



## The President and Fellows of Harvard College

---

Poltava: A Turning Point in the History of Preaching

Author(s): Giovanna Brogi Bercoff

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 31, No. 1/4, POLTAVA 1709: THE BATTLE AND THE MYTH (2009-2010), pp. 205-226

Published by: [Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41756504>

Accessed: 14-04-2015 01:14 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute and The President and Fellows of Harvard College* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## Poltava: A Turning Point in the History of Preaching

GIOVANNA BROGI BERCOFF

**I**T IS ASSUMED THAT THE BATTLE OF POLTAVA and the myth built around it represent a turning point in the history not only of the Eastern Slavic world but all of Europe. Indeed, if we take the date of the battle as a conventional chronological turning point, there is no doubt that after 1709 nothing was as it was before, whether in Ukraine, Russia, or Sweden. However, Poltava represents only the culminating—and most spectacular—point of a process of deep cultural changes that had been taking place for several decades in Ukraine and Russia.

Only the basic changes in the cultural and literary life of Ukraine before and after the end of Hetman Ivan Mazepa's rule are known. They may be "metonymically" represented through the symbols/personalities of Stefan Iavors'kyi and Feofan Prokopovych.<sup>1</sup> However, the history of Ukraine and its cultural and literary evolution in the eighteenth century remain a poorly investigated magmatic mass, where anonymity runs side by side with the splendor of genius, and history writing mixes a handful of new ideas with old-fashioned patterns and stereotypes; where Polish still is used among the members of the middle *szlachta* and churchmen, but loses its productive, inspiring function; where theater continues to be represented in the traditional scholastic baroque forms only slightly adapted to the new social situation; and where semipopular prose and satiric poetry, however interesting they may be for the history of literature and mentality, hardly represent a modern, dynamic system of values and forms.<sup>2</sup> It is interesting to note that the most cultivated—and up to a certain point innovative—push seems to have come from the highest level of ecclesiastical culture. On the one hand, with his blend of Slavo-Byzantine heritage and Western rationalism, Hryhorii Skovoroda, the Ukrainian poet, philosopher, and composer, represents the most mature fruit of the Kyivan Mohyla Academy's baroque scholarship. His genius led him to abandon official church institutions and to transform the religious tradition in such a way that it became the first modern philosophical system in any Slavic land. He became the first world-class writer in the Eastern Slavic lands and paved the way for the

emergence of nineteenth-century Ukrainian romantic literature, particularly Taras Shevchenko.

At the same time, Kyiv became the leading center of ecclesiastical literature in the Russian Empire: theology, patristic tradition, philological research in biblical studies, ethical thought, and discussion provoked by the challenge of Western (mainly German) rationalism, anti-Catholic polemics, and preaching continued to flourish and incorporate methodological principles and some new rationalistic forms, which brought ecclesiastical literature nearer to modernity. While remaining the center of ecclesiastical literature and church tradition, Kyiv became part of the culture of the Russian Empire, and the Mohyla Academy was increasingly turned into a “useful tool” in the hands of the imperial government. Although there were pockets of opposition, the tragic fate of Metropolitan Arsenii Matsiievych shows that the power of the church, both material and spiritual, had disappeared forever. The metropolitan was stripped of his rank and exiled to the Far North (where he died as a martyr) for having opposed the measures adopted by Catherine II, which were aimed at eliminating every last vestige of the church’s economic power.

Much work remains to be done to expand our knowledge of this important chapter of Ukrainian and Russian cultural history. Sermons are among the most important sources on eighteenth-century culture and literature, and thus deserve to be examined with modern research tools and without ideological prejudice. I will focus first on the two most famous sermons that were written in the first decade of the eighteenth century: Metropolitan of Riazan and the nominal head of the Russian Orthodox Church Stefan Iavors’kyi’s *Trost’ vetrom koleblema* and Rector of Kyiv Academy Feofan Prokopovych’s *Slovo pokhval’noe o preslavnoi nad voiskami sveiskimi pobeде...v leto 1709 mesiatsa iunია dnia 27 Bogom darovannaia*. Later, I will touch upon a few issues pertaining to the later development of homiletic literature and ecclesiastical culture. Iavors’kyi and Prokopovych’s sermons are famous because of their authors, but even more so because they are devoted to Mazepa’s “treason” and Peter’s victory at Poltava. Other sermons that were written in the following decades (e.g., the various orations of Prokopovych or the sermons of Hryhorii Konys’kyi) are equally important, but they are almost forgotten today.

The sermons of Iavors’kyi and Prokopovych, written in 1708 and 1709, respectively, may be considered two “icons” of two different worlds, even though they were created at approximately the same time and sprang from the same cultural cradle. Both preachers studied in Catholic colleges, but Iavors’kyi took from Western scholastic erudition the most traditional cultural patterns, Aristotelian thinking, and baroque forms, while Prokopovych (who belonged to a younger generation) was attracted by German rationalism as well, and preferred classical, Ciceronian stylistic forms. While both sermons represent a blend of Mohylian tradition with elements of the Catholic Counter-Reformation, *Trost’ vetrom koleblema* embodies the Polish Jesuit version of the

Counter-Reformation, while the *Slovo pokhval'noe* reveals the Roman Catholic influences of the *Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide* (Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith) and the Saint Athanasius Greek College in Rome. Thus, the two sermons devoted to the “fall” of Mazepa offer excellent material for studying their authors, as well as the culture that each represents.

\*

For more than ten years Iavors'kyi, who was a product of the Kyivan intellectual milieu, belonged to a group of panegyrists who wrote for Mazepa. The extant critical literature has partially described the main characteristics of the historical, rhetorical, literary, and cultural context of the Mazepa era. Nonetheless, the lack of clear-cut statements representing the political views of the Kyivan ecclesiastical elite makes it difficult to understand the extent to which such personalities as Metropolitan Varlaam Iasyns'kyi, and the ecclesiastical elite around him, were actually aware of and supported Mazepa's political plans and diplomatic contacts. Some symbols and metaphors that appear in the printed texts suggest that until the very beginning of the eighteenth century the intellectual ecclesiastical elite had a fairly positive and well-defined perception of the potential extent of the hetman's power, as well as of its limits. The Moon-Mazepa was said to receive his light from the Sun-Tsar; nevertheless, this did not prevent Iavors'kyi from exploiting the multiple semantics of baroque culture and its metaphorical interpretation of symbols in order to extol the majesty (*maiestat*) of the hetman-eagle; Mazepa is called *nayiasnieiszy* (equivalent to the Lat. *serenissimus*), and the eagle appears as an obvious parallelism to the “imperial eagles,” mentioned by Iavors'kyi a couple of lines earlier. This kind of symbolism, which appears in the final part of the panegyric *Echo głosu wołającego na puszczy* (Kyiv, 1689), seems to indicate that in the late seventeenth century this was the panegyrist's perception of Mazepa's (and the Hetmanate's) unique position between Russia and Poland.

