

IVAN VYŠENSKÝ

DMITRY ČIŽEVSKY

1.

The turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was a difficult but productive time for the Ukraine. It is clear that the attempts at a union of the Roman Catholic and the Greek Orthodox Churches divided the people into two warring factions, since these attempts did not bring a lasting union. However, the conflicts arising from the problems of Church politics contributed considerably to intellectual life. The new Ukrainian literature began at the end of the sixteenth century chiefly with the polemical writings of both factions, the Catholics and Uniates on the one hand, and the Orthodox on the other. This abundant literature is particularly copious in comparison with that of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which left us very few original works after the flowering of the thirteenth century. During this period some collections comprising revisions of older literature were made, somewhat similar to the compilations made in the west during the late Middle Ages. The attacks by the Crimean Tartars in the sixteenth century upon many Ukrainian cities and monasteries are partly to blame for the loss of manuscripts. In part, literary works of the Ukraine were lost only after the popularity of printing, that is, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, when old manuscripts were no longer considered to be very valuable. This was the time of the reshaping of the literary language: the Church Slavic of Ukrainian redaction now accepted numerous elements of the Ukrainian vernacular. It became necessary, consequently, to revise older literary works thoroughly so that they would be understood by a large circle of readers. This probably occurred in many instances. The Church Slavic-Ukrainian dictionaries which were published at that time bear out this fact (Lavrentij Zyzanij in 1596; Pamvo Berynda in 1627).¹

¹ *Ukrainian Literature* by C. A. Manning (New York, 1944) does not contain a description of this period. Hence I must refer to Ukrainian works, especially to the unfinished history of Ukrainian literature by M. Hruševskýj, v. 5 (1929), and to my own *History of Ukrainian Literature*, Vol. 2 (Prague, 1942).

2.

The outstanding author of this period, Ivan Vyšenškyj, is certainly one of the most important Ukrainian prose-writers of all times. Nevertheless, very little scholarly work has been published about him.² His works are in remote and inaccessible places and not always edited correctly as far as details are concerned.³ The most important factor, his basic point of view, has not received sufficient attention in all these works. He is regarded rather as an opponent of the Union and the quotations which are used to substantiate this interpretation are always the same ones, containing a sharp criticism of the life of his spiritual and secular contemporaries. In this short essay I wish to emphasize the main features of his Weltanschauung only, in order to point out that he was a mystic and that his criticism of contemporary conditions was only an expression of his opinions about the "true Church." I can only mention in passing that he approached the views and the literary style of some of his western contemporaries as well as of earlier authors.

We know almost nothing about the life of Vyšenškyj. Neither the date of his birth nor that of his death is known. Supposedly, he was born about the middle of the sixteenth century. It is possible that he came from Galicia from a village called Vyšnja, but since several villages with that name exist, we cannot even determine his birthplace with any degree of certainty. At the end of the century we meet him as a monk on Mount Athos; his first writings stem from the last years of the century. They are epistles to his compatriots. Of course, one can suppose that he had already been on

² Besides the book by Hruševskyj, which was cited above, there is only one other book which deals with Ivan Vyšenškyj. It is Ivan Franko's *Ivan Vyšenškyj* (Lviv, 1895) which treats biographical and bibliographical questions mainly. An analysis of his style is still lacking, except for two essays by V. Peretc in *Zapysky Naukovoho Tovarystva Imeni Ševčenka v Kyjevi* (Kiev, 1924) and in his *Issledovaniya i Materialy po Istorii Starinnoj Ukrainskoj Literatury XVI-XVIII Vekov (Sbornik Otdelenija Russkogo Jazyka i Slovesnosti) Akademii Nauk*, v. 101, 2 (Leningrad, 1928). Nor has the ideological aspect of his writings yet been investigated sufficiently (neither by Hruševskyj nor Franko). It is mentioned briefly in G. Florovskij, *Puti Russkogo Bogoslovija* (Paris-Belgrade, 1937).

