onions or garlic, and as a splendid delicacy "*na prepyšnyje dostatky*"—rice kasha with saffron. His contrast of Hungarian wine ("*vengers'ke vino*") which, as it were, had not formerly been available, and malmsey, which he says they drank

humbly (*"skromno pijali"*), for malmsey was not at all inexpensive, is humorous. Furthermore, the speaker's self-confidence is transformed into self-caricature, beginning with the impression that Pan Castellan will dress as he would at home (*"jak po-domovomu"*), that he is now working for his "little woman" (*"maľžonka svoja"*), for whom he is an unlimited source of happiness (*"ščo natišyt'sja i nasmotrit'sj ja/ na menja ne možet'"*), and including the mention of the fact that they had held consultations not only in Smolensk, but even in Mozyr to decide "what wise man should be sent to this gathering" (*"Koho b mudroho do vas na tot z'jzd vybraty"*). They chose Pan Meleško, who reminds the king: "I only remind Your Grace so that I would also be remembered however many senators and Lithuanians there might ever be at the court of His Grace. . . ." (*"To til'ki vašej milosti primoninaju ščob navsihdy, skilki senatoriv i paniv Litovs kyx pri koroni joho milosti bulo, buv by i ja. . . ."*).

3. This interesting trifle from the literature of the court, of which we have no other examples, presupposes a completely different type of reader than the one who read the religio-didactic works which have survived from the previous period. This satire does not ignore the private life of the Old World lords—Pan Meleško alludes on several occasions to the moral decline, the nonsensical romancing (*"ljubitel'na brednja"*) of the white-faced feudal woman (*"bilo-žonky"*); to the German living with his woman (*"z žonkoju našoptivaet'"*); and to the Polish servant who "quietly begins to make advances towards his woman as soon as the master leaves the house" (*"skoro z domu ty, to vin movkom prilaskajet'sja do žonki"*), or "He neighs like a colt near the girls, like a stallion by a mare; hire two Lithuanians as guards for him, for the devil himself could not watch him" (*"Kak žerebec ržet kolo dčevok, kak" drygant" kolo kobyl'"*; *pryjmj z" k" nemu dvox" Litvinov" na straž"*, *bo i sam" dčedko ne upil'nuet"*). And finally, he criticized fashions which, in his opinion, hinder modesty in erotic matters. . . . These few illustrations, without exception, make it even more apparent that satire is indeed a private sort of literature, which at this particular time began to find its reader among the nobility. This literary tradition survived with similar motifs even into the nineteenth century.

To a certain degree, this parallels the satirical attacks of the Western Renaissance on the culture of the Middle Ages, except that here the object of the satire is not intellectual culture as in the famous *Listy temnyx ljudej* (*Letters of the Unenlightened People*), but life in the Middle Ages, in general. "Meleško's Speech" was recorded in the seventeenth century (but there is no conclusive evidence indicating that it originated in the seventeenth century).

## F. POETRY

1. The beginning of Ukrainian poetry dates back to the sixteenth century. Folk songs had obviously existed prior to this period, although it was only in the second half of the sixteenth century (1571, in the grammar by Jan Blahoslav) that the first one was actually recorded (its formal character has yet to be determined). Later songs were greatly influenced by the artistic verses of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: in general, the oldest "verses" in Skoryna's Bible can hardly be classified as poems; they have neither a definite number of syllables in a line (e.g., 8, 12, 9, 8, 8, 7, 9, 9, 11), nor a definite rhyme scheme, and the rhyme which does exist is scarcely more than an approximate similarity of sounds ("jedyna"–"bludna," "slavi"–"poxvali," "veseliju"–"naučeniju"). Its ties with Polish or Czech poetry are doubtful, and those with the rhythmical pattern of religious chants have not yet been studied.

2. The Ostrih school produced poetry of a new type. Poetry (by H. Smotryc'kyj) was included in the Bible of 1581. Its principal features are rhyming couplets and a stanza-like structure. But the rhymes are often only "approximate" (e.g., "oružie"–"božije," "obojudu"–"pobidu," "lesty"–"spasty," etc.). The number of syllables in a line varies (e.g., 13, 21, 15, 12 . . .). The same year a special publication in verse, *Xronolohija* (*Chronology*) by Andrij Rymša, appeared in Ostrih; in it there is an almost perfect thirteen-syllable line with a caesura after the seventh syllable:

*Žydove suxo prošly/ Ćyrvonoe more,  
kormyl Boh jix na pušy, / ne bylo jim hore.*

("The Israelites crossed the Red Sea without getting wet, God fed them in the wilderness, they were not left in distress.")

In the various verses inscribed on "emblems" (coats of arms) dating from very early times (before 1605), lines of both even and odd numbers of syllables can be found. The syllabic principle was more closely adhered to in the editions which came out in Lviv several years later (the greeting, in verse, to Metropolitan Myxajlo Rohoža, "*Prosfontima*," in 1591).

The origins of Ukrainian poetry of a different, "more modern" type, which is akin to Polish verse, are not clear. Indications are that a collection of fifty songs (probably translated from German) of a religious nature with some Protestant coloring, belonged to as early a period as the middle of the sixteenth century. The language of this collection alternates between Ukrainian and



Belorussian (in rhymes the "jat" is sometimes written as "e," sometimes "i"). Bodjans'kyj published only six of these poems and now it seems that this collection has been lost. The verses sometimes contain an even number of syllables in a line and full rhymes. The song about the Incarnation of Christ includes stanzas of this type:

*Prestol on svoj ostavil  
pohybšix čtob izbavil  
Rovno Bohu bohotyr"  
svyše pryselilsja v mir . . .*

("He left His throne to save those who were lost. A hero equal to God, He came down to earth from above. . . .")

But side by side with this we find:

<i>Svjat v jaslex vozsijaet</i>	(7 syllables)
<i>svet noščiju oblistaet</i>	(8 syllables)
<i>tma pohibnet,</i>	(4 syllables)
<i>věra javljaetsja.</i>	(6 syllables)

("A holy child illuminates the manger, the light shines at night, darkness is overcome, faith appears.")

Rhyme, as we see, is not regularly employed but even the occasional lack of a consistent measure does not affect the lyrical character of the poem:

<i>Xvalyty načynaem,</i>	(7 syllables)
<i>Boha proslavljaem</i>	(6 syllables)
<i>za dary, čto my braly</i>	(7 syllables)
<i>ot ruky eho dostaly.</i>	(8 syllables)

("We are beginning to sing praises, we glorify God for the gifts which we took, and were given by His hands.")

Further on, a regular syllabic structure is maintained:

*On dušu blahodatno  
i plot' nam dal prijatno,*

*tu věrno soxraniti*  
*On sam izvolit bdeti.*

(Perhaps “*bděti*,” in the sense of “following,”  
 “watching.”)

(“Benevolently with pleasure He gave us soul and body,  
 deigning himself to watch over its faithful preservation.”)

The long and varied poems (48 poems, over 1,000 lines; probably from c.1590) directed against the Protestants (Arians) are surprising for the regularity of their measure and rhyme. For example:

*O, Xryste preblahyj, mylostyv budy!*  
*syloju tvojeju bljudi tvoja ljudi . . .*  
*Rozbijnyku za viru raja otverzajš*  
*bludnyc' i mytarej z hrixov očyščajš.*  
*Tomu vsi virnyji velyčije dajte,*  
*slavu i poxvalu veselo spivajte.*

(“O most kind Christ, be merciful! Guard your people  
 with your strength. . . . You open Paradise even to  
 criminals if they have faith; harlots and publicans you  
 cleanse from sin. And so all ye faithful give adoration,  
 happily sing honor and praise.”)

These verses demonstrate that the imitation of Polish metrics, which we know existed, was not very difficult and often gave rather happy results. We can assume that these were not the only poems that were written, but at the moment we do not know of any other of a similar quality which date from the same period. The development of Ukrainian versification belongs completely to the seventeenth century (see Chap. VIII).

3. In his grammar of 1596, Lavrentij Zyzanij also presented a theory of poetry, but one which was totally unsuited to Ukrainian verse, for this theory is built on the differentiation of long and short vowels (the long ones being: i, jat', “ot,” ja; the short ones: e, o, u; a, i, “jus,” “ižycja” could be either long or short!). But even the author of this odd theory did not follow it in his own poems.

4. At the same time, a new type of folk song—the *duma*—began to develop. This new Cossack epos completely supplanted the old Ukrainian epos, the remnants of which remained only in the prose oral tradition or in the “form” of

the verse, and which underwent some linguistic change when it reached Russian territory. The *dumy* were first collected and written down in the nineteenth century, but in the process they were partially reworked or falsified. Many aspects of the *dumy* still remain obscure. *Dumy* can be divided into two groups—those with “anonymous” heroes, and those whose heroes are named. From the thirty various *dumy* which are known to us, we have been able to date only a few, employing the same methods used to date the old epics. But even in those *dumy* whose heroes are famous people there exist some insurmountable problems with regard to their dating, since many refer to events which could have taken place more than once. This is the case with the famous *duma* about Marusja Bohuslavka, who became “Turkified and Moslemized” (“*poturčyvsys*’, *pobusurmenyvsys*’”) in Turkish captivity, and nevertheless frees at Easter “poor captive Cossacks from captivity” (“*Kozakiv bidnyx nevol’nykiv*”). There is a long *duma* about Samijlo Kiška, and his victory at Kozliv (which exists in many versions): Kiška is a historical figure who gained fame in the years 1575-1602; however, some details in the *duma* are reminiscent of the printed story about the escape of Muscovite captives in 1643, so that even here researchers have doubts about the actual date of its origin. The *duma* about Ivan Konovčenko-Udovyčenko contains a very general, although masterfully constructed story about the death of its hero while doing battle with the Tatars. The hero is perhaps a poeticized Xvylonenko, a contemporary of Hunja and Ostrjanycja, or perhaps Udovyčenko, the Cossack chief from the seventies of the seventeenth century. Similarly doubtful are other attempts to establish accurate dates. “Anonymous” *dumy* (e.g., the escape of three brothers from Oziv, the cry of the captives, the death of three brothers near Samara, the storm on the Black Sea, and so on) provide no helpful bases for their dating or else have sources which are too indefinite. In the *duma* about the storm we find among others, the name of Oleksij Popovyč (A’loša Popovič in the *stariny*), which may have found its way into this *duma* from the old epos. Only the equally unhistorical Gandža Andyber, it seems, points to the source of the *duma* about him—the later period of social strife in the lands of the Cossacks. In the sixteenth century, Lithuanian-Ruthenian culture still preserved the memory of the famous old *bahatyri* (*bogatyri*) of the Volodymyr cycle: this provides a more definite base for dating the new epos which completely replaced the old. We can presume that the *dumy* began to appear in the sixteenth century.

5. *Dumy* are a very unique type of epos, an epos without a great central hero, an epos with a tendency towards anonymity. The psychological soundness of its characterizations surpasses that of both the old Ukrainian and the Serbian epos: it is sufficient to recall the individual characteristics of the three brothers

who escaped from Oziv, the moods of the captives in captivity, Marusja Bohuslavka, etc. Unusually impressive are the picturesque descriptions of the steppe landscapes or the Black Sea, pictures drawn with very limited artistic devices.

6. The artistic form of the *duma* is also unique: the verses are made up of lines of uneven length, which, in contrast to similar forms of the verses, are very rhythmical; they can be compared with some attempts at versification in the seventeenth century (see Chap. VIII about Kyrylo Trankvillion Stravrovec'kyj).

The poetics of the Ukrainian *dumy* bear certain similarities to the Serbian epos, but the means by which the Serbian epos may have come to Ukraine is unknown; it is possible that what we have here is merely the innate resemblance of works of the same genre. The *dumy* are also similar to laments; but this, it seems, is a general feature of the epos (the Russian epos with Russian lament). The *duma*, like songs in general, was fond of employing parallels and contrasts. But there do exist some features specifically characteristic of the *dumy*: the frequent use of double synonyms: *dolom*–*dolynuju*, *kumy*–*pobratymy*, *plače*–*rydaje*, *bižyt'*–*pidbihaje*, *kylyt'*–*proklyvlaje*, *kljane*–*proklynaje*, *hraje*–*vyhravaje*, and so on. Favorite epithets were: *bujnyj viter* (blustering wind), *bystryj kin'* (swift steed); *jasnyj sokil* (resplendent falcon); *syva zozulja* (gray cuckoo); *siryj vovk* (gray wolf). Epithets associated with the heroes are generally maintained throughout the entire tale: "*divka-branka*, *Marusja popivna Bohuslavka*" ("Marusja Bohuslavka, a girl captive, the priest's daughter"). The use of Church Slavonic forms and compound words (characteristic of the Church Slavonic language) led some researchers to believe that the *dumy* had a "bookish" origin; however, it is possible that the national language of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries still contained some Church Slavonic elements which disappeared only later.

## G. THE HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LITERATURE OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

1. As we see, the great national awakening at the end of the sixteenth century was not paralleled by equally outstanding achievements in the literary arena. That which was truly significant—Ivan Vyšens'kyj, the *dumy*—was not closely tied to those new trends, influences, and currents which came to Ukraine. The polemical literature of the sixteenth century is not of very high literary value; only at the very end of the period did *Warning* raise some—and only a few—truly basic questions; up to that time, only secondary questions (regarding the calendar), or formal ones concerning the legality of the Synod at Brest, were discussed. The Uniates' attacks centered not on the teachings, but

rather on the rites of the Orthodox Church. Characteristic of almost all the literature of the time was its rhetorical nature, its oratorical style. In addition, the satire, "Meleško's Speech," shared many features with this polemical literature which was central to the time. The poetry was clumsy, and, in large measure, rather uninteresting forms such as emblematic poems were cultivated. Linguistic reform (translations of the Scripture) was unsuccessful; the language of the Church remained Church Slavonic. The Ukrainian renaissance cannot even be justified by the fact that it was, as it were, only a beginning. Old Ukrainian literature had proven that these "beginnings" could immediately become the peak of development.

2. The authentic *dumy* belong to folk literature, which was developing along an independent path, not yet well known to us. Ivan Vyšens'kyj, the single valuable and significant figure in the written literature of the sixteenth century, developed from different roots than did the rest of the literature of his period—partly from the patristic tradition, partly perhaps from the folk literature and possibly even from the very spirit of the Ukrainian language itself. His ideology was the ideology of reaction, but strangely enough a fresh and lively breeze seemed to spring from it! But history bypassed Vyšens'kyj: in place of a return to Byzantium, Ukraine turned to the West. Only some and not very numerous phenomena of the literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries can be traced back to that tradition which Vyšens'kyj tried to establish as the cornerstone of Ukrainian culture (Z. Kopystens'kyj, P. Velyčkovs'kyj). History bypassed even these intellectual successors of Vyšens'kyj, but this, of course, in no way lessens his importance or the significance of his works. However, the entire sixteenth century remains for us a period which looked to the past, more so than had the flourishing period of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, more so than did the unique, and to a large measure unfamiliar, period of the seventeenth and eighteenth century Baroque.

## **VII.**

### **BAROQUE**

#### **A. THE NATURE OF LITERARY BAROQUE**

1. The idea of a literary Baroque was accepted only quite recently, after World War I. The term "Baroque" had formerly been limited to the sphere of plastic arts (architecture, sculpture, painting), and only much later was it realized that the style of other art forms (music and literature) shared certain features with the plastic arts. Research into Baroque literature is still incomplete. The least attention has been devoted to this problem among the Slavs: only Polish and Czech Baroque literatures have been relatively well researched. Little work has been done on the Ukrainian Baroque, although some of the material has been available for quite some time.

2. Unable to establish a firm attitude to Ukraine Baroque literature (seventeenth–eighteenth centuries) the old Ukrainian literary historians could find no inner unity in either its form or contents and, because of this, considered its basic features as simply the manifestation of individual arbitrariness, caprices, and extravagances. Paying no attention to the distinctive character of the world view of the writers of the Baroque, old historians of Ukrainian literature and culture measured the ideological content of Baroque literature according to the standards of their own times. For this reason, Baroque literature was judged as "removed from life," foreign to the interests of the people, "scholastic," of use to no one. Its form was condemned for being amazingly contrived, extremely awkward, and quite inept, etc. Compounding this severe criticism was the fact that Kotljarevs'kyj's language reforms had made the language of the Baroque "old-fashioned," archaic, and once again, "unnational."

3. Although scholars agree in large measure on the characteristics of Baroque style, there still exist many differences of opinion as to the source of the criteria which conditioned the character of the Baroque style. Even today it is widely believed that Baroque culture was the culture of the Catholic Anti-Reformation. This view completely ignores the fact that some Protestant countries and nations developed a most brilliant Baroque culture. In Ukraine, as we will see, Orthodox circles were far more active in the creation of a Baroque culture, especially in literature, than were the Catholic ones. Closer to the truth are those who see in Baroque culture a "synthesis," a coalescence of the cultures of the Middle Ages ("Gothic"), and of the Renaissance. For, in fact, the culture of the Baroque, while not rejecting the accomplishments of the Renaissance era, in many ways returned to the themes and forms of the Middle Ages. In place of the clear harmony of the Renaissance we find the complex multiplicity of the Gothic; in place of the anthropocentrism, the placing of man in the center of everything during the Renaissance, we find in the Baroque a clear return to theocentrism, with God once again occupying the central position, as in the Middle Ages; in place of the liberation of man from the bonds of social and religious norms, we see in the Baroque once again a strengthening of the role of the Church and the state. But, as we noted earlier, the Baroque likewise assumed many of the features of the Renaissance. Especially important was its complete acceptance of the "rebirth" of ancient culture. Admittedly, it interpreted this culture very differently than did the Renaissance and tried to reconcile it with Christianity. The Baroque, like the Renaissance, afforded great attention to nature, but the Baroque considered nature to be important primarily as a path to God. Neither did the Baroque reject the cult of the "noble man"; however, it sought to educate this "strong man," to bring him up to serve God. But what was peculiar to Baroque culture, and especially to its art, what gives it its distinctly individual character is the movement, the "dynamism" of the Baroque. In the plastic arts it appears in the preference for the complicated curved line over the straight line, the sharp angle or the semi-circle of the Gothic or Renaissance. In literature and life it appears as the longing for movement, change, travel, tragic emotions and catastrophes, a predilection for bold combinations, for arguments. In nature the Baroque finds in place of staticism and harmony, great stress, struggle and motion. Most importantly, the Baroque does not shy away from a decisive "naturalism," the representation of the hardest, strictest and often most unaesthetic aspects of nature. Side by side with the representation of a colorful life full of tension, we find in the Baroque a certain predilection for the theme of death. The Baroque did not consider it the role of art to awaken a calm religious or aesthetic feeling—the creation of a vivid

impression, excitement and turbulence were of greater importance. To this attempt to stir up, excite and agitate the people are tied the main traits of the style of the Baroque which manifests itself in the desire for strength, the use of exaggeration, hyperboles, the love of paradoxes and of monstrous and unusual "grotesques," contrasts, and perhaps even the predilection for large forms, for the universal, the comprehensive. These peculiar traits of the Baroque are also the source of those very dangers which threatened Baroque culture and especially Baroque art—namely, the frequent over-emphasis of form at the expense of the content, emphasis on pure ornamentation as a result of which the meaning of a passage is either completely lost or forced into a secondary role. This desire to exaggerate, to heighten every source of tension or contradiction, and all that is impressive or peculiar, brought the Baroque to an excessive fondness for artistic games, poetic sports, oddities, originality and even eccentricity. Baroque works are frequently overburdened, overloaded and overcharged with formal elements. The Renaissance school of poetics contributed to this, to some degree, since it had taught the Baroque the subtleties of the classic teachings about poetic forms and poetic devices ("tropes and figures"). In some branches of literature (e.g., sermons) declamatory, theatrical style predominated.

We must not, however, forget that Baroque art, and especially Baroque poetry, was intended for the "people of the Baroque." The style of Baroque poetry seems strange to us, although we can objectively admire its subtlety. Consistency and sensuousness excited "Baroque Man"; it enchanted him, spoke to his aesthetic senses and thereby to his mind and heart. Love of naturalism, of the depiction of nature in its "low" elements as well, and of the concrete behind which Baroque always saw the spiritual, the divine, the ideal, turned the attention of art and poetry to the thus far neglected national poetry and folklore. In Baroque poetry we see the first step towards "folk spirit" ("*narodnist*"). The Baroque found a lively interest and following among the people and it is not surprising that unusually strong influences of the Baroque can be felt in all folk poetry and folk art in Europe even to the present.

4. The significance of the Baroque era for Ukraine must not be underestimated. This was a new period of flourishing, after a long period of decline, in art and culture in general. In the history of any nation, such times of flourishing not only have a purely historical significance, but also influence its subsequent historical development, contributing to the creation of "national character" or leaving enduring marks on its spiritual physiognomy. So, it seems, it was with the Baroque era in Ukraine. The Baroque left Ukraine many constructive elements which were reinforced by Romanticism (Romanticism shared many features with the Baroque—see Chap. XI). Of course, not all the elements which



the Baroque left in Ukrainian culture were positive ones. Nonetheless, Baroque culture played no mean role in the determination of the "historical fate" of Ukraine.

5. Baroque culture is certainly not limited to those "formal" features which have been discussed above. But the religious substratum of an individual historic era is generally characterized not by one but by several religious currents, which, as a rule, converge around two diametrically opposed poles in the intellectual sphere. So it was in the Baroque era: at one pole was nature, and at the other, God. The Baroque era saw on the one hand a great flourishing of natural science and mathematics (for the study of nature for Baroque man was based on number, measure, and weight), and on the other, a flourishing of theology, attempts at theological syntheses, a great religious war (the Thirty Years' War), and great mystics. A man of the Baroque either escaped into solitude with his God, or, on the contrary, threw himself into the vortex of political strife (and the politics of the Baroque was the politics of broad general plans and desires), crossed the oceans looking for new colonies, made plans to improve the state of all mankind, be it by means of political, ecclesiastical, scientific, linguistic (the creation of artificial languages) concerns, or attempted various other types of reforms.

In their ideal form both of the possible paths open to Baroque man led to the same goal: through the "world" (nature, science, politics, etc.) man always came to the same end—to God. Whoever remained too long in this world was merely considered to have gone astray. Thus, if Gothic culture was fundamentally religious and even ecclesiastical, if Renaissance culture was fundamentally secular (although there were attempts at spirituality), Baroque culture must have had both a religious and a secular domain; however, in some instances—and not infrequently—the religious element was either very strong or even predominant. It is this very type of predominance which we find in the Ukrainian Baroque.

## B. IVAN VYŠENS'KYJ

1. Alongside the polemicists who focused primarily on the secondary issues and only occasionally referred to the fundamental problems, there appeared a writer whose works were stylistically akin to those of the other polemicists, but who was as different from them as is day from night. He stands apart mainly because he was ordained to be a writer. He is Ivan Vyšens'kyj, one of the most prolific Ukrainian writers of all times, and the only writer of his era who has not been forgotten; his popularity in later times was due in large part to Ivan Franko's poem about him.

2. Vyšens'kyj possessed the inspiration of a real prophet and for that reason, even though he often dwells on questions of only secondary importance, he succeeds in connecting the arguments of these secondary questions into a tight whole and in instilling them with such biblical-like pathos that the reader is forced to believe, or at least to feel, that the matter at hand is not trivial, but one which concerns the eternal questions of the human race. But Vyšens'kyj is not only superior to his fellow polemicists because of his style. Not infrequently, he ignores the concrete trivialities of polemics (other writers, as it were, were writing enough about them) and introduces such fundamental and basic questions that his "polemic" extends beyond the limits of his time and his country: e.g., he discusses the question of the Christian ideal of the Church—the true Church being similar not to the ruling Catholic Church, but to the persecuted and suffering early Christian Church. Such a fundamental approach is unusually refreshing and gives life to the "polemic": strangely enough, in the opinion of modern historians of literature, Vyšens'kyj was actually deviating from the "major issues" of the religious controversy.

Vyšens'kyj's style is somewhat reminiscent of that of his fellow polemicists, although more masterful than theirs. (Whether his accomplishments on the stylistic level are a result of inspiration or some literary tradition is of no importance.) The main characteristic which it shares with these other works is rhetoricism, not to be understood in a negative way, but rather as a definite literary form which expresses all its thoughts in oratorical style, exhorting, rebuking and addressing the reader. . . . But whereas we could assume that the Ostrih or Lviv polemicists were influenced by the rhetoric of the Latin school, Vyšens'kyj's style is too much unlike the "Ciceronian" style, and his views on Latin culture too negative to allow us to assume that his literary techniques were derived from ancient rhetoric. His pathos is "biblical," but his style is not particularly reminiscent of the Old Testament prophets. It is more certain that he was influenced by the sermons of the Holy Fathers, perhaps mainly by *Chrysostom*, but even here the similarity is not very great.

Vyšens'kyj differs from his contemporaries in one major area: although he may have been bound by the traditions of his time (the usual assertions about Vyšens'kyj's "lack of culture" are groundless), he considered both the Renaissance and the Reformation to be no more than the manifestations of the decline, the disintegration of the anti-Christ "heresy." What he longed for was a return to Byzantine tradition, to ancient times. If Vyšens'kyj does indeed belong to the Ukrainian "Renaissance," then he is a Ukrainian Savonarola who would not relent until all the acquisitions of the new culture had been destroyed and who never expressly outlined or developed his positive ideal. Had he done so, we

would probably have found in it not only the desire for a return to ancient times, but also a large measure of late Byzantine mysticism (Hesychasm), which had taken root on Mt. Athos where Vyšens'kyj himself had spent the greater part of his life and from where he appealed to his contemporaries and countrymen. It is not accidental that of Vyšens'kyj's works only one was published during his lifetime—a work in which he appears as a representative of the monastery on Mt. Athos, as a monk from Mt. Athos. The polemicists in Ukraine and their patrons did not set for themselves the extreme goals to which Vyšens'kyj aspired: they sought only to protect the Orthodox Church from attacks, while Vyšens'kyj clearly desired the victory of Orthodox Christianity over all other “sects and beliefs.” (We see a similarly radical approach partly in the late *Warning* and in Bronski's work.) The Ukrainian Orthodox people effected a certain synthesis of Western and Eastern cultures (the Ostrih school), and each year drew more and more heavily from the coffers of Western culture; but Vyšens'kyj accepted nothing which originated in the West. In Ukraine, desperate attempts were made to create circumstances which would allow the Orthodox Church to survive within the existing bounds of the contemporary, national and social system. Basing his views on the ideals of ancient Christian “asceticism,” Vyšens'kyj voiced such radical and negative criticisms of the political and social order that its positive counterpart could only have been “the Kingdom of God on earth.” None of his contemporaries even hoped for such a transformation of the Commonwealth (*Rzecz Pospolita*) and, if Vyšens'kyj did in fact have any real or active followers, to his Ukrainian contemporaries he would have appeared as a dangerous man. Vyšens'kyj did not develop a following because he never put forth a concrete program of action; his contemporaries (mistakenly) considered him a partner, and only because of this, his works were read, recopied (although not printed), and in this way transmitted to us.

3. One of the stylistically most characteristic of Vyšens'kyj's works (of which nineteen are known to us in addition to the previously mentioned letter of the “monk of Mt. Athos”) is the early work, *Pysanyje do vsix u Ljads'kij zemli* (*A Letter to All the People Living in Polish Lands*). In it, Vyšens'kyj in fact addresses himself not only to those of the Orthodox faith: “*Tobi v zemli, zovemoj Pol's'koj, meškajučomu ljudu vsjakoho vozrasta, stanu i preloženstva, narodu Rus'komu, Lytovs'komu i Ljads'komu v rozdilenyx sektax i virax rozmajityx sej hlas v slux da dostyže. Oznamuju vam, jak zemlja, po kotoroj nohamy vašymy xodyte v neže v žyzn' siju roždenijem proizvedeni jeste i nyini obyčajete, na vas pered Hospodom Bohom plačet', stohnet' i vopijet', prosjačy stvorytelja, jako da pošlet' serp smertnyj . . . , kotoryj by vas vyhubyty i*

*iskorenty . . . mih.*" ("May this loud call reach you the people of every age and station living in that land called Poland—Ruthenian, Lithuanian, and Polish of divided sects and varying beliefs. I announce to you that the land on which you walk with your own feet, into whose life you were brought through your birth, and where you now live, is crying, moaning, complaining about you to the Lord God begging the Creator to send forth the sickle of death . . . that it might destroy you and consume you.") This motif can be found as well in Serapion of Vladimir: "*De nyini v Ljads'kij zemli vira? De nadižda? De ljubov? De pravda i spravedlyvist' suda? De pokora? De evanhel'skyje zapovidi? De apostol's'kaja propovid'? De svjatyx zakonov? . . .*" "*Da prokljati budut' vладыky, arxymandyty, i ihumeny, kotorije monastyry pozapustivaly i fol'varky sebi z mist svjatyx počynyly i samy til'ko z sluhovynamy i pryjatel'my sja v nyx tilesne i skots'ky perexovyvajut'. Na mistax svjatyx ležačy, hroši zbyrajut'. Z tyx doxodiv, . . . divkam svojim vino hotujut'. Syny odivajut'. Ženy ukrašajut'. Sluhy umnožajut'. Barvy spravujut'. Pryjатели obohačujut'. Karyty zyždut'. Viznyky sytyji i jedynobraznyji sprjahajut'. Roskoš svoju pohans'ky ispolnjajut'. Nist' mista ciloho od hrixovnoho neduha—vse strup, vse rana, vse puxlyna, vse hnyl'stvo, vse ohn' pekel'nyj, vse bolizn', vse hrix, vse nepravda, vse lukavstvo, vse xytrist', vse kovarstvo, vse kozn', vse iža, vse meč'tanije, vse sin', vse para, vse dym, vse sujeta, vse tščeta, vse pryvydinije.*" "*Pokajtesja ubo, Boha rady, pokajtesja, doneliže pokajaniju vremena imate! . . . Hotovite dila, hotovite čystoje žytije, hotovite Bohouhodženie.*" ("Where today in Polish lands is there faith? Where is there hope? Where is there love? Where are there truth and justice in the courts? Where is there humility? Where are the commandments set forth in the Gospels? Where are the laws of the Holy Ones?" "Accursed be the bishops, archimandrites and abbots who have neglected the monasteries and made villas for themselves out of holy places and who hide themselves there, with their servants and friends and living lustfully like animals. Lying in holy places they collect their money. From this revenue they prepare dowry for their daughters. They clothe their sons. They adorn their wives. They increase the number of their servants. They acquire liveries. They make wealthy their friends. They build carriages. The coachmen want for nothing and harness horses which are matched. They live their life of pagan luxury. There is not a single place free of this immoral sickness—all is covered with scabs, sores, swellings, decay. It is all infernal fire, illness, sin and untruth, hypocrisy, cunning, insidiousness, craft, lies, caprices, straw, steam, smoke, vanity, emptiness, and specter." "Repent, for God's sake, repent while you still have time for repentance! . . . Perform your work, lead a clean life, perform deeds pleasing to God.") This is, it is true, perhaps the most "rhetorical" passage in all of Vyšens'kyj's works. But generally

speaking, he did remain faithful to this style throughout his life, always preferring the genre of the epistolary sermon. The principal works of this style are: *Porada* (Advice), a letter to the runaway bishops (1597-1598), *Kratkoslovnyj otvit Feodula* (Terse Reply of Feodul), *Začapka* (Cautious Objection), *Oblyčenie diavola myroderžca* (The Unmasking of the Devil, the Ruler of the World), *Termina o lži* (Sermon about Lying), and finally (c.1614), *Pozoryšče myslennoje* (The Spiritual Theatre).

In his works, Vyšens'kyj touches on not only the contemporary questions concerning the religious strife ("the runaway bishops" were those who had "escaped" from the Orthodox Church and joined the Union); his works often transcend his time, concerning themselves with topics which, as we see from the quotations above, were contemporary issues then, but which remain basic issues throughout all time.

4. Vyšens'kyj's program for the Church was the same in all his works and is quite straightforward—the preservation of the old: "*Do cerkvy na pravylo sobornoje xodite i vo vsim po ustavu cerkovnomu—ni prylahajušče od svojego umysla ščo, ni otimljušče . . . , ni rozdyrajušče mninijem tvorite.*" ("Go to the prescribed Church services, follow the Church rules, neither adding nor subtracting anything according to one's own imagination . . . or bringing discord through one's own opinion.") But Vyšens'kyj even urges the preservation of the archaic: "*I Evanhelija i Apostola v cerkvy na lyturhiji prostym jazykom ne vyvoročajte*" ("Do not pervert the Gospel and Epistles in Church at the liturgy in the common language"). He does, however, approve of the use of the vernacular in the sermon: "*Dlja vyrozuminnja ljuds'koho poprostu tovkujte i vykladajte*" ("Explain and teach simply, so that the people will understand"); but in his opinion, all books ought to be printed in the Slavonic language ("*slovens'kym jazykom*"; he places the Slavonic language above Greek and Latin). In general he writes: "*Čy ne lipše tebi izučyty Časoslovec', Psal'tyr, Apostol, i Jevanhelije . . . i byty prostym bohohodnykom i žyzn' vičnuju polučyty, nežely postyhnuty Arystotelja i Platona i filosofom mudrym sja v žyzni sej zvaty i v hejenu otity? Rozsudy!*" ("Is it not better for you to learn the Breviary, the Psalter, the Epistles, and the Gospels . . . and be a simple pious person and receive life everlasting, than to come to understand both Aristotle and Plato, become known in your lifetime as a wise philosopher and depart unto hell? Decide for yourself!") In his opinion, it is totally unnecessary to devote any time to the question of the Union which he rejects on the ground that it is something new. (He plays on the words *unija*—union, and *junaja*—young.)

Vyšens'kyj never urges an outright confrontation, but he does advise: do not accept ("*ne pryjmujte*") priests who have been ordained against the laws of

the Holy Fathers (“*pravyl svjatyx otec*”). In his eyes, Rome was Babylon and the king, insofar as he supported the Union, was Nebuchadnezzar. Salvation would come only if individuals preserved the old laws (*pravyla*). Regarding these and the lesser laws (*malen'ki pravyl'cja*), he wrote: “*Pravoslavnyje u malen'kyx pravylec' pry pravdi doma sydjat'; nexaj doma u malen'kyx pravylec' istyny šanujut', nexaj doma malen'kymy pravyl'cjamy sja spasajut', kotorymy . . . zapevne spasut'sja. Avy juž tam z velykymy Skaržynymy jako xočete tak sobi postupujete.*” (Let “the Orthodox faithful hold to these lesser laws at home; let them guard the truth at home in these lesser laws, let them be saved at home by these lesser laws by which their salvation is assured. And you out there with the great rules of Skarga act as it pleases yourself.”) This is not a philosophy of aggression, but of passive resistance.

5. Vyšens'kyj favors ancient times, the Acts of the Apostles and the Gospel, and rejects “Aristotle and Plato,” favors Church Slavonic books and is against their being read in the vernacular. He makes similar demands of the schools: grammar, Greek or Slavic, he still recognizes, but beyond that he seeks to replace “fallacious dialectics” (“*lžyvaja dijalektyka*”) with the Breviary, logic and rhetoric with the “pious and prayer-like” Psalter (“*bohohodno-molebnyj psal'tyr*”), philosophy with the *Octoechos* (*Os'mohlasnyk*). The lessons of the Gospels and the Apostle were to be taught by explanations which were simple rather than intricate (“*prosto a ne xytro*”). The philosophy taught was not to be that of Aristotle, the pagan teacher, but that of Peter and Paul, the teachers of the truth (“*Filosofija ne pohans'koho učytelja Arystotelja, ale pravoslavnyx Petra i Pavla*”). In later years he even devised a plan for the printing of a complete anthology (*sobornyk*) consisting exclusively of the words of Christ, the Apostles and the Holy Fathers, a plan which was partly realized 150 years later by P. Velyčkovs'kyj (see Chap. VII). It is not surprising that Vyšens'kyj, as is evident from his letters, arriving in Ukraine in the year 1605-1606, was rather unfavorably impressed by all the activity surrounding the cultural Westernization which was beginning at that time. And in one of his last works (using a concrete example), he openly rebukes those who lean toward Latin models. Admittedly, at the time this was written (before 1621) attempts were being made to have Vyšens'kyj revisit Ukraine, but it is unlikely that he would have been satisfied by the cultural conditions in his native land had he seen it even then.

6. In effect, the themes of spiritual culture are not as frequent in Vyšens'kyj as are the themes of external culture, those concerning life, and social conditions. The great change which the Renaissance wrought in the way of life in Poland is well known. This change also had an impact on the Ukrainian nobility and even on some of the clergy. The corruption of the Ukrainian clergy

before the Union is well known, but it is very possible that it was exaggerated in the polemics, and that specific cases have been generalized to include the clergy as a whole. (In Germany, for example, the corruption of the Catholic clergy, at the time of Luther and the Reformation, was already largely a thing of the past, but this did not prevent it from playing an important role in the literature of the Reformation.) In any case, it is only in his letter to the "runaway bishops" that Vyšens'kyj attacks the specific faults of particular people. In other letters he depicts the life of the clergy as a whole; it may have even been accurate for isolated cases, but isolated cases are not important for Vyšens'kyj: his picture was intended as a general one. And, as we see from some of his works, he is likewise incensed by the way of life of the laity, for his ideal was completely beyond the realm of the possible. Its logical extension could only have been a general monastic life for the whole of mankind. The unobjective, hyperbolic picture that Vyšens'kyj paints is unusually interesting from the literary point of view: it represents the first attempt in Ukrainian literature to depict the ways of life (*pobut*) of various social groups; the pictures are painted in vivid colors and with broad strokes. Such portions of Vyšens'kyj's works are well known and often quoted. Consider the following example in which Vyšens'kyj defends a monk who does not know how to carry on a secular conversation because he does not understand worldly matters: "o tyx mnohyx mysax, pivmyskax, prystavkax čornyx i šaryx, červonyx i bilyx juxax, i mnohyx skljanycjax i kelyškax, i vynax, muskateljax, malmazijax, aljakontax, revulax, medax, i pyvax rozmajityx" ("those many dishes, side dishes, black and gray broths, red and white soups, the many glasses and goblets, the wines, muscatels, in Malvasia, Alicante, Rovigno wines, meads and various beers"). "*V statutax, konstitucijax, pravax, praktykax, svarax, . . . pomysla o žyvoti vičnim pidnjaty i vmistyty ne možet' . . . V smixax, ruhannjax, prožnomovax, mnohomovstvax, kunstax, blaženstvax, šyderstvax . . . pomysla o žyvoti vičnim vydity nikoly sja ne spodobyť . . .*" ("In statutes, constitutions, laws, practical matters, arguments, . . . he could neither raise nor include any thoughts on life everlasting. . . . He will never be able to think about life everlasting amidst laughter, swearing, empty chatter, ramblings, jokes, buffoonery or mockery.") Of course it is quite natural for Vyšens'kyj to blame the bishops: "*Lupyte i z humna stohy i oborohy voločyte. Sami z svojimy sluhovynamy prokormljujete onyx trud i pot kryvavyj, ležačy i sidjačy, smijučys' i hrajučy požyrajete, horilky prepuščanyje kuryte, pyvo trojakoje prevybornoje varyte i v propast' nenasytnoho čreva vlyvajete. . . Vy jix pota mišky povni—hrišmy, zlotymy, taljaramy, pivtaljaramy, orty, četvertaky i potrijnyky napyxajete, sumy dokladajete v škatulax . . . A tije bidnyci šeljuha, za ščo soly kupyty, ne majut' . . . Tije xlopy z odnoje mysočky polyvku*

*al'bo borščyk xlebčjut', a my predsja do kil'kodesjat' pivmyskiv rozmajitymy smakamy ufarbovanых požyrajem.*" ("You flay and drag bundles and stacks of hay from the barnyard. You feed yourselves and your servants at the price of their labor and bloody sweat; lying down and sitting, laughing and playing you gorge yourselves, distill filtered alcohol, brew select beer of three different kinds and ensure perdition as you pour it into an insatiable belly. . . . Your sacks are filled with their sweat—with money, gold pieces, thalers, half-thalers, *ortas*, quarters, and thirds you fill them, always adding more to your cash box. . . . And those poor bending souls do not even have enough to buy salt with. . . . Those fellows drink up their soup or *boršč* from a single dish, while we devour tens of courses seasoned with various flavors.") Numerous similar instances have been viewed as "social protest"—whereas in truth they represent a Christian-ascetic protest, directed not against any specific form of oppression, but against all contemporary society and culture. Vyšens'kyj only rarely mentions spiritual culture, but for him it is synonymous with "malmsey" and "side-dishes"; he is likewise opposed to the "constitution," to "comedies," and even to carols (*koljady* and *ščedrivyky*)! All this, together with logic, rhetoric, Plato and Aristotle, lies beyond the bounds of ascetic monastic culture.