Balancing between two powers in search of equilibrium was connected with the practice of concealing thoughts and sentiments by the Hetmanate's secular and religious elites. This was not just a necessity for Mazepa in the years following the 1686 submission to the Moscow Patriarchate, the fall of Sophia, and Tsar Peter's ascent to the throne. Nor was it a simple “baroque” habit—rather, it was the application of a well-represented body of political theory in seventeenth-century Europe. This was true of the hetman as well as of the ecclesiastical elite. The contemporary Ukrainian writer Valerii Shevchuk is correct in pointing out the Machiavellian character of Mazepa's policy.<sup>3</sup> Earlier, the French historian Daniel Beauvois wrote about “les sinuosités d'un Machiavel” when describing Orlyk: he pointed out how falsity went hand in hand with religious piety and political utopia.<sup>4</sup> Indeed, this was a “baroque Machiavelli,” who had undergone

a process of “Christianization” that implied at the same time a strengthening of the idea of *raison d'état* (which was perceived as sinful per se) and the creation of the ideal image of the sovereign inspired by Christian virtues (which forgave the “sins” of policy). Since political gamesmanship and the defense of the state often challenged ethical rules, it became necessary to endow the sovereign with the special grace of God. This brought to the fore a dramatization of the conflict between the “evil” of political deeds and the duty of carrying them out for the sake of the state. Seventeenth-century European culture substituted Tacitism for Livianism, with the model of the heroic history of Livius overturned by the hidden paths of the political game as depicted by Tacitus, and “crypto-Machiavellists” such as Justus Lipsius and Andrzej Maksymilian Fredro wrote collections of “rules” for the virtuous but strong sovereign.<sup>5</sup> If the “real” Machiavelli were considered the prototype of ambiguous (morally damnable) behavior in politics, *raison d'état* (political reason) was a useful, even necessary, instrument for good government. Ambiguity between a Christian ethos and cunning political intelligence became a system of thought, an all-encompassing *Weltanschauung* throughout Europe during the seventeenth century. Thinkers and historians, searching for a solution to the conflict between moral and political principles, proposed, among other things, the formulation of a kind of “legal lie” or “honest dissimulation,” which received theoretical justification in intellectual circles and political treatises; the most famous example of this is the Neapolitan Torquato Accetto's 1641 masterpiece, *Della dissimulazione onesta* (On Honest Dissimulation). Although the book focuses on specific situation and issue, the baroque concept of “honest dissimulation,” with its theoretical justifications, should be recognized as a specific intellectual and cultural trend that achieved a dominant position in seventeenth-century Western and Central European culture and thought. Pylyp Orlyk's letter to Iavors'kyi (1721) offers evidence of how deeply this intellectual attitude had penetrated the mentality of the Ukrainian elite.<sup>6</sup> Thus, the reading and interpretation of texts written in Ukraine or by Ukrainians in Russia, or related to Russia in the Petrine era, can hardly be correct without considering the dominant duplicity inherent in late baroque European culture.

I will now focus briefly on Iavors'kyi's famous sermon, delivered on 12 November 1708<sup>7</sup> together with the anathema against Mazepa, pointing out the ambiguity of its wording and message. In the first part of the sermon, commenting on the opening “Thema,” the preacher praises the Olive Tree for its moral strength and righteousness in contrast to the flexible Reed, even if the former is destined for destruction. The first idea that comes to mind is that Mazepa has been destroyed, but he had the opportunity to demonstrate his strength; he was a true olive tree. Immediately afterward this idea seems to be contradicted by the statement that Mazepa is a reed bowing to the gelid wind of Hell. Indeed, in his 1708 sermon the preacher could not help considering

Mazepa's last action as a "betrayal" and condemning it explicitly. He calls the hetman an Absalom, a Judas, an infernal lion, a false wolf, a "painted grave," a serpent filled with poison, an "apple of Sodom," a treacherous fox, and other similar epithets. Iavors'kyi's condemnation of Mazepa was not due simply to a lack of any other possible choice in the given historical and political situation. One should not forget that in no way could he have indulged in any kind of approval or justification of Mazepa's choice, because of his own deep ideological convictions. The fact that the hetman had looked to the Swedish king as an ally was unacceptable to the metropolitan of Riazan, since this meant a change of allegiance from the Orthodox tsar to a Lutheran king. However difficult his relationship with Peter may have been, Iavors'kyi was not only a church hierarch, but also—and first and foremost—a violent enemy of "Heresy." Since his youth, which he had spent in Polish Jesuit colleges, he had never ceased to attack Lutheranism and all other Protestant confessions (the most genuine expression is probably the long digression in the sermon *Vynohrad Khrystov* (Vineyard of Christ), which was written and published in 1698 for Mazepa's nephew Ivan Obydov's'kyi. The sense of sorrow and betrayal that Iavors'kyi may have experienced after Mazepa's "treason" was at once personal and religious. He certainly had not forgotten the hetman's generosity toward the Ukrainian church and to him, and he may still have admired his steadfastness, but could not help hating the religious "apostasy" with all his might.

In the 1708 sermon the anguish provoked by the contrast between the previous devotion for Mazepa and the religious damnation of his "apostasy" finds its rhetorical expression in the form of biblical symbology, which is organized in two contrasting series of questions and answers. With the first series, in which he presents the hetman's extraordinary merits, the author seems to offer precisely the opposite picture of what he is expected to say: "For twenty years and more he was Hetman, and in all this time he showed himself to be an olive tree. Look at his pure understanding, at his civility: this appears to be an olive tree. Look at his piety, the construction of houses of God, the riches given to monasteries and churches...his generosity towards the poor and pilgrims... he really seems to be an olive tree giving fruits in the house of God. And what shall I say about his faithfulness to the sovereign? Here he appeared to be not only an olive tree, but an oak and a cedar of Lebanon, strong and unwavering."<sup>8</sup> Without a doubt, the text leads to the expected damnation of Mazepa by introducing the last question that negates the positive image contained in the previous rhetorical questions: "What do we hear now?" the preacher asks. The answer is evident: "That oak and cedar appeared to be a reed." Nevertheless, one cannot but be impressed by the rhetorical skill with which the preacher induces the listener to remember the accumulation of laudatory phrases much better than the condemnatory ones.

The above phrases extolling Mazepa's extraordinary deeds on behalf of the

church and the tsar are not the only ones in the sermon. There is an entire paragraph (p. 510) elaborating the same metaphor, “shining star” (*svetlaia dennitsa*), which Iavors’kyi had used in his panegyric of 1689. No less impressive is the imitation of Jeremiah’s lamentation, in which the symbol of Jerusalem is used to describe Mazepa’s soul before his betrayal. One should not lose sight of the fact that in a letter to a fellow Kyivan churchman and intellectual Metropolitan of Rostov Dymytrii Tuptalo, Iavors’kyi had compared Kyiv with Moscow, praising the former as a place of “holy solitude,” where “intellect is vigorous” (O beata solitudo! ...*chto prezhdde bylo ingenii vigor*”),<sup>9</sup> whereas the latter is a “Babylon.”<sup>10</sup> More examples indicating this mental attitude may be found in the sermon. Given the text’s relative brevity (which is uncommon), the praises of the hetman’s past deeds are so numerous, long, and easily discernible that they dominate a large part of the text. Though now a traitor, Mazepa still appears as a hero and one that it is difficult to imagine as a devilish liar. The sermon is clearly not intended to extol Mazepa: it is and remains a malediction against the Judas and servant of the Devil; any record of his past merits is accompanied by the contrasting malediction of his infamous falsity. Nevertheless, the degree of ambiguity is very high, despite the fact that we will probably never know if the author actually sought this ambiguity consciously, or if it was the fruit of an exceedingly bitter sense of sorrow and despair.