³ The works of Ivan Vyšenškyj appeared in the following: *Akty Jugozapadnoj Rossii*, v. 2; *Archiv Jugozapadnoj Rossii*, v. 7; as a supplement to the first volume of S. Golubev's book *Petr Mogila* (Kiev, 1883); *Monumenta Confraternitatis Stauropigiensis Leopoliensis*, v. 1 (Lviv, 1895); *Kievskaja Starina*, 1889, no. 4, and 1890, no. 6. I am now preparing an edition of his works on the basis of the older publications, with textual emendations.

Mount Athos for some time, but we cannot be certain, since even as a young man he could have developed his literary talent and temperament. In any event, the monks of Athos entrusted him with the composition of a letter written in their name to one of the leading Orthodox princes, Ostrožskyj. This is the only one of his works which was printed. All others circulated in copies and some of them even penetrated into the Moscow state, which had no particular interest in the Ukrainian fight for union.

Around 1606 he came to the Ukraine, but it seems this visit did not change his point of view and we can assume that he did not find any close intellectual allies at home. Otherwise it would be difficult to explain his return to the monastery on Mount Athos.⁴ There he lived for several years more, for we still hear of him in 1621. We do not know when he died, but by 1630 he is no longer among the living.

The polemicists of the time composed their apologies and their attacks in a rather unskillful way, focusing their attention mainly on secondary questions and only occasionally posing questions of primary significance concerning the conflict between Greek Orthodoxy and Catholicism. But Vyšenškyj differed from all his contemporaries in the same way as heaven from the earth. In spite of the fact that in some degree he was related to the polemicists by his style and by his themes, he differed from all of them profoundly because he was a poet by God's grace. He is the only one of his contemporaries who has not been forgotten. His popularity in a much later period was increased by the poem of Ivan Franko.

3.

Vyšenškyj had the inspiration of a true prophet. Even when treating secondary problems he was able to fit the arguments around them into a definite whole, to imbue them with a powerful spirit of biblical pathos which made his reader feel immediately that he was

⁴ Ivan Franko, the author of the only monograph about Vyšenškyj in book form, and himself an outstanding poet, gave a poetic explanation for Vyšenškyj's return which is not psychologically convincing. Franko believed that he succumbed to the temptation of continuing his mystical life. However, mystics, once they find a soil for the fight for their ideals, do not part with it so easily.

not speaking about trifles, but about the ultimate and most vital questions which confront mankind. But it was not only stylistically that Vyšenškyj rose above his contemporaries. At times he left concrete details in polemics aside, because they had already been treated by others and brought up such principles, such fundamental problems as place his polemics entirely above his own time and country. Thus, for example, he posed the question of the Christian ideal of the Church—that of the true church, not the ruling church like the Catholic one, but the persecuted and suffering church like that of the early Christians. Such a basic method of investigation refreshed and enlivened the arguments to a high degree. (Literary historians in some strange way have seen in these instances an evasion of the “main issues” of the religious conflict by Vyšenškyj).

In a peculiar way Vyšenškyj reminds us of his contemporaries to some extent by his style. These contemporaries were his opponents, although he far exceeded them in literary skill, regardless of whether this “skill” originated in inspiration or in a literary tradition. The main feature which he shared with his contemporaries was the rhetorical method, not in any negative meaning of the term, but in the sense of a definite literary form which clothed all thoughts in the form of an appeal, turning to the reader, calling out, reproaching, demanding; occasionally he also used the dialogue form, although not very often (see below regarding the “Conviction of the Devil”). However, where we might admit the influence of Latin rhetoric of the Latin school upon the polemicists from Ostroh or from Lviv, Vyšenškyj’s style, in contrast, is not all “Ciceronian,” for his opinions on Roman culture were too negative. We cannot search for sources of his literary technique in ancient rhetoric. Although his pathos was “biblical,” stylistically he does not remind us very much of the prophets of the Old Testament. Most probably he learnt something from the sermons of the Church Fathers, perhaps most of all from John Chrysostom, but even here the similarity is not very striking.