7. Vyšens'kyj expresses his views on the "world" in the most general and fundamental form in *The Unmasking of the Devil, the Ruler of the World*, a dialogue between the Devil and a naked pilgrim ("*holjak i strannyk*"), who represents Vyšens'kyj himself. This is a parallel of sorts to Comenius' *The Labyrinth of the World*, except that Vyšens'kyj does not depict all facets of secular life, limiting himself to those which place the reader in Christ's position when he was tempted by the Devil. From the words of the Devil it appears that he is the omnipotent lord over all spheres of earthly life. "*Dam mylosty nylišneho vika, slavu, rosliš i bohatstvo . . . Jesly xočeš byty preložonym [duxovnym] . . . ot mene iščy i mni uhody, a Boha zanedbaj . . . a ja skoro tobi dam. Jesli xočeš byskupom byty pad poklony my sja . . . Jesly xočeš papežem byty—pad poklony my sja, ja tobi dam . . . Jesly xočeš vijs'kym, pidkomorym ili sudijeju byty . . . budy doskonalyj uhodnyk mui, ja tobi dam. Jesly xočeš hetmanom ili kanclerom byty. Jesly xočeš korolem byty obiščajsja mni na ofiru v hejenu vičnuju, ja tobi i korolevstvo dam . . . Jesly xočeš xytrcem, majstrom, remesnykom rukodil'nym byty i druhyx vymyslom prevozyjty, čym by jesy i od susid proslavyvsja i hrošyky sobraty mih, pad poklony my sja, ja tebe upremudrju, nauču, nastavlju i v doskonalist' tvojego prahnennja mysl' tvoju pryvedu. Jesly xočeš poxoty tilesnoji nasytytysja i hospodarem domu, dreva i zemli šmata nazvytysja, pad poklony my sja, ja tvoju volju ispolnju, ja tobi ženu pryvedu, xatu dam, zemlju daruju . . . tol'ko pojiščy, poprahny i mni sja*



*poklony, vsja syja az tobi dam.*" ("I will give you all the favors of today's world: honor, luxury, and wealth. . . . If you want to be cleric of superior rank . . . seek this from me, be pleasing to me and neglect God, . . . I will grant this to you quickly. If you want to be a bishop, fall down on your knees before me. . . . If you want to be a pope, fall down on your knees before me, and I will grant it. . . . If you want to be a warrior, a chamberlain, or a judge, fall down on your knees before me and I will grant it. . . . If you want to be a hetman or a chancellor . . . , serve me willingly and effectively, and I will grant it. If you want to be a king, promise yourself to me as an offering for eternal Gehenna, and the kingship will be yours. . . . If you want to be a cunning person, a skilled man, a master of handicrafts and want to surpass others with your skills which would make you famous among your neighbors and would enable you to collect your money, fall down on your knees before me and I will make you all-knowing, I will teach you, direct you and will bring you to perfection in whatever field you choose. If you wish to satisfy bodily pleasures and be called the master of the house, woods and land, fall down on your knees before me and I will fulfill your wish, I will bring you a wife, give you a house, present you with land . . . you have only to seek, desire and fall down before me, and I will grant you all of this.") The "Pilgrim" responds to the Devil on behalf of all mankind: ". . . Što za požytok z toho darovannja, koly od tebe, dyjavola, za hordist' z nebesa na dil zverženoho, toje dostojinstvo pryjmu, a ne od nebesnoho Boha? . . . Što ž za požytok z toje vlasty pastyrs'koji, koly ja rab, nevil'nyk i vjazen' vičnyj hrixovi jesm', za kotoryj v hejenu vičnuju otydu? . . . Što ž my za požytok z toje maloji roskošy, koly ja voviky v ohni pečysja i smažytysja budu? . . . Što z my za požytok z toho svojeho myrs'koho tytulu, koly ja carstva nebesnoho tytul pohublju? Što ž my za požytok z toho . . . korolevstva, kanclerstva al'bo vojevodstva, koly ja synovstvo božije straču, bezsmertnyj tytul? . . . Što ž my za požytok z slavy i česty susidskoji, koly ja v lyku . . . dobre Bohu uhodyvšyx slavytysja ne budu? Što ž my za požytok z mnohyx fol'varkiv i ozdob domku, koly ja krasnyx dvoriv hornoho Ijerusalyma ne uzrju . . . Što ž my za požytok z toje ženy, koly ja Xrysta, ženyx [v] svojeji ložnyci serdečnij pryšedšeho uspokojtysja i spočynuty, vydity ne mohu? . . . Što ž za požytok z toje maloji zemlyci i hruntyku, koly storyčnoji zaplatty rečennoji Xrystom v carstvi nebesnim za ostavlenije syx ne pryjmu i žyvota vičnoho naslidnykom i didyčem byty ne mohu? . . . Preto da znajesh, dyjavoľe, jak ja od tebe žony, domu, zemli dočasnoji ne prahnu, tobi poklonytysja ne choču. Hospodu Bohu . . . poklonjusja i tomu jedynomy poslužu." ("Of what advantage are your gifts if by accepting these honors from you, the Devil who was thrown out of heaven for your pride, I must reject those from God who is in heaven? . . . Of what advantage are those

pastoral powers if I myself become a servant, a slave, a perpetual prisoner of sin, for which I will be condemned to Gehenna forever? . . . Of what advantage are those small pleasures, if I will have to bake and fry in the fires forever? . . . Of what advantage are worldly titles if I lose my title to the heavenly kingdom? Of what use the kingship, chancellorship, or command if I lose my filial ties to God, my eternal title? . . . Of what use glory and honor among my neighbors, if I am not glorified among those who have pleased God? Of what use the many manorial and household decorations, if I will not see the beautiful courtyards of heavenly Jerusalem. . . . Of what advantage that wife if I will not be able to see Christ, the bridegroom come, in the chamber of my heart, to calm and rest himself there? . . . Of what benefit that small bit of land, of earth, if I do not receive rewards a hundredfold in the kingdom of heaven promised by Christ to those who foresake all these, and if I cannot be the heir, the inheritor of life everlasting? Furthermore, O Satan, know that I desire from you neither wife, nor home, nor temporal lands, and will not fall down on my knees before you. I will fall down on my knees before the Lord God . . . Him alone will I serve.")

To be a pilgrim ("*strannyk*," "*pel'grym*"—words which Vyšens'kyj uses frequently) is a Christian's only possible attitude to the world. Vyšens'kyj would like to say of himself as did Skovoroda: "*Svit mene lovyv, ale ne spijmav*" ("The world tried to catch me but did not succeed"). For, in Vyšens'kyj's opinion, the world was not only in sin ("*v hrisi ležyt*"), but was also totally within the domain of the Devil. This brief dialogue expresses most vividly Vyšens'kyj's attitude to the "world" and all secular culture in general.

8. There is no doubt that Vyšens'kyj highly cherished the Christian ideal. This is best seen in his attitude to his neighbors, likewise interpreted as a "social protest." Vyšens'kyj, however, does not demand some sort of rights, "statutes," for the lower classes, but a Christian brotherhood encompassing all mankind: "*Dobre, nexaj budet' xlop, kožemjaka, sidel'nyk i švec! Ale vspomjanite, jako brat vam rivnyj u vsim jest' . . . Dlja toho, iž vo jedyno treipostasnoje božestvo i odnym sposobom z vamy sja krestyv . . . I odnoju pečatiju Duxa Svjatohto na xrystijanstvo zapečatan jest'*" ("Fine, let there be a peasant, a tanner, a saddlemaker and a shoemaker. But remember that your brother is equal to you in all things. . . . For this reason, there is only one God, although in three persons, who was baptized in the same manner as were you. . . . And who is likewise sealed in Christianity by the stamp of the Holy Ghost"). While it is true that Vyšens'kyj wishes to eliminate existing social differences, he wants to establish other new ones: "*Podvihom i viroju dil'noju možet' byt' kožemjaka od vas lipšyj i cnotlyvijšyj . . . Daleko xlop od šljaxyčča roznist' majet'. Xto ž jest' xlop i nevil'nyk? Til'ko toj, kotrij myru semu jako mužyk, jako najmanec', jak*

*nevil'nyk služyt'.*" "Xto ž jest' šljaxyč? Tot kotorij z nevoli myrs'koj k Bohu vernet' i svyše sja od Duxa Svjatoho porodyt" ("Through his effort and by means of an ardent faith the tanner can be better and more valuable than you. A peasant is very different from a nobleman. Who then is a peasant and a slave? Only he who serves this life like a muzhik, like a servant, like a slave. . . . Who then is a nobleman? He who returns to God from the prison of the world and is reborn again from the Holy Ghost").

The only path to God in Vyšens'kyj's view is an inner or spiritual one; it is a mystical path, a path of self-purification and self-enlightenment, a path the Hesychasts of Mt. Athos had rediscovered from the traditions of the ancient mystics: the mystic, "*svoje načinnja dušenosnoje očystyv . . . i tot sosud duševnyj sl'ozamy pomyv; postom, molytvoju, skorbmy, bidamy, trudom i podvyhom vyžeh, vypik i vypolerovav, i novoje čystoje nasinnja bohoslovija posijav*" ("cleaned the vessels of his spirituality . . . and washed these spiritual dishes with his tears; he heated it, baked it and polished it through fasting, prayers, humility, poverty, hard work and good deeds, and planted it with new and clean divine seeds"). Purification leads to "*osv<sup>vy</sup>ščenija uma ot*" *kotoroho sja i tělo svētī*", . . . *za kotorym*" *ider*" *v*" *dospěvšyx' neizrečennaja radost', utěxa, myr*", *slava, lykovanie i toržestvo neizrecennaja so anhely*" ("the enlightenment of the mind by which the body is also enlightened . . . which is followed by radiant and unspeakable joy, happiness, peace, glory, rejoicing and undescribable celebrating with the angels"). There is no doubt that in Vyšens'kyj's view, the ideal type of person was one who had reached this stage of "maturity," i.e., a mystic.

"Social injustice" and "worldly teaching" are the two obstacles on the road to inner perfection and it is for this reason that Vyšens'kyj fights against them. In any case, it would be unjust to depict him simply as a social radical and a cultural reactionary: both his "radicalism" and his "reactionary" tendencies have as their source a singularly important motive—mystical asceticism.

9. In citing passages from Vyšens'kyj for the purpose of pointing out the characteristic features of his world view, we were able to present at the same time material which was typical of his style. It is the same rhetorical style as that of his fellow polemicists. In Vyšens'kyj, however, there is much more ornamentation: he clusters epithets, comparisons, questions, exclamations. His linguistic artistry is so great, however, that these accumulations do not create an unfavorable impression. Vyšens'kyj's nouns and verbs are always weighty, colorful, and saturated with meaning. His language is unusually close to the vernacular. It has already been pointed out that this rhetorical style is in the tradition of the religious literature of the Renaissance. However, Vyšens'kyj's works also

resemble those of certain Polish writers—Rej, Wujek, and Skarga. Some passages are even reminiscent of the writings of the Czech Protestant, Havel Žalanský; even more frequent are those passages which are stylistically related to the works of Comenius. There remains only one question: how could Vyšens'kyj, who completely rejected all that was modern, especially secular education, become so concerned with the spirit of his time, come so close to the rhetorical style of the Renaissance, the Reformation and the Baroque? For he states quite explicitly: *"A latynoju zo vsim na vsim ostavymo . . . Ni jix nauky . . . slušajmo! Nyže jix xytrosty na naše . . . polerovanije učymsja! . . . My že budem pered očyma jix po evanheliju—prosti, hlupi, nezlobyvi! Dosyt' nam spasty nas samyx!"* ("But we will abandon Latin in everything and for everything. . . Nor will we listen . . . to their teachings! Nor will we learn their cunning for our . . . advancement . . . For before their eyes we will be as [described] in the Gospel—simple, ignorant and meek! It is enough for us that we save ourselves!").

The spirit of the times overwhelmed Vyšens'kyj as a stylist. But he remains one of the best examples of the fact that a genius can rise above the limitations of his epoch, its stylistic limitations, and his own limited world view, for in his magnificent style, his originality, his combinations of the ponderous and the light, he comes very close to the best examples of Baroque style which did not become dominant until almost the end of Vyšens'kyj's life.

10. Completely unsuccessful and built on misconceptions are the recent attempts to compare Vyšens'kyj and the Russian Avvakum. The only similarity between them is the originality of their language. But, whereas in Avvakum this originality takes him beyond the bounds of religious problems to the question of his own personal tragedy, Vyšens'kyj's is a bold attempt to speak about deep theological questions in a "simple language" and we must acknowledge that he was highly successful in what he attempted to accomplish. Avvakum's theological sermons (we are not speaking of his "autobiography"), on the other hand, only demonstrate his complete lack of understanding of theological problems. Vyšens'kyj's linguistic talents led him to develop a new literary style—Baroque; Avvakum's language (perhaps "unfortunately") led Russian literature nowhere, and remained only a useless offshoot in the development of Russian literary language.

## C. LITERARY BAROQUE IN UKRAINE

1. The Literary Baroque in Ukraine is a phenomenon of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The Baroque plastic arts were sometimes designated as "Cossack Baroque" but such a term is misleading, for the Cossacks were by no

means the only culturally productive group in Ukraine at that time. There is even less ground for referring to the Literary Baroque as "Cossack": Ukrainian writers of those times were, in the main, not Cossacks but monks, and the principal consumers of literature were by no means the Cossacks. In Ukraine, the Baroque was not the universal phenomenon it was in the West, for in it we see the heavy dominance of religious elements over secular ones. A greater dominance of this type can perhaps only be found among the Czechs. Secular elements are not totally absent: there are secular lyrics, and novellas, and occasional secular elements in drama. Finally, there are secular chronicles, letters, and scientific tracts. But "religious" elements are the dominant elements of content. Completely absent are treatises on natural science which were so characteristic of the Baroque in general: at first there was simply no institution (of higher learning) which would foster this type of literature, and later (in the eighteenth century), Ukrainian natural scientists were able to find receptive ground only in foreign (Russian) scholarly literature.

2. Ukrainian and foreign elements in Ukrainian Baroque literature merge into not entirely usual forms. Ukraine, as we saw, did not possess a distinctive or characteristic Renaissance literature. As a result, the penetration into literature of secular elements, especially familiarity with classical antiquity, was still underway in the Baroque era and was never transformed into a struggle, or a revolution against Church tradition. The culture of antiquity did not come to Ukraine until after its reconciliation with Christianity, in the form of the Baroque synthesis of the Christian and the mythological. For this reason, slowly but relentlessly, the use of mythological images spread: religious lyrics are protected by the ancient "Muse," the Blessed Virgin becomes "Diana," the cross is compared to Neptune's trident, Amor and Cupid appear in mystical treatises, etc. The Baroque was established on Ukrainian territory without any great literary struggle and took root like a new plant on fruitful soil. The only person who might have fought against the Baroque, Ivan Vyšens'kyj, was actually very close to the Baroque in his literary style (see above), and was therefore quite likely instrumental in its success. Vyšens'kyj, however, would have never accepted "syncretism," the merging of Christianity and antiquity.

3. When did the Ukrainian Baroque begin? This is a complicated question not only for Ukraine: having begun in southern Europe around the middle of the sixteenth century, the Baroque was only able to slowly supplant the traditions of the Renaissance in some countries. In Ukraine, the first writer in whom we see signs of the Baroque style is Ivan Vyšens'kyj: his long digressions, accumulation of parallelisms, bold contrasts, his oratorical, or rather, his prophetic style, the almost unbelievable accumulation of formal embellishments (which never

obstruct nor detract from the content) would justify the inclusion of his works in the literature of the Baroque, if only the sources of his style had been different: but his sources are the Scripture and the Church Fathers, and perhaps most of all, *Chrysostom*. It is true that Vyšens'kyj may have already been familiar with the Baroque style from Polish polemical literature and may have been influenced by it. However, his ideology is also foreign to the Baroque: he did not wish to synthesize the valuable elements of the Renaissance with old traditions, but rather to return to pure tradition. The curious example of Vyšens'kyj's "baroqueness" before the Baroque, however, characterizes the affinity of the Baroque and the Ukrainian religious style; similarly typical is the "baroqueness" of the haughty "late Byzantine" style of some of the pages of the *Galician-Volhynian Chronicle*.

The real beginning of the Baroque comes with Meletij Smotryc'kyj, the sermons, and in part the poems of Kyrylo Trankvillion Stavrovec'kyj; and the triumph of Baroque with the founding of the Kievan Academy. The cultural-political accomplishments which played a significant part in the history of Ukrainian Baroque literature were the following: the reestablishment of the Orthodox hierarchy in 1610, and the founding of the Kievan Academy in 1615 and its reforms which were carried out by Mohyla (1644), and by Mazepa (1694). The new hierarchy and the professors of the Academy were the main representatives of the Baroque.

The Baroque, which began unnoticed and developed quite slowly, dominated the Ukrainian literary scene for an unusually long period of time and was unusually tenacious. Almost throughout the entire eighteenth century, Ukrainian schools of higher learning taught Baroque poetics, and nurtured Baroque poetry. Almost never overstepping the bounds of tradition (though he effected some decisive reforms regarding specific questions) was H. Skovoroda, the last great writer of the Baroque era. With him, the flame of Baroque literature not only burned more brightly, but reached the peak of its intensity and burned itself out completely. It died out at the same time as did the literary language of the Baroque: in its place came the native language (vernacular).

In some countries, the final period of the Baroque era created a style of its own, "Rococo." This courtly style, light and gracious, although at the same time playful and frivolous, did not develop in Ukraine, for in the middle of the eighteenth century there was no court in Ukraine and the noblemen who were fashion-conscious became greatly Russified. Only in the north, at the Court of Empress Elizabeth, was there an attempt to develop a Ukrainian Rococo, which was only reflected in some Ukrainian lyric poetry, in the rewriting of some folk poetry, and the musical rendering of others. A few attempts at original creations

were made, but they had neither literary pretensions nor literary significance.

4. The Ukrainian Baroque, like the era of Romanticism, was a time of borrowing not only from contemporary works, but from old ones as well. Writers sought out what had been neglected for centuries. Translations of literature dating from the Middle Ages, and even works of the fathers of the Church in new linguistic attire, arrived in Ukraine at this time. This is typical of periods of literary flowering; it was in this way that Shakespeare was later brought to Ukraine by the Romantics and the Realists. And just as the Romantics and Realists perceived Shakespeare in their own way, so also did the era of the Baroque perceive the works of olden times. Just how the people of the Baroque viewed these old works has not yet been established.

5. The Baroque changed and developed in the relatively brief period of its existence: from its beginnings through high Baroque (which was given various names in various countries, usually according to the most outstanding representatives of its style—Gongorism, Marinism, etc.), and finally, to Rococo. In Ukraine, the change was neither as decisive nor as noticeable. Some time after 1680, Ukrainian literature experienced a period in which the style was unusually flowery, overburdened with formal decorative elements (I. Velyčkovs'kyj, Stefan Javors'kyj), but there was no lack of representatives of the more moderate school and, what is most important, religious writers approached the literary radicalism of the secular poets only in exceptional cases. There followed a politically instigated decline which rarely favors literary radicalism.

On the other hand, the poetics of the Ukrainian Baroque did sustain certain rather radical reforms, notably those made by Skovoroda; however, Skovoroda's reforms had not yet taken root by the time the Baroque period came to an end.

6. Ukrainian Baroque literature did not develop the great variety of genres associated with the Baroque in other countries: circumstances hindered the development of many genres, notably secular ones. An especially significant factor was the difficulty of getting certain types of works printed: for this reason there were no long novels, for they were not suitable for distribution in handwritten copies and almost no epics, not even in translation (for exceptions, see below). We have, then, the following genres to discuss: 1) lyrics, 2) epics, 3) tales, 4) dramas, 5) sermons, 6) chronicles, 7) treatises. Some genres, however, found widespread popularity and were developed extensively.

Much of Baroque literature in Ukraine is still somewhat unfamiliar to us, although we are acquainted with a relatively large number of authors. There remain many writers about whom we know nothing or very little more than their names.

7. A very interesting problem is presented by the language of Ukrainian

Baroque literature. It remains fundamentally Slavonic, as in the previous period, but having absorbed a large number of elements of the vernacular language of the people, it did not function according to any set norms. For this reason we find many deviations—sometimes towards the vernacular language, sometimes towards Polish, sometimes—only in the eighteenth century and then only rarely—towards Russian, sometimes towards elements of the Church Slavonic. The language varies with the genre of the work or even within a particular genre—one part to another: e.g., in certain dramatic scenes, the language approaches the vernacular. A similar tendency can be found in humorous songs, whereas the tendency towards Polish is characteristic of works originating in the circles of the nobility (e.g., “emblematic verse”). Some forms foreign to the Ukrainian language became the standard in cases where the Ukrainian form did not seem logical; for example, the Polish model for the use of the past tense of the verb was adopted (*pysalem, pysales*’, etc.), and probably became widespread because it seemed clearer and more logical a form than *pysav*, which had replaced the old forms (*pisal*” *esm*’, *pisal*” *esy*, etc.). There are other similar examples. But the Ukrainian language always differed greatly from the Muscovite type of Church Slavonic, so that “translation” from one language to the other became ever more frequent as did the “revision” of Ukrainian texts which came to be printed in Moscow. (This ruined many Ukrainian works of the Baroque period which were printed only in Moscow.) A closer relationship between Ukrainian and Russian did develop in the eighteenth century—when the Russian language was influenced by Ukrainian: the number of Ukrainians among the translators (even in the seventeenth century) in government, in ecclesiastical positions, and later in the universities was so significant, that many Ukrainian elements found their way into Russian bureaucratic court and educational terminology, and finally even into scientific vocabulary. There might well have been an element of national self-preservation in the fact that Kotljarevs’kyj completely rejected the traditions of old (Baroque) Ukrainian to which Russian had become so similar, and began to create a new literary language on an entirely new base—the vernacular. This marked the end of Baroque literature, which had outlived its time, and the beginning of a new epoch in Ukrainian literature.

#### D. VERSE POETRY

1. Old Ukrainian poetry was later forgotten, more than likely because of its “outdated” language, but also because of the verse form it used. As we saw (Ch. VI, pt. G), versification began in Ukraine immediately before the Baroque period. Under the influence of Polish verse, Ukrainian verse adopted in Baroque



times the “syllabic” form, in which the rhythm of the verse derived from the set number of syllables in a line; each line ended with a feminine rhyme, as also in the Polish, i.e., with the stress on the penultimate syllable. Only as an exception were masculine rhymes (with the stress on the last syllable) and dactylic rhymes (with the stress on the third syllable from the end) permitted.

Consider the following example of syllabic verse. The theme is one of the favorite Baroque themes, death—the lines concern Sahajdačnyj’s funeral:

*Koždyj, xto sja urodyv, musyt' i umerety,  
 Žaden sja čolovik smerty ne možet' operety.  
 Nemaš na nju likarstva, nemaš i oborony;  
 Z samyx carej zdyrajet' svitnyji jix korony,  
 Ne bojit' sja žovnistva, vkruh carja stojačóho  
 Z oružijem i stril'boju, jeho vartujučóho . . .*

*Žyješ tak, jakobys' nihdy ne miv umerety,  
 Xočeš vsi bahatstva na zemli požerety,  
 V čim slavy porožnej na tom sviti sukaješ,  
 A že maješ vmerety, na to ne pamjataješ.*

(“Everyone who is born must also die,/ No man can avoid death./ There is no medicine against it, no manner of defense;/ Even tsars lose their glorious crowns to it,/ It is not afraid of the soldiers standing around the tsar/ Protecting him with munitions and arms. . . ./ . . . You live as though you had never to die anywhere,/ You want to devour all the wealth of the earth,/ That which you seek on earth is only vain glory,/ But that you must die, this you forget.”)

Or another poem on the same theme by monk Klementij:

*Ubohyj vmyrajučy ni v čim ne žalijet',  
 ničóho bo žalovat', že skarbov ne mijet'.  
 Bohatyj že ne xočet' z skarbom rozlučyty:  
 gdy by moščno, mih by uves' skarb v trunu vložit'.  
 Bo gdy vlastel, to vspomnyt' svij vysokij tytúl,  
 i pred konannjem mnoho z skarbom uzryt' škatúl,*

*I mnohocinnyx mnoho vysjaščyx sukmaniv,  
i sribjanyx na stolax stojaščyx dzbaniv,  
I uzryt', že mladaja žona pred nym xodyt',  
taja hirš do kripkoho žalju pryvodyt' . . .*

("The poor man regrets nothing when he dies/ he has nothing to regret since he has no wealth./ The rich man does not want to part with his riches:/ if it were possible, he would want to put all his wealth in his coffin./ For wherever there is a landowner, he remembers his high title,/ and before death he will see his many coffers of wealth,/ And his many priceless robes,/ and the silver jugs on the tables,/ And will see his young wife walking before him,/ and this will bring him deeper regrets. . . .")

The lines of a syllabic poem need not always be of identical length; Ukrainian Baroque poets created many stanza forms based on lines of various lengths; e.g.,

*Smotry, čoloviče, i užasajsja,  
Každoj hodyny smerty spodivajsja,  
Xodyt' bo tajno, nahljadajet',  
I dil tvojix rozsmotrjajet',  
Kak by ty žyv.*

*Ne zryt' na proz'bu ani na dary.  
Jak tja, čoloviče, viz'mut' na mary,  
Mynut' mysly i rozkoši,  
Ščo jesy zbyrav.*

("Look, man, and beware,/ Expect death at any hour,/ For it stalks secretly and watches,/ And observes what you are doing,/ And how you might be living.

It does not look at pleas or gifts,/ When you, man, are put on a funeral hearse,/ The thoughts and pleasures will pass,/ Which you enjoyed.")

Ukrainian poets make use of approximately 150 different strophic forms.

Side by side with syllabic verse, we sometimes find a type of verse close to folk tradition and similar to that of the *duma*, with its lines of uneven length. Kyrylo Trankvillion Stavrovec'kyj generally used this kind of verse; sometimes we come across it later as well—even St. Dmytro Tuptalo wrote his “personal” verses in this metre. Stavrovec'kyj treats the theme of death in the following way:

*De moji nyny zamky koštovne murovanyji  
i palacy moji svitne i slične maľovanyji,  
a škatuly, zlotom nafasovanyji,  
viznyky pid zlotom cugovanyji?  
De moji presvitlyji zlatotkannyji šaty,  
rysi, sobole sličnyji, karmazyny i dorohyji škarlaty?*

*Včora v domu mojim bylo hojne vesillja, muzykiv ihrannja,  
a spivakiv veseloje spivannja,  
i na trubax midnyx vykrykannja,  
skoki, tanci, veseloje pljasannja;  
vyna nalyvaj,  
vypyvaj, prolyvaj!  
Stoly moji koštovnymy sladkymy pokarmy pokrytyji,  
hosti moji pryjатели personsy znamenytyji.  
A nyny mene vse dobroje i veseloje mynulo,  
Slava i bahatstvo naviky uplynulo.*

*De nyny vojinove hordlyvyji  
i mučyteli nevynnyx zloslyvyji?  
De s(t)rohyji i strašnyji het'manove?  
Nespodivane smertnym mečem posičeni  
i bez pam'jaty vo t'mi nyny zaključeni.*

*O smerty strašlyvaja  
i nežaloslyvaja!  
Ty, jako kosar nyny nerozsudnyj,*

*pid nohy svoji kladeš cvit barzo cudnyj,  
molodosty i krasoty žalovaty ne znaješ,  
ani na jedynim z tyx mylosty ne maješ . . .*

("Where are my fortresses now, fortified at such expense/ and my palaces magnificently and wonderfully decorated,/ and the coffers full of gold,/ the coachmen teamed together in gold?/ Where are my most dazzling gold-trimmed garments,/ my lynxes, beautiful sables and expensive crimson robes?/ . . . Yesterday in my home there was a lavish wedding feast, with music playing,/ singers merrily singing,/ brass horns blaring,/ people jumping, dancing, clapping joyously;/ pour the wine,/ drink it, spill it!/ My tables were covered with expensive but sweet dishes,/ my guests and friends were famous personages./ Yet today all these good and happy things have passed from me,/ Glory and wealth are gone forever./ . . . Where are those proud warriors now/ and those wicked torturers of the innocent?/ Where are the strict and awesome hetmans?/ They were cut down by the unexpected sword of death/ and are now locked in obscurity and forgotten./ . . . O death, terrible/ and unmerciful!/ You act today like a hay-cutter lacking judgment,/ you let lovely flowers fall under your feet/ you have no pity for youth or beauty,/ nor do you show kindness toward any of these.")

Only rarely were poems ever published; they were generally copied by admirers—religious or secular. Occasionally this resulted in large hand-written collections. Ukrainian verse spread not only to the very borders of the Ukrainian lands but even beyond to Polish and Russian readers. Only small collections dedicated to specific persons or events (e.g., Sahajdačnyj's funeral) were published; but by the end of the seventeenth century, some of the better poets had published large collections. In the eighteenth century, a religious songbook, *Bohohlasnyk*, an interesting collection of religious lyrics of the Ukrainian Uniates, appeared in print.

Baroque writers often sought to "cycle" their poems, to put them in definite groups united by some inner elements, one of the latest and most

interesting collections being Skovoroda's *Sad božestvennyx pěsnej* (*Garden of Divine Songs*).

2. The religious song is the most frequently found type of Ukrainian Baroque verse. It assumes various shapes: we find here Christmas and Easter hymns, numerous songs about the Blessed Virgin, songs about particular holy days, about icons and miracles, songs dedicated to particular saints, etc. Besides these prayer-like songs and hymns we also find subjective religious lyrics: songs of "contrition," songs about death and about the Last Judgment.

The style of these religious songs varies greatly: from the hymn or ode to the Baroque grotesque song, a semi-parody which sought the most original expressions and often approximated the folk song.

Let us examine the various styles of Christmas songs:

*Vyflijeme hrade, hojne veselysja,  
Caru slavy myle svomu poklonysja!  
Vitaj, Caru, naroždenij  
i v jaslex položenij.*

*Pivci hučno, vdjačne pisni začynajte,  
Vysočajšym hlasom Pana pryvitajte!  
Vitaj, Caru . . .*

*Oraz vse stvorinnja do Tvorcja spišysja,  
Jedynomu Panu slušne poklonysja!  
Vitaj, Caru . . .*

("O town of Bethlehem, rejoice lavishly,/ Bow down kindly before your King of Glory!/ Welcome, newborn King,/ lying in a manger./ . . . Singers, loudly strike up your songs of thanksgiving,/ Greet the Lord with voices most high!/ Welcome, King. . ./ All creatures hurry at once to the Creator,/ To pay homage to their only Lord!/ Welcome, King. . .")

Or (Skovoroda's translation from the Latin):

*O noč' nova, dyvna, čudna,  
jasnišaja svitla poludnja,  
kohda črez mrak temnij, černij*

*blysnuv soncja svit nevečernij.  
Veselytesja, jako z namy Boh!*

*Tam pid Vyflyjems'kym hradom  
pastuxy, pasu<sup>šč</sup>e stado,  
vsix pervije vist' pryjemljut',  
ščo k nam pryjde Xrystos na zemlju,  
črez angeliv, jako z namy Boh! . . .*

("O wondrous, strange, new night,/ brighter than the  
noonday sun,/ as when through the dark black fog/  
the bright rays of the sun broke through./ Rejoice,  
for God is with us!/ . . . Not far from the town of  
Bethlehem/ shepherds minding their flocks,/ are  
the first to receive the news from the angels,/ that  
Christ will come to us on earth,/ for God is with  
us! . . .")

Alongside these odes we find original pseudo-Baroque ones:

*Soberitesja, vsi čoloviky,  
na trijumf nyni, angeliv lyky,  
spivajušče veselo  
vyskakujte navkolo:  
hoc, hoc, hoc, hoc, hoc, hoc, hoc, hoc!*

*Bo nam Marija, Diva Prečysta,  
v ubohij šopi zrodyla Xrysta,  
kotoromu xot' v bidi  
hraet' Hryc'ko na dudi:  
hu, hu, hu, hu, hu, hu, hu, hu!*

*Havrylo staryj zlovyy barana,  
uzjavšy na pleč'i, zanis do Pana,  
na koljadu darujet'  
i v nohy cilujet':  
cmok, cmok, cmok, cmok, cmok, cmok,  
cmok, cmok!*

*Marija Diva sja prytuljajet',  
 aby ne zmerzlo, Dytja vkryvajet',  
 prytyskajet', prytuljajet',  
 peljuškamy obvyvajet':  
 lju, lju, lju, lju, lju, lju, lju, lju, lju!*

*A u bydljatok osel iz volom  
 stojaly v jaslex, xuxaly spolom,  
 ohrivaly Dytjatko,  
 nevyynnoje Jahnjatko:  
 xu, xu, xu, xu, xu, xu, xu, xu, xu!*

("All men join together,/ rejoice today, hosts of angels/  
 are singing joyously,/ dance around:/ hop, hop, . . . !/  
 For our sake, Mary, the Blessed Virgin,/ brought forth  
 Christ in a poor stable,/ Hryc'ko plays on his pipe for  
 Him despite his poverty:/ toot, toot, . . . !/ . . . Old  
 Havrylo caught a sheep,/ and, placing it on his shoul-  
 ders, took it to the Lord,/ offering it to Him as a gift/  
 and kissing His feet:/ smack, smack, . . . !/ . . . The  
 Virgin Mary draws Him closer,/ covers the Child so  
 that He does not feel the cold,/ presses Him close,  
 draws Him near,/ covers Him with swaddling  
 clothes:/ lulla, lulla, . . . lullabye!/ Among the calves,  
 a donkey and an ox,/ stand in the manger, breathing  
 together,/ warming the Child,/ the innocent Lamb:/  
 whoo, whoo, . . . !")

There are thirteen such verses, each of which is also aptly "instrumentalized" (similar games can be found in German Christmas songs). There are also semi-parodies in the vernacular:

*Anhely svjatyji  
 dnes' dajut' znaty,  
 bo ššly pastyri  
 Boha vitaty.*

*A berehamy  
 Kas'jan lanamy  
 viz pyva bočku  
 tomu Otročku.*

*Savka z Jakymom  
z svojim pobratymom  
skoro pribihaly,  
zaraz zaspivaly.*

*Pylyp z Makarom  
pryjšov iz darom,  
pred Bohom staly  
i kurku daly.*

*Tuš iz Xomoju  
polonynuju,  
a Stax z Borysom  
pribihly lisom.*

*Usi pekari,  
molodi, stari,  
bižut' z orači,  
nesut' kolači.*

*A Marko ledom  
prybih iz medom,  
prudko stupajet'  
i vsix vitajet'.*

*Hraj že ty mylo  
v dudky, Kyrylo,  
a ty, Matviju,  
hraj v žolomiju.*

("The holy angels today tell the shepherds to go to greet God. . . . Savka and Jakym, his close friends, come quickly, immediately strike up a song. . . . Tuš and Xoma come over the high plain, Stax and Borys through the woods. And Marko runs over the ice with some honey; he moves smartly and greets everyone! And along the banks through the grainfields Kas'jan comes bringing a barrel of beer for this Child. . . . Pylyp and Makar come with a gift, stand before God, and offer a chicken. . . . All the bakers, young and old, come running with the plowmen carrying braided loaves. Play pleasingly on your flute, Kyrylo, and you, Matvij, play on your reed pipe!")

We need not be surprised that some of these songs became folk songs; even poems in the high style became part of the repertoire of *lirnyky* (lyre players).

3. Secular Baroque verse is much more varied thematically. Here we find melancholic lyric verse which is similar to the religious, erotic lyrics (ranging from melancholic to obscene), and political lyrics.

The themes of melancholic lyrics are the traditional "eternal" themes found in all lyrics—a longing for happiness and youth, complaints about one's fate. Occasionally personal notes are sounded amidst the philosophical reflections. Most characteristic are the various "worldly songs."



*A xto na sviti bez doli vrodýt'sja,  
 Tomu svit marne, jak kolo, točýt'sja.  
 Lita marne plynut', jak bystryji riky,  
 Časy molodiji, jak z došču potiky.  
 Vse to marne minjajet'.*

*Lipše by sja bylo nihdy ne rodyty.  
 Nižly mizernomu na sim sviti žyty.  
 Al'bo, vrodývšysja, skoro v zemli hnyty,  
 Ščoby bezdol'nomu na sviti ne žyty.  
 Nexaj žalju ne bude!*

*Ej, dole ž moja, de ty v toj čas byla,  
 Koly moja maty mene porodyla?  
 Koly b meni kryla orloviji mity,  
 Poletiv bym doli svojejì hljadity  
 Na čužyji storony.*

("And for him on earth who is born without good fate,/ The world is to no purpose, and he turns around senselessly like a wheel./ Vain years flow past like quick moving rivers,/ Youthful days like rivulets of rain./ Everything passes in vain./ It would have been better never to have been born,/ Than to live unhappily in this world./ Or else, having been born, to quickly rot in the earth,/ Rather than live in the world miserably./ Let there be no regrets!/ Oh, Fate of mine, where were you at the time/ My mother gave birth to me?/ If I could don the wings of an eagle,/ I would fly to look for my fate/ In faraway places.")

Or:

*. . . po sviti blukaju, otrady ne maju,  
 žalju ž mij, žalju, sam že ne znaju,  
 ščo čynyty maju.*

(" . . . I wander over the earth, there is no hope for me,/ regrets, oh my regrets, I myself do not know/ what I ought to do.")