A sort of crypto-celebration of the fallen hetman appears in the latter part of the sermon, in which the author touches upon more specifically “political” themes. First, he points to the dominant position and prestige that the hetman had enjoyed in the Russian Empire; second, he shows his concern for Ukraine as a land and a people. In the opening images in this part of the sermon the ambiguity is even more pronounced than in the preceding sections. According to the preacher, Mazepa was the “Little Russian star,” a “shining star.” This metaphor is elaborated in an even more laudatory manner than in the first part of the sermon and in the panegyric of 1689: honor, power, wealth, glory, and fidelity to the sovereign made him shine in the entire “Russian heaven” (*rossiiskoe nebo*); like a star, he was beloved by the boyars and notable people.<sup>11</sup> In the dedicatory poem to *Vynohrad Khrystov* Iavors’kyi points out that the sovereign is the sun and the hetman, the moon, thus establishing the officially correct political hierarchy. But in the same sermon he also uses the image of the sun for Mazepa himself. In *Trost’ vetrom koleblema*, too, the correct hierarchy (the sovereign as the sun, the hetman as a star) concludes the passage, but it is preceded by a lengthy sequence of highly rhetorical and laudatory phrases that seem to dominate the whole discourse. The metaphor of the star, which shines in the sky above the whole empire and is beloved by the tsar and all the boyars, makes of the hetman a very special and preeminent personality. As a result of the extremely laudatory emphasis, Mazepa’s fall acquires an unexpectedly high degree of dramatization: the blame after the exaltation

becomes stronger and politically significant, but the historical examples that follow now convey a “minor tone” of rhetorical emphasis. Mazepa is said to have acted like the “buntovshchiki” Stenka Razin and Bulavin,<sup>12</sup> and, like Brutus, he betrayed his sovereign. Then the preacher places himself in the tsar’s shoes: Peter had given all his confidence, love, riches, and privileges to the hetman, receiving in exchange an unbearable wound, an offense similar to the one Christ received “from those Jerusalem brigands in the garden” (*ot onikh razboinikov erusalimskikh v vertograde*; p. 508). This passage probably adheres most strongly to the official anti-Mazepist discourse that developed between 1708 and 1709; several months later this idea was strongly emphasized by Prokopovych in his Poltava sermon.

At this point the metropolitan of Riazan seems to address a message to his people, to the members of the Cossack community who may have been willing to offer resistance and to support Mazepa. He gives his benediction to all ranks of Cossacks “because they remained faithful to God and the sovereign and did not follow in Cain’s footsteps.”<sup>13</sup> This is undoubtedly a political appeal; Iavors’kyi was inviting his people not to follow the apostate, but to remain faithful to God and the tsar.

Thus, if any ambiguity may be detected in the words describing Mazepa’s former splendid deeds, there is no doubt as to the content of the metropolitan’s message: the Church and the Cossacks of Ukraine had to submit to the tsar’s will. As far as awareness of the existence of and worry for an autonomous Cossack state is concerned,<sup>14</sup> Iavors’kyi appeals to the ruling class, both ecclesiastical and secular, to reject the former “star” because he followed the Devil instead of Archangel Michael, thereby becoming “Judas.” It is impossible to imagine what the metropolitan of Riazan would have said if Mazepa had won the “game.” Certainly Iavors’kyi facilitated Peter’s victory by using religion (“benediction”) to discourage Cossack participation in the resistance to the Russians. The reasons for this appeal to submit to Peter may have been simultaneously “political” and religious. One should not forget that in Iavors’kyi’s appeal to his countrymen not to follow Mazepa there may have been cold calculation on the part of the highest hierarch of the Orthodox Church who lived in Russia, in the center of the empire, and had the opportunity to evaluate the futility of any attempt to rebel against Peter. Hence his exhortation to avoid hopeless bloodshed (the period of the Ruin was still deeply engrained in the memory of the generation to which Iavors’kyi belonged). Certainly, the appeal was also a clear expression of his opposition (of apostolic origin, as the famous Epistle of Saint Paul to the Romans attests) to any idea of challenging the legitimate power represented by the tsar. It is very likely that by 1708 this second motivation was dominant. If the idea of an autonomous status of the social body formed by the Cossacks and the Kyivan ecclesiastical community had ever glimmered in Iavors’kyi’s mind when he was a brilliant poet and scholar

in Mazepa's milieu in the 1680s and 1690s, he must have gradually abandoned any illusion when he viewed the evolution of the events from Russia, where he had lived since 1700, when he saw the growing grip of Peter's power over society, church, and policy. At the same time he appealed to obedience to the legal power of the Orthodox sovereign, and condemned any possible alliance with the "heretic" king.

Another question arises. Between October 1708 and July 1709 Iavors'kyi and his fellow Ukrainian hierarchs of the Petrine era must have spent dreadful months in fear for their positions, their very lives, and the institutions that they represented. Indeed, no church hierarch was able to offer active resistance to the tsar on behalf of the man who had dared refuse obedience to the authority of the legal sovereign. The tragic fate that befell Metropolitan of Kyiv Ioasaf Krokovs'kyi, who was investigated by the authorities, summoned in 1718 to St. Petersburg, and died in Tver en route to the capital, confirms the impossibility of any kind of opposition. At the same time it is difficult to imagine that those who had been Mazepa's associates or had received benefits from him were not aware of the terrible loss that the hetman's end would spell for the Kyivan church and the Mohyla Academy, and for the Hetmanate as well. They had lost the man who had brought them success in culture and society; he was the protector of the church, patron of art and literature, and the man who had fostered the ideas and the intellectual world in which they lived. In this situation, did Iavors'kyi—or the other churchmen in this same circle—ever really think about what the history of Mazepa and his anathematization meant for the future of Ukraine? Or was their concern limited to their own fates and that of the Mohyla Academy and the intellectual and spiritual world in which they lived?

It is difficult to formulate precise answers to these questions. The prevalence of duplicity and polysemantic thinking cast doubt on any answer. The depth of the ambivalence underlying Iavors'kyi's formulations is shown by the subsequent evolution of the metropolitan's relationship with Peter. Ten years after the Battle of Poltava, when the victory was to be celebrated again, Iavors'kyi was not allowed to deliver the sermon that he had prepared. Instead, his worst enemy, Feofan Prokopovych, was asked to mark the important anniversary with his speech.

\*

A few months after Iavors'kyi's condemnation of Mazepa in Russia, Prokopovych pronounced his famous *Slovo pokhval'noe* in Saint Sophia Cathedral in Kyiv on 24 July 1709, in the presence of the sovereign returning from the Battle of Poltava. I will not go into any details here, interesting though they may be as examples of the orator's audacious use of rhetorical devices and his

own psychological peculiarities. One example of Prokovych's aggressive way of addressing the audience is a passage in which he uses a typical rhetorical paradox to declare that even envious people will be obliged to confess and testify to the glory of the victory, a glory coming from God's will and surpassing any previous historical example.<sup>15</sup>

What are the main ideas characterizing the sermon, and how does it differ from Iavors'kyi's? To be sure, Iavors'kyi wrote an anathemizing sermon, which, by its very nature and the completely different historical circumstances in which it was written, had to be different from a laudatory sermon. The metropolitan of Riazan wrote his work in the period of great anxiety and uncertainty following Mazepa's decision to go over to the Swedish camp, whereas Prokopovych's work was written at a time when everyone already knew that the destinies of Russia, Ukraine, and Sweden had been decided. There are, however, more precise features that indicate how deep the chasm was between Iavors'kyi and his former student, Prokopovych.