However, Vyšenškyj is distinct from his contemporaries in one aspect. It may be that he was dependent on his period and closely linked with it intellectually (the usual statements about the small degree of his education are unfounded). Yet the Renaissance as well

as the Reformation were for him merely expressions of a decline and a disintegration, of the "temptation" of Antichrist. He wished to return to the Byzantine tradition, to antiquity. Even if he belonged to the Ukrainian "Renaissance," he represented a Savonarola within the movement, one who would not hesitate, perhaps, to annihilate all the values of the new culture.⁵ Vyšenškyj did not develop his positive ideal and did not expound it thoroughly. Perhaps we might find there not only the true antiquity but also some elements of the later Byzantine mysticism which had found refuge on Mount Athos (the Hesychasts), where he spent the greater part of his life and from whence he addressed his contemporaries and compatriots. It is not by chance that of all the works of Vyšenškyj only one was printed during his lifetime—the one in which he appears as the defender of the monks of Athos, the "Athonites." The polemicists in the Ukraine did not by any means set themselves the highest aims possible, such as Vyšenškyj had envisioned. They only wanted to defend the Orthodox church from attacks, but he definitely envisioned the victory of true Orthodox Christianity over all other "sects and faiths" (a radical point of view which we later find expressed also by the foreigner Bronewski in his *Apokrisis* 1598 and in the *Perestoroha* 1605). The Ukrainian people accomplished a certain synthesis of western and eastern culture (the Ostroh school) and from year to year drew more heavily upon the treasury of the west, but Vyšenškyj did not accept anything which originated in the west. In the Ukraine there was an attempt to create those conditions in which the Orthodox church would be able to exist within the framework of the contemporary state and of the social order; but Vyšenškyj, starting from the ideals of early Christian asceticism, developed such a radical, negative criticism of the political and social conditions that its positive counterpart could only be a program of the "Kingdom of God on Earth." Not one of his contemporaries could imagine the transformation of the Polish republic (*Rzecz Pospolita*) into the kingdom of God, and if he had found real and

⁵ Savonarola was not unknown on Mount Athos, as the testimony of an earlier Greek author in Moscow, Maxim the Greek, proves to us. Maxim the Greek, however, became acquainted with Savonarola in Italy. From Italy Maxim came to Athos, where he certainly must have spoken about this man whom he admired. Perhaps his memory was preserved until Vyšenškyj's time (Maxim left Athos in 1518).

active followers, he would have become a dangerous person to his Ukrainian contemporaries. However, he did not find them, primarily because he did not propose any concrete program. His contemporaries (mistakenly) regarded him as their ally. Therefore his works were read and copied (but not printed) and it is also for this reason that they have come down to us.

4.

One of the most characteristic works of Vyšenskyj, stylistically, is also one of his earliest writings, the "Epistle to all people in the Polish land." We know of nineteen works, counting the letter of the "Athonites," already mentioned. In the "Epistle" he turns, in fact not to the Orthodox alone, but: "To you, the people of the land which is called Polish, to the living people of every age, status, and faith, to the Russian, Lithuanian, and Polish people, of separate sects and faiths, may this voice reach your ears. I announce to you, that the land upon which you tread with your feet and upon which you were brought into this life through the process of birth, and which you now inhabit, weeps before God against you, it groans and cries out, begging the Creator to send the sickle of death... to destroy you and root you out..."⁶ "Where is religion now in the Polish land? Where is hope? Where is love? Where is truth and justice in the court? Where is obedience? Where are the commandments of the Gospel? Where are the sermons of the apostles? Where are the laws of the saints?... Let the bishops, archimandrites, and abbots be cursed who let the monasteries be ruined. They have formed for themselves estates from the holy places and together with their servants and friends lead a bestial life of fleshly, bodily pleasure. In the places where saints lie, they collect money. From their income... they give their daughters dowry (marriage-portion). They clothe their sons, they adorn their wives. They increase their servants, they acquire adornments. They enrich their friends. They build carriages. The coachmen want for nothing and harness horses which are matched. In a pagan way they display their luxury."

⁶ A motif we find already in Serapion of Vladimir (before 1274); it goes back to John Chrysostom.