Or:

*Trudno syrotynci na čuzyni žyty. . .*

("It is a hard life for an orphan in a strange country. . . .")

Or:

*Xiba meni taja budet' ščyraja rodyna,  
sažen' na cvyntari, vysoka mohyla.*

("Perhaps this one will prove to be a sincere family for me,/ the high burial mound when I am six feet under at the cemetery.")

Or various complaints about man's fate:

*O vsesujetnoho svita  
mymo idut' naši lita,*

*Rozstupit'sja vody, ot zemli vstupite,  
Junist' molodosty ko mni pryvernite!*

("Past the everboring world/ pass our years/ Waters divide! separate from the earth,/ and return me to the days of my youth!")

But this melancholy is often transformed into philosophical reflection: "Happiness, where do you live?" asks Skovoroda, and reflects:

*Rozprostry vdal' vzor tvij i rozumni lučy  
i kinec' poslidnij pomynaj.  
Vsix tvojič dil v kuju mit' strila ulučyt'?*

("Direct your gaze and your knowing rays into the distance/ and remember the ultimate end./ At what time will the arrow hit all that you have accomplished?")

Man himself was the author of his own fate and thus the subjective lyric merges with the religious lyric. However, the aphoristic form and images in some poems are formally akin to the folk song. Such, for example, is the following song by Skovoroda:

*Stojit' javir nad vodoju,  
 vse kyvajet' holovoju,  
 bujny vitra povivajut',  
 ruky javoru lamajut' . . .  
 Na ščož meni zamyšljaty,  
 ščo v seli rodyła maty?  
 Nexaj u tyx mozok rvet'sja,  
 xto vysoko v horu dmet'sja.  
 A ja budu sobi tyxo  
 korotaty mylyj vik . . .*

("A maple stands by the water,/ it always nods its head,/ wild winds are blowing/ they break the maple's hands. . . ./ Why should I care/ that my mother gave birth to me in a village?/ Let him worry his head,/ who aspires to great heights./ But I will quietly/ while away a pleasing life. . . .")

Here also we see the lyricist's longing for nature:

*Ne pidu v horod bahatyj. Ja budu v poljax žyt'.  
 Budu vik mij korotaty, de tyxo vremja bižyt'.  
 O dubrava! O zelena! O maty moja ridná!  
 V tobi žyzn' uveselenna, v tobi pokij, tyšyna.*

("I will not go into the rich city. I will live in the fields./ I will pass my time, where time passes quietly./ O oak woods! O verdure! O dearest mother of mine!/ In you is the joyous life, in you is there quiet and peace.")

Or:

*O seljanskij mylij ljubyj mij pokoju,  
 vsjakoji pečali lyšennyj!  
 O istočnykiv šum, žurčašcyx vodoju,  
 o lis temnyj, proxlaždennyj,  
 o šumjašči kudri volosiv drevesnyx,  
 o na lukax zelen' krasna,  
 o samota—maty rady dum nebesnyx  
 o sumna tyxist' užasna . . .*

("O, my favorite sweet country stillness,/ devoid of any sadness!/ O bubbling spring, gurgling with water,/ o cool dark forest,/ o branches rustling with leaves,/ o beautiful verdure-covered meadows,/ o solitude—mother of joyous heavenly thoughts/ o this sad quiet is frightful. . . .")

(This is actually a translation from Latin made by Skovoroda.)

Side by side with these are erotic lyrics with similarly traditional motifs; here we find both first love and declaration of it:

*Nist' bo v vertohradi takovoho cvita,  
krasotoju, dobrotoju sred samoho lita . . .*

("For in the whole garden there is no flower,/ of such beauty and goodness, not even in the very middle of the summer. . . .")

Or:

*Zryš prečudno očenkamy až serden'ko mlije,  
duša horyt', serce bolyt', krasnaja lelija.*

("You look so beautifully with your eyes that my heart becomes faint,/ my soul burns, my heart is sore, you are like a beautiful lily.")

Or:

*Da j po sadon'ku ja xožu,  
da j ne naxožusja,  
ja na tebe, moje serce, hljažu,  
da j ne nahljažusja.*

("And I stroll through the orchard,/ and I cannot find myself,/ I keep looking at you, my love,/ but I will never see my fill.")

But love also encounters various problems:

*Xto v sekreti ljubov tyxo deržaty ne bude,  
tot propade za sobaku, jak diznajut' ljude.*

("He who will not keep his love in secret quietly,/ will  
perish like a dog when people find out about it.")

The greatest problem is parting:

*ryba z ryboju i ta sja zlučajet'  
moja slična dama mene pokydajet' . .*

*Čornyji oči, čornyji brovy,  
usta saxarni, zubon'ky perlovi,  
tjažen'ko vas spomynaty,  
ščo nel'zja z vamy rozmovljaty.*

("Even a fish comes together with another fish,/ but  
my beautiful lady is leaving me. . . ./ Black eyes and  
black brows,/ a sweet mouth, little pearly teeth,  
how it hurts to remember you,/ and now I cannot  
speak with you.")

He does not even know where his loved one lives:

*O, rozkošnaja Venera, de nyny obcuješ?*

*Vyxodyv ja vsi dorožen'ky,  
vytoptav ja vsi stežen'ky,  
ne znajšov ja mylen'koji,  
de xodyly nižky jeji . . .*

*Pryšly, Bože, den', čas, hodynon'ku tuju,  
ačej bym de znajšov divčynon'ku svoju.  
Ščob juž bil še ne tužyty,  
holovon'ky ne sušyty,  
molodyx lit svojix  
marne ne hubyty . . .*

("O beautiful Venus, where are you today?/ I have  
travelled over all the roads,/ trampled all the paths,  
yet I could not find my sweetheart,/ nor where her  
little feet had trodden. . . ./ Send me, dear God, the  
day, the time, that happy hour,/ that I might find  
my little girl./ So that I would no longer have to

yearn for her,/ worry my little head,/ and spend my  
youthful years in vain. . . .")

A widely used motif was the sending of messages by carrier pigeons:

*Pyšu ja lystonky, na vsxid posylaju.  
Syvi holubonky, nexaj mni šakajut'  
molodoji divčynonky,  
v kotroji čorni očenky . . .*

*Na zapadnu stranu poslalem horlyci,  
a na juh i na siver—orly, lastovyci.  
Idit', v pylnosty šukajte,  
a mni vidomist' davajte . . .*

("I am writing a note, sending it to the east./ Let the gray  
pigeons find for me/ a young girl,/ with dark eyes. . . ./  
To the country on the west I sent turtle doves,/ and to  
the south and north—eagles and swallows./ Go and care-  
fully search,/ and bring any news to me. . . .")

Or:

*A ty, orle, bujajučy,  
v čystim poli huljajučy,  
dodaj krylec' dopomočy,  
poletity na vsi nočy  
mylen'koji šukajučy.*

("And you, soaring eagle,/ living in the open fields,/  
add your wings, give some help,/ to fly every night/  
looking for my love.")

And erotic lyrics, by means of comparisons which were possibly borrowed from old folk songs and descriptions of surroundings where the love affair is taking place, evolved into lyrics about nature:

*Popid haj ričen'ka  
da šumyt' bystren'ka,  
ryba do rybon'ky,  
a ja do divon'ky.*

("Down in the meadow is a stream/ which rushes quickly,/ one fish swims to another, and I go to my girl.")

Here we see both the language of the folk song and the phraseology of the nobility ("Venus," "Lady," etc.).

Ukrainian Baroque lyrics also devoted much attention to the political events of that tumultuous era. We find national heroes being honored: Sahajdačnyj—

*Nesmertel'noji slavy dostojnyj Het'mane!  
tvoja slava v movčannju nihdy ne zostane,  
poky Dnibr z Dnistrom mnohorybnyje plynuty  
budut', poty dijal'nosty tež tvoji slynuty.*

*Tut zložyv zaporozs'kyj Het'man svoji kosty,  
Petr Konaševyč, rannyj v vijni dlja vol'nosty  
otčyzny . . .*

("O Het'man, worthy of immortal glory!/ your glory will never become silenced,/ as long as the Dnieper and Dniester flow resplendent with fish/ so long will the glory of your deeds live among us./ . . . Here the Zaporozhian Het'man laid down his life,/ Peter Konaševyč, wounded while fighting for the freedom of his fatherland. . . .")

And Xmel'nyc'kyj (Skovoroda):

*Bud' slaven vo vik, o muže izbranne,  
vil'nosty otče, heroju Bohdane!*

("Be forever praised, o chosen man,/ father of freedom, our hero Bohdan!")

*Cest' Bohu, xvala! Na viky slava vijs'ku Dniprovomu . . .  
I ty, Čyhyryne, misto ukrajinne, ne menšuju slavu  
Teper v sobi maješ, koły ohljadaješ v rukax bulavu  
zacnoho Bohdana, mudroho het'mana, dobroho molodcja  
Xmel'nyc'koho čyhyryns'koho, davnoho zaporožcja.*

(from the *Chronicle of Jerlyč*)

(“Honor to God, and praise! Perpetual glory to the army of the Dnieper. . . / And you, Čyhyryn, Ukrainian city, no less glory to you/ You have now within your walls the mace in the hands/ of the worthy Bohdan, a wise het’man, a good fellow/ Xmel’nyc’kyj of Čyhyryn, an old Zaporozhian Cossack.”)

But in Ukraine, there was no less cause for “weeping” and “lamenting” over political and national difficulties and calamities:

*O Bože mij mylostyvyj,  
vozzry na plač mij revnyvyj!  
De bidnycja jest’ takaja,  
jak ja, Rosija Malaja?*

*Vsi matkoju nazyvajut’,  
a ne vsi za matku majut’;  
druhuj xoče zahubyty,  
v ložci vody utopyty.*

*Oj, ne syny, oj, ne dity,  
xoščut’ mene zahubyty!  
Ljaxoljubci, lyxoljubci,  
tiji moji, tiji zhubci . . .*

(“Oh my gracious God,/ look down upon my bitter tears!/ Where is there another woman as wretched,/ as I, Little Russia?/ Everyone calls me mother,/ but not everyone treats me as such;/ others want to destroy me,/ drown me in a spoonful of water./ O these are not my sons, and not my children,/ who want to destroy me!/ They who love the Poles, who love evil,/ these, these are my slayers. . . .”)

Tradition ascribes the lovely song “*Oj bida, bida čajci nebozi*” (“Oh Woe, Woe, the Poor Gull”)—which has all the traits of an artificial origin—to Het’man Mazepa. The song “*Vsi pokoju ščyro prahnut’*” (“Everyone Sincerely Longs for Peace”) is definitely Mazepa’s.



*Zžal'sja, Bože, Ukrajiny,  
ščo ne vkupi majet' syny!*

*Lipše bulo ne rodyty,  
nižli v takyx bidax žyty!  
Od vsix storin vorohujut',  
ohnem, mečem rujinujut' . . .*

*ozmitesja vsi za ruky,  
ne dopustit' hor'koj muky  
Matci svojij bil's terpity!  
Nute vrahov, nute byty!  
Samopaly nabuvajte,  
ostryx šabel' dobuvaite,  
i za viru xoč umrite  
i vol'nostej boronite!*

("God, have pity on Ukraine,/ whose sons are not together!/ . . . It would have been better never to have given birth,/ than to live in such straits!/ They are warring on all sides,/ ruining with fire and sword . . ./ . . . all of you grasp hands,/ do not allow your/ Mother to experience any more bitter suffering!/ Come, come now, fight the enemy!/ Get your muskets,/ find your sharp sabres,/ and die for the faith, at least,/ and defend all liberties!")

There is even a poem which tradition ascribes to the "last Zaporožian Cossack," Antin Holovatyj, "*Ej hodi nam žurytysja pora perestaty*" ("Hey, we have done enough worrying, it is time to stop"), written on the occasion of the Zaporožian settlement in the province of Kuban' in 1792.

Ukrainian poets also sang about the battles with the Tatars, and the Xotyn War, and the siege of Vienna. Some of these poems reached epic proportions (see below, pt. D).

We find other forms of secular verse as well: "scholarly" (e.g., in the praise of science and the arts in the Kievan *Evxarysterion*—(Eucharisterion, 1632), humorous (e.g., student verses), etc. Many are verses of welcome or panegyrics

(to E. Pletenec'kyj, P. Mohyla, the hetmans). There are verses of the ballad type, i.e., short narratives in verse form; a collection of these, for example, was published in 1705 by Ioan Maksymovyč, under the title of *Alfavit ryfmamy složennyj* (*An Alphabet Put Together in Verse*), which contains stories about punishments and wrongdoings, sins and godlessness.

4. Especially favored in Baroque times were epigrams, short verses of not more than two or four lines, very witty and abounding in puns, and consonances and repetitions. Religious verses of this type (praising the saints) were often grouped together in a cycle of 12 verses, called *vinci* (garlands). Some epigrams found their way even into liturgical texts, e.g., in the *Trioda Cvitnaja* (*Triodion for Eastertide*) of 1631:

*Sredě Učytelej stav'' Isus'' naučæet.  
V Sredu Prazdnykov, jako Posrednyk'', javljaet''.*

("Jesus teaches, while standing among the teachers./ One Holy Wednesday he appears as an intermediary.")

Here we find a play on the root, *sred*. Later, St. Dmytro Tuptalo also wrote such cycles of verse: e.g.,

*Záčataja bez hrixa, o Božija Maty  
Molju dažď mi bezhrišno žytije začaty.*

("Conceived without sin, o Mother of God/ I pray you, grant me to begin my life without sin.")

(Here we have a repetition of the roots *začat* and *hrix*.)

The master of the secular epigram was Ivan Velyčkovs'kyj, the archpriest from Poltava. His epigrams are witty and biting.

*Ščo jest' smert', pytaješ mja. Esly bym znæv, uže  
byv by mertvym. Jak umru, pryjdy v toj čas, druž'e!*

("You ask me what is death. If I knew/ I would already be dead. When I die, come then, my friend!")

*Čomu sut' mudrišije muževe, niž žony?  
Bo z rebra bezmozkoho, ne z holovy ony.*

("Why are men wiser than women?/ Because women were created from a senseless rib, and not from the head.")

Or a longer one:

*Ščos' boz'koho do sebe pan Xmil' zakryvajet',  
bo smyrennyx vynosyt', vyneslyx smyrjajet'.  
Vyščije sut' holovy nad vsi člony tyla,  
a nohy tež v nyzkosty smyrenni do zila.  
Leč pan Xmil', gdy do koho v holovu vstupajet',  
holovu ponyžajet', nohy zadyrajat'.*

("Mr. Hops is concealing something godly in himself,/ for he raises the humble and humbles the proud./ The head is higher than any other part of the body,/ and feet which are the lowest are most inclined towards evil./ But when Mr. Hops enters somebody's head, he lowers his head and raises his feet.")

These are unusually precise translations of the well-known English Baroque epigrammatist John Owen. But Velyčkovs'kyj also wrote some original epigrams which were equally successful:

*Pyšuščemu styxy:*

*Truda suščeho v pysaniji znaty  
ne možet', iže sam ne vist' pysaty.  
Mnyt' byty lehko pysanija dilo:  
try persta pyšut', a vse bolyt' tilo.*

*Lěstvyca Iakovlja:*

*Svit sej snu jest' podoben, a ščastja—drabyni:  
vosxodjat' i nyzxodjat' po nij mnozi nyny.*

("To the writer of verse: The toil involved in writing/ can never be known by him who knows not how to write./ He thinks it is an easy thing to write:/ three fingers write but the whole body aches"; "Jacob's ladder: This world is like a dream, and happiness—a ladder:/ many people climb up and down it today.")

A large collection of epigrams (369)—longer ones, of ten or more lines—were left by the well-known, poorly educated, but very talented and witty poet, priest and monk, Klymentij. The themes of his epigrams vary greatly: we find here didactic verse, verse about craftsmen and other professions (e.g., musicians), satirical verses and verses on various strange themes; for example, “*O kotax*” (“About Cats”):

*Izvykly koty oči xmuryt', hlavy xovat' . . .*  
 . . . . .  
 . . . . . *na peči sobi potjahajut',*  
*a zskočyvšy iz pečy po horškax nykajut'.*  
*A povynnist' bo kotam myšy ulovljaty,*  
*a bil's takyx, ščo vmijut' z mysok vosxyščaty,*  
*a osibnyj zvyčaj jix v sudna nanykaty,*  
*ježely xto zabudet' suden nakryvaty.*  
*A jest' takyj ljuďe, ščo toho ne dbajut',*  
*jednakože z toho sobi vredytel'nist' majut' . . .*

(“Usually cats screw up their eyes and hide their heads . . . / . . . they curl up on the stove, / or, jumping down from the stove, prowl around the pots. / But the duty of a cat is to catch mice, / but most of them, who find delight in bowls, / have the special custom of inspecting dishes, / especially if someone has forgotten to cover them. / And there are some people, who do not even mind / while others consider this to their own detriment. . . .”)

In some of his verses, Klymentij makes very unusual statements:

*Kotryj, movjat', čolovik dobre vypyvajet',*  
*tedy takomu pan Boh na pyvo davajet' . . .*

(“The man, they say, who drinks up well / will get money for beer from God. . . .”)

It is true that this is only a saying (*movjat'*), but Klymentij does perceive some “spiritual” benefits in drinking:

*... dobre, gdy ztroxa horlo promočylo:  
do ljudej vyrazniše budet' hlaholaty,  
i v cerkvi na krylosi hladšej zaspivaty.  
Začim, panove, sobi zdorovi buvajte,  
a gdy ly kolvik pyvo dobre potjahajte.  
A v holovi zdorovij vse ne perebyraj,  
da všeljakyj napytok zdorovno vypyvaj! . . .*

("It is good for a man to occasionally wet his throat:/  
he will speak more distinctly to people,/ and in church  
will sing more smoothly from the choir./ And so, men,  
fare ye well,/ and drink up your beer heartily./ And  
do not mull things over in a healthy mind,/ but in  
health drink up all manner of drinks! . . .")

In another poem he offers advice to musicians as well:

*Nexaj že bez linosty i muzyky hrajut'  
i veselosty ljudjam molodym dodavajut'.  
A nahravšysja nexaj troxa j spočyvajut'  
da po povnij skljanj horilky vypyvajut'.*

("Let the musicians, as well, play without laziness/  
compounding the joys of young people./ And having  
played a while, let them rest a bit, too,/ and drink a  
full glass of whiskey each.")

In Skovoroda's epigrams, which are short and akin to proverbs, there are no verbal games:

*Komu menše v žyzni treba,  
toj blyžaja vsix do neba.*

\* \* \*

*Ne to skuden, ščo ubohyj  
a to ščo želajet' mnoho.*

\* \* \*

*Lučše mni suxar z vodoju  
nežely saxar z bidoju.*

("He who needs less in life,/ is closer to heaven than the rest"; "He is not indigent who is poor,/ but he who demands too much"; "Dried bread and water are better, for me/ than sugar and troubles.")

With the epigrams are often included "burial verses" (epitaphs) and the like. Epigrams (even entire *vinci*) were incorporated into dramas and into prose works (e.g., Skovoroda's dialogues, the popular didactic work, *Dioptra*, the chronicles of Jerlyč and Velyčko, etc.).

5. Especially popular in Baroque times were "emblematic" verses. These were brief epigrammatic verses which accompanied drawings ("emblems")—in other words, short descriptions with some symbolic significance. In his works, Skovoroda expounded an entire theory of "emblematics": "The wise men of old had their own language, they painted their thoughts in pictures as if they were words. These pictures were representations of heavenly and earthly creatures. For example, the sun represented truth, the circle—eternity . . . , the dove—modesty, the stork—shyness . . .".

In Ukraine the emblematic literature of the West was not unfamiliar. Some of it was translated (well-known collections: a Latin one by the German, Hugo, a Spanish one by Saavedra). A collection of original emblematic verse, *Yfika ijeropolitika* (*Ethica Hieropolitica*), was frequently republished. Some excerpts from this collection:

*Xotjaj Hospoda istynno ljubyty,  
vo strasi Hospodni počšysja xodyty.  
Siju bo ljubov strax Hospoden' rodyt',  
jako vitr plamen z uhlija izvodyt'.*

("At least to love the Lord sincerely,/ humble yourself to walk fearful of the Lord./ Such love is kindled by the fear of the Lord,/ just like the wind draws out the flame from a coal.")

(There is a picture of a fire being blown up by the wind.)

*Prostranno more syl'ni imat' volny,  
malyja riky ne tako dovol'ni,  
v čaši i six nist', ne dvižut'sja vody,  
i smirenija takovy sut' plody*

("Far and wide the sea is covered with strong waves,/ small rivers are not so unrestrained,/ in the chalice there is none of this, the waters do not move,/ such are the fruits of humility.")

The picture portrays the sea, a river, and a glass of water; the idea expressed is the same as in Skovoroda's poem, "*Stojit' javir nad vodoju*" ("A Maple Stands by the Water") quoted above, no. 3. Prokopovyč also wrote emblematic verses and was preparing to publish a whole cycle of them dedicated to the memory of Metropolitan Varlaam Jasyns'kyj. Here is an extract:

*Vsi riky iznačala malyje byvajut',  
no, tekušče put' dovhij, vody umnožajut'.  
Podobni i Varlaam učenija rady  
prejde strany mnohije i mnohije hrady.  
I tako, od otčestva daleče stranstvuja,  
zilo sebe umnožy premudrosty struja*

("All rivers are small to begin with,/ but as they flow along their long journey, their waters increase./ Similarly, Varlaam for the sake of learning/ travelled across many countries and many towns./ And so, wandering far away from home,/ the stream of wisdom multiplied itself.")

(Here, probably, there was to be painted a river which increases in size as it flows ever further from its source.)

*Siji cinu javljajut', vydjat' bo xudaja, —  
voznosjat', i dolu nyzxodyt' druhaja.  
I dobroditel' ljubyt' tožežde mirylo,  
zilo bo čestna vo vsim, smyrjajet'sja zilo.  
Se že bo vo Varlaami izrjadne javysja:  
česten bo bi pače vsix, pače vsix smyrysja*

("These show the price, for they see it is low,—/ as they raise it, another comes down./ And the virtuous man likes that measure,/ for it is very honest in everything, and truly humbles itself./ This appeared espe-

cially in Varlaam:/ for he was more honest than others  
and humbled himself more than others.”)

(Here scales were to have been drawn.)

A variation on emblematic verse was “heraldic” verse, found on coats of arms, unusually popular in Ukraine (as early as in the sixteenth century), especially in the dedication of books. Such verse was to explain the drawing on the coat of arms of the person being honored. Consider, for example, this excerpt from the verse on Mohyla’s coat of arms:

*... Dva meči v spravax rycers'kyx smilist' pokazujut';  
lylija z xrestom viru xrystyjans'kuju znamenujut'.  
V tim domu ščyryja pobožnist' obytaet',  
a slava nesmertel'naja naviky obyvaet'.*

(“The two swords show boldness in chivalrous matters;/  
the lily and the cross represent Christian faith./ In this  
household dwells sincere piety,/ and its immortal glory  
will last forever.”)

6. Very characteristic of Baroque poetry are “versified quips,” whose significance must not be overlooked: they were manifestations of a definite accomplished virtuosity in the manipulation of a poem. Ukrainian poets were very fond of such games. One of the most popular forms was the acrostic, where the first letter of each line or each strophe formed the name of the author. Consider this short acrostic by St. Dmytro Tuptalo (it spells DIMITRI):

*Daruj mni Tebe, Xrysta, v serci vsihda čyty,  
Izvol' vo mni obyaty, blah mni javljajsja,  
Mnohohrišnym, nedostojnym ne vozhnušajsja!  
Izčeze v bolizni žyvot mij bez Tebe, Boha;  
Ty mni kripost' i zdravije i slava mnoha.  
Radujusja az o Tebi i veseljusja,  
I Toboju po vsja viky, Bože mij, xvaljusja.*

(“Grant me, Christ, always to have You in my heart,/   
Live in me, and be merciful to me,/ Do not abandon  
this unworthy sinner!/ My life will pass in sickness  
without you, God;/ You are my strength, my health,



and my glory./ I rejoice in You and am merry,/ And  
I will praise You, my God, forever.”)

Sometimes, some letters of the poem were written or printed in the upper case; when these letters were read separately, they also formed the name of the author. In some cases, it was necessary to calculate the numerical value of the letter (in the Slavic alphabet) to get the year the poem was written. These are “caballistic” poems. Compare this example also by St. Dmytro Tuptalo:

*IŽE v Runi inOhda preobrazovanna,  
Maty sOtvoršoho NAs vsiX zdi napysanna,  
Duševno I Mysllju Tu knyžku pRYmite,  
SAmi je Vnymajušče, I druhym proČtite.*

(Ieromonax Dimitry Savič)

The greatest master of figured verse was Velyčkovs'kyj. He cunningly works his name into the most varied little poems, e.g. (the capital letters must be read separately):

*Iz nesOzdANNa otca vosijavyj ěyste,  
VELYČaju z matKOju tja VseSladKIJ Xryste!*

Or:

*I O smerty pAmjataj,  
i Na sud'' bud' čutkyj  
VEL'mY Čas běžyt' sKoro  
V bžhu Svojym'' prudKYJ*

or even in reverse order (the words “*nastroj navpak cynobru*,” literally—“reverse the vermillion”—advise the reader to read the letters written in red vermillion in reverse order):

*NAstrOJ navpak'' cynobru, esly uhadaješ'',  
horšYY Kto z Syx'', VOIK'' ČY LEV'', to  
mene poznaješ''.*

(“Read the red letters in reverse, to see if you can guess,/ which of these—wolf or lion—you will recognize as me.”)

It seems there is no word he cannot incorporate into his poems; thus, as a great worshipper of the Blessed Virgin, he incorporates the name Maryja into verses employing leonine rhyme:

*MAty blaha, RYza draha, JAže nas kryet  
MALodušnyx, RYzonužnyx, JAko runo, hrěet.*

Velyčkovs'kyj also wrote "crabs," verses whose lines can be read in both directions, from the beginning or from the end, letter after letter, or word after word:

*Anna pyta my, ja maty panna,  
Anna dar i mně šěn' myra danna,  
Anna my maty i ta my manna.*

This is, of course, the Blessed Virgin speaking about her mother, St. Anna.

Velyčkovs'kyj also wrote the best "alphabet verses" in which each word or line begins with a different letter of the Slavic alphabet, in alphabetical order:

*Az blah vsěx hlubyna,  
Děva edyna.  
Žyvot začax zvanym,  
Isusa izbrannym,  
Kotrij ljude mnoju  
Na oběd pokoju  
Rajska sobyraet,  
Tune učreždaet.  
Umne Fenyks Xryste,  
Otče carju čyste,  
Šestvuj ščedrotamy,  
Matere mol'bamy.*

(There are two "u"s and two "o"s since in the Church alphabet there were two different letters for these sounds.)

To Velyčkovs'kyj belong also verse puzzles:

*So sm" bohom" děžl  
nop nas" st bljusty bude.*

—where the underlined letters had to be read according to their names in the Slavic alphabet ("gryphic verse"), so that it would actually be read thus:

*So Slovom Bohom'' dobro est' zyvot'', ljudy,  
naš'' On'' pokoj, nas'' Slovo tvrdo bljusty bude.*

(“With God-the-Word, people, life is good,/ He is  
our comfort, the Word will protect us securely.”)

Verses with “echoes” were also common. In these, the final syllables of the poem were repeated, giving an answer of sorts. Sometimes verses were written to correspond to definite shapes: cross, half-moon, egg, cup, etc.

Such games manifest the sheer joy of poetic virtuosity, of the ability to deal ably with verse forms. The content did not always play a significant role. It is hard to understand why later literary historians attacked “figured” verses and criticized them so severely; among those attacked was the monk-priest Klymentij, who had written “*Raxuba drevam roznym*” (“An Enumeration of the Various Trees”) in three verses. It was the first poem to be written in Sapphic verse (three lines of twelve syllables and a fourth with eight syllables):

*Dubyna, Hrabyna, Rjabyna, Verbyna,  
Sosnyňa, Klenyňa, Ternyňa, Vyšnyňa,  
Jalyňa, Malyňa, Kalyňa, V'jazyna,  
Lozyna, Buzyna, Bzyňa . . .*

(“Oak, Yoke, Elm, Rowan, Willow,/ Pine,  
Maple, Bramble, Cherry,/ Fir, Raspberry, Cran-  
berry, Elm,/ Osier, Linden, Elder. . .”)

Some poets were particularly concerned with euphony; the masters of euphony were Velyčkovs'kyj and St. Dmytro. An excellent example of euphonic mastery can be found in an anonymous dialogue between a man and God about “faith and good deeds.” The dialogue is directed, evidently, against the Protestants. In it, separate words and even syllables are repeated so that together they form a mosaic of sound.

*Vira i dobroditel' sut' to dvoje kryla,  
na dvojix tix vsja vysyt' spasenija syła.  
Ne možet' jednym krylom ptycja ponestysja,  
ne vozmožno samoju viroju spastysja . . .  
I vira krasna v dilex, ne krasno bez viry  
dilo i vira bez dil ne krasna bez miry.*

("Faith and good deeds are two wings,/ on these two is suspended the entire strength of salvation./ A bird cannot rise on a single wing,/ and it is impossible to find salvation through faith alone. . . ./ And faith is beautiful in good deeds, which are not beautiful without faith,/ good deeds and faith without good deeds are not beautiful if they lack measure.")

In the first four lines separate sounds are repeated; we give them according to the lines:

vir-d-d-dv-kryl  
n-dv-vs-v-s-s-s-s  
ne-mož-kryl-p-p-st-s  
ne-možn-s-vir-sp-st

In the last two lines, entire words (underlined in the text) are repeated.

7. Baroque poets approached the verse form with the utmost care. Although we may not care for their language, we cannot help but be impressed by the almost unfaltering attention given to formal questions. With time, the teaching of "poetics" in religious institutions resulted in a firm mastery of the form by Ukrainian poets. Masculine rhymes almost disappeared. However, enjambements, the running over of one line into the next (see above, Velyčkovs'kyj's epigram about death), came to be very freely used. Rhymes became richer, and similar grammatical forms were only unwillingly rhymed (*znaješ–maješ*, *darujet'–cilujet'*, *berehamy–lanamy*); wherever possible different grammatical forms were used ("ungrammatical" rhymes were favored; for example, *zamyšljaty–maty*, *uže–družē*, *bude–ljude*, etc.). Because of this, the verse seems freer and lighter.

In the middle of the eighteenth century, Skovoroda effected a further reform by introducing "masculine" rhymes (with the accent on the last syllable), previously allowed in only exceptional cases. Skovoroda writes entire poems with rhymes, such as: *tvojej–sej*, *otbižyt'–žyt'*, *žyvot–rod*, *pečat'–blahodat'*, etc. In Ukrainian, such rhymes are actually quite natural and are frequently employed in the modern period.

Skovoroda also introduced incomplete rhymes, where the endings differ somewhat: *suvory–ternovyj*, *nyvax–nežyva*, *xrest–perst'*, etc. This reform reflects the spirit of the language: incomplete rhymes are one of the most attractive features of Ševčenko's poetry (the beginning of "*Kateryna*"—

“Catherine”: *nen'ky-serden'ko, hovoryt'-hore, pokryta-potužyty, vtyraje-spivajut', plače-bačyv*).

Later, poets used ever more varied forms, e.g., the “cantos” found in dramas. Dissatisfied with simply rhyming the final words of the lines, poets began to rhyme words within the lines as well. Such “internal rhyme” can be seen in the following excerpt from Skovoroda where we find both incomplete and masculine rhymes:

*Jazvy tvoji surovj/ –to moja pečat',  
vinec' mni tvij ternovyj/ –slavy blahodat',  
tvij sej ponosnyj xrest—  
se mni xvala i čest',  
o Iisuse!*

(“Your painful wounds/ –this is my seal,// your crown  
of thorns for me/ –the grace of glory,// yours is this  
heavy cross—// this for me is praise and honor// O  
Jesus!”)

And from Konys'kyj:

*Čysta ptycja,/ holubycja,/ takov nprav imijet':  
bude misto,/ de nečysto,/ tam ne počijet' . . .*

(“The pure bird, the dove, is peculiar/ in that it will not  
rest in an unclean place. . .”)

Ševčenko was also fond of internal rhymes:

*ne dvi noči/ kari oči . . .  
ni rodyny/ ni xatyny . . .  
zmaljuvala,/ ne sxovala . . .*

The verse technique of the Ukrainian Baroque demonstrates the great attention paid by Baroque poets to formal problems and the careful work done on the verse form.

## E. THE EPOS

1. Neither a prose nor a verse epos developed in Ukraine. There are two main reasons: first, the Baroque did not create in Ukraine a class of poets, a

distinct circle of writers who might consider poetry as their vocation; clerics or monks were the only professional writers. For secular authors, literature remained an avocation. In addition, there were no opportunities to have secular literature printed. Together, these two factors greatly hindered the development of the epic genre. Nevertheless, some works of epic nature do exist from that time.

2. Half of a translation of Torquato Tasso's *Jerusalem Liberated* survived in manuscript form. We can assume that the translators in the Baroque period considered this poem to be an instructive work. It appears that the poem was translated by (Belorussian?) Uniate monks. The translation was made not from the Italian original, but rather from the Polish translation of P. Kochanowski. The Ukrainian translation is cumbersome, and lacks the lightness of both the original and the Polish translation. Oftentimes, however, it aptly renders the epic quality and especially the broad ("extended") metaphors with which, as we will see, Ukrainian poetic theory was also concerned. For example,

*Argilljan . . . pobiže žyvot svijna šancu postavyty.*

.....  
*Jako i mesk vo pans'kyj stajni urodyvyj,  
 Jeho že točiju ku brani okormljajut',  
 Ehda že sja on urvet', bižyt' nevstjahlyvyj  
 Na sinožati ily de stada pasajut'.  
 Vyneslym karkom trjaset', a u hustoj hryvy  
 Pletenyje kosy so vitramy ihrajut',  
 Pisok v bystrom bihu kopytamy meščet',  
 I ržet' hlasom velijim, i nozdrjamy pryščet'.*

("Agrillan will run and put his life in the hands of chance./  
 . . ./ For he even lives in the master's handsome stable,/ And they feed him for war,/ But as soon as he breaks loose, he gallops never stopping/ To the hayfields or to where the flocks are grazing./ His proud neck shakes, and the braids of his mane frolick in the wind,/ He pounds the sand with his horseshoes as he gallops on,/ Neighing loudly, his nostrils quiver.")

Equally typical for the epos is the following description of morning (the translation is in the stanza known as the "octave"):

*Dyxajuščemu vitru zary, vsim želannoj,  
Taja od stran vostočnyx radostno zjavljaše,  
Imijušče na travi vonnosty rožanyj  
Vinec', iž vsim vonju sladku ispuščaše,  
Ščō zrjašč vsjakyj vojin javlejsja byt' otvažnyj,  
Jehože hlas trub sladkyx k tomu vozbuždaše,  
Posližde vsja tympany hlas svij izjasnyša,  
V to vremja vse množestvo voj sja opolčyša.*

("Like the light breeze at dawn which everyone longs for,/ The one which joyously rises in the lands of the East,/ Which covers the grass with the fragrance of a rose/ A wreath, which envelops everything else with its sweet fragrance,/ Seeing it, every soldier appeared emboldened,/ Encouraged by the sounds of sweet trumpets,/ Then the sound of the drums was clearly heard,/ And simultaneously a multitude of soldiers prepared for battle.")

As we see, we cannot expect much from the translation of a secular epos, done by a writer accustomed to writing sermons and using ponderous Slavonicisms. The translation, it seems, was never published, nor did it receive widespread distribution. An attempt at a short historical epic by Bučyns'kyj-Jaskol'd about the war in Čyhyryn in 1678 was preserved in Velyčko's *Chronicle* (see below). Some historical poems, because of their length, almost qualify as examples of the historical epos. However, the Ukrainian Baroque did not produce a single great epic.

3. Several religious epics have been preserved. The Baroque, with its return to religion, produced a great number of different types of religious epos—various "Christiads," etc. Inspired by this same spirit of epic poetry was the versification of the Book of Genesis and the Gospel according to St. Matthew. Both were even printed in 1697, and dedicated to Hetman Mazepa by their author, Samijlo Mokrijevych. His works have not yet been properly studied, and the condemnations and a rather negative reception given him by old scholars must be approached with some scepticism, for these scholars were generally incapable of dispassionately evaluating Baroque poetry. Among the attempts at a religious epos one could also mention a versified Apocalypse of which, unfortunately, only excerpts were printed. To the "learned" or didactic epos belong such works as I. Maksymovych's "*Bohorodyce Divo*" ("Hail, Virgin, Mother of God"—23,000 lines!), and his "*Osm' blazenstv*" ("Eight Beatitudes"—6,000 lines). Neither of

these works has yet been closely studied. At this point in time, the negative stand taken towards his poetry appears to be totally unfounded.

To the "didactic" (instructive) epos belong other works of the eighteenth century as well. Such, for example, is one of the poems which can definitely be ascribed to "the Cossack Klymovs'kyj"—"*O pravosudyju, pravdi i bodrosti*" ("On Justice, Truth, and Courage"). This is a didactic epos, relatively short in length (902 lines), of a somewhat unusual character and written in 1724 obviously for Tsar Peter I. Klymovs'kyj's work is not a panegyric, but an instruction for the tsar. Typical of the epos (compare below, the examples from Skovoroda's poetics), are short descriptive metaphors:

*Jako pes, jehda budet' kamenem jazvlennyj,  
ne za človikom imže kamin' tot veržennyj,  
no za kamenem bižyt', kamin' uhryzajet':  
semu na vlast' hryžuščyjsja podobnyj byvajet'.*

("He who grumbles about the authorities,/ is often similar to the dog which,/ when hit by a rock does not run after the man who threw it:/ but after the rock and chews on it.")

These instructive lines are often reminiscent of epigrams when they play on words of similar roots:

*Cars'kaja jest' duša pravda; jako že bo tilo  
bez duši nedištvenno, mertvo jest' i hnylo,  
tako car bez pravdy jest' mertvyj, nedištvennyj,  
ašče i mnyt'sja v žyvyx obrazom javlennyj  
otvni tila, no vnutr syj jest' trupom sohnylyj;  
nist' v nim duši pravdy, ležyt' v hrobi ztlilyj.*

("Royal is the righteous soul for a body/ without a soul is not real, but dead and decaying,/ likewise a tsar without truth is dead, unread,/ even if he thinks that he is among the living/ because of his flesh, inside he is but a decayed corpse;/ if there is no righteousness in him, he lies decayed in a grave.")

A second author, St. Ioasaf Horlenko, a bishop from Bilhorod, wrote an original epos, "*Bran' česnyx sedmy dobroditelej z sedmy hrixamy smertnymy*" ("The Battle Between Seven Virtuous Men and the Seven Capital Sins," 1737).