After the introduction, the sermon is divided in two parts: the first is dedicated to the victory over the Swedish king, and the second, to the humiliation inflicted on Mazepa the "traitor." The first part is constructed around a rhetorical device based on contrast: in order to extol Peter's victory, Prokopovych underlines the prowess of the fallen enemy; Charles's fame as an invincible hero makes Peter's victory the greatest event in world history. Prokopovych's sermon is a product of Kyivan oratory, carrying within itself the Mohylian heritage as well as the Ciceronian tradition that originated in Italian (especially Jesuit) schooling. (Famiano Strada's rhetoric is one example.)<sup>16</sup> In the *Slovo pokhval'noe*, however, one must acknowledge profound changes with respect to the tradition of Tuptalo or Iavors'kyi. I will mention just two points.

First, like any other orator/preacher of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Prokopovych uses history to illustrate his arguments. Yet, for him history is not a simple collection of facts or anecdotes for comparison, or a metaphorical demonstration of religious or moral truths, as it was for the Jesuit model and its derivatives. He quotes Sigismund von Herberstein to extol Tsar Ivan IV through a *dictum* by a sultan who supposedly expressed his critical concern to the Polish ambassadors for having declared war on the invincible Muscovite tsar. The fact that no such episode may be found in Herberstein does not change the importance of the (pseudo)quotation. Prokopovych quotes one of the best sources of the Western Renaissance tradition, but manipulates it in order to posit Peter's glory as an event connected—through Ivan IV—to Russia's "national" history. The orator's example is clearly related to Peter's time, since Ivan also fought to gain the Baltic lands. A previous parallel may be found in the *Synopsis* (originally attributed to Innokentii Gizel', but elaborated after his death), where the author/elaborator refers to the Battle of Kulikovo and turns it into one of the first "national" myths of Russian power. This text,

however, followed the Kyiv-based Mohylian tradition of the anti-Tatar struggle. The *Synopsis* is a curious blend of Renaissance and baroque history writing, but it incorporates myths of the late Middle Ages, such as pan-Orthodox religious thinking of the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Muscovite anti-Tatar discourse and hagiographic exaltation of warrior princes.

Prokopovych's approach is more "political" and modern. His search for an exemplum serving a mythologized image of Ivan IV introduced a new trend in historical thinking, one that adhered more closely to Western historiography of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but which was specifically adapted to Russian imperial strivings in the Petrine era. Also typical of Renaissance and baroque historiography is his description of the borders of the immense Russian state—an empire stretching from "our river Dnieper" to the Caspian Sea and the Persian Empire, to "Novaia zemlia," the Northern and Baltic seas, and again to the Dnieper. This kind of "political geography," which points to the expansion of the state "from sea to sea" (*a mare ad mare*) was typical of all major monarchies and their historiographers and panegyrists, from the British to the Swedish, and included the Polish Commonwealth in Jan Sobieski's time. In the Kyivan homiletic tradition this was an innovation.

Second, Iavors'kyi's sermon is dominated by a pessimistic "mood" and is basically grounded on "negative" devices and images expressing sorrow, denial, and ambiguity. Prokopovych's sermon is emphatically "positive." It declares, states, and asserts new values and a new order. The author thus makes use of typical rhetorical devices of classical or baroque origins—the ones he himself described in his *Rhetorica*. Often, however, it is easy to spot phonetic, lexical, and syntactical parallelisms that seem to hark back to the religious rhetorical model of the so-called Second South Slavic influence, a model that had its origins in Byzantine and early Church Slavonic literature. This question needs to be investigated further. To my knowledge, the evolution of Prokopovych's language has been studied only from the point of view of its "Russification" on the phonetic and morphological levels. A deeper and more modern approach may uncover interesting interplay between the *pletienie sloves* (weaving of words) of Church Slavonic and classical and baroque rhetoric.<sup>17</sup>

By the sixteenth century the Church Slavonic tradition, which originated in the mystical religious Byzantine and Slavic heritage, had become an effective tool of Muscovite political practice thanks to Metropolitan Makarii's literary and ecclesiastical activities in the service of the growing Muscovite power during the reigns of Ivan III and Ivan IV. This Muscovite heritage, which had been overshadowed by Polish baroque influence during the reign of Aleksei Mikhailovich and Mazepa in both Ukraine and Russia, seems to have particularly impressed Prokopovych, although he embedded them in Ciceronian-oriented rhetorical forms, probably of direct seventeenth-century Roman origin. In his sermon the proclamation of a new "national" (Russian imperial)

mythology is conveyed by means of a unique blend of historical symbols and stylistic manners of sixteenth-century Muscovite origin, with rules and symbols derived from the classical historical (or mythological) tradition, the whole skillfully combined with audacious rationalistic thinking of Northern and Central (Western) European origin.

The historical examples introduced by Prokopovych have nothing to do with the idea of stronger "realism" in his sermon, in comparison with the kind of "abstract" or "artificial" character traditionally ascribed to the baroque sermons of Iavors'kyi or Tuptalo. Prokopovych was as "artificial" and "abstract" as his predecessors and he was no less "rhetorical" and baroque; he had the same Mohylian and Roman Catholic background. A member of the younger generation and having other mental inclinations, he chose ideological and political patterns that differed from those employed by the metropolitans of Riazan and Rostov: German rationalism and the classical and Renaissance heritage played a major role in his mentality and system of thought. Thus, in Prokopovych's work, the new choice and novel use of historical examples and cultural references (the Renaissance "heroic" tradition instead of Jesuit "moral" and "allegorical" historiography, Herberstein's<sup>18</sup> "pragmatic" approach instead of moral conflict) aimed at and satisfied the need to create a new political discourse, the kind of new imperial mythology that induced Peter to adopt the title of *Imperator* instead of (or together with) *Tsar*.

The second, and considerably longer, part of the sermon is devoted to Mazepa. The hatred directed at the hetman seems to have no limits. It is interesting to note that many passages are devoted to the horrible pain Peter felt when he learned of Mazepa's "treason." The pathetic, almost sentimental, phrasing and images build up the mythical atmosphere around the personality of Peter, here presented as a victim and a glorious victor "beloved by God," a true defender of Orthodoxy. The description of Peter as a warrior modeled on ancient Roman patterns dominates a good half of the text. Military images and phraseology create a special literary effect of glorification.<sup>19</sup> By the same token, Prokopovych emphasizes the tremendous danger represented by the Swedish "devilish enemy" (*supostat*), the fear brought by the dark night, the fires, the impenetrable smoke, and the unbearable clamor of the warriors. The extreme dramatization of the account of the battle and the tsar's superhuman, selfless courage and spirit of sacrifice transforms Prokopovych's sermon into a highly emotional text that may be considered one of the most effective contributions to the creation of Peter's myth.

What about Mazepa? His name is never mentioned; he is not even called a "devil" or a Judas, as Iavors'kyi calls him. The devil is mentioned only as the inspirer of the "treason." Iavors'kyi's Mazepa is an impressive, even "heroic," figure in both the good and the evil that he did. In contrast, Prokopovych presents the hetman as a coward, "a cursed traitor," and, more significantly, as

a bad statesman. For the purpose of disparaging the hetman he not only makes use of denigrating epithets, he also gives them concrete and politically rational substance. Mazepa, he maintains, has brought war to his own homeland, Little Russia, thus causing devastation and misery for his own people. These kinds of accusations were part of the stock arguments Peter used in his *gramoty* (the term is Prokopovych's) to dissuade Ukrainians from following the hetman after October 1708. The text of the sermon follows the same pattern and condemns Mazepa not only because he was a traitor, but because he acted against the elementary rules of statecraft. The depredations of war within the borders of one's own land were discussed in seventeenth-century treatises: one example is Justus Lipsius's work, *Monita et exempla politica*, which Prokopovych had translated into the Russian language by Simeon Kochanovskii.<sup>20</sup> Similar theories were known to Prokopovych also from the works of Leibniz's student, Christian Wolff.