"There is not a place left which is free of the disease of sin, all is an ulcer, all a wound, a swelling, all is putrefying, all is hell-fire, all is sickness, all is sin, all is a lie, all is deceit, all is cunning, all is treachery, all is guile, all is falsehood, all is illusion, all is a dream, all is vapor, all is smoke, all is bustle, all is vanity, all is delusion. Repent for the sake of the Lord, repent while you still have time for repentance! Perform your work, lead a clean life, perform deeds pleasing to God." This, it is true, may be a most "rhetorical" quotation of Vyšenškyj's style. On the whole, he adhered to this style during his whole life, for later he wrote mostly sermons. The main ones are: "A Council," "Epistle to the Runaway Bishops" (1597-1598), the "Short Answer by Theodosius," "Začapka" ("Captious Objection"), "The Conviction of the Devil, the Ruler of the World," "Sermon about the Lie," and finally (around 1614), "The Spiritual Theatre."

In his literary work Vyšenškyj touched upon actual problems of the religious conflict as well ("Epistle to the Runaway Bishops") but his writings went further than that. He spoke, just as in the passages which have been quoted, about questions which were acute then, but which in reality are problems of all times.

5.

To sum up—the ecclesiastical program as Vyšenškyj presented it to us in all his works is simple. He wanted to preserve the old ways: "Go to the general meeting of the community, follow the church canons, not adding to everything from one's own imagination, nor subtracting; do not separate according to your opinion." Vyšenškyj, however, even stood for the preservation of the antiquated methods. "Do not, in church, during the liturgy, pervert the Gospel and the Acts of the apostles with the common language." Yet he still permitted sermons in the vernacular: "so that the people may understand, speak and explain simply," but all books according to his opinion, were to be printed in the "Church Slavic" language (he put Church Slavic above Greek and Latin). He even asked, "whether it is not better for you to learn the Prayer-Book (*Horologium-Časolovec*), the Psalter, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Gospel and to be a simpleton who is pleasing to God, and to gain

eternal life, than to know Aristotle and Plato and to call yourself a wise philosopher in this life and go to hell? Think this over!" For him any consideration of Union was quite superfluous; he rejected it just because it was something new (playing with the words *unija*, "Union," and *junaja*, "young").

Actually he did not sound the call to battle, although he advised—"do not accept" priests who are ordained against the "rules laid down by the Church Fathers." Rome was Babylon in his eyes, the king, insofar as he supported the Union, was Nebuchadnezzar. He expected, however, salvation for every individual who followed the "old rules." Although these rules may be even "lesser rules," let "the Orthodox sit at home in truth beside their lesser rules, let them, at home, with their lesser rules respect the truth, let those at home be saved by these lesser rules, for they will certainly save them. But you, with the great rules of Skarga, do whatever you please." This is a philosophy not of battle, but rather of passive resistance.

6.

Vyšenškyj stood for the old times and conditions, for the Apostolic Acts and the Gospel and against "Aristotle and Plato," for the books in Slavic but against their "perversion" "by means of the vernacular." He put like demands in a similar way before the school; he still recognized grammar (Greek or Slavic), but further "instead of the deceitful dialectic," he proposed the *Časoslovec*, instead of logic and rhetoric — the Psalms which are pleasing to God, instead of philosophy — the "Octoechos" (*Osmoglasnyk*); he even suggested both "the sermons of the Gospel and of the apostles" which were to be studied with "a simple, not a cunning interpretation." "The philosophy of the Orthodox Peter and Paul, not of the pagan teacher Aristotle." In later years he even elaborated a plan for the printing of an "Anthology" (*Sbornik*), a collection or compilation exclusively of the words of Christ, the apostles, and the Holy Fathers, a plan which P. Velyčkovskyj only realized one hundred and fifty years later. It is not surprising that Vyšenškyj, who came to the Ukraine in the years 1605-1606, as we know from his letters, was very unfavorably impressed by the cultural westernizing movement which began at that time. In one of his last works (on a concrete

basis), he simply accused his contemporaries of a leaning towards the Latin patterns. It is true that at that time, prior to 1621, an attempt was made in the Ukraine to extend an invitation to Vyšenškyj, but it is highly improbable that he would have been satisfied with the cultural conditions of his native land if he had seen it then. It would seem that Vyšenškyj took a more conciliatory view of the new western education in his last works. We do not know his motives, and besides, a decision as to possible change must be connected with the very difficult question of dating his writings, which cannot concern us here.

7.