The poem consists of prologue, epilogue, and eight "songs" (about 1,000 verses). It is written in various rhythms, and uses Church Slavonic with noticeable Ukrainian lexical elements: *lancužok* (chain), *pobožnost'* (piety), *doškuljat'* (torment), *korohov* (banner), *obmežennja* (delimitation), *utikaty* (flee), etc., but where St. Ioasaf portrays symbolic battles, modern military terminology also appears: *batal'jon* (batallion), *šlem* (helmet), *armata* (cannon), etc. Consider the following symbolic description of a battle:

*Nač<sup>ŷ</sup>aša že strojitys' tak: z vojskom od vostoka  
sta Dobroditel' vel'my mužestvom vysoka,  
a vrazi od zapada zilo mnoholjudni,  
obače malodušni i ko brani trudni.*

("And they began to assemble in the following manner: in the east/ stood the Benefactor with his very brave army/ while in the west were his enemies, very numerous,/ but cowardly and slow to battle.")

The Benefactor addresses his warriors:

*Vožd' ljubvy, ohn' ljubovnyj  
veržy v oboz toj hrixovnyj.  
Ty, posnyku, lehkyj voju,  
vizmy krotost' zo soboju.  
Udarite i spalite,  
vr<sup>ŷ</sup>aha v pepel obratite!  
Boh z vamy, kripkyj v brani,  
se vam xrest v zaščytu dannij.  
Vo Bozi vozmahajte,  
vr<sup>ŷ</sup>aha pobíždajte!*

("Leader of love, living fire/ sally forth into that sinful camp./ O you, faster, agile warrior,/ take meekness with you./ Strike and burn,/ turn the enemy into ashes!/ God is with you, strong in battle,/ the cross has been given you for protection./ Fight in the name of God,/ conquer the enemy!")

Many of the themes and episodes are derived from military tales, but in addition to this, there is the symbolism traditionally employed in religious literature: the

cross is the sceptre, on which God caught the Devil, and so forth. Furthermore, we encounter the typical Baroque metaphors—e.g., spiritual choirmasters (*kapel'majstry*) of military music. Several letters are incorporated into the text: the letter of the virtuous men to God, one from Christ which was written down by John the Theologian, etc. Besides the virtuous men and the sins, other concepts are also personified (prayer, and so on). The action is developed, and events take place in accordance with the various holy days during the year. Although, according to Skovoroda, St. Ioasaf was very fond of Ukrainian folk songs, his poem does not draw upon the oral tradition.

4. While Ukrainian poetics was quite concerned with the epos, which was one of the fundamental forms of Baroque poetry, epic works from antiquity and the western Baroque were read in their Latin originals. There were but a few attempts to translate excerpts from these works, perhaps to serve as examples for study. Skovoroda worked on such translations. Below is his rendering of one broad epic comparison from the *Aeneid*. One of the Trojans unexpectedly attacks the enemy:

*Ostovbiv i pirvavsja vdruh nazad s slovamy  
Tak kak xto miž ternijem nevznačaj nohamy  
Nastupyť zmiju, i vdruh zblidnet', odbihaja,  
A vona zlyť'sja, z jadom šyju pidnymaja.*

("He was thunderstruck and suddenly retreated  
with his words/ Like one who unexpectedly among  
the thorn under foot/ Finds a snake, and suddenly  
turning pale runs away,/ While it becomes excited  
and raises its venomous neck.")

A military skirmish is compared to a storm:

*Tak kohda zbižat'sja vitry povnomočno,  
Burnym vyxrom z zapada, juha i vostočnoj  
Storony, triščat' lisy, vopjat' voznesenni  
Volny, i z peskom rvut'sja vyspr' mista bezdenni.*

("Like when winds clash at full force,/ Like a stormy  
hurricane from the west, south and east/ The fore-  
casts crackle, again the waves have risen up/ The surg-  
ing waves roar while the fathomless deep and sands  
rush upwards.")

Influences of the epic style can sometimes be found in drama as well. But the Ukrainian Baroque was unsuccessful in establishing a secular epos of any consequence. Examples of the old epic style can be found much later, in nineteenth century translations of Homer, and in Ryl's'kyj's version of *Pan Tadeusz*.

## F. THE TALE

1. The prose literature of the Ukrainian Baroque is quite extensive, but there is no great "epic" narrative literature. The novel, in the precise meaning of the term, i.e., a broad narrative, typical of the Baroque era, did not take root in Ukraine. The reasons are the same as those cited in the case of the epos. Very popular, however, were other types of narrative literature. Other traditional types of this literature did exist: first, Lives of saints, and apocryphal writings. In both cases, old sources were not merely transcribed but reworked—on the stylistic and, especially, on the linguistic level. It must be said, however, that this reworking destroyed some of the features peculiar to the old literature. The old Lives attained a certain finesse in their psychological characterizations, although through devices which were very different from those of the nineteenth century psychological novel; this feature is not present in the Baroque narratives, and disappears completely from new versions of the Lives. Apocrypha also differed from their original models and became more akin to the Baroque narrative. The most famous reworking of old material in a religious tale (Life) was St. Dmytro Tuptalo's well-known *Menaea for Daily Reading*, which was compiled in twelve parts. Its literary significance cannot be questioned; its Baroque quality is most striking (and derives, in part, from his reliance on Western sources). Its language was, unfortunately, corrupted during a subsequent printing in which Russian "corrections" were made. Some interesting examples of religious narratives about miracles have also been preserved, among them the works of Mohyla and Galjats'kyj.

Mohyla wrote his works with a view to having them appear in printed form, but his hopes were never realized. However, we can see here the technique of the narrative—quite lively, with the obvious desire to reach a wide audience. For example, Mohyla frequently gives as a parallel the usual everyday word when he occasionally uses a word from the "high" style: "*želězokovca . . . abije sljusar*" ("ironworker . . . or locksmith"), "*zemnuju ogradu, se est' val*" ("the earthly fold, that is, rampart"), "*lovcy, ix' že narycajut' sevruky*" ("huntsmen, they also call them watchmen"), "*na nosylax-marax*" ("on a funeral litter"), "*s'zdanie pyrha, se est' bašny*" ("the building of a stronghold, that is, tower").

The narratives vary: stories about miracles, an old genre in Ukrainian literature (compare Ch. III and IV—"The Tale"), frightful "modern" stories, e.g., how the bishop of Xolm, Dionysij Zbyrujs'kyj, on the advice of the sorcerers, tried to cure himself of a fatal disease by rubbing his body with the blood of his boy-cook, whose heart he ordered to be cooked and ate it like a beast. Charming are the short little tales in the style of the patericons (compare Ch. IV, pt. D and Ch. I, pt. B, sec. a, no. 2). The hero of several such stories is Father Leontij Karpovyč (see below—"Sermons," no. 3): he never left his cell (except to go to church) without his "clepsydra" (sand clock), to remember that no hour should pass without his performing a good deed. (The "deed" is, of course, a spiritual one, related to the spiritual conflict in man.) The same priest said: "If the smallest drop of ink falls on white cloth, it is immediately noticeable, whereas on black cloth even a large stain cannot be seen; similarly, when a man with a clear conscience falls into a small sin, he soon becomes repentant when he regains his senses; whereas a man whose conscience is not clear, is not even aware of his fall, and for him it is not an easy matter to improve." He, himself, believed in frequent Communion: just as the man who in the sunlight sees in himself darkness and the smallest stains, so the man who receives Communion frequently becomes aware of his sins. To this same type belongs the story about the hermit who was attacked by bandits who then watched as he was raised into the air while praying. . . .

2. Stylistically, Ukrainian Baroque narratives cannot be compared to the extremely refined Baroque verse. We do find some witty turns in the tales, some especially well-formulated sentences, and so on. The important part of a Baroque narrative was not in its form, but in its content. For the main part, this content concerned itself with the development of a theme, chains of events, interesting and intense situations, conflicts, and resolutions. As was generally the case in old literature, individual characters are interesting for the author and the reader only inasmuch as they are chess pieces, as it were, in a strained and complicated game, controlled by God, "fate," or demonic forces. It was up to the author or the person reworking the old material to make of it an interesting game. This does not mean that the Baroque tale lacked depth. It was often closely tied to the idea of a general pious life and included a "moral" or, in some cases, set itself goals of a sententious, moralizing, or philosophical nature (in the old tradition). A purely adventurous, completely "secular" tale did not develop in Ukraine. Even in the secular fable, there was always some religious moral, or at least a reference to some saint.

We might add that little work was done by Ukrainian authors on this genre of Baroque literature. Almost exclusively, we find the adaptation of old tales or

new ones of foreign origin. Western influence on the Baroque tale was very great, and only the Russians (who followed the paths of the Ukrainians and Poles in other branches of Baroque literature), and in part the Czechs, developed any sort of tale demonstrating some independence of style or literary character.

3. A great number of longer and shorter narratives, from miniature anecdotes to tales with numerous adventures, found their way into Ukrainian literature in the form of translations of several collections from the Middle Ages: *Velyke Zercalo* (*The Great Mirror*), and *Rymski Dijannja* (*Gesta Romanorum* or *The Deeds of the Romans*). In its most complete edition, *The Great Mirror* consisted of almost 2,000 separate stories. It came to Ukraine by way of Polish literature which had printed versions of this work. Some of the migratory anecdotes about wanderings included in it were already known in Ukraine, but from other sources—Byzantine collections of Lives (the so-called “Prologues”). Many were entirely new. Ukrainian translations consisted of only a selection (273) from the vast amount of material in *The Great Mirror*. But even this selection served as a reservoir for many genres—from sermons (where they were drawn on for didactic tales or examples) to folk tales. In *The Great Mirror*, for example, there is a story about an enchantress who was taken to hell by the devils after her death (the model for Gogol’s *Vij*). Another concerns a stubborn woman who argues with her husband about the semantic difference between two verbs: *pokošene* (literally, “mowed down”) and *postryžene* (literally, “sheared”), etc. In addition, in Ukraine, “examples” were also frequently drawn directly from the Latin original or Polish translation.

More secular in character are *The Deeds of the Romans*, a collection which also dates from the Middle Ages, and which contains 150 stories. In Ukraine we find some incomplete translations of the “stories,” and selections from, or translations and reworkings of separate tales. The basic source for these “stories” is again Polish translations. We find here a story about Pope Gregory which has nothing to do with real fact, but which provides a Christian version of the ancient story of Oedipus the King, who marries his own mother. The narrative about “Apollonius of Tyre” is a large adventure tale. It concerns the complicated adventures of two lovers separated by fate, but who come together again after long wanderings and various episodes.

4. Secular adventure stories were a characteristic feature of the Baroque era, although the actual stories were often much older.

In Ukraine some classical adventure stories became very well known. Among these we find *Peter’s Golden Keys* (*Petra Zoloti ključī*)—a story about two lovers, Count Peter from Provence and Princess Magelona (in Ukraine, Magylena), who remain faithful to each other in spite of the many trying obstacles

which separate them. This is an adventure tale of the chivalrous type. The chivalrous tale about Prince Bova did not gain widespread popularity, but it was well known (see Ch. VI, pt. B, no. 3). It is possible that other classical tales of the same type were also known (e.g., Melusina and Brunswick).

In the story about Emperor Otto we have a variation on the adventure tale. It is a story about the unjust condemnation of the Emperor's wife and her twin sons who were purposely lost by their mother. After numerous episodes, children and father are reunited. A similar theme is developed in the story about Countess Altdorf who orders that eleven of the twelve twin sons, to whom she had given birth, be killed. But the children are saved and later they once again return to their father.

The content of an adventure tale cannot be given concisely. The heroes are rarely fully drawn. The interest of the story lies in unexpected turns of events: lost children are found; those who are missing turn up alive; Gregory, a great sinner, becomes a saint and a pope. Baroque man liked this tension, the unexpectedness of the changes, the *peripetiae*, which were likewise characteristic of the life of this lively era.

5. The "philosophical" or "ideological" tales are of a completely different nature: this type was already common in old Ukrainian literature. The most famous tale of this type, *Barlaam and Josaphat*, survived in Ukraine to Baroque times and, with some linguistic innovations, was even printed in the seventeenth century (see Ch. II, pt. D, sec. b, no. 7). Another story of this same type, *Istorija semy mudreciv* (*The Story of the Seven Wise Men*—see Ch. VI), also survived to Baroque times and even longer. The story about the knight and Death is new: it takes the form of a dialogue between the knight and Death, and is a translation from the Latin; the conversation and chain of events climax in the victory of Death. The same idea about the vanity of life is found in another tale, written in prose, and which takes the form of a conversation between Life and Death. In both works we find the same idea, characteristic of the times, and which we come across in numerous poetic works of the time. Death, in an altercation with the knight, says: "My dear man, am I not lovely, . . . not beautiful, but I am very strong, too; young and old, rich and poor I destroy equally; remember dear man, how many tsars, princes, patriarchs, metropolitans, rich and poor people, old and young people there have been from Adam to the present day—old and young, I took them all. . . . Tsar Alexander who reigned over everyone—even him I took. I collect neither wealth nor beautiful raiments, but I am unmerciful and do not postpone anyone's time until later." "You have great wealth, but you cannot take it with you; you will have nothing left, except your own shirt." Ideological tales are also found in *The Great Mirror* and in *The Deeds of the Romans*.

6. Death uses Alexander of Macedon as an example of a most famous hero. He was the hero of old military tales (see Ch. II), which came to Ukraine in olden times. *Alexandreis* survived to Baroque times, and even to the end of the eighteenth century, but in a linguistically and stylistically more modern form. Kievan Ukraine was familiar with the "military" *Alexandreis*; the Baroque (under influences from Western sources) imbued it with a different character. *Alexandreis* is perhaps the "richest" tale known to Baroque times: various types of stories are found in it, although the military elements are not as strong as in the old *Alexandreis*. However, now to the military are added chivalrous, adventurous, ideological, and even Christian elements. "*Tak vel'my micno a okrutno bylo pobyt'tje, že sja sonce zatmilo, ne xotjačy vyhljadar' na onoje velykoje vylyttje krovy,*" "*Rušylosja vijs'ko tak micno i syl'no, až zemlja stohnala i dryžala.*" ("So great and cruel was the slaughter that the sun became dark, not wishing to witness such a shedding of blood." "The army marched forth with such power and strength that the earth moaned and shook.") This is still in the style of the old military tale. But Alexander is more than just a victorious hero. He writes to Darius, the Persian King: "*Vim, gdyž vsi v koli prutkom fortuny obcujemo, častokrot z bahatstva vo ubožestvo, z veselija v smutok, z vysokosty v nyzkist', i tudy i sjudy pereminjajemo . . . Ja zapravdu jestem smertel'nyj. A tak do tebe jidu, jako z smertel'nym čolovikom valčyt' . . .*" ("I know that everyone's life is in the hands of fortune; oftentimes we must exchange wealth for poverty, happiness for sadness, haughtiness for lowliness—changing sometimes one way and another. . . . In truth, I am mortal. And I am going to fight against you as another mortal.") In the later redactions of the translation of this text there are also some interesting dialogs, often very dramatic, as well as letters on various subjects. It comes as no surprise that this lengthy tale (which could perhaps also be called a novel) aroused such interest in the Baroque reader.

7. Erotic themes are rare, although eroticism of various types is not unfamiliar to the Ukrainian Baroque narrative (see above, nos. 3 and 4). Eroticism without an admixture of adventurous motifs can be found in a versified tale about Tancred, Guiscardo and Sigismunda, which was based on Boccaccio's *Decameron* in the Polish translation by Hieronim Morsztyn. Princess Sigismunda is in love with Guiscardo, a nobleman of insignificant birth; her father, Prince Tancred, sentences Guiscardo to death; Sigismunda poisons herself; the lovers, however, at Sigismunda's request, are buried together—a sure sign of reconciliation in a very tragic story. The Ukrainian version of the story weakens the erotic elements, but ably portrays the psychological sufferings by means of epic comparisons of a completely different character than those we find in Boccaccio. For example, Tancred's lament when he learns of Sigismunda's death:

*Vydja ž otec' smert' javnu dščery svojij mylij,  
 ne plakav, no rydav po tij vtisi cilij,  
 na sebe i na dočir svoju narikaja,  
 i den' tot svij neščasnyj hirko proklynaja.  
 Aky pry Meandrovyx brehax lebed' bilij,  
 tak žalisno nad dščerju plakav otec' mylij.  
 Lebed' hlasom plačevnym kryčyt', vozdyxaja,  
 i krylamy bystryji vody rozbyvaja,  
 pojet' pism' pečal'nu hlasom umylennym . . .*

("When the father saw the apparent death of his charming daughter,/ he did not cry, but lamented for her who had been his whole joy,/ complaining both about himself and his daughter,/ cursing bitterly that unhappy day./ Like the white swan by the Meander shores,/ so mournfully did the dear father cry over his daughter./ A swan cries out in a mournful voice, sighing,/ and beating the water quickly with its wings,/ sings her sad song in a sweet voice. . . .")

8. Typical of the Baroque are demonic tales. Demonology became very widespread in the West during the Renaissance. A certain harmony in the world view of the Middle Ages did not call forth as great an attention to demonic powers, as did Renaissance and Baroque culture which differentiated between the religious and the secular. In those times, as is well known, interest in "magic" grew, and witch trials spread.

The content of the demonic tales is not new. It derives from the old ascetic tradition and is based on the ability of a demon to dominate man in any set of circumstances. The theme was developed in the old Lives, and in the Baroque era found its way into secular tales as well. We are already familiar with the tale about the enchantress, whom the devils stole from the church and took with them to hell (see above, *The Great Mirror*). From another tale we learn about a knight, a great sinner who wants to repent for his sins. The priest, who at first demands that he do penance for many years, finally settles for one night of prayer in the church. The Devil, however, is reluctant to part with his prey, and the Devil's servants try to interrupt the knight's penance, to frighten him with fire. They appear as his sister, wife, and children, and finally as the priest himself. But no one is successful in persuading him to leave the church, and his confessor



absolves him from all his sins. We also encounter tales about the sufferings of sinners in the next world: a sinful mother tells her priest-son of her sufferings (a theme which later became part of the folk tale, "*Babusja na tomu sviti*" ("The Little Old Woman in the Other World")). Stories about selling one's soul to the Devil, of course, were well known. Eladij, the hero of one Ukrainian tale does so in order to gain his lover as his wife, and is only released from his pledge by Basil the Great. We even find tales which parody belief in devils and their power, as in the story about the cunning woman who tricks three young people by taking advantage of their belief in miracles.

9. We also find other types of tales in Ukraine. But even the examples cited above should suffice to demonstrate the significance of the tale in Baroque times, even though it was not as well developed as were other genres. Numerous classical subjects found their way into Ukrainian literature and later became part of the folk poetry, stories and legends. Many were used by later poets. Franko drew heavily from the treasury of old literature in general and the oldest Ukrainian literature in particular, e.g., *Mij izmaragd* (*My Emerald*).

The Baroque tale had no great immediate influence on subsequent narratives. Through folk poetry, it did, however, exert some influence even on the Ukrainian narrative of the Romantic era.

## G. THE THEATRE

1. The theatre developed significantly in the Baroque era. With the advent of Shakespeare and the great Spanish and French dramatists, this era saw the second major flourishing of the theatre since the development of classical Greek drama. But the outstanding masters were not the only dramatists who were highly successful during this period. The Baroque, with its fondness for all manner of painting and decoration, for pathos and tension, was easily charmed by colorful theatrical performances and the declamatory speeches of the actors—even if the play was not of the highest quality. Under the influence of the Polish and Latin drama, the theatre arose in Ukraine at this time. In the West, drama evolved from the folk and Church traditions of the Middle Ages. In Ukraine, there were certainly no Church traditions and almost certainly no folk tradition from which drama could develop. For this reason, Ukrainian theatre is a product of Baroque dramatic art alone and, in particular, of the Jesuit drama, which had reached a high level of artistic accomplishment. However, there is another possible influence which ought not to be overlooked—the Protestant theatre—for the Protestants also had a "school" theatre and wrote numerous plays, e.g., the "school" games of Comenius.

Drama and comedy are the most common genres of Ukrainian Baroque literature. In this area, authors imitated foreign models, but worked independently. The influence of Ukrainian Baroque drama was strongly felt even beyond the borders of Ukraine, in Moscow, and in the Balkans.

2. In his time Vyšens'kyj was already complaining about some sort of "comedies," but it is possible that what he had in mind was only the theatrical style of the sermons. The initial attempts of the Ukrainian theatre were possibly in Latin and Polish, and, as such, intended solely for school productions. But soon drama outgrew the bounds of the school and its restricted circle of students, teachers and parents. The earliest dated printed work is from 1616—Pamva Berynda's dialog on the birth of Christ. However, it is a dialog or a declamation without any action. A second manuscript, "*Xrystos pasxon*" ("*The Suffering Christ*"), 1630, is more dramatic in nature; its dramatis personae are drawn from the Bible, and although they also speak in declamatory style, their speeches have a rather pronounced subjective tone (especially the moving laments of the Mother of God, a theme which had been earlier developed by Cyril of Turiv). Added to this play is an untheatrical dialog about Christ's resurrection. "*Rozmyšljannje o muci Xrysta*" ("*Meditations on the Passion of Christ*") by J. Vovkovyč, printed in 1631, is a genuine play. Although the action takes place off stage and is only reported by messengers, there are "God-fearing souls" on stage who react in a most lively manner to the accounts of the messengers. Some of these "God-fearing souls" are even individualized to a certain extent. Such is the case of the young child ("*malyj otrok*"):

*A ja malyj otrok jesm', ne mohu movyty,  
ne mohu—uvy mni! ust mojix otvoryty . . .*

("And I am a small child and cannot speak,/ woe is  
me! I cannot open my lips. . . .")

Again, here we find a tearful speech of the "Blessed Virgin" with its moving laments:

*Uvy! tjažkaja skorb' mja obtočyla,  
Otxlan' okrutnyx smutkiv pohlotyla,  
Obišlo mene hlubokoje more,  
Hirkoje hore.*

*Juž moja radist', juž preč ustupujet',  
 Ljutaja tuha ljute obyjmujet',  
 Moja juž reč, juž utixa odxodyt',  
 V zemlju zaxodyt' . . .*

("Woe is me! A heavy sorrow has come over me,  
 The abyss of the cruel sadness has swallowed me,  
 A deep sea has overcome me,/ A bitter grief./ . . ./  
 My joy is already leaving me,/ A violent grief is surrounding me,/ I am at a loss for words—my joy is leaving me,/ Entering the earth. . . .")

Less theatrical are the poems about the resurrection appended to this edition of the play. There are also poems in dialog form about Christmas and other important events as well as in honor of the greatly revered K. T. Stavrovec'kyj. Some dialogs are complete, others fragmentary.

3. There were several basic types of Ukrainian Baroque drama and we will organize our discussion of the drama around these types.

Christmas plays were a favorite. Among those which have come down to us is the Christmas play of Dmytro Tuptalo. The play begins and ends with symbolic scenes. There is a "prolog" of sorts in which "Love," "Fortune," "Death," "Earth," "Heaven," "Enmity," and "Cyclopes" are the actors. A similar symbolic scene concludes the play. "Mysteries" are included to reveal the sense of the main action. The main action provides the series of events which comprise the Christmas story, first from the point of view of the shepherds, the astrologers (the Magi), and finally, from that of Herod and his court. Following the pantomime of the slaughter of the children, there is the lament of Rachel. The drama ends with Herod's death and his sufferings in hell.

Only Herod is individually drawn, but other persons are characterized by means of the language and content of their speeches as "types." For example, Herod's "senators," or "the shepherds," are "types" as shown by their language and manner of speaking with folk coloring. Alongside the dramatic monologs (Herod in hell, Rachel) there are also lively dialogs (among the shepherds, and between Herod and the senators). Between the scenes are song or dance interludes (*intermedia*; for example, at Herod's court). The "echo" replies to one of Herod's monologs. The play was intended to be performed with various theatrical effects (see below, no. 9).

The other five Christmas dramas known to us (from excerpts or occasionally only from announcements) have a similar structure, the only marked difference

being the way in which the material is divided: sometimes the entire Christmas story proper disappeared, sometimes the shepherds were left out, the content of prolog and epilog varied from play to play, etc.

4. Easter dramas were built along completely different lines. In only two of those known to us do real events—the Passion and Resurrection of Christ—play a significant role. In some, only the instruments of Christ's Passion are brought on stage. For the most part, these are mystery plays, in which particular scenes from the story of man's fall into sin and his subsequent redemption are portrayed. In addition to these scenes, there are dialogs between symbolic figures, in which Christian and Classical elements are often found in imaginative combinations: "Human Nature," "Eternal Grace," the "Wrath of God," "Mercy"—these Christian virtues and sins stand together with the Furies or Nero. . . . Although some of the themes are didactic, there is no lack of brisk scenes in which contemporary figures appear (the eight revellers—*huljaks*), lively and almost biblical scenes (the Pharaoh and Moses, Peter the Apostle and the Jews), and finally, scenes in which Lucifer himself (the characteristic "hero" of Baroque literature), appears on stage. These mystery plays contain canticles, and the favorite type of monologs—laments of the Mother of God, of Peter who denied Christ, of Human Nature, and so on.

Standing apart from these is the "*Slovo o zburennju pekla*" ("Concerning the Destruction of Hell"), from Galicia, which was constructed in a straightforward manner. The action takes place in hell and the events occurring on earth (the crucifixion and death of Christ) are relayed to Lucifer by messengers, until Christ appears and destroys hell. The folk language, the verse which resembles that of the *dumy* (see Ch. VII, pt. F, no. 4), the witty lively discourses, are reminiscent of the folk scenes (*pastyry*) of the Christmas dramas.

5. Dramas about the saints stand apart. Several dramas have survived about Patriarch Joseph, St. Alexis, St. Catherine. Here, too, we can include Tuptalo's "*Uspinnja Bohorodyci*" ("Assumption of the Blessed Virgin"). Not all of these are alike. The first three contain a genuinely dramatic representation of events, whereas the last is more akin to a mystery play. The drama about Joseph, in a very lively fashion, although avoiding all "immoral" scenes, relates the story about Potiphar's wife; the drama about Catherine has some moments of great tension, but is written in a language which has been heavily Polonized. The drama about Alexis belongs to the best of the Ukrainian Baroque dramas. It contains the entire fascinating story of Alexis, who escaped from home before his own marriage. Returning home, he lives near his parents as a complete stranger for years, and reveals his true identity only as he is about to die. The plot of the play develops in a genuinely dramatic fashion. The language varies,

and in large folk scenes (with peasants or servants) approaches the vernacular. New are the prose laments of the father, mother and Alexis' fiancée. The play opens with a brief conversation among angels, and ends with Alexis' apotheosis, that he is rejoicing in heaven with the angels ("tišyt'sja na nebesy posredy anhel").

6. There are also several morality plays. They are allegorical plays in which the realistic level is not totally absent. Real figures sometimes appear as "types," or representatives of definite types: the Rich Man and Lazarus, or the Prodigal Son are favored. Several Ukrainian plays of this type have been preserved: "*Užasnaja izmina*" ("*A Terrible Change*") based on the Rich Man and Lazarus theme; "*Tragedokomedija*" ("*Tragicomedy*") by Skovoroda's teacher, Varlaam Laščevs'kyj, about the rewards for doing good deeds; to him is attributed another "*Tragicomedy*" preserved by Skovoroda, about the struggle between the Devil and the Church; "*Voskresennja mertvyx*" ("*The Resurrection of the Dead*") by G. Konys'kyj. Of a similar type is "*Spir duši i tila*" ("*The Dispute Between the Soul and the Body*") which has several versions, including a later one by Nekraševyč. "*A Terrible Change*" begins with a prolog with allegorical figures as the dramatis personae. The action follows—the fate of the "lover of feasts" who is reminded by the lament of Job (who appears to him in his sleep) and poor Lazarus that his happiness on earth is very insecure. The struggle between the body and soul of the "lover of feasts" forms but one episode: the "Judgment of God" condemns him to tortures, and the play ends with his sufferings. The epilog takes the form of a lament for the "lover of feasts" by the Orthodox Church.

This type of drama tends to merge with other dramatic forms: "*A Terrible Change*" is also a good example of the type of morality play in which the dramatic action is quite lively. Other dramas of this type are sometimes akin to mystery plays, sometimes to dialogs.

7. Ukrainian literature did not lack completely secular dramas; they were in the form of historical dramas. Three of them are drawn from Ukrainian history, one from Roman, and one from Serbian. Under the title "*Fotij*" ("*Photius*"), 1749, G. Ščerbač'kyj developed the theme of the struggle between the Orthodox and the Catholics (the Ukrainians and Poles). In his "*Blahoutrobiji Marka Avrelija*" ("*The Kindness of Marcus Aurelius*"), M. Kozachyn'skyj united the historical drama with a panegyric to the Empress Elizabeth. In 1733, while in Serbia, he had written a drama about Uroš the Fifth, the last Serbian tsar. This drama is a type of chronicle which portrays more important moments from Serbian history from the twelfth to the eighteenth centuries; it is only known to us through later Serbian revisions. The oldest and most interesting dramas

dealing with Ukrainian history are “*Vladymyr*” by Teofan Prokopovyč, and “*Mylost’ Božija*” (“*The Grace of God*”) by an anonymous author.

“*Vladymyr*” is a drama about Volodymyr the Great to whom Prokopovyč compares Hetman Mazepa as his political descendant and heir. The drama begins with the agitation of the pagan priests Žeryvol, Kurojad, and Pyar who have received word from hell that Volodymyr (Vladymyr) is preparing to Christianize Kiev. Žeryvol, with the help of the evil spirits, wants to prevent him by poisoning him with the spirit of debauchery (a theme from the chronicles). Volodymyr listens to the Greek “philosopher” who tells him about the essence of the Christian faith and his controversy with Žeryvol. He takes council with his sons, Borys and Hlib, and in a long monolog after much indecision, decides to accept Christianity. The idols are destroyed. Andrew, the Apostle, appears on stage and reads the epilog in which Prokopovyč combines the prophecy about the future fate of Kiev (the first saints, the Tatar attack, etc.) with panegyrics to Hetman Mazepa, Jasyn’sky (who was metropolitan at that time), and the Kiev Academy. The action of the drama does not move quickly, and the strength of the play lies in its effective monologs and the witty and satirical depiction of the pagan priests, in which contemporary audiences could easily pick out members of the Orthodox priesthood.

If “*Vladymyr*” is dedicated to the first outstanding episode in the history of Ukraine, then “*The Grace of God*” is dedicated to the second significant moment, the times of Xmel’nyč’kyj. The drama opens with Xmel’nyč’kyj’s lament over the fate of Ukraine:

*Ehej slavy našeja upadok poslidnyj!*  
*Čoho v sviti žyvučy, dožyv kozak bidnyj!*  
*Dokozakuvalysja i my pid ljaxamy;*  
*Čoho nam ne dilajut’ ljaxy iz žydamy!*  
*Čest’ i slavu našu nivoščo obraščajut’,*  
*kozac’koje potrebyt’ im’ja pomyšljajut’ . . .*

(“Oh, glory of ours, in final decline!/ What did the poor Cossack living on this earth survive to see!/ Cossack times also came to an end under the Poles;/ What don’t the Poles and Jews do to us!/ They turn our honor and glory into nothing,/ and are planning to destroy the Cossack’s good name. . . .”)

The Hetman decides to engage in battle with the Poles.

*Krajnij ly pohybeli ješč<sup>ě</sup>e vyhljadaty  
budem? . . .  
. . . Tatory, turky i nimci byvaly  
ne strašni— i ljaxy ly užasni nam staly?*

*Kohda šablja pry nas jest', ne zovsim propala  
mnohoimenytaja onaja poxvala  
naša . . .  
Ne otobraly ješč<sup>ě</sup>e ljaxy nam ostatka:  
žyv Boh, i ne umerla Kozac'kaja Matka.*

("Are we always going to wait for our ultimate destruction? . . . / . . . The Tatars, the Turks and the Germans were once here;/ they were not very terrible—and have the Poles become more terrible for us? / . . . / When the sabre is at our side, we see that our pristine valor has not entirely disappeared . . . / The Poles have not yet taken everything:/ God is alive, and Cossack Mother is not yet dead.")

Apollo and the Muses foretell the destruction of the Poles. Xmel'nyc'kyj delivers a long speech to the Cossacks; the chief of the Cossacks answers:

*Vidajem, jaka vsim nam Ukrajina maty!  
Xto ž ne poxoščet' pomošč<sup>i</sup>i podaty  
pohybajuščij matci, byv by toj tverdišč<sup>ě</sup>cyj  
nad kamen', nad l'va byv by takovyj ljutijšč<sup>ě</sup>cyj!  
My vsi jak prežde byly, bez vsjakoj odmovy,  
tak i najpače teper služyty hotovy,  
budemo sebe i matku našu boronyty,  
ašč<sup>ě</sup>e nam i umerty, budem ljaxiv byty.*

("We know how good a mother Ukraine has been to all of us!/ Whoever, then, would not want to come to the aid/ of a perishing mother is harder/ than a stone; more fierce than a lion!/ We are as we were before, ready without hesitation/ to serve, above all now;/ we will protect ourselves and our mother,/ even if we must die, we will fight the Poles.")

Ukraine begs God for help. Xmel'nyč'kyj's apotheosis upon his return from the war follows: he is greeted by children and Cossacks and he answers with a long speech. The play concludes with a thanksgiving to God by Ukraine, panegyric memorials to Peter II and Hetman Danylo Apostol, and finally, choirs of praise for Xmel'nyč'kyj.

As we see, Ukrainian drama with its variety of types was capable of satisfying the most diverse interests and tastes. Even comedies existed.

8. Comedy first appeared in Ukraine within the framework of Baroque dramas. In addition to less ponderous themes, moments of a "light" or humorous nature can be seen in the dialogs. A student remarks:

*Daj že, Xryste voskresšyj, ščob rosła kropyva!  
Otto to budet' moja hodyna ščaslyva!  
Okryj že, Pane možnyj, i lisy lystkamy,  
ščoby my v nyx huljaly sobi z teljatkamy,  
bo vže sja myni škola barzo izbrydyla,  
a jak u turmi temnij mene posadyla.*

*A koly b to kropyva, to b sja ja i sxovav  
i, xoč by m'ja šukav djak, v kropyvi b ja ne dbav . . .*

("Grant, o risen Christ, that the nettles may grow!/  
Then will my happy hour come!/ Cover the woods  
with leaves, Powerful Lord,/ so that we can gambol  
there with the calves,/ because I am already fed up  
with school,/ and feel as if I were locked up in a  
dark jail./ . . ./ And if there were nettles, I would  
hide myself in them/ and even if the deacon were  
to look for me, I would not mind as long as I were  
in the nettles.")

In some types of dramas, it seems that particular scenes were specially designated for the incorporation of humorous elements. In addition to idyllic shepherds of Dmytro Tuptalo, we find some completely humorous ones: in one excerpt from a Christmas play, shepherds describe the fall from grace in the following manner:



... Ne rozžovav Božeho slova došnyra,  
da vtokmyv ves' rozum v molodyci,  
i vkusyv tojej, ščo ne veliv Boh, kyslyci...

Et-eto jak napohanyt' inohdi kiška v stravu,  
to až pasokoju vmyjetsja, jak tovcut' pykoju ob lavu...

Da ot narobyv xalepy, ščo za odnu kyslycju  
zaper vsim ljudjam do raja hranycju.

("He did not completely understand the Word of God,/ so he put his whole reason in the young girl,/ and took a bite of that crabapple which God had forbidden them to touch./ . . . / A similar thing happens when a cat happens to befoul some food,/ they beat their snouts so hard against the bench that they suddenly begin to bleed./ . . . / And because of one crabapple this is how he created so much misfortune/ as he closed the door to Paradise for everyone.")

Humorous notes are sometimes sounded even in an essentially serious scene or uttered by a serious figure, as, for example, by Lucifer in "Concerning the Destruction of Hell":

*Ljucyfer* (do sluh movyt' i korohov sobi velyt' daty):

... Pyl'no sterežite  
I v rukax svojix oružije micno deržite!  
A jak do vas pryjduť, hrizno odpovidajte  
I plečyma dveri micno pidpyrajte!  
I jesli by sja lamav, anholiv zabyvajte!  
Nexaj on tut ne idet'! Nikomu ne fol'gujte.  
Bo ničoho tut.  
Po nemu ne but'.  
Koly on Božij syn, nexaj sobi v nebi sý'dyt'.  
A vojuvaty sja z namy i peklom nexaj ne jidet'.  
Koly on Božij syn,  
Ja ne znaju, z jakyx idet' sjuda pryčyn,

*Ne majet' on do nas žadnoji spravy!*  
*I ne možu rozumity, ščo to za "car slavy."*

("Lucifer addresses his servants and orders the standards to be brought to him: Cautiously keep watch/ And hold your weapons tightly in your hands!/ And if they come to you, answer them threateningly/ And use your backs to force the door to remain shut!/ And should they break it down, kill the angels!/ Keep Him away from here! Give in to no one./ For there is nothing here./ Nor will there be anything more after He has been here./ If He is God's son,/ I cannot understand why He wants to come here./ He has no matter to settle with us!/ And I cannot understand what kind of "King of Glory" He is.")

Of a purely humorous, "comic" nature are the *intermedia* or interludes, short scenes which were presented between the acts of the drama. Ukrainian *intermedia* can be found in some Polish dramas, viz., in the dramas of Jakub Gawatowicz from 1619—"Prodav kota v mišku" ("He Sold a Cat in a Sack") and "Najlipšyj son" ("The Best Kind of Dream"), which later became famous as folk anecdotes. One of the special features of these *intermedia* was their multilingualism: in them we find Ukrainians, Belorussians, Poles, Gypsies, etc. The most interesting *intermedia* from the Christmas and Easter dramas are those in the works of M. Dovhalev'skyj. They are not mere anecdotes, but, as is generally the case in comedy, they are directed against particular phenomena or persons: against astrologers, against the Poles whom the author accuses of political arrogance and social tyranny, against the Muscovites, and the wandering scholars. The author even pokes fun at the peasants. The situations found in the comedies are traditional ones: errors, misunderstandings, theft, deceit, arguments, fights and so forth. Their language is close to the vernacular, and at times is even vulgar. There are *intermedia* in Konys'kyj's dramas as well.

The *intermedia* revealed a tendency towards an independent existence in some humorous dialogs (as in the "lament" of the drunken monks), which, however, were not intended for theatrical performances, but only for reading. Without a doubt, the *intermedia* did exert a tremendous influence on the Ukrainian puppet theatre, the so-called *vertep*, which exists even to this very day. Later, after the Baroque era, Nekrasevyč (see Ch. VIII) imitated the *intermedia*. Traces of the influence of the *intermedia* and of the *vertep* which

was dependent on it, can be detected in the humorous stories of the nineteenth century as well as in the "Ukrainian school" of Russian literature (Gogol' and others).

9. The technical achievements of the Baroque dramatists were very uneven. However, we must bear in mind that a great number of dramas have been lost, some even in our own time, and that some have survived only in fragmentary form.