In contrast to Iavors'kyi, Prokopovych brought to the fore myths that were to gain increasing momentum in the Russian imperial discourse against Mazepist (Ukrainian) separatism and in foreign politics in general: the myths of a perpetual "Polish connection" in any dangerous moment, and of "foreign conspiracy" in any kind of situation. At the same time he introduced a new historical symbol of classical origin, that of Hannibal as an image of the most dangerous enemy of Rome. There may even be some apparent contradictions between the insulting epithets used for Mazepa and his companions, such as *kovarnyi*; *pes*; *polchiishcha zmennicheskii*; *kliatvoprestupnyi zmennitsi*; *lukavyi zaporozhtsy*; *neblagodarnyi rab*; *bezsovestnyi rab*; *vrag i liakholiubets*; *malodushen*; etc. (perfidious; dog; traitorous armies; oath-violating traitor; canny Zaporozhian Cossacks; ungrateful slave; dishonest slave; enemy and Liakh-lover; cowardly) and the lengthy comparison with Hannibal. Mazepa and his supporters are only cunning traitors, unfaithful servants, hounds, and scorpions, who do not deserve even the epithet of *supostat*,<sup>21</sup> which was used exclusively for the Swedish king and the "unlawful king of Poland" (illegitimate but nonetheless a king!). Hannibal, on the contrary, was a legendary figure, a fierce enemy of Rome but a heroic enemy. It may be assumed that Prokopovych needed the figure of Hannibal for two reasons: on the one hand, this contributed to the heroic image he wanted to create for Peter as a defender of the fatherland from its worst enemy.<sup>22</sup> On the other, it was a perfectly rational way to describe in hyperbolized terms the danger of Charles and Mazepa's actions and of the battle itself; hence the importance of the victory. Indeed, Hannibal forced the Romans to fight in many countries (Spain, North Africa, and Italy). In the same way, Prokopovych maintains, Peter had to divide the Russian army into many parts to face an enemy who came from different places and was represented by the Swedes, Poles, and Tatars. Historical truth was not the point here: the important thing was to create a new political discourse and this aim was consummately achieved.

Another distinguishing feature of Prokopovych's sermon is the use of extensive military descriptions, which are extremely vivid and effective. Some details attest to the orator's interest in the techniques of warfare. He mentions ancient peoples (e.g., the Parthians) who would flee in order to defeat the enemy more easily when he began pursuing them. Here Prokopovych uses the historical topos to denigrate the Swedes and their allies (vividly contrasted with the earlier exaltation of Swedish strength as a means to extol Peter's victory): they ran away not in order to strike at the enemy, the author explains, but because they were afraid of fighting the likes of Peter and his heroic army. "Did you come to us to hide, O devilish enemy?" (*Kritisia li k nam prishel esi, o supostate?*) the orator asks with acute rhetorical irony.

In the final part of the speech Prokopovych abandons historical and rational argumentation and privileges hyperbolic rhetorical discourse. Peter is presented as a young god, appearing before his troops, armed only with divine protection: "not...garbed in iron, nor covered with hard armor, [he] had neither a shield nor a copper helmet" (*ne...odeian v zhelezo, ni oblozhen tverdoiu broneiu, ne imel esi ni shchita, ni shlema midianago*) because God Himself and His "right arm" defend him "like an immovable wall and diamantine visor" (*aki nerushimoiu stenoiu i adamantovym zabralom*; p. 32). Against any kind of rational recommendations offered by political thinkers and military theoreticians, Peter appears here without defensive arms, following the model of medieval princes whose actions in war were protected by God and the saints. In Prokopovych's laudation Peter is protected by God and acts as a warrior saint.

The *Slovo pokhval'noe* is a splendid piece of rhetorical art. In the history of Ukrainian and Russian homiletics it represents the beginning of a new era, even though it is constructed according to the same rhetorical rules that governed all seventeenth-century sermons. Prokopovych's influence on the further evolution of ecclesiastical history and culture in the eighteenth century has probably been equally strong in both Russia and Ukraine. The same may be said of the evolution of rhetorical theory, oratorical art, and homiletic patterns. I will focus here only on a couple of ideas and examples concerning Hryhorii Konys'kyi and Arsenii Matsiievych.

\*

Among the most outstanding representatives of ecclesiastical culture in the mid-eighteenth century are Heorhii Konys'kyi and Arsenii Matsiievych. The extant literature has focused mainly on the philosophical merits of the former and the latter's strenuous defense—culminating in martyrdom—of the church's autonomy and economic rights. Beyond a doubt, both men were influenced by modern rational and "scientific" thought; they also took part in pioneering expeditions and were interested (especially Konys'kyi) in mathematics, physics, and other experimental sciences.<sup>23</sup> With regard to other aspects of

their activities, they were bound not only to Orthodox doctrine but also to the more traditional patrimony of ecclesiastical and Russian “national” ideas and values.

Many of Konys’kyi’s sermons have been published and partially studied. His masterful use of rhetorical devices, extensive references to historical exempla, frequent mentions of heroes or mythological figures from antiquity, brilliant style, and passionate religious and ethical tension blend together to form unique masterpieces.<sup>24</sup> Some specialists have pointed out the penetration in these sermons of elements stemming from the new rationalist, sensist, and naturalist trends of European culture and sciences.<sup>25</sup> The influence of Prokopovych’s literary writings is evident in the construction of Konys’kyi’s rhetorical periods. The regular, anaphoric repetition of chains of rhetorical questions and numerous syntactic parallelisms (introduced by *kto, chto, kogda bo, ne khotem, ne zhelaimo, ne sobyraimo, ne liubim*, etc.)<sup>26</sup> is inserted in the rhythmical flux of segments (*cola*) rooted in Renaissance and baroque rules of rhetoric. At the same time, as in Prokopovych, the rhythmic placement of stresses and the segmentation in parallel *cola* are reminiscent of the prose of the *pletienie sloves*, but with its own specific rhetorical flow.

More striking is Konys’kyi’s constant, somewhat obsessive, use of military imagery and war commemorations. The above-mentioned sermon dedicated to Saint George is entirely based on metaphors connected with the semantic fields of battle, warriors, and arms. His military imagery does not refer to a specific sovereign and a specific historical battle but to the “soldier of Christ” (*miles Christi*) and the principal idea that life is a battle of men against “passions” (*strasti*), the “sellout” of eternal values in exchange for inferior temporal goods (*kuplia zhiteiskaia*), and moral decay (Epicureanism): the very subject and occasion of the sermon make it quite different from Prokopovych’s. Nevertheless, there is an obvious similarity between the splendid, divine warrior that Prokopovych presents in the finale of his laudatory sermon for the victor of Poltava and the allegorical victories of the martyr, Saint George, over worldly temptations. I would suggest that there is continuity between Prokopovych’s rhetorical theory and Konys’kyi’s style, which is characteristic of mid-eighteenth-century classicism. Indeed, the “Ciceronian model” followed by the former in his baroque rhetorical system, as I suggested earlier (n. 17), distinguishes Prokopovych from his fellows and teachers, such as Iasyns’kyi, Tuptalo, and Iavors’kyi. The kind of classic rhetoric that Prokopovych preferred to other models (e.g., Tomasz Młodzianowski, or Agostino Mascardi) may have helped him become an enduring ideal for classicist trends in eighteenth-century Russian homiletics.