In any case, a definite development from declamations spoken by characters who appear on stage one following another, to actual dialogs, conversations which include replies and exchanges of ideas can be clearly seen. Replies become shorter and some do not even fill an entire line; e.g.,

Bezumiye:

*Kako sja vam mnyt', druzi?*

Hrixy:

*Dostojna jest' smerty!*

Vojiny:

*Dostojna abije od ruk našyx umerty!*

("Foolishness: What do you think, friends?

Sins: She is worthy of death.

Warriors: She is worthy of death at our hands.")

Or:

Myr:

*Xto vy jeste; odkudu prytekoste simo?*

Volja:

*Az—volja.*

Rozum:

*Az že—rozum, da tebe uzrymo.*

("Peace: Who are you; whence have you come?

Freedom: I am freedom.

Reason: I am reason and we have come to see you.")

Or:

Dioktyt:

Ščo to, o tunejadci?

Žebrak I:

*Nesem Hypomena*

*Mertva.*

Dioktyt:

Znat', z p'janstva umre?

Žebrak II:

*Vseho ujazvalenna*

*Obritoxom.*

Dioktyt:

*Nesite ž i v hnoji zahrebite!*

("Dioktyt: What have you there, sluggards?

1st Beggar: We are carrying dead Hypomen.

Dioktyt: So he died from drinking?

2nd Beggar: We found him covered with sores.

Dioktyt: Take him and bury him in the dung.")

These are partly conversations between allegorical figures from "*Mudrist' predvičnaja*" ("Everlasting Wisdom"). Very lively are the dialogs of the "shepherds," villagers, Herod and his senators, the pagan priests (*Vladymyr*), etc. The most successful dialogs are those in which we find a favorite feature of the Baroque—antitheses, and the tension between ideas or persons.

No less accomplished are the monologs. Dramatic monologs occur when the main character debates the pros and cons of a particular action or critically evaluates his own actions or beliefs. Good examples of this are the monologs of Xmel'nyč'kyj, or Volodymyr who must decide between paganism and Christianity. The language of the monolog is also lively and familiar (see above, the many enjabments in the speeches from "*The Grace of God*"). Laments were a favorite type of monolog. Consider the following excerpts from the lament of the Apostle Peter:

*O ljute mni o hore! de dnes' obraščusja?  
 I kamo pijdu i k komu hršnyj pryhornusja?  
 Zabludyx od puty dnes' istynna vo viky,  
 Poneže otverhoxsja tvorcja i vladyky.*

*O hory! pokryjte mja, da vnutr vas prebudu;  
 Strax dnes' neukrotymij obijmet' mja vsjudu.  
 O pad'te na mja, molniji, kamennyji stiny;  
 Drevesa mja bihajut', az ne imam siny;  
 Vozdux mja oblyčajet. Izlijesja riky!  
 Da pijdu. Nism' dostojin žyty z čoloviky  
 Otverhoxsja—jeho že tverd', vozdux y more  
 Trepeščut', kincja zemli, o hore mni, hore!*

("O what a severe misfortune has come over me!  
 Where will I turn today?/ To whom will I go, and  
 from whom will I, a sinner, seek embraces?/ Today  
 I have strayed from the path of truth forever,/ For  
 I have renounced the Creator and the Lord./ . . ./  
 O mountains! Cover me, that I may spend time  
 within you;/ An implacable fear overcomes me  
 today from all sides./ Let the lightning strike me  
 and stone walls fall on me;/ The trees flee before  
 me until I have no more shadow;/ The very air  
 exposes me. Let the rivers pour forth!/ I will leave.  
 I am not worthy to live among men, for I have/  
 denied Him—before whom the firmament, the air,  
 the sea/ And the ends of the world are trembling,  
 o woe is me!")

In addition to dramatic monologs, there are also monologs which take the form of addresses, as Xmel'nyc'kyj's speech in "*The Grace of God*," the whole of which is built on the juxtaposition of iron and gold:

*Želizo dobre važte, i nad zlato.  
 Zlato bo potemnijet' bez neho, jak blato.  
 Čto zlato i čto srebro ljaxam pol'zovalo,  
 kolikije ž bohatstva želizo pobralo?*

*Z sribnyx polumys otci naši ne jidaly:  
i z zolotyx puhariv ony ne pyvaly,  
o želizi staralys', želizo ljubylly,  
i velyku tim sobi slavu porodyly.  
onyx putem idite, onyx podražajte,  
slavy išča, bohatstva by za nyčto majte.  
Ne toj slaven, kotoryj mnoho ličyt' stada;  
no iže mnohyx vrahiv svojix šlet' do ada:  
semu jedyno tokmo želizo dovlijet',  
a zlato ily srebro nyčtože umijet'.*

*Na poslidok hlaholju: samy ne kupujte:  
luka, strilky, mušketa i šabli pyl'nujte!  
Kupljamy bo obov'jazan žytejs'kymy vojin,  
imeni seho ves'ma takov ne dostojin.  
I ditej svojix skoro otpravljat' nauky,  
do sej že obučajte kozac'koji štuky.  
Tako tvorja, vražiji potrete navity:  
radost' siju na mnohi uderžyte lity . . . \**

("Value iron highly, even above gold./ For without it gold becomes as black as mud./ Of what use to the Poles was gold or silver,/ and how much wealth did iron bring them?/ Our fathers did not eat out of silver bowls:/ nor did they drink out of golden goblets,/ they sought iron, they loved iron,/ and it brought them great glory./ Follow the path, emulate them,/ seek glory, consider wealth to be worthless./ He who counts his large herd does not become famous;/ rather he who sends many enemies to hell:/ iron alone is the only pleasure for this type,/ and gold or silver is good for nothing./ . . . / Finally I say to you: do not buy them either:/ take care that you have bows, arrows, muskets and sabres!/ For a warrior burdened by worldly purchases,/ is totally unworthy of being called such./ And teach your

---

\*The language here is so close to the vernacular that in the appropriate places, I have replaced "o" and "e" by "i."

children, too, that Cossack art as soon as they complete  
their studies./ By doing this, you will dispel the enemy:/  
and will maintain this happiness for many years. . . .")

This style of "extended sentence" is, perhaps, best known from Shakespeare's dramas. A favorite type of monolog is the monolog "with an echo," in which the latter, by repeating the final words of the character, seems to be answering him.

Many writers also showed themselves very able in the technique of describing the events taking place off-stage: the descriptions were generally given by "messengers." In "*The Destruction of Hell*," for example, "messengers" rush to hell to tell Lucifer what is taking place on earth: Christ was sentenced, died and has risen again . . . Lucifer's mood changes accordingly.

Individual characterization is rare—Herod, some shepherds in Tuptalo's work, the pagan priests in Prokopovyč's. The characters are more frequently "types": Xmel'nyc'kyj, for example, is never more than the usual knightly figure.

Together with the usual dramatic elements, we find numerous songs, canticles, close in form to religious hymns, except that their stanza scheme is generally more involved. Also part of this same ornamentation, the prologs and epilogs, when panegyric in nature, are reminiscent of heraldic verse. (Actual heraldic verse does sometimes occur in the dramas.) There is also emblematic verse (e.g., in respect to the instruments of Christ's torture) as well as epigrams—whole *vinci* (garlands) which are read when instruments or paintings of Christ's suffering are brought on stage, or when mention is made of Christ's crucifixion and death.

We have already seen how varied the language of the drama was. This depended in part on the taste of the author and the "school" to which he belonged, and in part on the nature of individual scenes.

Similarly varied were the theatrical productions of these plays. While this aspect of drama is outside the realm of literature, the Baroque drama cannot be evaluated if the complexity of its staging is ignored. The stage was composed of three levels—Hell, Earth, and Heaven. Although the greater part of the action took place on Earth, some scenes did move to Hell (Herod and the "lover of feasts" suffer there), or to Heaven (where "poor Lazarus" is consoled, and where the angels appear). This division allowed Herod to "fall to perdition" or the angels or other characters to "rise to heaven." Stage effects were numerous. In the stage directions we read that "heaven sends forth lightning, thunder and hail," or "thunder claps." There are dances as well as songs—e.g., at Herod's court, or effects such as the Cyclopes who sing while they forge on stage

(probably "below the earth" on the lower level), or "Wickedness" which overcomes the evil snake. The use of processions was very common—e.g., angels who carry the instruments of Christ's suffering or shields. There were also pantomimes, such as the "silent" slaughter of the children in Bethlehem, etc.

The immediate importance of drama has already been mentioned. It must also be remembered that the later tradition of Ukrainian theatre was possibly connected in spirit with the flourishing of Baroque drama. The influence of Ukrainian drama, outside the boundaries of Ukraine, was very strongly felt in Moscow and in all of Russia, even as far as distant Siberia. Russian eighteenth century literature was to a large degree dependent on the Ukrainian tradition in general and on the drama in particular. Mention has already been made of the influence of Ukrainian drama in the Balkans (see above, no. 7).

## H. SERMONS

1. The sermon, which today is no longer a part of *belles-lettres*, was in Baroque times still considered as belletristic literature. Furthermore, it was one of the most important and most favored literary forms. There were various types of sermons, but especially characteristic for this period were the following three types: the sermon which was directly connected with Holy Scripture, the moralistic sermon, and the sermon-panegyric. The essence of the sermon, it must be noted, lay not only in its theme, but in its form as well. The form of the Baroque sermon was similar to that of the other literary genres of the time. The technique of the person delivering the sermon was to shock the listener, attack his reason or emotions, in order to arouse and sustain his interest; the listener in these stormy times was occupied with many non-ecclesiastical problems, and took part in a rather broad sphere of secular life which did not come under Church control. This explains the Baroque preacher's fondness for the original, the surprising, for special effects, and his reliance on "sensationalism." The late Baroque even developed a certain type of witty, sharp and paradoxical sermon (in Italian it was called a "conchetto" sermon).

Almost all these types of sermons appeared in Ukraine. Paradoxically, literary historians have often rebuked the preachers of this era for delivering sermons which were actually quite in keeping with the spirit of their times! Just as their Western counterparts, Ukrainian preachers differed—not by personal choice alone, but also because of the differing social and cultural milieus in which they lived and worked. If it is unreasonable to expect a preacher of the Baroque era to abide by the literary norms of antiquity, how much more unreasonable is it to require that he satisfy nineteenth or twentieth century



tastes! If it is unreasonable to expect a preacher who addressed himself to monks to attack the drunkenness of either peasants or landowners, how much more unreasonable is it to expect a preacher who spoke at either the Hetman's or the Tsar's court to discuss the failings in the lives of the general masses! The harshest criticism was levied against the witty Stefan Javors'kyj, who preached in "con-cetto" style; if we consider his sermons in historical perspective, the unfairness of such criticisms becomes apparent.

A large number of sermons which appeared in printed form have been preserved. Unfortunately, many of them were printed in Moscow and their language was extensively corrupted as a result of Russian "corrections." At the same time, a relatively large number of written sermons by the same preachers are available to us in correctly printed versions. It is impossible to examine all of the various types of sermons and all of their stylistic features in a general study of this type.

2. To the initial stages in the development of Baroque homiletics belong the sermons of Kyrylo Trankvillion Stavrovec'kyj, *Instructional Gospel* (1619, and reprinted in 1696).

As the title would suggest, these sermons are to a large degree based on the Scripture, but any direct ties with the Bible are weakened by the fact that the sermons are dedicated to certain holy days and saints. Their language is rather lofty—Slavonic. Several details place the author in this particular period. References to the "Arians" and the "Calvinists," quotations from "foreign" authors (Latin), rhetorical embellishments, exclamations and appeals both to the saints and the listeners, which take the form of questions and even rebukes, for example: "*O, Petre! ščo tvoryš? Hdiže nyny tvoje onoje derzovenije?*" ("O Peter, what are you doing? Where now is your former boldness?"). In Stavrovec'kyj's *Perly mnohocinni* (*Priceless Pearls*, 1646, 1690), we find sermons which are intended for reading. The sermon on the occasion of the death of Father L. Karpovyč, delivered by Meletij Smotryc'kyj in 1620, demonstrates that new directions in the sermon form were already discernible. Smotryc'kyj surprises the audience by telling them that there exist five forms of life and death: 1) natural life and natural death, 2) life of grace and death in Gehenna, 3) sensuous life and death of virtues, 4) worldly life and rapturous life—ecstasies in which the righteous join God transported in an unconscious state, and 5) a life of glory, and death of perdition, in the next life. He then proceeds to apply these distinctions to the life of Father Leontij. Certain parts of this sermon are panegyric in nature, while the conclusion is akin to a prayer. Euphony is frequent (alliterations: "*pobožne požylyj*"), rhymes ("*nadary . . . i osmotry,*" "*zmohaješ . . . zažyvaješ*") and the language is noticeably rhythmical. These

features reflect the style of the late Baroque sermon.

3. In Ukraine, the first theorist of the Baroque sermon was I. Galjatsov's'kyj, although in Petro Mohyla's sermon of 1632 the later style was already rather well developed. Galjatsov's'kyj published *Ključ rozumynija* (*A Key to Learning*, 1659, 1663 and 1665) as well as the theoretical *Nauka, al'bo sposib zložennja kazaniј* (*The Teaching or the Manner of Composing a Sermon*, 1659, 1660 and others with many additions). He gives advice about choosing themes "to entice the people into listening," and although he bases his teachings on the traditions of the Holy Fathers and demands that the content remain quite orthodox, he also requires that the content correspond to the spirit of the time, that it contain "ideas both wise and strange, sometimes happy, sometimes sad to make the people keen on listening" ("*propozycij . . . mudryx ta dyvnyx, časom veselyx, časom smutnyx, kotri ljudej barzo oxočymy do sluxannja čynjat*""). In addition to the material from the fathers of the Church, he urges that writers make use of chronicles and histories, books about animals, birds, snakes, fish, trees, herbs, rocks and waters as well as the homilies of the various contemporary preachers. Galjatsov's'kyj's rather simple plan for writing sermons is supplemented in his own works by a variety of extra material which is used as examples (taken from historical and other types of tales), or in metaphors, in various comparisons. The nature of these comparisons is similar to that of the comparisons used in emblematic verse, e.g., Galjatsov's'kyj compares the Old and New Testaments to two celestial poles. In his own sermons, he actually makes use of all the scholarly forms which he mentions in his guide. Some of his sermons are built according to the rules of logic. He quotes numerous ancient and new Western writers. Varied, too, are his reactions to contemporary events. He is especially concerned about the strife at home ("*vijna domovaja*") and, among other things, relates a fable: "*Jednoho orla postrileno striloju, a gdy pozriv orel na tu strilu, pobačyv na nij pera orliji, i počav movyty: ne žal' mni, že mene b'jet' toje derevo i želizo, ale žal' mni, že moji ž pera orliji orla b'jut' mene*" ("A certain eagle was hit by an arrow, and when the eagle looked at the arrow, he saw eagle feathers on it and he began to speak: I am not sorry that this wood and iron are striking me, but that I, an eagle, am being struck by eagle feathers"; this is a quotation from Aristophanes).

4. Much more complex is the style of Galjatsov's'kyj's contemporary, Antonij Radyvylov's'kyj, whose works include the collections *Ohorodok Mariji Bohorodyci* (*Orchard of Mary, Mother of God*, 1676), *Vinec' Xrystov* (*The Crown of Christ*, 1688), and some handwritten sermons. In spite of this complexity in style, the influence of contemporary times and folk literature can be felt. His sermons contain a certain amount of moralizing. Radyvylov's'kyj

frequently draws "examples" from *Gesta Romanorum* (*The Great Mirror*), and *Barlaam and Josaphat*, Polish sources and, it seems, even from the *Decameron* (X, 1). Characteristic of Radyvylov's'kyj is the humorous modernization of antiquity: "*Mojsej, het'man ljuđu Izrajl's'koho, xotjačy vijs'ko svoje . . . polkamy rušyty, uškovavšy onoje, a vdaryvšy v bubny, truby, napered kazav pidnesty značok polka*" ("Moses, hetman of the Israelites, wanted to move his army by regiments; he lined it up and sounding the drums and trumpets ordered the standard to be raised"). John the Theologian is referred to as the "secretary of heaven" ("*sekretar neba*"), John the Baptist as the "Lord's majordomo" ("*maršalok Hospoda*"), etc. He frequently speaks about the shields and insignias of the saints: "*svjatyj arxystratyh Myxajil, iž v ony valečnij peršij v nebi z Ljuciferom potrebi nabuv mečem zvytjazstva, preto . . . dan (jomu) za herb meč*" ("Even in that stormy time the Archangel Michael was the first one to win a heroic victory in heaven by taking up the sword against Lucifer; because of this, the sword became his emblem"). Radyvylov's'kyj's works are full of proverbs, some of which are translations from Latin, others come from folk culture: "*Jakoje odijannja, takoje i pošanovannja*" ("Clothes make the man"); "*Iskra lyxaja . . . i pole vyžyhajet' i sama potim hynet'*" ("An evil spark destroys both field and itself"); "*Tonučyj xvatajet'sja j meča*" ("A drowning man will resort to anything"); "*Psu bytomu til'ku pokažy kyj, až zaraz utikajet'*" ("A once-beaten dog need only catch sight of the stick and he will run the other way"); "*Smil'saja . . . baba za stinoju, nežely rycar' v poli*" ("A woman hiding behind a wall is more bold than a knight in the field"); "*U syroty tohdi praznyk, koly košulja bilaja*" ("It is a happy day for an orphan when he has a white shirt"); "*Jakij pan, takyj i kram*" ("The wares betray the master"); "*Holyj rozboju ne bojit'sja*" ("A naked man is not afraid of being robbed"), etc. (The monk Klymentij also makes use of such proverbs.) Radyvylov's'kyj is fond of both dramatic scenes and dramatic dialogs: the Virgin Mary talks with an angel; Radyvylov's'kyj poses rhetorical questions and then answers them, asks questions of the saints and rebukes them as well: "*Ax apostolove! Takaja ž to vaša protyvko Xrystu Spasytelevi, učytelevi vašomu, mylost'! Takaja virnist', že v neščastju i zlim razi vsi jeho ostavujete! O Petre! de onaja tvoja obitnycja: Hospody, z toboju hotov i v temnycju i na smert' ity, koly juž sja počynaješ zapyraty Hospoda svojego? dež, Fomo, onaja tvoja odvaha . . . ? . . . ne vsi movyly: Hospody, se my ostavyxom vsja i vslid tebe idoxom? čemu ž teper ne idete za učytemem svojim? čemu Jeho samoho ostavujete v rukax nepryjatel's'kych?*" ("O, Apostles! Such is your love for Christ the Savior, your teacher! So great is your faith that in misfortune and bad times you all abandon Him! O, Peter, where are all your earlier promises: 'Lord, with you I am ready to go to

prison and die,' if now you are beginning to deny your Lord? Where, Thomas, is your former courage . . . ? . . . Did not everyone say, 'We have left everything and have gone after you'? Why do you not follow your teacher now? Why do you leave Him all alone in unfriendly hands?") Radyvylov'sky delights in drawing verbal pictures: he describes the solemn greeting of the Trinity by the angels or Christ's reception in heaven, etc. He is fond of symbolism and emblems, but also frequently comments on contemporary issues—national and social notes emerge clearly in his "moralistic" sermons. He appeals to the Cossacks: "*Prypomnite sebi svojix starodavnix predkiv, het'maniv, polkovnykiv, sotnykiv, osauliv i inšyx molodciv dobryx, Zaporožciv, jak z tym pohanynom otvažne morem i polem val'čyly . . . jako jix mnoho na pljacu klaly, jako mnoho v nevolju braly!*" ("Remember your old forefathers—the hetmans, colonels, centurions, deputy-hetmans and other brave and good Zaporozhians and how they boldly fought against the unbelievers on land and sea, and how many of them they killed on the battlefield and how many they took into captivity!"). He voices his response to the events leading up to the period of ruin: "*Ščo to čynjat' bohatyji i syl'nyji, gdy to lyxvamy, to poboramy tjažkymy, to pozvamy ubohšyx i podlišyx nad sebe ljudej styskajut'? Jako ryby velykije menšyx rybok požyrajut'*" ("What are the rich and the strong doing when they oppress those who are poorer and less fortunate through usury, heavy taxes, and summonses? They show that small fish are eaten up by larger ones"). "*Vyneset' Boh koho na staršynstvo, obdaryt' mudrist'ju, šljaxetnist'ju, bahatstvy, to uže sja podlomu čoloviku ne čynyt' bratom, ale hospodynom*" ("If God raises someone's birthright, endows him with wisdom, nobility and wealth, then, should this man be petty, then he is no longer a brother, but a master to the common man"). "*Jesly ženščyna jest' bahataja—ona čeljadku budyt' do roboty . . . Jesly zas' ubohaja, musyt' bidnaja vstaty, a, ostavyvšy v domu ditja svoje, pijty, . . . de by (mohla) osmačok jakyj zarobyty al'bo vyprosyty u koho na požyvinnja svoje*" ("A rich woman rouses her servant girl to work. . . . A poor woman, however, must get up herself, and leaving her child at home go somewhere where she can earn a piece of bread or beg for some money to live on").

5. Over the relatively straightforward style of Radyvylov's'kyj, towers the splendid style of the late Baroque: the sermons of Lazar Baranovyč--[*Meč duxovnyj* (*Spiritual Sword*), 1666, 1686], and *Truby sloves propovidnyx* (*The Trumpets of Words Preached*, 1674, 1679), of St. Dmytro Tuptalo and of Stefan Javors'kyj (printed later).

Dmytro Tuptalo, however, only began his career as a preacher in this pompous symbolic style. In his sermon for the funeral of Innokentij Gizel' (1685), he compares Gizel' to one of the columns of Solomon's temple, and

Solomon's temple to the Kievan Caves Monastery. His later sermons are not as rich in symbolism, but are frequently very dramatic. A preacher would almost have to be an actor to read the long dialogs (such as that between Abraham and God) well. The preacher speaks with the Apostles Peter and Paul, with John the Baptist, and David and studies his Psalter with the listeners; his sermons consist of long sections with numerous parallels and contrasts. Their structure is rather complex—long series of questions which are answered in separate parts of the sermon. Occasionally, he uses some artificial symbolism: e.g., the various symbolic connotations of the water which St. Dmytro proposes that the readers use instead of vodka to whet their appetites; or the symbolic connotation of the various trees from which, according to apocryphal tradition, Christ's cross was carved—cypress, cedar, palm; or the various types of bread. Sometimes there are extended descriptions—for example, the one traditionally found in Baroque literature and later employed by Skovoroda: that of life as a vast sea. Or we find the symbolic explanation of Adam's name—"microcosm" or "of a little world," which provide the author with a frame upon which to build his sermon.

St. Dmytro was particularly fond of surprising his audience with the unexpected: modern images in the middle of a biblical text, or a Classical anecdote among the dialogs in a sermon; there is also a conversation between a preacher and the dead. As in his verses (see Ch. VII, pt. C), St. Dmytro employs alliteration and other devices of euphony, for example: "*pryčascajsja časti časi Hospodni*"; "*pasjaše svynija i svyns'koju pyščēju pytaša'sja*"; "*vitru i volnam vovstavšym*"; "*o zlatoslove, zlatolaholyve, Zlatouste loanne, zlatymy tvojimy ustamy...*". Not infrequently the language he uses is syntactically rhythmical.

But St. Dmytro is also adept at formulating theological or moral ideas. Beautiful and moving descriptions permeated by light humor are even more frequently encountered; for example, his depiction of the Nativity. The stable is filled with holy people, and "all around heavenly forces are singing in concert, with St. Gabriel conducting the choir by beating the rhythm with a lily which does not wither, even in the winter" ("*kruhom syly nebesnyji koncerty vospivajut', a xorom upravljajet' sv. Arxanhel Havryjil, bija taktu neuvjadajuščuju i v zymi lylejeju*"). But Tuptalo was also capable of courageously attacking the things which he believed to be wrong: before the eyes of Tsar Peter, he described Herod's banquet attended by the pagan gods, Venus, Bacchus, and Mars, thus alluding to the habits and occupations of the tsar. His best sermon, and one which is very moving, is reminiscent of Skovoroda's dream: the "Kingdom of Heaven" descends to the earth but can find no room for itself in the tsar's treasury, it finds much unjustly acquired wealth, collected through thievery, and by human suffering and tears ("*mnohaja bahatstva*

*nepravednaja, sobrannaja od hrablenija, od obid i sl'oz ljuds'kych*"); it goes among the merchants and finds only deceit and lies; it goes to the courts where the judge speaks righteous words while thinking evil thoughts ("sudyja myrnaja slovesa hlaholet', a duša joho pomyšľajet' zlo"); it goes to a banquet which, although merry, ends in an argument; it goes to the church and finds a lack of attention and piety not only among the laity, but the clergy as well; it then goes to a village where it finds poor hungry people, condemned by the courts, crying and sighing; seeing this, the Kingdom of Heaven decides to settle in the village, for here there is peace and it will be happy ("to vydja, nebesnoje carstvo vozljubylo na seli žyty: . . . sej pokij mij, zdi vseljusja"). There are several such gems of Ukrainian preaching in St. Dmytro's writings. The typical Baroque style is clearly evident here—the polished form, repetitions, parallels, contrasts, "rhetoric," and the desire to startle the listener by presenting ideas in new ways. In St. Dmytro's sermons we see the best example of the fact that this Baroque apparel need not obscure the meaning nor lessen the impact of images or ideas.

6. The most famous writer of sermons in the late Baroque style is Stefan Javors'kyj. Javors'kyj was the author of *Retoryčna ruka* (*The Rhetorical Hand*), one of many books of poetics written in the Baroque period. This work describes a great many (59) tropes and figures, many of which the author himself was fond of using. (It should be added that these were not new ornaments peculiar to the Baroque, but ones which belonged to Classical poetics.) Javors'kyj's sermons are, in fact, overburdened with embellishments. They are frequently constructed on the basis of extended metaphors; for example, his sermon about St. Nicholas is built on a comparison of the saint and a church altar. Javors'kyj examines the altars which are mentioned in the Bible. The material of which they are constructed has symbolic meaning—gold symbolizes love, copper—sonority, wood which does not decay—chastity, stone—masculinity and suffering, earth—humility. All these symbols are then related to the life of St. Nicholas. In other instances, the comparisons are rather unexpected: the Blessed Virgin or the twelve Apostles are compared to the signs of the Zodiac, the Holy Ghost to wine, etc. Javors'kyj also uses individual comparisons, examples (frequently Classical), questions and dialogs, puns (frequently Latin), assonance ("nehnijuščeje netlinnoj čystoty derevo, myslennaja maslyna"), rhymes ("vkorenjty i vščepyty, zaključennyj—nasadžennyj"), and sometimes even incorporates rhyming couplets into his sermons. His sentences are built on parallels or contrasts—"Ty truždajěšsja, a my trudamy tvojmju počyvajem. Ty na smert' ustremľajěšsja, a my tim od smerty svobodni" ("You work, and we rest through your labor. You attack death, and because of this, we are free from death"); "Ty malo spyšy, a my bezsonnyceju tvojeju vysypljajemsja . . ." ("You

sleep little, but we sleep well because of your insomnia"); etc. He has a predilection for semi-humorous comparisons, as well: "*herb ahncja*," ("the coat of arms of the Lamb of God"); "*pryvyleja z samej kanceljarii nebes'koj*" ("a privilege granted by the chancellery of heaven itself"); "*Noj jest' pervym admyralom i vodnoho puty iz'javytelem. O Noje! o preslavnyj admyrale! o kolykoje imamy vozdaty blahodarenije za tvoje od Boha dannoe masterstvo . . .*" ("Noah is the first admiral and initiator of water travel. O Noah! Most illustrious admiral! How we ought to give thanks for this talent which God gave you . . .") He turns to God with the following: "*O aptykarju nebesnyj, kol' dyvna u Tebja alchymija, kol' čudesna u Tebja apteka, kotoraja i samyje jady v likarstva peretvorjajet' i samuju l'vovuju ljutist' v sladist' prominajet' i samuju žovč mannoju tvoryt'*" ("O heavenly apothecary, how strange is your alchemy, how wonderful your apothecary shop which is capable of transforming poisons into medicine, lion-like ferocity into sweetness, and bile, itself, into manna"). The content of the comparison is frequently traditional: for example, life is a sea—"Ščo jest' hrišnyk, ašče ne more Čornoje, bezzakonije očorniloje, dna i miri hrixam ne imuščeje, hordym volnenijem dmjaščejesja, vitramy duxov zloby koleblemoje, horist' i slanist' hrixovnuju v sobi soderžaščeje, kytov ads'kych pohloščajuščyx preispolnenoje." "Plovuščym nikohda v korabli kupcjam prebohatty, najdet' strašnaja burja, načnut' volny o korabl' šturmuvaty, strax na vsix velyk, pohrjaznovenije korablja blyz'ko, smert' tut pred očyma . . ." ("What is a sinner if not a Black Sea, lawless and dark, knowing no depth or limits to his sins, proud waves beating, made unsettled by the winds of evil spirits, harboring in itself the brine and the bitterness of sin, teeming with infernal whales eager to swallow him." "When a fierce storm rises and waves begin to pound the boat a great fear overcomes everyone; the destruction of the boat is near, and those very wealthy merchants who never sail in boats think that death is before their very eyes.")

Unfortunately, Javors'kyj's sermons were published in Moscow with the result that their language underwent some alteration and, for the most part, only his panegyric sermons were selected for publication. Javors'kyj likewise found a comparison for Tsar Peter similar to that used by St. Dmytro, namely Belshazzar's feast. However, Javors'kyj deleted this comparison when he delivered this sermon, whose theme was similar to one used by St. Dmytro about the Kingdom of Heaven: the preacher is searching for truth, but cannot find it anywhere—"Xotiv ja jiji šukaty tu, v Moskvu, a meni dexto skazav, Ščo zdaleka mynula horod, znaty, ščo bojalasja abo knuta, abo plaxy abo katorhy" ("I hoped to find her [Truth] here in Moscow, but someone told me she had avoided the city, meaning that she feared either the knot, or the scaffold, or penal servitude").

In any case, Javors'kyj's sermon represents very ably the Baroque style and is a masterpiece in its own right.

7. The ornamental Baroque sermon encountered a certain opposition in the works of Teofan Prokopovyč. He opposed both artificially imposed plans and theatrics in the sermon. Unfortunately, those sermons of his which were actually printed were chosen with a specific purpose in mind—all are panegyrics to Peter I. While Prokopovyč demanded that the content of sermons be didactic, most of his sermons which are known to us contain no religious elements at all, and are little more than political speeches. But in these, too, the use of all the rhetorical devices can be seen clearly, and they, too, require that the preacher make use of theatrical gestures and speak in declamations. They differ from Javors'kyj's sermons—their metaphors and symbolism are not as striking.

More straightforward in both content and theme are the more or less purely religious sermons of a more modest Ukrainian preacher, Havrylo Bužyn's'kyj. His sermons are primarily significant for the history of the Ukrainian sermon because they were carefully printed and the language was not altered.

The sermons of S. Todors'kyj, the favorite preacher at the court of Empress Elizabeth, are almost unknown. They are interesting because they reflect the great influence of Western (German) mystical thought on the author.

In Konys'kyj's sermons embellishments are also less frequent.

Two sermon-lectures by Skovoroda can be included among the sermons of the second half of the eighteenth century: in these works, he outlines his mystical world view in a manner that is reminiscent of an introductory academic lecture. But despite their philosophical content, their form is still traditionally Baroque: the author is attempting to startle his listeners, and in this way direct their attention to the ideas he is expressing. He begins his first sermon-lecture in the following way: "*Ves' myr spyt', ta šče ne tak spyt', jak o pravednyku skazano: ašče padet', ne rozbijet'sja . . . Spyt' hlyboko protjahnuvšys' . . . A nastavnyky, pasuščyj Izrajilja, ne til'ko ne probužyvajut', no šče pohlažyvajut': spy, ne bijsja, misce xorošoje, čoho opasatysja . . .*" ("The whole world sleeps, but it is not the sleep of the righteous man of whom it is said: If he falls, he will not hurt himself. . . . It sleeps soundly, having stretched itself out. . . . And the guardians keeping watch over the Israelites not only do not wake them, but caress them: sleep, and have no fears, it is a good spot, why worry. . . .") In the second sermon, he expresses his ideas about idolatry, and begins by describing the futility of seeking Truth and Christ in this world: "*Ne smyslym de iskat' . . . Mnohiji iščut' Jeho v jedynonačal'stvijax Kesarja Avhusta, vo vremenax Tyverijevyx . . . Něst' zdě! Mnohyji voločat'sja po Jerusalymax, po Jordanax, po Vyflyjemax, po Karmylax, po Favorax; njuxajut' miž Evfratamy i Tyhramy . . .*



*Něst' zdě, něst'! Mnohyji iščut' Jeho vo vysokyx myrskyx čestjax, vo velykolipnyx domax, vo ceremonijal'nyx stolax . . . Mnohyji iščut', zivaja, po vseholubim zvizdonosnim svodi, po soncju, po luni, po vsim Kopernykovym myram . . . Iščut' v dovhyx molennjax, v postax, v svjaščenyčes'kyx obrjadax . . . iščut' v den'hax, v stolitnim zdorov'ji, v plots'kim voskresenni . . . Něst' zdě!*" ("We do not know where to look. . . Many seek him in the one man rule of Caesar Augustus, in the reign of Tiberius. . . No not here! Many roam through Jerusalems, River Jordans, Bethlehems, Mt. Carmels, and Mount Tabors; they nose around between the Euphrates and the Tigris. No, no not here! Many seek Him in high worldly honors, in splendid dwellings, ceremonial feasts. . . Many seek Him, sighing, in the blue of the firmament, in the sun and in the moon, in every part of Copernicus' world. . . They seek Him in lengthy prayers, in fasts, in priestly rites . . . they seek Him in wealth, in centuries of health, in bodily resurrection. . . Not here!") Stylistically, Skovoroda's sermons are traditionally Baroque: appeals to the listeners, dialogs, humorous expressions (see examples cited above), symbolism even more daring and startling than the symbolism of other preachers, contrasts and paradoxes.

The Ukrainian sermon remained within the Baroque tradition for almost 200 years. In the nineteenth century the sermon was excluded from the realm of *belles lettres*. Its influence on literature is thus minimal. To the present time, literary history has done little research in this area. The treasures of the Ukrainian Baroque sermon—formal and intellectual—still await the attention of our generation.

## I. HISTORICAL LITERATURE

1. Historiography, like the sermon, belonged to *belles lettres* in Baroque times. Perhaps only purely annalistic works had a non-literary function. In any case, as early as 1670 a monk of Hustyn, Myxajlo Losyc'kyj, in the introduction to one of his chronicles, recognized Homer as the predecessor of the seventeenth century chroniclers; he saw in Homer a patriot as well as a poet.

That the achievements of the Baroque era in this branch of literature were significant can be seen in the very fact that historical studies at the time were very intensive, that the number of historical works of various types was quite large and that in these works we almost always find a distinct "nationalistic" world view. Sometimes interwoven with Slavic or Orthodox ideology, this national world view appears to be present in every historical work of the Ukrainian Baroque era.

Some works are still linked to the old chronicle (*litopys*) tradition: at the

turn of the century (c.1621), the *Hypatian Chronicle* (the so-called Pogodin collection) was rewritten, but even as late as 1670 there appears the so-called *Hustyn' Chronicle* (from the Hustyn' Monastery) which bears a close resemblance to the old type of chronicle. With time, many chronicles, diaries and notes (some of which have been lost) appeared. We will not discuss these works here as they are interesting only insofar as they reflect the literary tastes and ideology of their time. In addition to purely historical works, autobiographies also began to appear; as they tended to focus on religious rather than political events, they are interesting as revelations of the inner development of the author (e.g., the day-book of Anastasij Fylypovyč [c. 1645]. V. Hryhorovyč Bars'kyj's notes on his trip through the Holy Land [before 1745] represents another original type of record). Even if we take into account a few more diaries and notes which were devoted not to historical events but rather to the experiences of an individual, we are still faced with the fact that this favorite Baroque form, the autobiography, was not very widespread in Ukraine—a result of the marked religiosity in the educated circles in Ukraine, and the lack of interest in purely literary matters of a secular nature.

2. Several famous chronicles were compiled during this period; while they are called "chronicles," they differ markedly from the genuine chronicles. The first of these is the *Litopys "Samovydcja"* (*The Eye-Witness Chronicle*), the author of which has yet to be positively identified. *The Eye-Witness Chronicle* covers the period up to 1702, but its first version probably appeared after 1672, and included events only until 1674. The author's style is quite picturesque with beautiful descriptions and occasionally rather tensely dramatic narration. The language is quite simple, close to the vernacular and includes some proverbs. All this, however, is no more than a literary mask behind which the author hid his identity, and quite successfully, as his identity has yet to be discovered. His epic style is also a mask behind which lies a fundamentally tendentious treatment of the events from the point of view of the monarchy and the nobility. Consider the following example of the language used by the author: "*I tak narod pospolytyj na Ukrajinu poslyšavšy o znesennju vijs'k koronnyx i het'maniv, zaraz počalysja kupyty v polky ne til'ko tije, kotorije kozakamy byvaly, ale xto i nidy kozactva ne znav . . . Na tot čas tuha velykaja ljudem vsjakoho stanu znatnym byla, i naruhanja od pospolytyx ljudej, a najbil'še od hul'tjajstva, to jest' od brovarnykiv, vynnykiv, mohyl'nykiv, budnykiv, najmytiv, pastuxiv . . .*" ("And so the common people in Ukraine hearing about the rout of both royal and hetman armies, immediately began to group into regiments, and not only those who had been Cossacks, but even those who knew nothing of Cossack ways. . . . At that time a great grief came over men of all stations, and they suffered

outrages at the hands of the common people, especially the brewers, the wine-pressers, the grave-diggers, the watchmen, the servants and the shepherds.”)

3. Hryhorij Hrabjanka, the author of a second famous historical work, conceals neither his identity nor his point of view. Although he wrote his chronicle after 1709 and describes the history of Ukraine from its beginnings, he is primarily concerned with the era of Xmel’nyč’kyj. With the exception of but a few pages which are devoted to certain people or events to which the author is sympathetic or in which he is particularly interested, the section dealing with this period is the only one that is artistically accomplished. Hrabjanka relies not only on Ukrainian sources but also on Polish (in both Polish and Latin) and Western materials (e.g., Pufendorf) and does not hide this fact. In accordance with the norms of the Baroque historical style, Hrabjanka follows in the traditions of the Roman historians, notably Livy; unlike that of the *Eye-Witness Chronicle*, his style is “lofty.”

4. The most outstanding and the most extensive chronicle from this period is that of Samijlo Velyčko. Admittedly, parts of his work have been lost and, as a result, the extant portion only describes events up to 1700; however, it appears that the author had actually extended his narrative up to 1720. In the prefaces to the first and second volumes, Velyčko develops some of the basic ideas underlying his world view and his historical “methodology.” The sources upon which Velyčko draws are no less varied than those employed by Hrabjanka (he also uses Pufendorf, and the poet Tasso), while the influence of the style of the Roman historians is greater here than in Hrabjanka. Velyčko’s heroes utter short or long speeches modelled on those used by Latin historians. Velyčko’s style changes with the subject he is discussing, so that one can speak of various shadings in his style. “High” style, reminiscent of the language of the Baroque sermon, is used in speeches and in moments of pathos; in those passages in which Velyčko expresses his own views, a much simpler style is used. More straightforward still and more poetic are the passages describing various events. This variety of style is reminiscent of the old Ukrainian chronicles. Just as the old Ukrainian chronicles can be viewed as collections, encyclopaediae of old and frequently lost literature, the same can be said of Velyčko’s work: his work includes poems predominantly of a historical and political nature by many known (I. Velyčkovs’kyj) and unknown poets, as well as panegyrics, eulogies (epitaphs), etc. Velyčko’s work is essentially historical and not literary and in this lies the explanation of the fact that we find in it both documents and excerpts from some sources, as well as oral tales and so on.

Consider Velyčko’s melancholic description of Ukraine after her ruin:

*Pohljanuvšy . . . vydix prostrannyji tohobočnyji Ukrajino-malorosijs'kyji polja i rozlehlyji dolyny, lisy i obšymyji sadove i krasnyji dubravy, riky, stavy, ozera, zapustilyji mxom, troptijem i nepotrebnou ljadynoju zarošyji . . . Pred vijnoju Xmel'nyc'koho byst' aki vtoraja zemlja obitovannaja, medom i mlekom kypjaščaja. Vydix že k tomu na riznyx tam miscjax mnoho kosty čelovičes'kyx, suxyx i nahyx, til'ko nebo pokrov sibi imuščyx i rekox v umi—kto sut' syja?*

(“Looking around . . . I saw stretching before me on the other side, Ukrainian-Little Russian fields, expansive valleys, woods, large orchards and beautiful oak groves, rivers, streams and lakes—overgrown with moss, reeds and wild bush. . . . Before Xmel'nyckyj's war it had been as if another land, overflowing with milk and honey. And then I saw in various places small piles of human bones, dry and bare, guarded over by heaven alone, and I asked myself: whose bones are these?”)

Or this example of his narration:

*[Vijs'ko Sirka] rušylo vhoru Dnipra do Siči svojeji, majučy množstvo vsjakoji zdobychi kryms'koji, i jasyru tatars'koho z xrystijanamy v nevoli kryms'koji byvšymy trynadcjaty tysjač. Otdalyvšysja tedy Sirko zo vsim vijs'kom i koryst'my od Krymu u myl' kil'konadcjat', i stanuvšy nihdys' v prylyčnom miscu na popas poludnevyj, veliv odnym kozakam po dostatku kaši varyty, žeby dlja nyx i dlja jasyru mohlo staty onoji, a druhym veliv jasyr nadvoje rozlučyty, xrystijan osibno a bisurman osibno.*

Some of the Christians wanted to return to the Crimea:

*Odpustyvšy tedy onyx ljudej do Krymu [Sirko] vzošedšy na mohylu tam byvšuju, smotriv na nyx potil', pokil' ne stalo jix vydno; a gdy uvydiv jix nepremiinnoje v Krym ustremenije, tohda zaraz tysjači kozakam molodym veliv na kin' vsisty, i dohnavšy vsix . . . na holovu vybyty i vyrubaty. . . . Malo zas' pohodyvšy, i sam Sirko na konja vsiv i skočyv tudy, de jeho ordonanc soversavšja skutkom . . . , do mertvyx trupiv vymovyv taki slova: Prostite nas, bratija, a sami spite tut do strašneho sudu Hospodnja, nežely byste mily v Krymu meždu*

*bisurmanamy rozmnożatysja na naši Xrystijans'kyji molodec'kyji holovy, a na svoju vičnuju bez xreščenyja pohybel'.*

("Sirko's army advanced up the Dnieper to its Cossack camp with a vast amount of booty from the Crimea, as well as Tatar captives, of whom there had been thirteen thousand in captivity with the Christians in the Crimea. Then, after he had gone several miles from the Crimea with his army and his loot, he halted them in a suitable spot for lunch. He ordered some Cossacks to cook sufficient gruel for themselves and the captives, and ordered another to divide up the captives, the Christians in one group, the Moslems in another. [Some of the Christians wanted to return to the Crimea.] Letting these people go, Sirko climbed up on a mound which happened to be there, and watched them until they disappeared from sight. Seeing their singular desire was to return to the Crimea, Sirko immediately ordered thousands of young Cossacks to mount their horses and overtake the former captives, attack them and slaughter all of them. Not only did he send out his men, but Sirko himself mounted his horse and galloped off to the spot where his orders were being carried out . . . , to the dead corpses, he spoke the following words: 'Forgive us, brothers, and sleep here until the last judgment. This is better for you than living in the Crimea, breeding among the Moslems at the expense of our brave Christians, and unbaptized, assuring your eternal damnation.' ")

As a whole, Velyčko's chronicle paints an unusually colorful picture of the interests, styles, experiences and manner of thinking of the man of the Ukrainian Baroque. Thus, his work (and to a lesser degree that of Hrabjanka) filled the gap left in Ukrainian Baroque literature by the poorly developed tale.

5. In addition to chronicles, the Ukrainian Baroque also produced scholarly treatises which attempted to give a synthetic view of Ukrainian history. Not all such works have a purely literary significance.

In 1672, Teodosij Safonovyč, a Kievan professor, compiled *Krojnyka z litopysciv starodavnyx* (*Chronograph Compiled from Ancient Chronicles*), namely, old Ukrainian and Polish ones. Although its author did not possess a great deal of literary talent, this work has a definite literary goal—to provide information about "everyone born of the Orthodox faith," and about the developments in Ukraine which brought it to its present state. Far superior in literary merit is Safonovyč's *Synopsis* (earlier credited to I. Gizel') which

appeared in 1674, was already reprinted in 1678 and 1680, and subsequently appeared yet another 25 times, even as late as 1861. This work deals primarily with Ukrainian history, with some events occurring on Russian territory included (but with large gaps) only to fill out the overall picture. In the spirit of "Slavophilism" and the historical universality of the Baroque, Safonovyč begins with the history of the Slavs in ancient times. He provides (fantastic) etymologies of historical names and titles, and takes into consideration Slavic paganism and old folk customs. That a conscious effort to provide a synthetic view of Ukrainian history was made in Kiev during this period is demonstrated by the fact that even later, in 1682, another work was compiled (by Koxanovs'kyj), *Obšyrnyj synopsys* (*A Comprehensive Synopsis*). However, this work is merely a collection of a vast amount of material.

6. The historical synthesis which actually offers a complete picture of Ukrainian history from the Ukrainian national point of view, belongs to the post-Baroque era; it is the famous *Istoriija Rusiv* (*The History of the Rusy*), which covers Ukrainian history to 1769. Although the introduction refers to the work as a "chronicle" begun still in ancient times, it is quite clear that this work is not as much historical, as politically-nationalistic and literary. The author of the work was once considered to be H. Konys'kyj who purportedly conveyed the work to H. Poletyka, who was later himself thought to be its author. But it must be remembered that this work appeared at the beginning of the nineteenth century on the initiative of some Ukrainian patriots who used the historical tradition of the Baroque to give substance to the political demands made to the Russian government by Ukrainians. The author of *The History of the Rusy* consistently develops the same idea which had already been touched upon in earlier literary works about Ukrainian history, that the political, national and cultural history of Ukraine has its own tradition stemming from ancient times. The Lithuanian and Polish periods of Ukrainian history are also considered from this point of view: it can even be said that in some cases the nationalistic intuition of the author did bring him to a correct understanding of the historical past. The author considers Xmel'nyč'kyj and Mazepa to be the central figures of Ukrainian history, although he does not devote much space to the latter. The author's political views are incorporated into speeches (Xmel'nyč'kyj and Polubotok), letters (Nalyvajko and Dorošenko), proclamations (Mazepa), judgments by foreigners about Ukraine and Ukrainians (Gustavus Adolphus, Charles XII). At such moments, the author reveals himself as a writer with great power of expression, and in the epic sections demonstrates his narrative skill. The principal purpose of this historical narrative is the portrayal of the national and religious oppression of Ukraine by the Poles and later, by Moscow. It is not

clear whether the lack of unity in this work (some individual and relatively unimportant episodes remain without obvious connections to the whole) stems from a lack of polish or is a deliberate attempt to create the impression that this work is a "real chronicle." The language stands midway between Russian and Ukrainian; Ukrainian elements are the exception. This work can be included among those of the "Ukrainian school" of Russian literature which reached the pinnacle of its development with the appearance of Gogol'. Connections with the style of Ukrainian Baroque historiography are quite strong, but there are already many Classical elements in it (see Ch. VIII).

7. The national significance of Baroque historiography is unquestionable; the literary achievement it represents cannot be questioned: Ukrainian historical poetry and *belles lettres* rely on the works of Baroque historiographers for their sources. Ševčenko based his *Hajdamaky* on *The History of the Rusy*, Kuliš—his *Čorna rada* (*The Black Council*) on Hrabjanka, and so on. Not to be considered as unimportant are the works written in either Polish or Latin. The most important of these is the *Chronicle of Jerlyč*, written in Polish and of Polish orientation. Also helpful are the remarks and reports about Ukraine in foreign literature—a fruitful area for further research.

## J. THE TREATISE

1. The Baroque treatise was more than a literary form. For the most part, it was written in Latin. Among the treatises of the Baroque era are a large number of textbooks from the Kievan Academy, as well as other (both Orthodox and Catholic) schools. Of importance to literary history are those texts which discuss poetics, for in these the theory of Baroque belletristic literature is explained. Some theological works which were written in Latin—as, for example, the only existing major treatise concerning the essential difference between Catholic and Orthodox dogma, *Poxodžennja sv. Duxa* (*The Origin of the Holy Ghost*) by Adam Zörnikaŭ, or Prokopovyč's textbook of Orthodox dogma—have not completely lost their validity even to this day. Also worthy of note are the linguistic works from the Baroque era—Meletij Smotryč'kyj's grammar, Pamva Berynda's dictionary. The Baroque treatise always takes some literary form used in belletristic literature and is usually a combination of several stylistic forms. Consequently, Baroque stylistics affected the style of scholarly works—even of physics and astronomy. Most immediately related to *belles lettres* are, however, the works written in a combination of Slavonic and Ukrainian: they appealed to a wide circle of readers and almost always possess a stylistically interesting form. We will consider only a few examples of the Baroque treatise.

2. The polemical treatise continued to be popular (see Ch. VI). Its style became gradually more complex, replete with witticisms, curses and other appeals to the emotions and the will, as opposed to the reason of the reader; ideas were relegated to a secondary level. The most characteristic of the works written in this complicated emotional style is Meletij Smotryc'kyj's *Threnos* (written in Polish). It is the lament of the Ukrainian Church in which she, as the true Mother, puts forth arguments against the Union and in defense of the Orthodox faith. Such a framework is in itself typically Baroque. In the first two parts Smotryc'kyj successfully imitates the form of the folk lamentation (*holosinnja*), with its rhythmical language, numerous repetitions, assonances, and its great vividness of expression: "*Hore meni bidnij,/ hore neščasnij,/ ax—z usix bokiv ohrabovani,/ . . . ruky v kajdanax,/ jarmo na šyji,/ puta na nohax,/ lancjux na kryžax,/ meč nad holovoju obosičnyj,/ voda pid nohamy hlyboka/ ohon' po bokax nevhasyj/ . . .*" ("Ah, what a bitter fate has befallen poor me who has been robbed from all sides . . . my hands are bound, my neck is yoked, there are fetters on my feet, chains on my back, a double-edged sword hangs suspended over my head; the water beneath my feet is deep, the fire on either side of me inextinguishable.") "*Prekrasna ja bula pered usima,/ ljuba j myla,/ harna, jak zorja rannja na sxodi,/ krasna, jak misjac',/ vyznačna, jak sonce,/ odynačka u materi svojej.*" ("Once I was more beautiful than everyone else, dear and pleasant, as lovely as the morning star in the east, as beautiful as the moon, as bright as the sun, my mother's only child. . .") "*Vsi mene odbihly,/ vsi pohordyly,/ rodyči moji daleko vid mene,/ pryjатели moji nepryjateljamy staly . . .*" (translated into modern Ukrainian by M. Hrušev's'kyj). ("Everyone has fled from me, abandoned me; my parents are far away from me, my friends have become my enemies.") The personified Orthodox Church enumerates those many princely and noble families which abandoned Orthodoxy and converted to Catholicism to "Arianism," both of which resulted in de-nationalization! The Church turns to her sons, urging them to return to their faith; the entire lament is twenty-two pages long; the purely theological parts are also presented in artistic form—they are embellished with texts, and occasionally with quotations from the poets (Petrarch, among others), etc. *Threnos* did not mark the end of Smotryc'kyj's activity as a polemicist. He continued his polemic "from the other side" even later when he became a Uniat. The work of K. Sakovyč and the Orthodox work, *Lithos*, written as a response to it (possibly by Mohyla) are likewise outstanding works of polemical literature (also written from both points of view). The literary style of these works possesses the same Baroque pompousness, uncontrolled expressiveness, wittiness, and accusations. The most famous polemical work is Zaxarija Kopystens'kyj's *Palinodija*, written in the years



1620-21. Fundamentally the work is a genuinely serious theological polemic. However, it is embellished with the same Baroque pathos, exclamations, pleas, witticisms, proverbs, panegyrics (to Ostroz'kyj), and with Herbut's speech to the Warsaw *sejm*—which the author clearly wrote with painstaking care.

3. Ukrainian Baroque literature also possesses treatises of a purely scholarly nature. Among the pioneers of Baroque stylistics is Kyrylo Trankvillion Stavrovec'kyj's *Zercalo bohoslovija* (*The Mirror of Theology*, in editions from 1618 and 1635 as well as others). "In this book, the common language has been put alongside Slavonic. . . ." The book contains an exposition of the theological doctrine concerning God, the four divisions of the world—the invisible world of the angels, the visible world, the human world, and the world of evil (that of the devils)—and finally the four last stages in a man's life: death, the last judgment, paradise and hell. The style is quite straightforward, the exposition is unencumbered by literary embellishments. A system of "moral theology" was put forth by Innokentij Gizel' in the *Myr z Bohom čoloviku* (*Man's Peace with God*, 1661 and 1678): in effect, it is a textbook to be used by priests during confessions. Here, too, the exposition is simple, even though the book was written at a time when the Baroque style was at its peak of popularity. The book possesses great force because the author draws on material from his surroundings (*pobut*), although only occasionally introducing folk language and never taking advantage of the oral traditions of the folk culture. Interesting but "chaotic" treatises come even from the region beyond the Carpathians, from the pen of Rev. Myxajlo Andrella; they are Baroque attempts at writing popular scholarly works of a theological nature.

4. The works of Havrylo Domec'kyj form an interesting page in the history of the Ukrainian treatise. Of his many prose works, some were printed, such as *Put' k vičnosti* (*The Road to Eternity*), a hundred years after his death (in 1784) in a Russified form; two others were published in scholarly editions in the twentieth century. Their content is traditionally ascetic and therefore of little interest. Their language, however, is greatly removed from the Church Slavonic, and, although it only closely approaches the vernacular, it remains one of the best examples of the language of the educated circles of the time—the end of the seventeenth century. (Domec'kyj's works, for the most part, were written between 1680 and 1690.) *O vozvannju do zakonu i o doskonalosti všedšyx v neho* (*Concerning the Call to the Law and the Perfection of Those Who Abide By It*), which was written for monks, is well constructed and quite systematic (three sections in twenty chapters), but, except for infrequent biblical quotations, is in no way reminiscent of Church language; even quotations taken from the fathers of the Church are written in the same language as are the remarks of

the author. To those who live by the letter of the law, he writes: "*Bo v nebi ne tyx koronujut', kotoryji načynajut', ale tyx, kotoryji až do smerty vytryvajut'. Ješče v pys'mi božom toje oznajmujet', iž Hospodu Bohu nihdy ne podobajet'sja hlupyj i nevimnyj obit . . . ale ščo horšaja, že besčestyje Bohu prynosjat' i kryvdu čynjat', ponevaž, učynyvšy obit i vykonavšy prysjahu, ne zaxovujut', jako prystojit; na takovyx spuskajet' Boh luk hnivu svojego.*" ("For in heaven are crowned not those who began, but those who persevered to the end. Even in the Holy Scriptures it has been proclaimed that a foolish and faithless vow is never pleasing to God . . . but even worse are those who behave disgracefully before God, doing Him injustice, showing Him a lack of respect, for having made their vows and taken their oaths they do not keep them as they should; on these types, God sends down the bow of his anger.") Domec'kyj writes the following in his *O poslušanyji* (*About Obedience*): "*Uvaž, iž zakon jest' slyčnyj i dorohyj vertohrad, porjadky i ustavy sut' ščepinnja dreves v nem, kotorye ščepyv sam Syn Božij . . . Sterečy toho vertohrada jest' svjatoje poslušanye, kotoroje koždomu robotnykovi ukazujet', ščo majet' čynyty . . . Tiji, kotoryji opatrujūt drevesa i ščepinnja, to jest' zaxovujut' porjadok i ustavy, sut' barzo mylymy Hospodu Isusu Xrystu. Ale na neposlušnyja, kotoryje psujut' vynnycju jeho, jako možet' laskave na nyx zrity? . . .*" ("Take note that the law is like a good and dear vineyard, onto whose trees order and law have been grafted by God Himself. . . . Guarding this vineyard is a sacred duty, but one which shows the worker what he ought to do. . . . Those who take care of the trees and their grafts, that is, those who keep the laws and order, are very pleasing to the Lord Jesus Christ. But as for those who are disobedient, who destroy His vines, how can He look mercifully on them?") In addition, this work is an interesting manifestation of the fact that there was a lack of definite linguistic norm for the various literary genres. While this undoubtedly enriched the linguistic possibilities within these genres, it hindered the development of a stylistic tradition on various linguistic levels.

5. Towards the end of the Baroque era, the treatise reached one of the peaks of its development in the works of H. Skovoroda. Skovoroda's moral theological treatise, *Načal'naja dver' ko xrystyjans'komu dobronraviju* (*The First Door to Christian Seemliness*), however, differs from the others since it was written for the lay reader. Generally speaking, this is the essence of Skovoroda's expositions: sometimes he develops his ideas systematically, while at other times he presents his ideas aphoristically. In those dialogs in which Skovoroda discusses his mystical, theological and moral views, both of these forms are combined. Skovoroda is particularly fond of contrasts and repetitions: "*V c'omu cilomu sviti baču ja dva svity . . . Svit vydnyj ta nevydnyj, žyvyj ta mertvyj, cilyj*

*ta rozpadlyvyj. Cej je ryza, a toj—tilo. Cej tin',—a toj derevo . . . Otže, svit u sviti je to vičnist' u tlinni, žyttja u smerti, probud u sni, svitlo u t'mi, u brexni pravda, v pečali radist', v oščaji nadija*" (translated by D. Čyžev's'kyj; "I see two worlds in this whole world. . . . A visible world and an invisible world, a live one and a dead one, a whole one and a crumbling one. One is the raiment, the other the body. One the shadow, the other the tree. And so the world in the world is like eternity in mortality, life in death, wakefulness in sleep, light in darkness, truth in the midst of lies, happiness in the midst of sorrow, hope in the midst of despair"). Or: "*Svit cej je velyke more . . . Na c'omu šljaxu zuстріčajut' nas kam'jani skeli ta skel'ky; na ostrovax—syreny, v hlybynax kyty, u povitri—vitry, xvyljuvannja usjudy; vid kameniv—štovxannja, vid seren—zvedennja, vid kytiv zahlytannja, vid vitriv—protyvlennja, vid xvyt' potoplennja . . .*" ("This world is a vast sea . . . as we journey over it we come across rocks and boulders; on the islands—sirens; in the depths—whales, in the open air—winds. The rocks jostle us; the sirens tempt us; the whales swallow us; the winds drive us the wrong way; the waves drown us."). In addition to such external embellishments, Skovoroda's works also contain many striking comparisons, some short and some extended. He relates some rather lengthy stories which he later explains symbolically, and introduces shorter prose fables (of which he wrote a significant number himself), to which he adds only a short "moral." Occasionally he uses straightforward comparisons: "*Boh je podobnyj povnomu fontanovi, ščo napovnjuje rizni posudyny za jix vmistom. Nad fontanom napys: nerivna usim rivnist', Lljut'sja z riznyx rurok rizni toky v rizni posudyny, ščo kolo fontanu stojat'. Menša posudyna maje menše, ale v tomu je bil'sij rivna, ščo tak same je povna*": "*Vsi . . . obdarovannja (ljudyne), ščo je taki rizni, čynyť toj samyj Dux svjatyj . . . U muzyčnomu orhani te same povitryja vyklykaje rizni holosy čerez rizni rurky*." ("God is like that fountain which fills various containers according to their individual capacity. Above the fountain hangs a sign: unequal equality to all. Streams of water pour from various pipes into the various containers which stand around the fountain. A smaller container has less, but is equal to the larger one since it is likewise full." "All gifts bestowed on men, how various their forms may be, all come from the same Holy Spirit. . . . In a musical organ, the same wind calls forth different sounds from different pipes."). Skovoroda is fond of harmony on the linguistic level. His exposition abounds in assonances: "*nosymym nosyt'sja i deržymym deržyt'sja*," "*molvyt' vsimy molvamy*," "*vitreno veselije*," "*bezzakonija bezdna*," "*svit i sovit*," "*more myra*." In addition, some individual words are rhymed: "*biža i nabiža*," "*čeho želat', a čeho ubihat'*." Rhyme is frequent, especially in aphorisms: "*xto vo ščo vlyubysja, tot vo to i preobrazyvsja*," ("man becomes what he adores"), "*z pryrodoju žyt' i z*

*Bohom byt'*," ("to live in nature and be with God"). From such aphorisms it is but a small step to the epigram. The language is often rhythmical.

6. The dialog form of Skovoroda's works is also interesting. Unfortunately, it must be admitted that it is in large measure only a superficial embellishment, which does not tie in organically with the content of the work. Only rarely are the persons engaged in the dialog individually characterized, and the author sometimes, perhaps forgetting their individuality, assigns them different roles in subsequent parts of the same dialog. The questions posed by those taking part in the dialog in no way contribute to the development of the idea. Ideas are simply divided up among the speakers. Much more interesting are the dialogs written by Teofan Prokopovyč, who also wrote other treatises—*Pravda voli monaršej* (*The Truth of Rulers' Will*), and *Duxovnyj regljament* (*Concerning Spiritual Rules*)—which formed the foundation for Russian absolutism; these works are also interesting because they use the modern judicial theories of Hobbes, Grotius and others. Prokopovyč's dialogs, *Rozhovor derevodila z kupcem* (*The Dialogue Between the Lumberman and the Merchant*) and *Rozhovor hraždanyňa z seljanyňom ta pivcem cerkovnym* (*The Citizen's Conversation with the Peasant and the Church Singer*), which are concerned with religious issues (the former about the importance of the Church, and the latter, the importance of spiritual enlightenment) are in parts very successful as dialogs. The conversation progresses naturally, with one idea tied into the next; the speakers, even in their speech, are individualized.

7. The dialog form was not new to Ukrainian literature. Typical thematically of the treatise written in dialog form is *Knyha o smerti* (*A Book About Death*, 1626), which paints most terrifying pictures of the last stages of man: death, the last judgment, hell—and, rather briefly, paradise. The following example is typical of the angel's words to mortal man: "Tvoje tilo . . . vže teper, bidnyj čolovice, slabije, a po maloži xvyli i oderv'janije; . . . dryžannja sercja nastupaje, persy zadmut'sja, pul'sy vstanut', oči mhloju zajdut', jazyk umovkne, horlo oxrypije, zuby počornijut' i vsi členy, jak kamin' ztverdijut' i poblidnut'. Doktory tebe odstup'jat', likarstva ne pomohut', otec', i maty, i bratija, i pryjатели vže tebe ne porjatujuť, potravu žadnoje i pyva dobryji koštuvaty ne budeš, z miscja na misce, a ližka na ližko perenosyť tebe budúť, budeš xotity ščo movyťy, ale jazyk služyťy ne bude, sxočeš vzdoxnuty, ale persy ne dopustjat', budeš xotity z pryjateljamy rozmovyťysja, ale ne vozmožeš; vnutrenosti bude harjačka pekty, a zvni xlad i pit zymnyj, znak defektiv tilesnyx na tobja sja pokaže; pryjатели pry tobi budúť stojaty, a ty jix vydity ne budeš, budúť z toboju movyťy, a ty jix slyšaty ne budeš, budúť nad toboju plakaty, ale tobi ničoho ne pomohut', budúť tja napomynaty, a ty toho rozumity ne budeš; a

*potim, kohda od tebe smrod zaxodyty bude, niž prežde umreš, vsi tebe ostavljat'.*" ("Now, my poor man, your body is weakening, and in a little while will become wooden; your heart will then begin to shake, your chest will be out of breath, your pulse stop, a mist will cover your eyes, your tongue will be silenced, your throat will become hoarse, your teeth will turn black, while all your members become pale and hard as stone. Doctors will abandon you, medicines will be of no help; neither father, nor mother, nor brothers, nor friends can save you now. You will never taste food nor drink good beer again. They will move you from place to place, from bed to bed. You will want to say something but will not be able to use your tongue; want to sigh, but your chest will not move; want to talk to your friends, but be unable to do so. Inside, a fever will be burning, while outside, cold and sweat will show the weakness in your body. Your friends will stand around you, but you will not see them, will talk to you, but you will not hear them, will cry over you but be unable to help you, will admonish you, but you will not understand. And then, when a smell starts to rise from your body, everyone will leave you—even before you are dead."). This is a most vivid example of typical Baroque "naturalism" and the manner in which the Baroque developed one of its favorite themes.

From the middle of the eighteenth century, treatises by Ukrainian authors became ever more frequently written in Russian. Such works must be considered in a study of the development of Ukrainian thought, but they do not belong to the Ukrainian literary heritage.

## K. UKRAINIAN BAROQUE LITERATURE AGAINST THE BACKDROP OF WORLD LITERATURE

1. The significant development which occurred in Ukrainian literature in the Baroque era established strong ties between Ukrainian literature and world literature, for a literature which undergoes a period of intense activity always draws on various other national literatures. On the other hand, one could expect Ukrainian literature to exert an influence on neighboring countries. In fact, such an influence, and not an insignificant one, did make itself felt but only in the territories of Ukraine's closest neighbors.

2. We have already seen that the religious element played a dominant role in Ukrainian Baroque literature. For this reason knowledge of Western literature and the uses to which it was put was rather one-sided. But a certain familiarity with secular literature is also apparent (see the sections on the epos and tale). Direct references to Western writers provide the most definite proof of this, although quotations were common only in polemical and scholarly works.

Further information is provided by the descriptions of the libraries of various Ukrainian scholars and leaders (for the most part, spiritual: Mohyla, Slavy-nec'kyj, St. Javors'kyj, Prokopovyč, D. Tuptalo, A. Macijevyč, although we do have some information about secular persons as well: cf. references in Ja. Markovyč and Xanenko). Ancient literature (notably Latin) and the works of the fathers of the Church (eastern ones primarily from Latin translations; Stavrovec'kyj even spoke Greek, while Kopystens'ky was at least able to read it) were well known. Mention is also made of the ancient philosophers; medieval scholasticism was well known in Catholic circles, as were the works of the representatives of non-Orthodox thought, in general. Especially interesting is the familiarity with the Renaissance thinkers (Machiavelli, Pico della Mirandola, Gemistus Pletho, Nicholas of Cusa, Zabarella, Peter Ramus, Giordano Bruno, Cardano, Erasmus, Agrippa von Nettesheim, Bodin, Vives), and even more so, of course, with those of the Baroque era (Bacon, Kepler, Alsted, Descartes, Locke, Hobbes, Grotius, Comenius, and perhaps even Spinoza). Broader still was the knowledge of religious literature which played an important role in belletristic literature (e.g., the religious song, the works of the mystics, and so on).

3. Translations were not numerous. This, however, is typical of Baroque culture: the Baroque was, to a large degree, intended for the religious and secular upper strata. There was no need for translations from Latin since these people knew Latin; even less necessary were translations from Polish. Thus, only the "lower" literary forms (tales meant for the people, verse) were translated—from Latin (see above—Velyčkovs'kyj, who translated Owen, the English epigrammist, Skovoroda, who translated Vergil, Ovid, Horace and the neo-Latin poets, Muretus, and Hosius, etc.), from Polish (tales and verses, see above), sometimes from Czech. There were even some translations made of German religious songs (S. Todors'kyj). However, translations of serious material were also made, among which are the translations—adaptations made from Plutarch and Cicero by Skovoroda. It would be far more interesting to discuss the foreign works which were used as models in this period (compare the reference to Boccaccio in the section about the tale), but little has yet been done in this area. Characteristically, the preachers frequently quote old and new Latin literature and even make their dispositions in Latin (Javors'kyj, Bužyns'kyj). But we have at the moment very little material about the extent of the use made of old and new Latin literature. Characteristic proof of the fact that Ukrainians did know neo-Latin literature is provided by the Ukrainian translators in Russia: their number was large and they translated hundreds of works, many of them Latin works of the seventeenth century.

4. The influence of Ukrainian literature on Russian literature was very

great in the seventeenth century and remained important in the eighteenth. We have already referred to more than one Ukrainian (e.g., the preachers), who worked in Russia. Frequently, Polish and Western works (e.g., tales—although in this area, Russian literature did make its own peculiar contributions) came to Russia by way of these Ukrainians. But it was the Ukrainians who generally introduced definite literary genres, e.g., verse and drama into Russia; a representative of the Kievan school, Symeon Poloc'kyj (a White Russian) revived the dying Russian sermon—and his successors were, for the most part, Ukrainians. Quite impressive also was the role played by Ukrainians in Russian scholarship, although the works (theological) written by Ukrainians were not infrequently banned, or the cause of persecution. Interestingly enough, even the theological literature of the “Old Believers” is to a large degree composed of Ukrainian works. As a whole, Russian literature of the seventeenth century can, at certain moments and in certain areas, seem to be but a “branch” of Ukrainian literature. Very great, although less easily visible, is the influence of Ukrainian literature on Russian literature of the eighteenth century: one of its founders, A. Kantemir, wrote in the tradition of Ukrainian syllabic verse; the influence of Ukrainian verse is quite strong (all the more so as syllabic verse existed for a rather long time in Moscow, side by side with the new tonic lines). The number of Ukrainian translators (among them H. Poletyka) was quite large, as was the number of Ukrainian scholars, who to a large degree, developed Russian terminology. Ukrainian poets writing in Russian (the most famous of whom are Bohdanovyč and Kapnist, who, by the way, translated Skovoroda) were brought up in the style of the Ukrainian Baroque, but wrote in the spirit of the new “classicism,” and introduced into Russian literature, sometimes in newer forms, the traditional themes of the Ukrainian lyric. A Ukrainian who was in many ways related to his countryman Skovoroda, Semen Hamaliija, played the leading role in the development of eighteenth century Russian mysticism. Greater still was the influence exerted by the Orthodox, Pajisij Velyčkovs'kyj (see below, no. 6).

5. In Polish literature, the Ukrainian stream had established a definite “Ukrainian school” quite early, and certainly long before the nineteenth century. Understandably, the existence of such a “Ukrainian school” does not arouse very pleasant feelings in the hearts of patriotic Ukrainians, for it gives sustenance to certain not totally unfounded Polish pretensions regarding some areas of Ukrainian culture and reminds them of the loss to the Polish camp of Ukrainian writers, whose national feeling was weak. Ukrainian themes in Polish literature, of course, also point to that certain abundance of “potential energy” in Ukrainian culture, which, unfortunately, was sometimes spent only on foreign ground.

In this connection, one need only mention the very famous works which can be attributed to the "Ukrainian school" of Polish literature during the Baroque era. Already in the poems of the first representative of the Polish Baroque lyric, M. Sęp-Szarzynski (d. 1581), we find a quotation from a Ukrainian song. Latin poems written on themes from Ukrainian life, e.g., "Roxolania" by Klonowicz (1584), were imitated by such Polish poems as "*Sielanki*" ("The Peasant Idylls"), by Sz. Szymonowicz (1614 and 1628), and later in works by the brothers Zimorowicz, "*Roksolanki to jest ruskie panny*" ("Roxolanas or Ruthenian Girls," 1654), and "*Sielanki nowe ruskie*" ("New Ruthenian Peasant Idylls," published in 1663, but written earlier); finally, there are Ukrainian *intermedia* in the Polish dramas of Gawatowicz which were mentioned earlier, the *Chronicle of Jerlyč*, as well as the witty Polish verses of Danylo Bratkov'skyj (1697), a Ukrainian nobleman who even sacrificed his life in service to Ukraine. If we were also to include works not of the first calibre, or the occasional Ukrainian elements in the works that were written in Polish, the list would be extremely long. Ukrainian motifs are clearly perceptible in the poems of the famous Baroque poet, Waclaw Potocki (1625-1696). Both Ukrainian poets and prose writers contributed to the incorporation of Ukrainian elements into Polish poetry: Lazar Baranovyč published numerous poems in Polish as well; many works of polemical literature were published in Polish, as were numerous Orthodox writings, often simultaneously with the Slavonic edition (even publications of the Kievan Caves Monastery). More examples could be found if we were to begin to search out the less significant Ukrainian motifs in Polish literature: we would find, for example, many echoes of Ukrainian songs (e.g., the well-known *Kulyna*). No less numerous are the motifs derived from Ukrainian history which appear in poems as well as Polish Baroque chronicles. That no inventory of such Ukrainian motifs has been made by literary historians does a great injustice to Ukrainian Baroque literature. Many Ukrainian writers also lie hidden among the "Polish" authors of Latin works (see Ch. VIII).

6. Likewise perceptible is the influence of the Ukrainian Baroque in the southwest, in the Balkans. Reference to this was made above (Kozachyn'skyj's dramas, as well as his work among the Serbs). G. Stefanovič-Venclovič (eighteenth century) imitated L. Baranovyč. Of particular importance for the southern Slavs was Meletij Smotryč'kyj's grammar which was republished by the Serbs in 1755 and became the foundation for a Serbian language based on Church Slavonic—it was the prototype for several Serbian grammars until the beginning of the nineteenth century. Among the Bulgarians, this grammar was most important in the attempt to bring the Bulgarian language closer to Church Slavonic. In Rumania, Church life was revived by the son of the Ukrainian poet



Ivan Velyčkovs'kyj, the "elder" Pajisij, who established an entire literary school there, and whose Slavonic version of *Dobrotoljubye* (*The Love of Goodness*) was very significant for all Orthodox Slavs (but least of all in Ukraine). There is also a Latin idyll by an anonymous writer, dated 1658, which describes the life of Ukrainian shepherds in the Tatra mountains (possibly near the Poprad). Further research into Latin literature in Slovakia would also probably yield interesting results. The furthest outpost of Ukrainian Baroque literature was located in Trnava in Slovakia (although this must still be researched). Numerous Ukrainian students went even further west (as far as England and Spain). At the end of the Baroque era, in the eighteenth century, the Ukrainian Poletyka was a professor in Kiel, and Ivan Xmel'nyč'kyj was a lecturer in philosophy in Königsberg. Through their works they helped to enrich Western scholarship although to a very limited extent; much more interesting was the influence they exerted at home (see above, no. 2). In Halle, Germany, for a time around 1735, translations of German theological works as well as religious songs by S. Todors'kyj were published in the typical Slavonic-Ukrainian language of the Baroque.

7. Finally, Baroque literature—especially verse and drama—played a very significant part in the development of folk poetry in all parts of the world. Leaving aside the semi-mythical authors (Marusja Čurajivna) of folk songs in the Baroque era, we can observe concrete evidence of how the folk song acquired the stylistic elements of the Baroque verse, while, on the other hand, the Baroque itself was attracted to folk poetry and drew on its wealth of devices; for the Baroque poet, variety was important and material derived from the oral tradition served to give an added dimension to his works. Earlier, we intentionally paused to discuss the use of proverbs by both Baroque preachers and chroniclers. Proverbs are also frequently encountered even in verse. The proverbs were commonly translated from Latin; some were created by the writer himself, others taken from among the people. Similarly, in addition to verses which were written in accordance with Baroque poetics, there are also poems which give the impression of being "montages" of folk songs (this aspect of Baroque poetry has also as yet not been thoroughly investigated).

8. There has never been an historical epoch which developed, even within the confines of one country, one definitive ideology. On the contrary, for the most part, a given society develops diametrically opposed ideologies. From our temporally distant vantage point certain features common to all the currents of thought of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries become visible. We spoke of these earlier (Ch. VII, pts. A and B), but will mention the most important ones again here. The ideology of the Ukrainian Baroque, while remaining within the Old Ukrainian Christian tradition, at the same time absorbed some elements of

ancient (through the Baroque synthesis of Christianity and antiquity), and Western culture. Admittedly, only certain elements from antiquity and seventeenth century Europe were adopted in Ukraine; first a definite aesthetic ideal and a belief in the almost independent merit of aesthetic values, and secondly several elements of the political and national ideology of the Baroque. Baroque aesthetics deeply instilled in Ukraine the belief in the value of external form: the cultivation of the purely formal aspects of literature (especially in versified poems) and the introduction of formal embellishments into all genres of literature, even into those in which the main emphasis should be on content (sermon, chronicle, tract) become all the more striking when we compare Ukrainian Baroque literature to its Russian counterpart. The political and national ideology without a doubt strengthened the idea of a nationally independent Ukrainian people in many circles, and was instrumental in establishing the politically active man as a heroic chivalrous ideal. In both of these ideological acquisitions of the Ukrainian Baroque we can detect many negative features. But there is no doubt that both played a major role in the intellectual life of Ukraine in the nineteenth century. Especially important is the fact that they deterred Ukrainians from accepting abstract and utopian ideologies for a considerable length of time and assisted in maintaining literary and national traditions in times of great despair and in very difficult situations. Also very important were those tight bonds which Ukraine established with the West in the Baroque era. The Christian culture of the Ukrainian Baroque created and strengthened a certain broader outlook on "externals" in areas of both religious and national matters; "external" features were no longer as important as they had been for Ivan Vyšens'kyj, for example, and many of his contemporaries; at the same time, however, the "internal" was regarded as more important. Once again, one need only glance at the situation in Moscow at that time to appreciate the significance of this achievement: in Ukraine, a Russian *raskol*, and *starobrydčestvo* were absolutely impossible. One could speak of the fact that the adopting of elements of Western culture resulted in a certain frivolous attitude to Christian tradition, but at the same time, it must not be forgotten that within its bounds, there was still room for such ascetics as St. Joasaf Horlenko, St. Dmytro Tuptalo, St. Innokentij Irkuts'kyj or a martyr such as Arsenij Macijevyč.

The names mentioned above lead us back to the question of the essentially Christian nature of the Ukrainian Baroque. Outside the area of theology, there is no other name to be found in the Ukrainian literature of the Baroque which would be considered important today: with the theological works of St. Dmytro Tuptalo we must also include those of Adam Zörnrikau (see pt. I, no. 1) as well as Pajisij Velyčkovs'kyj's, *The Love of Goodness*, (see pt. J, no. 6). Only one

attempt at a philosophical-theological synthesis survived from this period, and although not new in the details used, it is, as a whole, an independent artistic creation, the significance of which extends beyond its own era. This is the system devised by Skovoroda. The greatest ideological accomplishments of the Ukrainian Baroque belong to the nature of its literary creativity.