If the representation of St. George as a warrior and his sermon as an endless chain of military actions appears natural because the saint himself is an incarnation of the militant aspect of Christian virtues, the author’s predilection

for military images and his treatment of a battlefield as an allegorical place for the sermon for St. Varvara (Barbara) indicates that this theme was fundamental to Konys'kyi's mental and philosophical outlook.<sup>27</sup> Indeed, the prologue to the *Slovo v den' sv. Varvary*<sup>28</sup> shows the place of Varvara's life as an arena (*pliats*) where two warriors engage in an unevenly matched tournament: the beautiful young maiden, noble and sensitive, who has devoted herself to God, opposes (like David versus Goliath) myriad dreadful enemies, heavily armed and motivated by their devilish hatred of virtue and devotion. The entire narrative is conceived as a succession of episodes in which external enemies (the pagan persecutors, the father) and internal enemies (youth, beauty, nobility, wealth, patrimony, pleasure) struggle by all means to break down the frail maiden. As expected, each battle is won brilliantly by the saint: against youth and its sense of modesty she accepts the shame of being carried naked among the crowd; against beauty she is beaten and covered in horrible wounds; against nobility and wealth she is deprived of all worldly goods; against passions she joyfully encounters torture; against the admiration she provokes, she exults when entering the tower that will shield her from temptation. In the concluding section the orator presents Varvara as the ideal in the daily battles that every Christian has to fight against sin and the devil's machinations.

This sermon is a marvelous piece of classicist harmony in terms of structure, clarity of reasoning and imagery, and transparency of the allegorical signification. Beyond the traditional use of rhetorical devices, metaphors, and biblical quotations, the text contains several signs pointing to a new understanding of narration and literary taste; a new kind of sensibility in the description of feelings, thoughts, and even of the human body of the martyr maiden. Dramatic and bloody descriptions of tortures inflicted on female bodies (or on young men's bodies) are well known from medieval and baroque hagiography as well as didactic and homiletic literature. Here, however, an elegant sense of equilibrium and sensitive attention to color nuances, lines, and movement of the limbs of the young woman and her persecutors denote that the preacher was exposed to the influence of new literary trends. Not only classicism underlies his imagery and style but also a portent of sentimental tendencies, or at least an appropriation of the poetics of sensism on the one hand, and on the other, perhaps, of spiritual pietism as known in the German philosophical and religious tradition.

The images of war and violence in Konys'kyi's sermons of the Kyivan period are also frequently encountered in texts that were written for ecclesiastical celebrations connected with the liturgical calendar. There are also frequently recurring details that bring the ecclesiastical sermon closer to the times in which he lived. This easily detectible feature has been recognized by earlier critics. For example, Konys'kyi often compares ecclesiastical or theological truths to worldly institutions, authorities, and situations. However traditional

this comparison may be, it always undergoes variations when society, culture, and literature change their main patterns and reference points. This seems to be especially true of Konys'kyi. To illustrate, I will recall the lengthy, detailed description of the institution and functioning of a state judicial court, whose elements become metaphorical exemplifications of divine judgment and the importance of the mediation of Christ as a "defender" (advocate) of the sinner, hence of human beings in general (because every man is a sinner).<sup>29</sup> These metaphors offer excellent opportunities for developing intricate theological ideas and interpretations based on paradoxes. On another page of the same text (p. 37), however, Konys'kyi presents a concrete and strikingly vivid image for explaining good deeds as tools of salvation (the passage pertains to the controversy between the Protestant doctrine of "pure faith" and Catholicism's strong emphasis on, among other things, salvation through good deeds). Konys'kyi tries to clarify how good deeds are important but not enough for salvation by comparing them to a small copper coin. One can hardly buy anything in the market with such a coin; nevertheless, it acquires a certain purchasing value when the image of the sovereign is stamped on it, he declares. I would not exclude the possibility that this image, too, has its antecedents in previous centuries, but the way it is revealed and interpreted in the context of the Russian Empire in the mid-eighteenth century attests to the new political, imperial situation and to Konys'kyi's broad culture and his thirst for modern knowledge. Other images—far too many to enumerate here—originating in the world of scientific discoveries may be found in his many writings, including his sermons.

No less than Konys'kyi's works, the sermons of the Metropolitan of Rostov Arsenii Matsiievych deserve to be analyzed and published.<sup>30</sup> To date only eight of them have been published; the rest are still in manuscript form.<sup>31</sup> I will briefly note an interesting point about Matsiievych's way of thinking. In his "Report" (*Donoshenie*) to the Holy Synod,<sup>32</sup> written in 1763 in defense of the church's right to ownership of land, he complains that monasteries are obliged to subsidize the academies. It would be better to care for the clergy's education and well-being on the level of the parish, the metropolitan of Rostov suggests. Instruction is needed, he writes, but not for teaching Latin and supporting the kinds of preachers active at the time: instruction should be Russian, in the Russian language, and sermons should be read from the ancient patristic tradition, as it was in the old times. Matsiievych believes that too often contemporary preachers convey heretical messages (*liuterskie, kal'vinskie, i zhidovskie*).<sup>33</sup> Academies teach foreign, unorthodox learning, while bishops and monks are forced to live in misery because the state is depriving monasteries of their means of survival. Matsiievych's ideas cannot be reduced to this single episode, which was clearly aimed at a specific moment in the struggle between church and state. Nevertheless, even this minor episode

shows that Matsiievych's opposition to the Holy Synod and imperial power was not inspired by particularly "enlightened" ideas. The defense of church goods belongs to the "natural" reaction of hierarchs of any time. However, the attack against the kind of preaching that belonged to the seventeenth-century Mohylian tradition inspired by Latin theory, the emphasis laid on the Russian language and "national" (Russian imperial) tradition, and the appeal to resume the older practice of reading the sermons (*slova*) of the "Fathers" rather than risky "heretical" and "Judaic" teachings—all this belongs to a set of ideas quite opposite to the Mohylian culture of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth. Matsiievych seems to concur with Catherine's policy to eliminate the Mohylian Latin-based culture and the preponderance of "Little Russians" (mainly Ukrainians) in all the top ranks of the ecclesiastical hierarchy.<sup>34</sup> At the same time, his ideas are reminiscent of the conservative and nationalistic trends of Russian Orthodoxy, trends that continued throughout the nineteenth century and which persist to this day.

\*

The works of Konys'kyi and Matsiievych (like other outstanding figures of eighteenth-century Russian and Ukrainian culture), both of whom came from the school of the Kyivan Mohyla Academy—more precisely, the school of Feofan Prokopovych—must be reanalyzed and reevaluated. Some questions for further study are: How deeply did the heritage of the Mohylian tradition and the era of Tuptalo and Iavors'kyi penetrate their works? What was the relationship between that heritage and the new ideological discourse of the Russian Empire? Is there some way to distinguish their "Russianness" from their "Ukrainianness" (or "Belarusianness")? Can they be included in the concept of "Little Russianism," or was their integration in the highest echelons of Russian society so complete that nothing Ukrainian may be detected in them? To what degree did Ukrainian culture participate in the new European trends and cultural models? Is it possible to distinguish Kyivan ecclesiastical high culture from the general flow of Russian culture, both ecclesiastical and secular? Is there any difference between the sermons that Konys'kyi (and some of his fellow hierarchs) wrote and delivered in the Kyivan period and those that were written in Russia or other parts of the empire?