9. As for its national value, it must be said that Baroque literature did not come to use the vernacular, the language of the people. But a literary language need not be close to the vernacular, and the Baroque followed one possible course whose unsuitability became obvious only at the end of the eighteenth century when the upper strata of Ukrainian society began to appear and political oppression demanded a "radical" criterion for national awareness: the national language became this criterion. Meanwhile, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, such a criterion was not yet necessary. What was necessary was the creation of definite linguistic, orthographic and stylistic norms. The religious school did not aspire to leadership in this area: no orthographic norms were established which might have decisively distinguished Ukrainian from other eastern Slavic languages with which it was tied, e.g., the change of "ě" to "i" occurs under Western influence. A grammatical norm was established only for Church Slavonic (important here was Meletij Smotryč'kyj's grammar). There was no attempt at all at resolving the question of the relationship between the level of language and its possible stylistic function. Nothing could have been more natural in the Baroque era than measuring the level of the Church Slavonic language by the character of the work (of the "high" style were liturgical books, religious treatises, scholarly works, "lofty" epics; in "low" style more vernacular elements were introduced) or the use of the vernacular in only certain genres (epigrams, fairy tales, comedies, etc.). Such norms were established (albeit, later) quite openly and according to a definite plan in Russian literature (and, curiously enough, possibly under the influence of a *theory* of Ukrainian origin); less according to plan, but rather consistently, it shaped the linguistic tradition of the literary Czech of the Baroque era (where it was a matter of distinguishing between the functions of a more archaic or more modern language); this did not happen in Ukrainian. For this reason, we have such examples as the religious treatises of Havrylo Domec'kyj in which use of Church Slavonic is minimal; and for this reason we have epigrams of a purely Church Slavonic nature (e.g., those of Dmytro Tuptalo and, so it seems, of Havrylo Domec'kyj; striking is the inconsistency of the language used by Velyčkovs'kyj in his epigrams). Such linguistic normalization could have greatly altered the further development of the Ukrainian literary language, but whether this would have been for the better or the worse need not be discussed here.

With regard to the protests against “outdated,” “narrow,” and “unnational” themes of the literature of the Ukrainian Baroque, we can only say that these protests reveal a lack of understanding: the themes found in Ukrainian Baroque literature, with but a few exceptions, are the same as those used in Baroque literature in general. Any deviations were the result of the difficult position of the Ukraine during this period—a position which hindered the development of a separate class of literary men. Ukraine lost many men of letters to foreign countries. Many left as a result of the general predilection of the Baroque man for spiritual wandering (Leibniz, the most outstanding representative of German Baroque, wrote the majority of his works in Latin or French). This “loss” was not so important to the Ukrainian Baroque which, if it had been in a more favorable political situation, would not have read those works which were Russified before publication or the Polish works of St. Dmytro Tuptalo, Javors’kyj or Baranovyč, but rather their Ukrainian versions, or at least, Ukrainian translations. The “loss” was to the nineteenth century, the historical development of which led to the neglect of such an interesting, and to a certain degree illustrious, page of the past—the Ukrainian Baroque.

The spiritual and national importance of the Baroque has been repeatedly noted. We will add in conclusion that the accomplishments of this era could have a positive influence on both the present and future generations of Ukrainians if their tremendous significance is recognized.

## VIII.

# LITERATURE WRITTEN IN LATIN

1. In the period extending from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries Ukrainian literature in Latin begins to appear. Latin was the international language of scholarship and, in Poland, the official language of the administration and the schools. At the end of the sixteenth century Ukrainian schools (especially that of the brotherhood in Lviv) were oriented toward the study of Greek. But as it soon became obvious that it was impossible to avoid Latin, the Ostrih school and then the Kievan Academy began to teach Latin and to use Latin as the language of instruction. From the time of Petro Mohyla, Latin became the norm, and Greek receded to a secondary level.

Latin became important when polemical literature began to develop, and as early as the sixteenth century we actually find works beginning to be written in Latin. Although the majority of these works cannot be classified as "belletristic" literature in the narrow sense of the term, they are important because of the light they cast upon the literature written in Ukrainian—upon the nature of its content and ideological tendencies as well as the sources and characteristics of its style.

Equally important is the fact that even the most superficially educated man at that time, while at school, had to read the Latin authors—"pagan," old Christian and contemporary. Cicero and Erasmus were most important in the teaching of style, and their works were ordered in large numbers for use in the schools.

2. At this time no survey of Ukrainian literature in Latin nor any preparatory work on the subject exists. As a result, we are forced to limit ourselves only to some general comments.

As early as the sixteenth century we find Ukrainians among the representative of Polish Protestant sects and, by the end of the century, among Uniate writers. An especially prominent Protestant publicist, Stanislaw Orzechowski (1513-1566), himself professed to be "Gente Roxolani," wrote his name in Latin as "Orichovius," adding afterwards "Ruthenus." As was mentioned earlier, the sympathies of the countrymen of Ivan Vyšens'kyj and Marcin Krowicki lay with the Orthodox Church. Some members of the Ukrainian gentry found their way into the camps of the radical Protestants, the "Socinians" or the "Arians," and took part in the religious polemics of the time.

3. More intense activity in this branch of Ukrainian literature took place in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Since Latin became the language of instruction at the Kievan Academy and later in other schools of higher learning (the Seminary in Perejaslav, the Xarkiv Collegium), texts of Latin manuscripts were compiled: most numerous in the archives are textbooks of poetics, philosophy and theology. Almost every professor of these subjects left behind written notes which were rewritten and found their way to the far north and east; in the eighteenth century they came to be used in seminaries throughout the Russian Empire. Prokopovyč's textbook on poetics (*De arte poetica*, 1786), one of those which was later printed, is not characteristic of the Baroque (see above, Ch. VII, pt. H, no. 7). Four volumes of theological tracts written by Prokopovyč were published in Germany in the years 1782-84. This book was used in Ukrainian and Russian Orthodox seminaries for many years. Separate treatises also appeared in print: *Kamen' very* (*Rock of Faith*, 1782) by Javors'kyj, a collection of articles by Prokopovyč, *Miscellanea sacra* (1745), and *De processione Spiritus Sancti* by Adam Zörnigau (of German origin, published in 1773), which was the most valuable of all the theological treatises of the Kievan Academy. Also attributed to Prokopovyč are some parts of the response to Javors'kyj's anti-Protestant *Kamin'*, which a cunning Jena professor, Buddeus, published under his own name. Until the twentieth century, these theological works provided Western theologians with their only knowledge of Orthodox theology. A large number of Uniate treatises and some "Arian" ones were also written by Ukrainians (some of the Ukrainian "Arians" lived in exile beyond the Polish borders). Finally, there were several Ukrainian professors teaching at the Hungarian University in Trnava in Slovakia (until 1777, when it was moved to Pest); some of their works have also survived.

The works on poetics (which also use Slavonic material) have not yet been thoroughly studied, while philosophical texts published in *Universae matheseos brevis institutio* (1752) by Anton Revyc'kyj, one of the professors at Trnava, have not been studied at all.

Ukrainian authors wrote Latin verses for their textbooks on poetics; however, the writing of Latin verses was not limited to such purposes. Javors'kyj is credited with a beautiful elegy—a farewell to his library, Prokopovyč, with a panegyric to Kiev. Several Latin verses by Skovoroda have also survived.

Finally, there are letters. Almost every writer, whatever his field may have been, left behind a large number of letters in Latin, some of which have been published (e.g., 150 Latin letters by Skovoroda). Characteristic of the Baroque because of their literary form, they are potentially valuable sources for a study of the poetics of the time as well as the ideology and education of their authors. Even in letters written in the Slavic languages we encounter Latin terms, quotations or particular formulations, especially in those instances when the author required a special term to express his idea. In addition, excerpts from Latin, quotations, epistles, and entire plans for sermons can be found in the Slavonic sermons of Ukrainian preachers.

None of this material has yet been researched or even compiled.

## IX.

### THE LITERATURE OF “NATIONAL REVIVAL”

1. In general, it is difficult to assign a specific date to the beginning of any literary or historical period. Nevertheless, the beginning of modern Ukrainian literature is usually designated as 1798, the date of publication of Kotljarevs'kyj's *Enejida* (*The Aeneid*). The isolation of this date is perfectly justified, for the appearance of the *Enejida* signalled the beginning of the use of the Ukrainian spoken language as a literary language. The establishment of the living vernacular as a literary device was not at all a “necessary” development: of all the Slavs, only the Slovenes and Belorussians were as resolute as the Ukrainians in adapting popular speech for literary purposes. In Ukraine, this change in the literary language was associated with the development of national consciousness (although the national movement as such began, in its new forms, only several decades later). It is not axiomatic that a modern literary language, whether vernacular or not, must be connected with a new national awareness. However, in Ukraine such a connection did arise and later generations regarded the linguistic reform of Kotljarevs'kyj as the beginning of the modern period of national life. As shall be seen, this judgment was not altogether correct.

2. The psychological link which was established between the vernacular as the basis of the literary language and the national consciousness had certain literary consequences. The principal one was that for a long time all works written in the popular language were, in the opinion of national circles, considered as one group. The emotion generated by the national revival blinded authors, readers and critics alike to differences of literary taste and to divergences of outlook in individual authors and literary currents. It was a time when world literature in the nineteenth century saw literary currents that were sharply



defined and differentiated one from the other and which often began their existence with the publication of literary "manifestos." However, it was not until almost the end of the nineteenth century that the Ukrainian writers and readers were conscious of any sense of the variety of literary styles and ideologies. In part, they accepted all older writing in the vernacular simply as such; in part, they misinterpreted it in the spirit of their own views. In this same manner, later Populist Realism earnestly sought out the democratic elements not only in Kotljarev's'kyj, but also in Hulak-Artemovs'kyj and other older writers. Likewise, representatives of the "moderates" purposely overlooked the social and political radicalism of Ševčenko, etc.

3. However, it is not simply that the differences in literary trends among the nineteenth century Ukrainian writers were not felt by the readers and critics. To a certain degree, these differences, in fact, did not exist. They did not exist because literature, just recently revived by the new language, was taking its "first steps" and was only gradually defining itself, breaking off into currents and becoming differentiated. Moreover, the later writer with his modern literary views recognized in every older writer who wrote in the vernacular not an enemy or rival but an ally with whom he was spiritually united through the use of the same literary language. All writers, regardless of the differences in their social situation, outlook, and style, etc., felt themselves to be members of one family with the same nationally oriented ideology. Clearly, this was a delusion, and it led to the fact that later writers neglected their own personal literary views and imitated their predecessors. Such imitation not only contributed to a definite stagnation in literary forms, but was also a considerable impediment to the individual development of particular writers. Even in recent times, literary creativity has often fallen back on works that have been preeminent in the development of the national literature, but which are antiquated in form, e.g., "kotljarevščyna," the cultivation of fables, etc.

4. Another consequence of the use of the spoken language by modern literature was that Ukrainian literature remained tied for too long to those sources upon which the modern literary language was forced to draw—folk poetry. As a result, the thematic material and the phraseology of literature narrowed somewhat, again impeding its development.

However, the narrowing in literary themes stemmed from yet another cause. It was not simply a whim of Kotljarev's'kyj and his followers that turned the vernacular into the literary language. Its establishment as such had a real basis: at the end of the eighteenth century in Ukraine certain culturally active strata became denationalized—in particular, the upper nobility and the higher circles of the clergy. Therefore, the task of the Ukrainian national movement during the

entire nineteenth century was to create its own circles of cultural leaders. The simple revival or "regeneration" of the "lost" strata did not succeed; the leading role was taken up by other, newly created strata. The Ukrainian nation, having lost its leading classes at the end of the eighteenth century, became a nation that was "incomplete"; similarly "incomplete" was its literature (see below). The entire meaning and thrust of the Ukrainian national movement during the nineteenth century consisted in "completing" the national organism, in raising it to a true culturally independent stratum. In the field of literature, this difficult task involved the creation of a complete system of literary forms. For a long time the attempt failed, especially since various social and political conditions stood in its way. Occasionally literature did attain its goal, only to be followed by a period of decline. Fundamentally, an "incomplete" literature was unable to satisfy the needs of even the culturally-leading class. The creation of a self-sufficient literature was achieved by Ukrainian literature only in modern times with its variety of literary genres and currents. However, here the obstacle of politics has arisen, for the Soviet regime purposely maintains all national literatures, except the Russian, at the level of "incomplete" literatures.

5. This designation of the entire literature of the nineteenth century as a literature of "national revival" or, more accurately, of "national awakening" necessitates certain observations about the discussion that is to follow. A literature that is insufficiently differentiated by trends can be divided into currents only to a certain degree and under certain conditions. Nineteenth century Ukrainian literature is characterized by many prominent writers of indistinct literary complexion. There are Romantics who imitated Classicism in either form or style; there are Realists whose creations were in the tradition of Romanticism and who also adopted certain elements of classicist poetics. Moreover, there are some currents represented in other literatures that did not develop in Ukraine at all. In addition, Ukrainian literature found itself losing its own identity from time to time under the inescapable influence of its strong neighbors. In itself, this would not have been so harmful (for both Russian and Polish literatures were in a period of full bloom); however, these foreign influences tore Ukrainian literature away from the wider sphere of world literature. Furthermore, they were not always well digested nor creatively reworked in consideration of the needs and problems of Ukrainian national life. It is only with qualification, therefore, that the following discussion sometimes will assign particular phenomena according to the literary principles of differentiation. And only under certain conditions will it venture forth from the sphere of Ukrainian literature into foreign (and not always fertile) fields.

There is a modification in the discussion in another aspect as well: beginning

with Romanticism, the material will be divided not according to literary genre, but according to author, for the Romantic period in Ukraine produced a fundamental change in the psychology of the author and in his attitude toward his work. In this world, man was the focus of attention for the Romantic worldview; and in works of literature, the subject was the author, either real or fictitious (as in instances of pseudonyms, or in attempts to speak in the name of an omniscient author, or a *kobzar* minstrel, etc.). Former times had numerous pseudonymous, anonymous, or "pseudoepigraphic" works (attributed by the author to someone else—e.g., poetry or *Istoriia Rusiv* [*The History of the Russes*]). Since the time of Romanticism, every author has had his own literary biography (only *literary* biographies interest us in this book). Accordingly, it is impossible to fragment the creativity of a particular author, and to insert his individual works in different divisions in the book.

## X.

# CLASSICISM

### A. LITERARY CLASSICISM

1. The transition in world literature from the Baroque to Classicism was one of those typical transitions away from an "extremely ornamental, embellished style" (see Introduction) which the history of literature has undergone from time to time. In Ukraine, literature had already experienced such a transition by the thirteenth century when it was a phenomenon that was part of a certain literary decline. In the present period (Classicism), however, such a transition was in complete opposition to the style of the Baroque. In the West, it was practically a literary revolution at the base of which lay a change in literary tastes and objectives. Formerly, the aim of literary works had been to excite and arouse the reader, to create a powerful effect on him by their originality of structure and artistic devices. Novel, yet profound, ideas had been pursued, while old ones had been formulated in an unexpected, new way so as to produce an impression of unconstrained spontaneity. Now new literary ideals arose which eschewed this Baroque dynamism. The representatives of this new style consciously sought after the most precise expression for their ideas, clarity in form, and logic in construction. The work as a whole had to project the impression of tranquil harmony—in pursuit of which the ideal of beauty assumed prime importance. Not originality nor novelty but traditional canons became highly valued once more. Furthermore, the "grotesque," which had played such a major role in Baroque literature, either became almost insignificant or receded altogether. The return to the ideals of the Renaissance was complete.

Classicism assumed a peculiar form in Ukraine where certain factors (see

below) precluded the establishment of any significant opposition to the Baroque. In addition, the new "classicist" style did not enjoy the wide development found in the West or among other Slavic peoples: Ukrainian Classicism was weak and rather poorly defined.

2. Classicism involved a return to the aesthetic ideals of antiquity, or more properly, to its own notions about these ideals. In reality, it made use of only certain elements of the aesthetics of antiquity—and then not always correctly: consequently, it did not develop its own aesthetic system. For this reason, "Classicism" might perhaps be called "pseudo-classicism" as some literary historians of the nineteenth and early twentieth century have done. However, their particular use of the expression "pseudo-classicism" was altogether unhistorical since it was meant to imply the awkwardness, the imperfect nature and the relative insignificance of this literary trend; moreover, it merely paralleled the negative attitude of this later period itself (Classicism) towards its literary predecessor, the Baroque. It is advisable, therefore, to ignore this unhistorical and unfair label, "pseudo-classicism."\*

3. The literary theory of Classicism accepted—as did the Classicists as a whole—the canons of the literary theory of antiquity. Beauty once again became, along with sublimity, the fundamental aesthetic ideal. At the basis of this trend lay the fulfillment of a whole system of prescriptions which had more or less regulated classical poetry (Horace) and which were ultimately reworked by the theoreticians of Classicism (Boileau, for example). Like all precepts of artistic technique, these principles assumed fixed and perhaps even narrow proportions. Nevertheless, far from restricting the authors' basic, untrammelled creativity within their confines, these precepts actually facilitated it.

This system of prescriptions will not be examined in detail; however, it must be recognized as having been neither arid nor unduly limiting. Following the classical models, lyricism was allowed. As well, a specific place was reserved for pathos, humor and even "poetic disorder." The extraordinarily high value attributed to "the lofty and sublime" determined that the greatest role should be played by historical (either classical or national) motifs and figures (kings and heroes). Yet, the poetics of Classicism also found room for humor and satire, the common people and even their language, and the contemporary scene in all its diversity. Later of course, the depiction by the Classicists of all these spheres appeared artificial to succeeding generations; but this was a matter of literary

---

\*In this discussion, the terms "Classicism" and "Classicists" will be used. The word "classics" will be avoided in order to prevent confusion with the other meaning of "classic"—a writer who belongs to that small circle of the greatest (i.e., classic) writers of a given nation.

taste. Classicism rejected altogether the excessively complicated style, the overburdening of details and the superfluity of formal embellishments characteristic of works of the late Baroque. Simplicity, clarity and lucidity of construction constituted its ideal.

The Classicist system of poetics was characterized by certain traditional literary forms, all linked with classical antiquity. A theory of genres was elaborated in detail covering: drama (including tragedy and comedy), *epos* (long epic poem in verse), the novel and other prose forms, and various types of lyrics (ode, satire, fable, lyrical epistle, idyll, elegy, epigram, etc.). For each of these categories there were fixed rules regarding content and form.

The fact that later the epic poem, tragedy and the ode were deemed to be the typical forms of Classicism is due partly to an error of historical perspective. In fact, this school provided the best modern examples of other genres as well, such as comedy, fable, satire. Another mistaken notion later held that kings and demigods were the typical heroes of Classicist literature. Yet common folk too were introduced into certain of its categories—the above-mentioned comedy, fable, satire, and, to a degree, the idyll and lyrical epistle, and the prose epic. In these latter genres, even contemporary life could be depicted; consequently, the charges concerning the preponderance of historical and abstract themes in Classicism are not altogether justifiable. To be sure, in comparison with the distribution and type of thematics in subsequent literature, Classicism suffers a great deal. And, while common speech found its way into this literature, it was, again, limited to particular forms such as the fable and certain secondary genres.

4. It was these "lesser genres," specifically travesties, that acquired the greatest significance in Ukrainian Classicism. Probably to this day, travesties remain better known to readers in the Ukraine than elsewhere because of the archetype [*Enejida* (the *Aeneid*)] Kotljarev's'kyj "turned inside-out." Ukrainian travesties also claimed kinship with classical tradition, harking back primarily to the pseudo-Homeric "War Between the Mice and the Frogs" and works such as Seneca's masterly parody on Emperor Claudius. The travesty genre spanned the entire history of European literature, incarnating in particular mankind's natural impulse away from art which was totally serious self-representation and towards that which had some measure of lightness, amusement and spontaneous merri-ment.

In his system of poetics, Boileau sought to limit the possibilities of the travesty genre: he restricted the mock-heroic poem to "vulgar" motifs from everyday life and to heroes from social milieux unworthy of legitimate literary attention. But he also stipulated that the style, language and techniques of the poem must adhere completely to the canons of classical poetics. The

requirements set forth by Boileau and illustrated by the example of his own mock-heroic poem *Le Lutrin* (*The Lectern*) did not endure however. Even the older type of travesty, which treated "elevated" themes in "low" language and style, remained on the periphery of Classicism. Travesties were, nevertheless, common to all Classicist literatures, and in Ukraine it was precisely one such poem that initiated a new period of literary development.

5. Literary theory is not the only, nor always the principal, characteristic distinguishing the literature of a given era. The ideology of its time and the social structure of its society are also reflected in literary practice. Accordingly, because of its connection with "enlightened despotism," the political phenomenon which in almost all of Europe coincided with the time of Classicism, the literature of this particular period acquired a distinctly aristocratic cast. This outlook was adopted by works emanating from the provinces as well as those close to the centers of political power. In Ukrainian literature, such upper-strata coloration was slight.

Of the ideologies prevalent during the period of literary Classicism, the most influential was the philosophy of the "Enlightenment." Its representatives believed in "reason" as the loftiest and most essential manifestation of the human spirit and as the prime mover in history. In every instance, they dismissed lightly, or ignored altogether, the irrational forces that figure in the life of every man, in society and in the historical process, and which cannot be controlled by reason. Their attitude toward them was one of scepticism, indifference and disdain. Falling within this neglected and disparaged sphere of man's irrational feelings were his incomprehensible customs and traditions which the Enlightenment dismissed as superstition. The Enlightenment failed to understand a great deal of that which is involved in religious life, especially the sensuous aspects of worship. It misunderstood national sentiment or misinterpreted it through rational deduction, and it derided folk habits and customs insofar as they were not entirely "comprehensible." The Enlightenment narrowed the concept of devoutness and, in part, substituted morality for religion. National feeling was replaced altogether with that of the political and dynastic. Customs were revered only to the extent that they attested to the original "innocence" of common man. The Enlightenment acknowledged age-old traditions not for whatever specific meaning they had for the time, but for their universality, relevance and instructive value for the "enlightened" elements of contemporary society.

Clearly, there was much that was pernicious in the psychology of the period of Classicism. In Ukraine in particular, the social structure led to a narrowing of the thematic range of literature. At the same time, the ideology of the Enlightenment brought on rationalistic aridity and the neglect of a great part of

life—especially in that sphere which is so important to literature (and to all art in general)—that of the feelings.

6. The most illustrious flowering of Classicism took place in France where it had already evolved to a considerable extent alongside the literature of Baroque. In the eighteenth century, largely due to the influence of French Classicism, the literatures of two of Ukraine's neighbors, Russia and Poland, rapidly came of age. In both countries, Classicism enjoyed a wide development, and in Poland—an exceptionally brilliant one. In Ukraine, however, neither the political nor spiritual atmosphere was favorable to the development of Classicism.

During the second half of the eighteenth century almost all traces of Ukrainian autonomy were erased. The abolition of the Hetman state, the destruction of the Sič, the introduction of serfdom for the peasants were merely the main steps in the process of turning Ukraine into a Russian province. The only political force capable of perhaps arresting this process, the Ukrainian gentry, was mainly composed of recent aristocracy. As such, it was subject both to intimidation by the Russian government, and to capitulation because of various Russian inducements. Often employed in the higher ranks of government service, the Ukrainian nobility became, in fact, an instrument of Russian politics. Even the Ukrainian clergy, which had been such a significant cultural force during the time of the Baroque, was gradually stripped of all independence and the energies of its greatest representatives were wasted to a great extent in service in non-Ukrainian lands. For a long time the cultural needs of the country were neglected altogether. Schools such as the Kiev Academy—which in the mid-eighteenth century had still been able, by and large, to fulfill the demands for higher secular education—slowly became exclusively religious institutions. The gentry then grew dissatisfied with the educational system whose one-sided religious character kept it behind the needs of the times—needs which, in large measure, were only the demands of fashion. This resulted in the next exodus (this time, of Ukrainian youth) to St. Petersburg and Moscow, centers of suitably lofty status.

In this way the Ukrainian people became, in time, a typical example of an “incomplete nation,” a people deprived of those social classes vital to its culture—the senior clergy and upper nobility. Because of this factor, the number of creative groups decreased somewhat. More critical still was the dwindling away of those circles whose members were the principal consumers of literature, who were the arbiters of its social relevance, and who in the eighteenth century had contributed most to its development. That an incomplete nation spawns an incomplete literature is thus amply demonstrated by Ukrainian Classicism. During the period of the Baroque, when Ukrainian literature lacked only certain



genres, the average Ukrainian could, on the whole, still satisfy most of his literary requirements with Ukrainian works. During the time of Classicism however, Ukrainian literature was merely some sort of possible supplement to a foreign literature such as Russian, French or Polish. But this non-independent status of Ukrainian Classicist literature did not at all reflect any inferiority in the works themselves—among which figure those that are clearly superior. The problem lay in the fact that despite the existence of various literary genres, Ukrainian Classicism developed only a small number of them. And, in every instance, these genres were totally unable to satisfy even the most modest intellectual requirements of the modern man.

7. The significance of Ukrainian Classicism for Ukrainian literature extends beyond merely signalling a change in literary style. It consists in the change it brought about in the literary language—in the transition from the variegated language of the Baroque (with its two poles, the Ukrainian redaction of Church Slavonic and the vernacular) to a *single* literary language that was in addition the spoken language. In comparison with the reform or even revolution in the sphere of literary style, this development in language was something still more completely new, radical and far-reaching. It may be an exaggeration to define this innovation in language as a “national rebirth” or, as the Romantics began to say, “a renaissance”; but it was indeed a *literary* rebirth or awakening.

The conversion to the vernacular came about as a result of precisely those conditions discussed above and evaluated as the one great weakness of Ukrainian social life. For, while Ukraine's loss of its upper strata of society, together with the concomitant narrowing of literary genres in Ukrainian Classicism, led to the “incomplete” status of Ukrainian Classicist literature, those genres which did evolve in Ukrainian Classicism (travesty, fable, comedy) were exactly those which most favored and, in fact, required the use of common speech. Of course, it was not until Romanticism and Romantic theory (see below, particularly regarding Kuliš) that the cultivation of vernacular as the language of *belles-lettres* was undertaken in a discerning and coherent fashion. The nature of the literary language and its development will be more closely examined later.

8. The linguistic innovation initiated by Ukrainian Classicism led to the anomaly that the works of this period retained their significance longer than was expected and, in some cases, longer than the works deserved. The tradition of Ukrainian Classicism dragged on until the time of Realism and then smouldered away until the very end of the nineteenth century. With few exceptions (such as Kuliš) succeeding generations failed to detect the stylistic and ideological limitations of these works. Until recent times these creations were elaborately misconstrued as the manifestations of a spirit totally different than the one from which

they actually arose. It was quite easy to overlook the "classicism" in Ukrainian "Classicism," for Ukrainian literature lacked those characteristic Classicist genres and stylistic and ideological traits (rationalism, "high style," etc.) which would have been unacceptable either to the Romantics or to the Realists. The works of Ukrainian Classicism had a lasting influence—in part enriching literature, especially the language of later periods. In part they impeded the process of literary development, blurring the lines of delineation between later styles, and promoting those general obstacles to literary differentiation discussed above.

Ukrainian Classicism was unique in any case—not merely because its language innovation bisected its development into two parts, but also because it was characterized by a very minimal use of "high" genres (employed by the writers of Ukrainian Classicism in their Russian productions) and of an elevated linguistic style. A high style becomes possible only after a language has been prepared for it by its preceding development: in Ukraine, the literary language was a recent phenomenon and still colloquial. Naturally, certain originality was also provided by the new linguistic levels, for the new language had not yet been normalized in either its lexical system or its style. In this respect the literature of Ukrainian Classicism is somewhat reminiscent of the Baroque. On the other hand, not having created a high style, it later appeared similar to Realism in certain linguistic features (i.e., insofar as this latter trend aspired to close assimilation with the spoken language). Clearly, it was the stylistic indistinctness of Ukrainian Classicism that contributed to its influence on subsequent literature.

## B. THE BEGINNINGS

1. Classicism did not come to Ukrainian literature as an already formulated aggressive theory. Unlike its appearance in other literatures, it did not arise in challenge to the prevailing Baroque, or combat it in order to assert its own place and then to establish its ascendancy in the literary world. Rather, Classicism emerged almost imperceptibly without any struggle whatsoever with Baroque literature which, with its variegated Slavonic-Ukrainian language, was bound to weaken and then perish. The demise of the Baroque was inevitable when Ukrainian life became completely provincial and when former centers of literary life, notably the Kiev Academy, gave over all their energies to the service of the new "all-Russian" centers.

Even during the Baroque period some Ukrainian writers, religious figures mainly, began to accept the new Classicist literary forms. Certain elements of the new, simpler, more harmonious, non-Baroque style may be found, for example,

in the sermons (although not the plays) of H. Konys'kyj. Closer still to the stylistics of Classicism was *Istoriia Rusiv* (which did not originate until the nineteenth century); however, this work, written almost entirely in Russian, stands more or less on the periphery of Ukrainian literature. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, some Ukrainians emerged as Russian Classicist poets. The most famous of them were Ippolit Bohdanovyč (1743-1803), Vasyli' Kapnist (1757-1823)—both of whom belonged to the most aesthetically dazzling stars in the galaxy of Russian Classicism, and who are both known by the idyllic coloration of their verses—and the less talented, but indefatigable journalist, Vasyli' Ruban (1739-95).

2. No doubt this transition to a new literary style in the new cultural centers of St. Petersburg and Moscow may have been reflected in Ukraine also, perhaps even directly in some poet's manuscript-relegated works. For the most part, however, the change to a new style meant a change to *Russian* Classicism with its own, non-Ukrainian language. The transformation of this language had already been begun in literature that was stylistically Baroque (Skovoroda). Thus, there arose the threat of the incontrovertible waning of Ukrainian literature as an integral whole. It was saved by the new psychology formulated by Classicism with its aristocratic tenor. For example, the Ukrainian language lent itself well to parody (an old Baroque genre), or to "drawing room" adaptations of folksongs, popular even in St. Petersburg. But these modern parodies were characterized by a new spirit: their authors seem imbued with enthusiasm for the Enlightenment; their attitude to religion appears ironic, even blasphemous. Also noticeable is a new aristocratic spirit characteristic of the Enlightenment's disdain for the beliefs of the common people. A final symbol of the new times was the apparent disintegration of the Ukrainian language: although the vernacular was used, some authors could not refrain from occasionally including Russianisms.

3. It is unimportant to note exactly which of the many Ukrainian poems of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were permeated with this new spirit. It is significant, however, that the features in them that were derived from this Enlightenment *spirit* are stronger than those that are attributable to Classicist *stylistics*. Their language is also indicative sometimes; for while the Ukrainian in which they wrote was fairly good, the authors used not the actual popular speech but rather a *coarse* one. And they treated it as they did everything emanating from the people—with unmistakable disdain and contempt.

An example is contained in the following lines, a parody of religious verses on the theme of the Nativity:

*Dja syx rodyn vsjak xrystyjanyn vymynaje kovbasy.  
 Baby, didy, pyvo, medy, horilku varenu  
 kuxlykom pjut', z knyšamy trut' svynynu pečenu.  
 Xlopci, divky navperedky bihajut' pid xatky  
 i, jak vovky abo svynky, skyrhyčut koljadky . . .*

("On the occasion of this birthday party, every Christian wolfs down sausages. The grannies and grandads guzzle beer mead and fermented brandy with a small dipper, and 'polish off' a roast pig with stuffed bread. The lads and lasses run ahead and under cottage roofs screech out carols like wolves or hogs. . .")

Following this is a scene which takes place in heaven:

*I uves' tut zahudiv ljud, mov litom ti bďžoly:  
 berut' žinok, idut' v tanok, zatykavšy poly . . .*

*Prorok Davyd tam ž sydyt' i v kobzu ihraje,  
 pisnju svjatu Spasu Xrystu z Psaltyri čytaje.  
 Čornjavyj Xam sydyt' tež tam i riže v sopilku,  
 sam dobre pje i vsim daje kvartuju horilku . . .*

("And all the people here began to buzz, like those bees in summer: they choose their ladies and join the dances, having tucked in their skirts . . .

.....  
 There sits the prophet David, strumming his *kobza*, and reading from his Psalter a holy song to Christ the Saviour. The dark Ham sits there, too, rasping away on his flute. He drinks a good deal himself, and hands round a quart of brandy to everyone. . .")

This is typical of "manorial" poetry with its "enlightened" near-blasphemies and Russianisms. The Easter verse parodies are similar:

*Podaly jim xlib i sil',  
 koždyu po čarci pyva.*

*Tut Davyd narobyv dyva:  
 pryudaryv v husli tak,  
 ščo skakat' xotiv usjak,  
 Sara kynula i ložku,  
 pidnimala harno nožku . . .*

*Zasmijavsja tut i Boh.  
 Tut i babky, tut i vnučky,  
 vsi pobralysja za ručky  
 i pišly u xorovod . . .*

("They gave them bread and salt, and to each one, a glass of beer. Then David wrought a miracle: he plucked his zither so that everyone wanted to jump; Sarah even threw away her spoon, and, daintily, raised her leg . . .

.....

Now God too began to laugh. Then the old grannies, and then their grandchildren all linked hands and joined the circle. . . .")

This is another variant of the same verse:

*Kažut', bucem molodyci  
 nehodjajky, ledaščyci  
 i puhlyvi, jak zajci—  
 až nepravda, molodyci!*

*Se ž Marija sered noči  
 pustylasja zo vsij moči  
 plakaty na hrob Xrystov,  
 na Golgofu, miž kustov.*

*Čoho, Maruse, tak ty plačeš?  
 Ja voskres—sama ty bačyš.  
 Žydy že jak na pup kryčat',  
 ščo ne rušena pečat' . . .*

*A Xrystos buv na roboti –  
pokaljav sobi čoboty,  
pokil' peklo pohasyv,  
i Adama voskresyv . . .*

(“It is said that young wives are good-for-nothings, loose wenches, and fearful as rabbits— No, young fellows, that’s a lie! For Mary in the middle of the night started out, with all her might, for Christ’s grave upon Golgotha, there to weep among the shrubs.

.....  
Why, Mary, do you grieve so? I am risen—you can see for yourself. The Jews are bawling at the top of their voices that the tomb has not been unsealed . . .

.....  
And Christ was at His work—he soiled his boots all over while he extinguished the fires of hell and resurrected Adam. . . .”)

The dreadful accents (*narôbyv, pustylásja*) and Russianisms (*pryudaryv, nožku, nehodjajky, miž kustov*, etc.) oblige one to regard this literature as another sign of decline rather than of florescence as literary historians have sometimes thought.

4. In the category of works bearing traits of Classicist style must definitely be placed at least some verses of Ivan Nekraševyč (1780s–1790s). To a certain extent, his writings followed the devices of Baroque poetics and were directly connected with the tradition of the Kiev Academy, as, for example, his versified thank-offering (1787) or his dialog “*Spor duši z tilom*” (“An Altercation of the Soul with the Body,” 1773). His later verses, however, belong to somewhat more modern genres: “*Jarmarok*” (“The Fair”) and “*Spovid*” (“The Confession”) fall somewhere between the Baroque interlude and the Classicist idyll. Another of these new genres was the personal letter in verse, whose most interesting feature is its use of almost pure popular speech:

*. . . a mene bo navčyly otec' muj i maty  
koljadivok i ščedrivok, Boha zuxvaljaty,  
hoviju ja ščoroku, pjatinku šanuju,  
ne jim, ne pju, ne roblju do večera v tuju.  
Ot bryznula na hubu, jak syr odkydala,*

*čoho ja ne robyla, vves' rot poloskala  
Isuse, prosty mene, hrišnuju takuju,  
a bišše ja na sobi ničoho ne čuju . . .*

(" . . . and me, my father and mother taught to sing  
carols for Christmas and Epiphany and to praise God;  
I observe Lent every year, and keep Friday holy; I do  
not eat or drink or work until evening on that day.  
Lo, when I was draining the cheeses, some splashed  
on my lips; what did I not do then! I rinsed my mouth  
completely. Dear Jesus, forgive me, sinner that I am.  
There is no other iniquity of which I am aware. . . .")

This verse displays the same condescending attitude toward the common people as is seen in the parodies of religious chants. Yet, the works of Nekraševyč are an anticipation of Kotljarevs'kyj's, the founder of Ukrainian Classicism and modern Ukrainian literature, primarily because of the authenticity of their language. It appears that Nekraševyč arrived at his achievement by way of the same route taken by Kotljarevs'kyj—the travesty genres of Classicism. Although not as distinguished as his successor's, Nekraševyč's accomplishment, taken as a whole, denotes an interesting phenomenon illustrating the convergence of old and modern literature and of the two styles, Baroque and Classicism.

A genre that is typically Classicist, satire, was represented by a few works of local significance. These attempts at satire, perhaps derived from the Russian and Polish Classicist tradition, produced no outstanding achievements in Ukraine.

### C. THE MOCK-HEROIC POEM

1. The work which introduced the use of the vernacular as the language of literature, the *Enejida* of Ivan Kotljarevs'kyj (1769-1838), belongs to a specific genre of Classicist poetics, the "mock-heroic poem." Kotljarevs'kyj was acquainted with one of the most popular Russian works of this category by N. Osipov (1751-1799). His *Eneida* (1791-96, later editions 1800, 1801) and its ultimate conclusion (editions 1802, 1806) written by A. Kotel'nickij (dates unknown) were themselves modelled on the work of the eighteenth century German writer Blumauer. The travesties of Vergil's *Aeneid* were the most popular of all the numerous travesties during the Baroque period. The most famous was the French *Le Virgile travesti* by Scarron (1648, with various

conclusions by different authors); several travesties of the *Aeneid* were also written in various French dialects. Kotljarevs'kyj's *Enejida* appeared in 1798, without the author's consent. In 1809 he added part four to the third edition, and the last two parts, on which he worked for the rest of his life, were published posthumously (1842).

Kotljarevs'kyj made use of Osipov's work most of all. However, as a former seminary student, he was well acquainted with the Latin original of the *Aeneid*, and it seems that he also availed himself of Scarron's travesty. Yet Kotljarevs'kyj's "imitation" is neither a translation nor even a recasting. The Osipov-Kotel'nickij *Eneida* and Scarron's *Le Virgile travesti* each contains over 20,000 lines while Kotljarevs'kyj's work has a little over 7,000. As these figures suggest, Kotljarevs'kyj did not hesitate to expunge even crucial episodes of the action. Accordingly, the very popular second canto in Vergil's *Aeneid*, which describes the fall of Troy, is omitted altogether. Where Osipov's work appealed to him, Kotljarevs'kyj followed him very faithfully. But from the other versions of the *Aeneid* he took, for the most part, only the general outline. Sometimes, Kotljarevs'kyj abridged the narration of Osipov or the others; sometimes he expanded it, and at other times he went his own way entirely. Certain parts were derived from a different tradition: the best passage, Enej (Aeneas) in hell, was composed in fairly close imitation of the Baroque "*Pisni pro čotyry ostanni reči ljudyny*" ("Songs About the Four Ultimate Things of Man")—death, Judgment Day, hell and heaven. Unfortunately, the Ukrainian versions of these songs in part perished, and in part remained unpublished; however, Kotljarevs'kyj could have used either Latin or Polish works on the same subject. In any case, the important part of his poem is original, not imitative. The vast superiority of his work over Osipov's is unanimously acknowledged by both older and modern Ukrainian and Russian scholars.