With all due circumspection, it may be assumed that after the "turning point" of 1709<sup>35</sup> the Kyivan (or Kyivan-trained) high church hierarchy fully joined the framework of the all-Russian, or imperial ecclesiastical life. Kyivan education contributed greatly to the development of Russian theology and ecclesiastical life. Ruthenians occupied practically all ranks in the church hierarchy until the end of Elizabeth's reign. In the first half of the eighteenth century there were attempts to resume "ancient" or "local" traditions and to restore

some elements of Ukrainian ecclesiastical autonomy; there were also attempts to oppose Russia's centralizing policy. Some of them were momentous, such as the struggle for the election of bishops and book printing.<sup>36</sup> It is conceivable that the high erudition of Ukrainian churchmen and the apparent power that they held in Russia until Catherine II's ascent to power gave them the illusion of a permanent and dominant intellectual position and power. The church hierarchs were probably not even aware of their own degree of adaptation and assimilation in the Russian Empire. The predominance of Russian policy and social pressure became truly evident only after Elizabeth's death. Catherine needed no great effort to reverse the situation completely and destroy all remnants of both Ukraine's ecclesiastical and sociopolitical autonomy and the Ukrainian cultural tradition. Within a few years the church hierarchy and culture were in the hands of Russians. Thus, as has been shown in the extant literature on the subject, and confirmed by the observations made here, the bishops and metropolitans who were trained in Kyiv were an important factor in the consolidation of the unity (and uniformity) of Orthodoxy in the Russian Empire, hence of the empire itself. Russian *realpolitik* pushed away any remaining illusions about the possibility of the autonomous development of Ukraine's ecclesiastical high culture based on the seventeenth-century tradition. Only romanticism managed to restore the seventeenth-century Ukrainian tradition, turning it into a founding myth of the new Ukrainian identity, but this time it was the Cossack myth that played the determining role.

Many questions remain open and await further investigation. Sermons are not simply important testimonies of the literary and theological culture of the time, as they may conceal unexpected information that can expand our knowledge of Ukrainian and Russian culture. Matsiievych's sermons are little known and have received insufficient attention. The same may be said of other important preachers of eighteenth-century Ukraine and Russia. It should also be remembered that Konys'kyi, the archbishop of Mahilioŭ and Belarus, spent some time in Warsaw, where he was constantly in contact with Polish society because of his struggles against the Uniate Church and on behalf of Orthodox believers in the former lands of the Polish Commonwealth. He also wrote several texts in Polish, a detail that probably does not change our general knowledge of Konys'kyi, but should at least be known.

#### NOTES

1. Several important books have appeared about Peter I and his era, but the best general evaluations of the complementary and contrastive positions of the two churchmen remain the essays of Yurii Sherekh [George Shevelov], "On Teofan Prokopovič as Writer and Preacher in His Kyiv Period," *Harvard Slavic Studies* 2

- (1954): 211–23; idem, “Stefan Yavorsky and the Conflict of Ideologies in the Age of Peter I,” *Slavonic and East European Review* 30 (1951): 40–62.
2. For general information on the history of Ukrainian literature, Mykhailo Vozniak's book is still very useful. It is now available in a German translation: Mychajlo Vozniak, *Geschichte der ukrainischen Literatur im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert.*, trans. Anna-Halja Horbatsch (Cologne, 2001). On Ukrainian theater, see Paulina Lewin, *Ukrainian Drama and Theater in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Toronto, 2007).
  3. V. O. Shevchuk, *Prosvichenyi volodar: Ivan Mazepa iak budivnychyi Kozats'koi derzhavy i iak literaturnyi heroi* (Kyiv, 2006).
  4. D. Beauvois, “Le Journal de Philippe Orlyk: du mirage de l'exile au mythe identitaire ukrainien,” in *Mazepa e il suo tempo: Storia, cultura, società = Mazepa and His Time: History, Culture, Society*, ed. Giovanna Siedina (Alessandria, 2004), 147–77.
  5. For a discussion of Tacitism in Europe, Poland, and Russia, see Giovanna Brogi Bercoff, “V. N. Tatiščev: l'innovation et la tradition,” in *Dall'opus oratorium alla ricerca documentaria: la storiografia polacca, ucraina e russa del XVI–XVIII secolo*, *Europa orientalis* 5 (Rome, 1986), 374–420. For a Polish translation, see my *Królestwo Słowian: Historiografia Renesansu i Baroku w krajach słowiańskich* (Izabelin, 1998), 197–255. See also my “Rhetorical Reworking and Ideological Background in the ‘Istoriija Rossijskaja’ of V. N. Tatiščev,” in *Contributi italiani al X Congresso internazionale degli slavisti: Sofia, 1988*, *Europa orientalis* 7 (Rome, 1988), 339–60; and E. J. Głębicka, “Lektury Andrzeja Maksymiliana Fredry,” in Siedina, *Mazepa e il suo tempo*, 279–90. On Machiavellianism and Tacitism in general, see G. Toffanin, *Machiavelli e il tacitismo* (Padua, 1921); L. Firpo, *Pensiero politico del Rinascimento e della Controriforma* (Milan, 1966).
  6. For additional details about this letter and the episodes to which it refers, see my paper, “Ambiguity as a Main Component in the Discourse of ‘Mazepian Literature,’” in *Ivan Mazepa ta ioho doba: istoriia, kul'tura, natsional'na pam'iat': materialy mizhnarodnoi naukovoï konferentsii* (Kyiv, 2008), 369–94. The letter was published in *Osnova*, no. 10 (1860), “Akty istoricheskie,” 1–28. The manuscript also contains many Polish and French words, in keeping with the practice of Mazepa's time. (I am grateful to Gary Marker for pointing this out to me.) My quotations from this letter follow the *Osnova* text, so they may differ somewhat from the original. I will not delve into the issue of the historical value of the letter, which I am considering only as a document of culture.
  7. Published in *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii* 3, no. 12 (1865): 499–512.
  8. “Двацать лет и слишком гетманом был, и чрез все тое время являлся быти маслина. Воззришь на благоразумие, на политику, мнится быти маслина. Воззришь на благочестие, на строение домов божиих, на обогащение монастырей, церквей, на созидание богаделень, на нищелюбие, страннолюбие и иные добродетели, ей, поистинне, мнится быти маслина плодовита в дому

Божиим. Что ж о верности к государю своему возглаголю? Ту уже не токмо маслиною, но дубом и кедром ливанским мнился быти непреклонным и неподвижным: ныне же что слышим?” (507).