2. In defining the character of the *Enejida*, it can be said to be a mock-heroic poem. At the same time, it is a travesty and is linked with the ancient tradition of burlesque. The role of the mock-heroic poem in the poetics of Classicism has already been discussed. It was a classical poem with a low subject (according to the theory of Boileau) or else a lofty subject depicted in low style. (In practice, even those poems expressly proscribed by Boileau's theory existed as well.) Poems of the second type had been known previously. If the lofty subject matter were taken from the old, traditional epics, it was called a travesty (of course, other literary genres could also be travestied). Works not of serious intent but written in jest were given the name burlesque (joke), another ancient but fortuitous term. In reality, burlesque works, too, often had a serious literary or ideological intent: Blumauer, an author of the "Enlightenment," wrote his



German *Aeneid* as a satire against ecclesiastic (primarily Catholic) pietism. And “jest” was, in the main, the literary aspect of burlesque—the playful application of literary forms and style for a specific purpose.

The content of *Enejida* was taken from Vergil. The story involves the wanderings of the Trojans who, following the fall of Troy, fled with Aeneas, one of the younger members of its royal family. After various adventures, they founded a new homeland in Italy where, having conquered the local ruler, Latin, they established the roots of the future Roman empire. A certain political tendentiousness characteristic of Vergil’s legend—as he attempted to link Rome with ancient history, even with Olympus (Aeneas as the son of Venus), in order to emphasize Rome’s lofty historical mission—was lost in travesties of the work. The *Aeneid* was chosen simply because it was a well-known work. The plot of the various travestied *Aeneids* held no particular appeal for their readers since the entire sequence of events was familiar to them beforehand, having been studied at school. Nor were the authors and readers of the travesties interested in the diverse historical, archeological and ideological motifs of the original.

What was new in the content and what did attract the attention of the readers was the variations on the individual scenes and episodes of the poem. In the tradition of travesty, the author replaces the particular historical and ideological atmosphere of the original work with another one. Accordingly, Kotljarevs’kyj transformed the Trojans—and indeed, the representatives of other nations (Carthaginians, Italians, etc.)—into Ukrainian Cossacks. The other-worldly inhabitants extolled in the ancient epic, the Graeco-Roman deities, were turned into Ukrainian landowners. All the details were incorporated into the texture of everyday Ukrainian life: Prometheus “*na lju’ku . . . ohon’ ukrav*” (“stole the fire for his pipe”); “*bohyni v hnivi—tak že baby*” (“infuriated goddesses are just like a bunch of old women”); “*Enej був парубок моторний і хлопець хот’ кудь козак*” (“Enej was a daring young fellow and lusty Cossack blade”); Venus—“*мов сотника якогось пані*” (“the wife of some Cossack captain”), etc. Everything was travestied: the psychology of the leading characters, the treatment of individual episodes, and the motivation for the heroes’ actions. However, even this transformation could not by itself have rendered the poem interesting for its contemporaries, much less for succeeding generations. For Kotljarevs’kyj paid little attention to the character of his heroes: they are completely non-individualized, their characters changing unrecognizably, in some cases, during the course of the poem. It is something else that enraptured the poem’s readers, and still does—its language and trappings such as details of Ukrainian history and everyday life, as well as certain formal stylistic features.

3. First and foremost, the language: Kotljarevs’kyj succeeded in creating a

Ukrainian that was extraordinarily colorful, rich and supple. His love of synonyms accounts for the extremely vivid quality of the language. Employing a different word each time for every notion including the most unusual, Kotljarevs'kyj created a lexicon that was inexhaustible. For example, to describe the various alcoholic beverages consumed by the Trojans, Latins and gods, he used the following battery of names: *horilka*, *braha*, *horiločka*, *syvuxa*, *slyvjanka*, *med*, *pyvo*, *horilka prosta i kalhanka*, *varenuxa*, *varena*, *z imberom pinna horilka*, *mokruxa*, *pinnen'ka*, *harjačyj*, *pyvce*, *syvuška*, *rens'ke z kurdymom ta pyvo čorneje z lyonom*, *sykizka*, *derenivka i kryms'ka vkusnaja dulivka*, *ščo tam ajvivkoju zovut'*, *oxtyrs'kyj med*, *paljonka*, *z strjučkom horilka*, *hanusna*, *pid pinok*, *čykyldyxa*, etc.

The following passage also defies literal translation:

*Abo horiločku pyly--  
ne tjutjunovu i ne pinnu,  
ne tret'oprobnu perehinnu,  
nastojanuju na bodjan,  
pid čeljustjamy zapikanu,  
i z hanusom, i do kalhanu,  
v nij buv i perec', i šapran . . .*

Replacing the common verbs of motion—*pišov* (he left), *pojixav* (he rode off), *pobih* (he ran away)—is a multitude of expressions: *vvijšly* (they entered), *vperlysja* (they pushed on), *hanjaly* (they drove), *dav drala* (he scampered off), *nu vin drala* (well, he's on the run), *dunuv vo vsi lopatky* (he ran off in great haste), *dmuxnim* (let's blow!), *dav vidtil' dropaka* (he ran away from there), *donosyvsja* (he reached), *išov* (he went), *liz* (he crawled), *račky liz* (he crawled on all fours), *mandruvat'* (to wander), *metnuvs'* (he sprang forward), *maxnula* (she ran away headlong), *mčyt'* (he is hurrying away), *neset'sja* (he rushes past), *pjatamy nakyvav* (he took to his heels), *nastupala* (she advanced), *počuxrav* (he ran off quickly), *popxavsja* (he dragged himself on), *pryplentavs'* (he came crawling), *pidtjupcem išla* (she went at a trot), *pomčalysja* (they darted off), *pomčaly* (they rushed away), *pryčvalav* (he came galloping), *pobihla* (she ran up), *prypxalys'* (they dragged themselves there), *pokotyła* (she set out speedily), *stežku protoptala* (she beat a path [to]), *poplelysja* (they sauntered), *pustylas'* (she started out), *poskakav* (he jumped a little), *polizly* (they climbed), *prut'sja* (they push off), *spišyt'* (he is hurrying), *slonjavysja* (he strolled about), *sunuvs'* (he crawled along), *sovavs'* (he kept on moving), *tynjavs'* (he rambled about), *dav tjahu* (he scampered off), *čkurnula* (she ran off), *čymčykuvav* (he walked

quickly), *šmyhneš* (you disappear in a flash), *šljalyš'* (they gadded about), *švendajut'* (they roam about), etc.

In both instances, the choice of appropriate word is crucial. Kotljarevs'kyj also accumulates synonyms or semantically related words as in this scene describing the manner in which Hell Fury tortures sinners:

*robyla hrišnym dobru šanu,  
remnjamy drala, mov bykiv,  
kusala, hryzla, byčuvala,  
kryšyla, škvaryla, ščypala,  
toptala, drjapala, pekla,  
porola, korčyla, pylyla,  
vertila, rvala, špyhuvala,  
i krov iz tila jix pyla.*

("She did the sinners proper honor, she lashed out at them with whips as though they were oxen, she bit, gnawed and flailed them, hacked them into small pieces, fried, nipped and stamped upon them, clawed, roasted, thrashed, rooted out, sawed, drilled, plucked and stabbed them, and she drank the blood from their bodies. . . .")

In addition to these "ordinary" words, onomatopoeic ones may also be found in Kotljarevs'kyj: *xaramorkaly* (they mumbled), *even'katy* (to jabber), *cmok* (smack), *zamekekav* (it began to bleat), *šokala* (she shocked), *murmotalo* (it muttered away), etc. Kotljarevs'kyj had a special liking for rare words (for some of which he even gave the meanings): *dzyndzyver-zux* (gay, young fellow), *pudofet* (one difficult to move), *fil'tifiketnyx* (coquettish), *baskalyčytys'* (to resist), *tymfy daty* (to confuse, astound), *ryčka* (cow-maid), *furcjuvaty* (to express the sound of a flight or spurt), *soforok* (sauce), *žeretija* (gluttonous woman), *xaljandra* (gypsy dance), *šuxalija* (large boat), *jarmys* (method), *prydzyl'ovanka* (fidgety woman). Such examples are found on practically every line (the reader need only consult the pages from which the excerpts above have been taken). However, Kotljarevs'kyj rarely invented new words himself. Only a very few neologisms may be noticed in his work, such as: *druželjubyvyj* (friend-loving), *obezhluzydvy* (he rendered stupid), *lycarkuvatyj* (having chivalrous manners), *herojity* (to play the hero), *koral'nyj* (made of coral), *bajevyj–bajkovyj*–(fable-like), *čortopxajka* (uncomfortable carriage), and a few others (some of which cannot precisely be determined as neologisms).

It was as though Kotljarevs'kyj wanted to incorporate in his poem the complete lexicon of the Ukrainian language of his time. Clearly, while making use of all these words he was not thinking of any *norm* for the Ukrainian language. For among the words he employed were numerous regional expressions (dialectalisms) and still more "*argot*" or "jargon," the language of particular groups of people: drunkards, ox-cart drivers, townsfolk, seminarians, etc.

It is obvious that Kotljarevs'kyj's language was not always pure. It included a large number of Church Slavonicisms still present in the Ukrainian of the time and, in part, in the language of students and seminarians upon which Kotljarevs'kyj drew extensively. Some examples of such Church Slavonic expressions are: *neskazanno* (ineffably), *červ i prax* (vermin and ashes), *bezčuvstvenno* (insensitively), *ispuskala* (she released), *iskusno* (skillfully), *bohohodna* (pious), *v sije vremena* (at this time), *iskorenim* (let us uproot), *vred* (harm), *puskajuščyj* (who is setting free), *hlas* (voice), *hrad* (city), *nadežda* (hope), *nauščaly* (they instigated), *črez* (through), *preslovytyj* (notorious), *oblobyzyv* (he kissed), *poboiščce* (slaughterer), *zrit'* (he sees), *iskoni be* (in the beginning was), etc. These Slavonicisms produced a somewhat disagreeable effect on later readers who mistakenly believed them to be "Great Russianisms." The representation of the latter in the poem is, in fact, considerable: *vblyzi* (close by), *styšok* (rhyme), *kart'jožnyj* (gambling), *plut* (swindler), *jele* (hardly), *nehodjaj* (scoundrel), *ubirajsja* (be off!), *lyšnij* (superfluous), *beztolkovi* (absurd), *duralej* (nitwit), *mel'kom* (cursorily), *oplošaj* (fail), *obez'jana* (monkey), *izjan* (flaw), *vľjublennyx* (beloved), even "*Poltava-matuška*" (mother Poltava), etc. Included in the poem too are entire sayings in Russian: "*žizn'-altyn, a smert'—kopijska*" ("life is three kopecks, death is a kopeck"). Admittedly, such expressions are often linked with Russian manners or with those elements of the Ukrainian way of life already affected by Russification: *altyn* (three kopecks), *mundyr* (uniform), *na perekladnyx* (by relay), *ranžyr* (line), *pylypony* (schismatics), *Tula ta Toržok*, *čynovnyky* (officials), *smyrytel'ni domy* (asylums), and expressions such as "*na prynadležnost*" ("belonging"), "*dolžnostni*" ("official duties"), and others. Several Polish terms are also scattered throughout the text. Yet, on the whole, these incidental foreignisms only serve to enhance the lexical wealth of the poem.

Equally interesting is Kotljarevs'kyj's phraseology. Its variety reconfirms his genius for making the fullest possible use of the resources of the Ukrainian language. It is often difficult to say whether Kotljarevs'kyj employed expressions and turns of phrase that were already widely known or whether he invented them himself in the folk spirit. He readily availed himself of folk forms such as the type so characteristic of Slavic languages (although rare in their literatures)—

the short form verb.\* Some examples of this form are: *torox* (slap), *zyrk* (glance), *hljad'* (look out), *hul'k* (suddenly); *stryb-stryb* (with a hop and a skip . . .), *xljs'* (splash), *pljus'* (clash), *blys'-blys'* (flash), *skic'* (hop), *žust'* (in a twinkling . . .), *žerk* (with a swoop . . .), etc. But it is Kotljarevs'kyj's figures of speech which are the best: "*Naduvs', mov na ohni lopux*" ("He was as puffed up as a burr in a fire"), "*Vertilas', jak v okropi muxa*" ("She whirled around like a fly in boiling water"); *hiršyj vid percju*" ("stronger than pepper"); "*bucim v boloti čort, zasiv*" ("as if there were a devil sitting in the mud"); "*Naduvsja, jak indyk*" ("He was as puffed up as a turkey"); "*Zanudyvsja, jak po boloti' kulyk*" ("He was as bored as a woodcock in the mud"); "*Slova tak syple, jak horox*" ("He scatters his words like peas"); "*Nadojilo, jak čumakam došč voseny*" ("It was as annoying as autumn rain to čumaky"); "*Tulyvsja, mov od kota v komori myš'*" ("He cowered like a mouse in a pantry hiding from a cat"); "*Kryčav, jak v marti kit*" ("He bawled like a cat in March"); "*Propaly, jak Sirko v bazari*" ("They disappeared, like Sirko, the dog at the market"), and so on.

In addition to these images which, in their role of "metaphor," actually conformed to the requirements of Classicist poetics, Kotljarevs'kyj favored *sententiae* and proverbs which derived, in most cases, from the idiom of the people: "*velykiji u straxa oči*" ("eyes, wide with fright"); "*Ne liz' prožohom peršyj v vodu*" ("Do not rush headlong into the water"); "*De xto ne duma, tam nočuje*" ("Where one least expects it, there one spends the night"); "*Bida bidu-hovorjat'-rodyt'*" ("They say that misfortune begets misfortune"); "*De jist'sja smačno, tam i pjet'sja*" ("Where the food is tasty, drink is likewise"); "*Koly koho mix nalakaje, to pislja torba spat' ne dast'*" ("Once frightened by a large sack, henceforth even a little bag will confound your sleep").\*\* It is only conjecture that Kotljarevs'kyj himself coined the well-known adage, "*Mužyc'ka pravda jest' koljuča, a pans'ka na vsi boky hnuča*" ("The peasant's truth is thorny while the master's bends every which way"); the following maxim however, is definitely his own: "*Žyve xto v sviti neobačno, tomu nide ne bude smačno*" ("He who lives an incautious life will nowhere find contentment").

Nevertheless, it is not these sayings and edifying proverbs that constituted the most characteristic feature of his phraseology. It was rather expressions of an altogether different style that drew the travesty epic closer to the status of serious genres. These were rude vulgarisms and coarse (but non-folk), cynical and harsh expressions: "*Junona, suča dočka*" ("Juno, that daughter of a bitch");

\*Often incorrectly labelled a "verbal interjection," this form in Ukrainian is actually "a verb."

\*\*A collection of sayings of this type existed as early as the Baroque period; its compiler was the already mentioned Jeromonax Klymentij.

"*ljapas dat'*" ("to give a cuff on the ear"); "*Eneja za žyvit bere*" ("Enej is seized by a stomach ache"); "*Daly nam hreky pročuxana*" ("The Greeks gave us a thorough trouncing"); "*Mov zzadu pxaly jix čorty*" ("It was as though devils were pushing them on from behind"); "*Pyly, jak brahu porosjata*" ("They drank, like little pigs at their mash"); "*baby sučoji*" ("bitchy woman's"); "*v mordu tyče*" ("aims right for his mug"); "*Jiv až za uxamy ljaščalo*" ("He ate so much, his ears started ringing"); "*xropty uklavsja*" ("he got ready to croak"); "*račky liz*" ("he crawled on all fours"); "*Turn, sobačyj syn*" ("Turn [Turnus], son of a dog"); "*zhamkaty, jak blyn*" ("to gulp [something] down like flat-cakes"); "*Trojanci zarevily*" ("the Trojans began to roar"); entire stanzas are filled with such phrases. Yet, although very successful in and appropriate to the travesty genre, these expressions offended readers for by then the poem had attained, to Kotljarevs'kyj's surprise, the reputation of a composition of *serious* significance, the first work of modern Ukrainian literature.

Within the limits of the travesty genre as such, Kotljarevs'kyj can be faulted only for his adherence to its linguistic style even in those scenes (such as death or battle) which, although part of a comic work, are themselves serious: "*Holovku odčesav*" ("He cut off the hair on his little head"); "*Makitru oddilyv od pleč*" ("He severed the head from its shoulders"); "*Iz nosa bryznula tabaka*" ("Snuff sprayed from his nose"); "*U Turna okoliv u nohax*" ("At Turn's feet, he croaked"); "*Pobjut' v jaješnju*" ("They will beat [him] to a pulp"); "*puzo rozplatať*" ("he was disembowelled"); "*vlipyv takoho makohona*" ("he struck [him] such a blow on the head"); "*dutelja zjiv*" ("he died"), etc. Even on the few occasions when Kotljarevs'kyj does use a serious tone, the context seems purposely vulgar: "*Rič taku jim udžygnuv*" ("He blasted them with such words")—leads up to a speech that is very serious indeed. The lamentation of the mother of Evrijal (Euryalus) for her dead son (an interesting imitation of folk laments) is introduced by the following lines:

*I koly holovu piznala  
svoho synočka Evrusja,  
to na valu i rozplatalas',  
kryčala, gedzalas', kačalas',  
kuvikala, mov porosja . . .*

("And when she recognized the dear little hand of her beloved son Evrus', she sprawled out on the ramparts, shrieked, ran about like mad, rolled around and squealed like a little pig. . .")

Because readers regarded the poem as a serious work, from a certain point of view, a negative impression was produced on them by the strange, coarse (and non-folk) "corrupted" words in its lexicon: *obtekar* (pharmacist), *kalavur* (sentry), *anaxtem* (anathema), *manixvest* (manifesto), *leport* (report), etc., and by its diminutives which were not of folk origin either: *duška* (tender soul), *holosok* (sweet voice), *hilečka* (twig), *holovka* (dear little head), *slizky* (little teardrops), *harnen'ko* (quite prettily), *smašnen'ko* (so deliciously). The readers' national pride was insulted by the use of vulgarisms and even more by the trifling attitude toward the people which they detected in coarse expressions such as those above. Their reproaches were unjust, historically, for these linguistic features legitimately belonged to the travesty genre. Nevertheless, the influence that Kotljarevs'kyj's style had beyond the limitations imposed by the restrictive genre of the *Enejida* was, in fact, pernicious for Ukrainian literary development. The work of his epigones is proof of this.

4. For Kotljarevs'kyj, words were also material for linguistic games—as they had been for his predecessors in Classicism and their somewhat belated parodies of Baroque word play. While Kotljarevs'kyj's lexicon is the most commanding aspect of his work, his word games are also excellent; they are, in addition, superior to Osipov's and Blumauer's, although not quite as successful.

The rhyming of foreign names with Ukrainian words falls into this category. In most cases, the rhyme is apt although sometimes Kotljarevs'kyj purposely avoids true rhymes. Here are some examples: Troju—*hnoju*, Trojanciv—*lanciv*, Dydonā—*motorna*, *pes*—*Zeves*, Kupydone—*stohne*, Palinur—*balahur*, Amata—*xata*, Astreji—*kaznačëji*, Ippolyt—*valyt'*, Kamylla—*kobyla*, Merkurij—*muryj*, Neptun—*škardun*, Lavyna—*slyna*, *idykiv*—*Ammalykiv*, Evrijalom—*kalom*, Emfiona—*makohona*, Holiaf—*hyltav*, *donju*—*Tezyfonju*, Karfageni—*don'ci i neni*, Turn—*verzun*, Eneja—*kereja*, Avanta—*seržanta*, *škelet*—*Avlet*, *filozopy*—*krutopopy* (dating from the old tradition), etc.

This same humor of apposition of two languages also occurs within Ukrainian names (an old device, dating back to the eleventh century translation of Hamartolos' *Aleksandr Fylypovyč* (*Alexander the Great of Macedon*): *Enej—Anxyzyn'ko* or *Enej Anxyzovyč*, *Tales—Ahamemnonenko*, *Iul—Iul Enejovyč*, *Zeves—Saturnovyč*, *Ippolyt Tezejovyč*, *Pallant Evandrovyč*, *Hlyppencko*, the son of Vulkan Cekul—Kovalenko. Names are Ukrainianized by other methods as well, as can be seen from *Eneječko*, *Evrus'*, or *Irysja*, *Lavysja* (women's names), or this excerpt:

*Nevtesom vsi joho dražnyly,*  
*po našomu ž to zvavs' Oxrim . . .*

(“They teased him with the name Nevtes while to us  
he was known as Oxrim. . . .”)

or the following passage describing Enej's encounters in hell:

*po dorozi povstričavsja  
z hromadoju znakomyx duš . . .  
. . . znajšov z Trojanciv os' koho:  
Ped'ka, Tereška, Šelifona,  
Pan'ka, Oxrima i Xarka,  
Les'ka, Oleška i Siz'ona,  
Parxoma, Is'ka i Fes'ka,  
Stec'ka, Onys'ka, Opanasa,  
Svyryda, Lazarja, Tarasa,  
buly Denys, Ostap, Ovsij,  
i vsi Trojanci, ščo vtopyls',  
jak na čovnax z nym voločyls';  
tut buv Vernyhora Musij.*

(“Along the way he came across a throng of familiar  
souls . . . among the Trojans he found were: Ped'ko,  
Tereško, Šelifon, Pan'ko, Oxrim and Xarko, Les'ko,  
Oleško and Siz'on, Parxom, Is'ko and Fes'ko. Stečko,  
Onys'ko, Opanas, Syvyryd, Lazar, Taras; there were  
Denys, Ostap, Ovsij, and all the Trojans who had  
drowned—his companions in wandering on the seas;  
Musij Vernyhora was here too.”)

This type of whimsical literary “bilingualism,” so seldom found in Ukrainian writing, is similar to the “macaronic” style of the Baroque. There are also Ukrainian-Latin passages in the *Enejida* that are completely macaronic and most ingenious, as for example:

*Enej, k dobru z natury sklonnyj,  
skazav poslam latyns'kym tak:  
Latynus reks jest' nevhomonnyj,  
a Turnus pessimus durak.  
I kvare vojuvat' vam mekum!  
Latynusa but' puto cekum,  
a vas sen'jores bez uma;*



*Latynusu rad pacem dare,  
permitto mertvyx poxovare,  
i zlosty koram vas nema . . .*

(“Enej, inclined by nature toward benevolence, declared to the Latin envoys thus: King Latinus is restless, and Turnus, the worst fool. Wherefore do you fight with me! Latinus, I consider to be blind, and you officers out of your minds. To Latinus I gladly offer peace; I permit you to bury your dead, and I hold no malice against you. . . .”)

Another word game, based on the language of seminarians, consists in transposing the endings of various words (following Osipov’s model):

*Borščiv jak try ne poden’kuješ,  
na motorošni zaserdčyt’,  
i zaraz tjahlom zakyškuješ  
i v burkoti zakendjušyt’.  
Koly ž ščo napxom z jazykaješ,  
i v tereb dobre zžyvotaješ,  
to na veseli zanutryt’;  
ob lyxo vdarom zazemljuješ,  
i ves’ zabud svij zholoduješ  
i bih do horja začortyt’ . . .*

(“If you go without borshch for three days, you will become ill at heart, and right away you will feel something pulling at your intestines, and a rumbling in your stomach. When you cram something in with your tongue, and clean out your stomach well, your insides will rejoice. You will stop worrying, and you will forget all your hunger, and your grief will go to the devil. . . .”)

The conglomeration of synonyms or otherwise related words represents another type of word play in the *Enejida*; within this category fall abusive epithets:

*Pohannyj, merz’kyj, skvernyj, brydkyj,  
nikčemnyj, lanec’, katelyk,  
hul’visa, pakosnyj, prestydkyj,  
nehidnyj, zlodij, jeretyk!*

("Vile, loathsome, nasty, abominable, good-for-nothing, wretch, Catholic, scoundrel, malicious, most shameful, wicked, thieving heretic. . . .")

and curses (which were later developed into a fine art by Gogol'):

*mandruj do satany z rohamy,  
nexasj tobi prysnyt'sja bis . . .*

("Go to the horned devil, may the fiend haunt your dreams. . . .")

A still different kind of word game is contained in the numerous "catalogs" (see above; the lists of names and of the tortures of hell). The following is an excerpt from the catalog of the denizens of the underworld:

*Palyvody i volocjuhy,  
vsi zvodnyky i vsi pluty,  
jaryžnyky i vsi pjanjuhy,  
obmanšcyky i vsi moty,  
vsi voržbyty, čarodiji,  
vsi hajdamaky, vsi zlodiji,  
ševci, kravci i kovali;  
cexy, riznyc'kyj, konoval's'kyj,  
kušnirs'kyj, tkac'kyj, šapoval's'kyj  
kypily v pekli vsi v smoli.*

("Madcaps and vagabonds, all the panderers and all the knaves, debauchees and all the tipsters, cheats and all the spendthrifts, all the fortune-tellers, sorcerers, all the *hajdamaky*, all the thieves, bad shoemakers, tailors and blacksmiths, craftsmen, butchers, veterinarians, furriers, weavers, felt-makers, all boiled in the pitch of hell.")

5. One of the weakest aspects of the *Enejida* is its verse. There is no doubt about Kotljarevs'kyj's expertise with the four foot iambic meter (—'—'—'—') which he adapted from the Russian literary tradition, and in some cases used with greater originality. His handling of long words was especially apt: he reduced the numbers of stresses per line thereby making it sound better and more natural:

z obstryženymy holovamy                    -' - - - - -'  
z obrizanyymy pelenamy . . .                -' - - - - -'

("with shaved heads, with lopped-off skirts . . .")

or:

jak rozihralos', zašypilo,                    - - -' - - -'  
zaparylos', zaklekotilo . . .                -' - - - - -'

("When it got into the mood of playing, it hissed, it steamed, it began to boil. . .")

The structure of Kotljarevs'kyj's stanzas is sound, but the rhyme is poor. In most cases, it is weaker than the frequently stagey rhymes of certain Baroque poets. Often, it is grammatical (that is, the rhyming of identical grammatical forms); *motornyj*–*provornyj*, *kozak*–*burlak*, *Trojanciv*–*lanciv*, *dav*–*nakyvav*. Imperfect rhymes are also common: *Neptun*–*zabuv*, *poplyv*–*nastyh*, *pohlumyt'sja*–*spastysja*. Generally speaking, Kotljarevs'kyj avoided incomplete rhymes: found in folk poetry, and used to a degree in Baroque verse (introduced by Skovoroda into comic poems familiar to Kotljarevs'kyj), these rhymes later constituted the attraction of Ševčenko's verse (see Ch. XII, pt. F, no. 5). There are only a few examples of incomplete rhymes in the *Enejida*: *Enej*–*zleje*, *zižla*–*pomyšljav*, *preslovtyj*–*buty*, etc. The rhymes seem monotonous, due partly to the frequent repetition of certain words. Another cause of monotony is the almost complete absence of *enjambement* (the carrying over of a sentence from one line to the next) with the result that one line practically always comprises one entire sentence.

6. The greatest strength of the *Enejida* lies not only in its language but also in the abundance of those themes from everyday life whose presentation is the function of this language. As well as being the first broad dictionary of the Ukrainian national language, the *Enejida* was the first encyclopedia of Ukrainian ethnography. Through the medium of the linguistic wealth of the *Enejida*, the reader is witness to everything: the material culture of the people, their dwellings and wearing apparel, food and drink, music and dances, their forms of entertainment as well as their daily routine, superstition and religious customs.

An examination of some of this *pobut* is worthwhile. The passage below, for example, presents an account of diverse kinds of food:

*Tut jily rizniji potrawy:*

*svynjaču holovu do xrinu  
i lokšynu na pereminu,  
potim z pidlyvoju indyk;  
na zakusku kuliš i kašu,  
lemišku, zubci, putrju, kvašu  
i z makom medovyj šulyk.*

*I lasošči vse til'ky jily:  
slast'ony, koržyky, stovpci,  
varenky pšenyčni bili,  
puxki z kavjarom buxanci;  
časnyk, rohiz, paslin, kyslyci,  
kozel'ci, tern, hlid, polunyci,  
krutiji jajca z syrivcem,  
i duže vkusnoju jaješnju . . .*

*. . . jily bublyky, kavjar,  
buv boršč do špundriv z burjakamy  
a v jušci potrox z haluškamy,  
potim do soku kapluny;  
z otribky baba, šarpanyna,  
pečena z časnykom svynyna,  
kroxmal', jakyj jidjat' pany . . .*

*Vbyraly sičenu kapustu  
šatkovanu i ohirky—  
xoč ce bulo v čas mjasopustu,—  
xrin z kvasom, red'ku, burjaky,  
rjabka, teterju, salamaxu . . .*

(“Here they ate various dishes: . . . pigs’ heads with horseradish alternating with noodles, followed by turkey with gravy; as appetizers, corn flour gruel and grits, corn meal pap, onions, cooked barley, boiled sour-sweet dough and poppy seed honeycake.

And they fairly gobbled up all the dainties: the pastries, small biscuits, lady fingers, white wheaten *varenky*, rich little caviar-stuffed bread puffs; garlic, mace, morels, crabapples, valerian herbs, sloes, hawthorn berries, strawberries, hard-boiled eggs with kvass, and a very tasty omelet. . . .

. . . they dined on rolls and caviar; there were gallons of beet borshch with pork, and in the broth a few dump-lings, followed by succulent capons; a meatless baba bread, garlic-spiced roast pork and farina which the landowners eat. . . .

They took in shredded cabbage chopped fine, and pickles, and—although it was Shrovetide—horseradish with kvass, radishes, beets, millet porridge, rusks, crushed garlic. . . .”)

Clearly, the cuisine of their masters has been mixed with that of the peasants. However, any loss in ethnography is compensated by the gain in cultural history. Attire, music, dances, etc. are treated in like fashion.

It is interesting that the oral tradition too receives its share of Kotljarevs’-kyj’s attention. In addition to his intriguing references to songs and folktales, there are quotations from them as well as from proverbs and adages (see above, section 3). Kotljarevs’kyj cites sayings and fables such as: “*Zaxrymotila, kobyľjača mov holova*” (“She made such a noise as might have come from the head of a mare”); “*Na nižci kurjačij stojala ta xatka*” (“That house stood on a hen’s leg”); “*Ce kylym-samol’ot čudesnyj za Xmelja vytkavsja carja*” (“This magic carpet was woven during Tsar Hop’s reign”); “*Os’ skatert’ šl’ons’-kaja . . . na stil jak til’ky nastely i zahadaj jakoji stravy, to vsjaki vrodjat’sja potrawy*” (“Here is a tablecloth made of Silesian wool . . . the moment you place it on the table and think of some kind of food, all sorts of dishes immediately appear”); “*A ce sapjanni-samoxody*” (“And this is a self-propelled Moroccan leather vehicle”); “*Poodal’ buv malyj Telesyk . . . do joho kralasja zmija, krylataja z simju hlavamy*” (“At a distance stood Telesyk . . .; up to him stole a winged serpent with seven heads”).

There are also references to folk songs:

*Hrebci i vesla položyly,  
ta syďja ljulečky kuryly  
i kuhykaly pisen’ok!  
kozac’kyx harnyx zaporožs’kyx*

*pro Sahajdačného spivaly,  
lybon’ spivaly i pro Sič,  
jak v pikinery nabyrally,*

*jak mandruvav kozak vsju nič;  
 Poltavs'ku slavyly Švedčynu  
 i nenja jak svoju dytynu  
 z dvora provadyla v poxod;  
 jak pid Benderju vojuvaly,  
 bez halušok jak pomyraly  
 kolys' jak buv holodnyj hod.*

("The oarsmen even put down their oars, and sitting down, let up their pipes and hooted out some ditties, fine Zaporozhian Cossack songs! . . . They sang about Sahajdačnyj, and probably about the Sič, how their lancers were drafted, how the Cossack wandered all night long. They sang the glories of the Swedish campaign in Poltava, and how mothers led their children from home and into battle. They sang of how they fought at Bendery, how they died from starvation once upon a time, during that lean year.")

Mention is made too of popular chapbooks, e.g., "Bova," and "Marzipan, the Famous Knight" (evidently a parody, for this story does not figure among known folk tales). Kotljarevs'kyj's debt to the folk tradition or ritual wailing at burial is apparent in the moving lament for Evrija by his mother. One stanza is written entirely in the style of a folk song:

*Ne xmara sonce zastupyla,  
 ne vyxor poroxom vertyt',  
 ne halyč čorna pole vkryla,  
 ne bujnyj viter ce šumyt',  
 Ce vijs'ko jde vsima šljaxamy,  
 ce ratne brjaskotyť zbrujamy . . .*

("It is not a cloud that has blocked out the sun, it is not a whirlwind that is whipping up the dust, it is not black crows that have covered the field, it is not a violent wind that is blustering nearby. It is the army marching on every road, it is the fierce clashing of their steeds' harnesses. . . .")

Admittedly, this material is not always reliable, for Kotljarevs'kyj does not seem to make any distinction between that which is Ukrainian and that which is

foreign. There are occasional references in his work to popular stories that are Russian.

Kotljarevs'kyj draws attention to folk beliefs and to such phenomena as magical spells; here, his Syvylla (Sybil) declares:

*. . . ljudjam v nuždi pomagaju:  
ja jim na zvizdax vorožu;  
komu čy trjascju odihnaty,  
od zaušnyč' čy pošeptaty,  
abo i volos izihnati'—  
šepču, uroky prohanjaju,  
perepoloxy vylyvaju,  
hadjuk umiju zamovljati' . . .*

(" . . . I help people in need: I foretell their fortunes by the stars. Whether to drive off someone's fever, or to conjure away the fever or to drive away swelling of the gums, I whisper softly and expel the evil spirits; I heal those who are frightened, I know how to charm snakes. . . .")

Even at the beginning of the twentieth century the following passage remained a compelling description of hell:

*Vid'om že tut kolesuvaly  
i vsix šeptux i vorožok . . .*

*na prypičkax ščob ne oraly,  
u komyny ščob ne litaly,  
ne jizdyly b na upyrjax;  
i ščob došču ne prodavaly,  
vnoči ljudej ščob ne ljakaly,  
ne vorožyly b na bobax . . .*

("Here on the rack they tortured the witches and all the conjurers and sorceresses . . . so they would disturb no more the peasant's hearth, nor fly down his chimney, nor ride around on vampires; and so they would sell rain no more, nor terrify people at night, nor tell fortunes from beans. . . .")

Another subject seized upon by Kotljarevs'kyj was Ukrainian antiquity which, since the days of his youth, signified that period of history known as the Cossack Era. It was transformed, first of all, into components of the travesty: King Latin speaks of "our Sič"; Enej describes himself thus: "I—Enej the Trojan—am a Zaporožian chief" (*košovyj*); Evrijal's father was as severe as a hetman's bodyguard (*serdjuk opričnyj*). Terms like bailiffs (*vozni*), quartermaster general (*oboznyj heneral'nyj*), ensign (*xorunžyj*), "the wife of some captain or other" (*"sotnyka jakohos' pani"*), etc. occur throughout the text. Kotljarevs'kyj also inscribed lines such as the following, and possibly from not altogether perfect knowledge:

*Tak vičnoj pamjati buvalo  
u nas v Het'manščyni kolys'  
tak prosto vijs'ko šykuvalo,  
ne znavy: "stij, ne ševelys'!"  
Tak slavniji polky kozac'ki—  
Lubens'kyj, Hadjac'kyj, Poltavs'kyj  
v šapkax, bulo, jak mak, cvitut'.  
Jak hrjanut', sotnjamy udarjat',  
pered sebe spysy nastavljat'—  
to, mov metloju, vse metut'.*

("Indeed there once was a time when the fame of our *Hetman* state seemed immortal. So perfect was the rank formation the troops drew almost unconsciously: "Halt, not a sound!" Renowned Cossack regiments were there then—from Lubny, Hadjač and Poltava, resplendent in their poppy-red caps. At the blare of trumpets, the companies strike out, bearing their lances at the ready—and, like a mighty broom, all sweep forward.")

However, having aroused in readers their sense of nationalism and even sovereignty, Kotljarevs'kyj deals them a bitter blow only a few lines later with this unheroic and vulgar tableau:

*Tak Sahajdačnyj z Dorošenkom  
kozac'kym vijs'kom velyčavs'.  
Odyn z bunčukom pered rattju,  
pozadu druhyj pjanu brattju  
dons'kym nahajem pidhanjav.*



(“Thus, Sahajdačnyj and Dorošenko prided themselves on their Cossack forces. One marched at the head of the host with the Cossack standard, the other brought up the rear, driving the drunken brethren on with his Don-made whip.”)

7. Nevertheless, serious ideological themes are not entirely absent from the *Enejida*. Kotljarevs'kyj was a religious man, adhering to conventional spiritual beliefs; but at the same time he was very much taken with the Enlightenment, especially its humanistic aspirations. Far from being limited to the touching scene of Evrijal's mother's lament, Kotljarevs'kyj's sensitivity and even sentimentality may be found in several places in his work: “*Enej spodar posumuvavšy, . . . poplakavšy i porydavšy . . .*” (“The commander Enej, having grieved awhile . . . wept and lamented . . .”), “*Proščalysja i obnimalys', sliz'my hirkymy oblyvalys'*” (“They bade farewell to one another and embraced, shedding bitter tears”). Nyz tenderly reminds Evrijal about his “aged mother,” then Evrijal asks lul Enejovyč to look after his mother for him. Just before dying, Turn calls to mind his “aged father”; Enej “could scarcely stop weeping,” etc. Of course, alongside such depictions of tender feelings, there are instances of sheer caprice: Anxiz, weeping as he bade farewell to Enej in the underworld, “*kryčav jak v marti kit*” (“bawled like a cat in March”), etc. A serious tone is maintained for certain elevated passages—such as one of Venus' addresses to Zeus or some of the more or less pathetic scenes in the various parts. Certain descriptions are also written in a serious vein; for the most part, however, they are not very successful, and in any case contain a considerable number of vulgar words. Possibly the only places in which Kotljarevs'kyj refrained from using travesty are those having a moral or humanistic character:

*De obščeye dobro v upadku,  
zabud' otcja, zabud' i matku—  
lety povynnist' ispravljat'.*

*Za mylu vse terjat' hotovi—  
klejnoty, žyvyty, obnovy;  
odna dorožče myloj—čest'.*

(“Wherever the general good is threatened, forget your father, forget your mother too—and fly to carry out your duty. For your sweetheart you are ready to lose everything—attributes of power, sustenance, amusement.