9. I use italics to show the language-switching in Iavors'kyi's multilingual letters.
10. Marina A. Fedotova, *Epistoliarnoe nasledie Dimitriia Rostovskogo: issledovaniia i teksty* (Moscow, 2005), 252–53.
11. “Смотри только на малороссийскую денницу. Боже мой! В какой светлости она денница была! Воззришь на высокую почесть и властительство: денница светлая. Посмотришь на богатство и славу и великолепие: денница светлая. Воззришь на милость государево, неизреченную к нему бывшую: денница светлая. Воззришь на друголюбие, которое имел у князей, у бояр, у вельмож: и ту денница светла. Кратко рекше: гетман в Малой России был то денница, сияющая на российском небе. Государ—солнце, а гетман—денница.”
12. These were Mazepa's “companions” in the rite of anathema, which was celebrated regularly by the Russian Orthodox Church until the twentieth century. As is known from the sources, Peter himself probably “suggested” to Iavors'kyi what he should write about the damnation of the “Judas-Mazepa.” See my article, “Mazepa, lo zar e il diavolo: Un inedito di Stefan Javorskyj,” *Russica Romana* 7 (2000 [2001]): 167–88. See also my article, “Diiavol, het'man i tsar: nevidomyi tekst pro Mazepu,” in *P'iatyi Konhres Mizhnarodnoi Asotsiatsii Ukrainistiv, Literaturознаvstvo* 1, (Chernivtsi, 2003), 252–59.
13. “Вам же буди безсмертная слава и благословение Божие, благочестивое и верное Богу и государю своему, войско запорожское: генералы, полковники, сотники, атаманы и вси сердечные молодцы, яко во след Каинов не идосте,” 509.
14. The church hierarchs' attitude toward Ukrainian autonomy and their consciousness of the destiny of Ukraine as a people and a “quasi-state” (or a “possible state”) are questions that require further study. They are connected to other questions; e.g., were the metropolitans Varlaam Iasyns'kyi, Stefan Iavors'kyi, or Ioasaf Krokovs'kyi aware of Mazepa's political plans (with or without actual double-dealing) of 1706, 1707, and 1708? Are there any writings that would attest to some secret maneuver that the church hierarchs may have known about and “concealed”? Is it possible to assume that no other ecclesiastical authority knew about (or imagined) the hetman's suspicious contacts with high-ranking Poles (and, later, with the Swedes), when even Mazepa's own mother, who was the mother superior of an Orthodox monastery, knew about them, as Pylyp Orlyk writes? The scarcity and ambiguity of extant texts only lead to suppositions and readings “between the lines.” The obligatory literary convention and prudence obfuscate these baroque literary texts, thereby creating difficulties for contemporary historians and literary scholars.
15. The text was published by I. P. Eremin in F. Prokopovich, *Sochineniia* (Leningrad, 1961), 23–38 (here p. 23).
16. The Jesuit Famiano Strada (1572–1649) was one of the most authoritative theoretic-

- cians of baroque sacred and profane oratorical art, but he followed the Ciceronian and Quintilian “classical” model, while other theoreticians (e.g., the Jesuit Agostino Mascardi) had a preference for more “typically baroque” kinds of tropes and devices, where the role of *furor poeticus*, the inspiration for creativity, was emphasized. The impact on Eastern European literature of this kind of differentiation merits closer investigation.
17. The Russian philologist Boris Uspenskii demonstrates convincingly how the principles behind the creation of compound adjectives and nouns stemming from the Second Slavic Influence were adapted to the literary linguistic practice of the Petrine era. See his *Istoriia russkogo literaturnogo iazyka (XI–XVII vv.)* (Moscow, 2002), 288–90.
  18. The fact that it was a pseudo-quotation does not change the issue; Prokopovych certainly knew the most famous work of the Western “imperial” diplomat.
  19. See, e.g., Prokopovich, *Sochineniia*, 32–34.
  20. The translation was never published. See Petr P. Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura v Rossii pri Petre Velikom: izsledovanie*, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1862), 1:218–20.
  21. The word *supostat* is used once in the part devoted to Mazepa (36), but here too the phrase “strashnyi, nepobedimy supostat” refers to Charles, not to the hetman.
  22. Cato the Elder’s (or Censor’s) fulminations against Carthage and his famous saying, “Ceterum censeo Carthaginem esse delendam” (And therefore I believe that Carthage must be destroyed), was certainly known to Prokopovych and his milieu.
  23. For general information, in addition to the well-known works of Viktor Askochenskii (ideologically biased and outdated), Fedor Titov, Stepan Golubev, and Nikolai Petrov, see Alexander Sydorenko, *The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century* (Ottawa, 1977) (with an extensive bibliography) and *Kyievo-Mohylians’ka Akademiia v imenakh: XVII–XVIII st.: Entsyklopedychnye vydannia* (Kyiv, 2001).
  24. I will focus here only on eight sermons of the Kyivan period (until 1754), which were published in *Chteniia v Istoricheskoi obshchestvennoi Nestora-Letopistsy*, vols. 1–2, bk. 21 (Kyiv, 1909), 33–94; vols. 1–2, bk. 22, pt. 3 (Kyiv, 1911), 1–66. Many other sermons are published in *Sobranie sochinenii Georgiia Koniskogo, arkhiepiskopa Belorusskogo*, comp. Ivan Grigarovich, pts. 1–2 (St. Petersburg, 1835). This book contains a couple of sermons from the earlier, Kyivan period, but most are dated between 1755 and 1791; the second part also contains a Latin oration to the king of Poland, Stanisław August (1765), letters, Latin and Polish poetry (mainly religious), Russo-Slavonic verses dedicated to icons, various occasions, or important figures, and *Slova i rechi Georgiia Konisskago, Arkhiepiskopa Mogilevs’kago* (Mahilioù, 1892). Other bibliographical data are in *Khristianstvo i novaia russkaia literatura XVIII–XX vekov: bibliograficheskii ukazatel’ 1800–2000*, ed. V. A. Kotelnikov (St. Petersburg, 2002), 94–95.
  25. See, e.g., M. V. Kashuba, *Z istorii borot’by proty unii XVII–XVIII st.* (Kyiv, 1976). Some statements in this book (and others) on Konys’kyi are impossible to accept

today (e.g., the statement that he “rejected” dogmatic interpretations and was seeking the liberation of human thought from “ecclesiastical/religious principles” (108). That said, Kashuba makes numerous valid points.

26. See, e.g., “Slovo v den’ velikomučenika Georgiia,” *Chteniia* (1911), 13–16.
27. As metropolitan of Belarus, he spent most of his life vigorously opposing Catholics and Uniates and defending Orthodoxy and the religious unity of the Russian Empire.
28. *Chteniia* (1911), 39–52.
29. *Slovo...v den sv. Voskreseniia Gospodnia*, in *Chteniia* (1911), 19–38 (here 22–23, 29–30). The sermon is dated 1749.
30. The extant literature focuses almost exclusively on his life, his struggle in defense of the church, his condemnation, and his death.
31. A large number of his sermons are now available online, but, as far as I know, they have not been the object of any serious analysis.
32. *Chteniia v Imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete*, bk. 2 (April–June) (Moscow, 1862), 25–39.
33. *Ibid.*, 33.
34. Still the most useful work on this question is Konstantyn Kharlampovych, *Malorossiiskoe vliianie na velikoruskuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn’*, vol. 1 (Kazan, 1914), esp. 459–504.
35. In fact, the positions and moods of church hierarchs between 1710 and 1730 are very complex and differentiated; this question requires a separate study. In this paper I focused only on two of the main personalities and a few texts; sermons seem to indicate that with the advent of Elizabeth II, the church hierarchy enjoyed a privileged position and experienced a brief cultural renaissance. Nevertheless, it was not really linked to the development of Ukrainian culture, as their activities and writings were embedded in the all-Russian ecclesiastical and state discourse.
36. Kharlampovych, *Malorossiiskoe vliianie*, 502. The author notes that it was not just a struggle between Ukrainian and Russian trends, but a conflict among the Kyivans themselves, more precisely between the metropolitan, who wanted to have a new printing house, and the Kyivan Cave Monastery, which wanted to maintain its monopoly.