Actually problems of spiritual culture were not as frequent in Vyšenškyj as were themes concerning material culture and social conditions. One can see the tremendous change which the Renaissance had produced on daily life in Poland. This change was also transmitted to the Ukrainian nobility and in part took hold on the Ukrainian clergy as well. The decline of the Ukrainian clergy before the unification is well-known, but it is quite possible that this fact was exaggerated in the polemics, that it was represented as applicable to the entire clergy, although it was only characteristic of a small group. (We know that in Germany the decline of the Catholic clergy of Luther's time and the Reformation was largely a thing of the past. Yet this did not prevent that decline from playing a tremendous role in the literature of the Reformation). In any case, Vyšenškyj attacked the real crimes of "particular" persons only in the "Epistle to the Runaway Bishops." In other letters he painted a picture of the life of the clergy as a whole. This picture was perhaps true for individual cases, but individual cases did not play any significant part for Vyšenškyj; his picture was general. Yet, as we see from some of his works, the life of the laity also aroused his indignation. Generally, his ideal was beyond the range of the possible; it was a monastery for all mankind. The non-objective, hyperbolic picture painted by him is extremely interesting from the literary point of view, since it was the first attempt made in Ukrainian literature to give descriptions of everyday life, and these pictures were painted broadly and colorfully. These passages

are known and have been often quoted. We shall cite one example: Vyšenškyj was defending a monk who did not know how to carry on a worldly conversation, because he was not expert in "those many bowls, plates, the black and grey side-dishes, in red and white soups, in the many glasses and chalices, in Muscatel wines, in Malvasia, Alicante, Rovigno wines, in meads and beers," that in the "statutes, constitutions, laws, methods, and quarrels . . . he cannot discern and find room for thoughts about eternal life . . . and is never able to see the thought of eternal life in the laughter, swearing and empty chatter, redundancy, jokes, foolishness, and knavery." In accusing the bishops it was, of course, natural for Vyšenškyj to say: "You and your servants feed yourselves by the servants' labor and bloody sweat; lying down and sitting, laughing and playing, you devour your food; you distil schnapps, brew three kinds of selected beer, and you pour it into the abyss of insatiable entrails . . . Your sacks, full of their sweat, you stuff full of golden coins, thalers, half-thalers, groschen, quarters, and small coins, and you add money in strong-boxes . . . And that poor trash has no money to buy salt." "Those poor boys eat soup or borshch out of the same dish and we eat from half a dozen different dishes decked out with tasty viands." In numerous similar instances, some people have wanted to see "social protest"—actually, this was a Christian ascetic protest, as well as a protest not so much against the "yoke," as against the entire contemporary society and culture. Only at times did Vyšenškyj mention intellectual culture, but it is identical for him with "Malvasia" and "side-dishes." He was against "constitutions" and "comedies" and against carols and Christmas carols. All this, together with logic, rhetoric, Plato, and Aristotle, was outside the limits of ascetic, monastic culture.

8.

It was in the "Conviction of the Devil" that Vyšenškyj expressed his views on "the world" in a most general way, with emphasis on principles. This is a dialogue between the Devil and the "Poor Pilgrim" who represents Vyšenškyj himself. In a way it finds its parallel in the "Labyrinth of the World" by Komensky (Comenius), except that Vyšenškyj did not describe to the reader all the spheres

of the worldly life, but limited himself to depicting Christ's temptation by the Devil. From this picture of the Devil, it appears that he is the almighty ruler of all spheres of the world. "I give you all the worldly graces, glory, luxury, and wealth... If you want to be a cleric of superior rank ask me, please me and forget God... and I shall give it to you immediately. If you want to be a bishop, fall down and bow to me... If you wish to be the pope, fall down before me, bow to me, and I shall grant it to you... If you wish to be a military man, an official or a judge, falling down, bow to me and I shall grant it to you... If you want to be a commander-in-chief or a secretary... serve me conscientiously and I shall grant it to you. If you want to be a king, promise me to be my hostage in the eternal fire of hell and I will give you a kingdom. If you want to be a skilful master and craftsman, and to exceed others in skill so that you would be glorified by your neighbors and make money, come and bow before me and I shall make you wise, teach, instruct you and guide your thoughts to the perfection of all your desires. If you want to be content with bodily pleasure and be called the master of the house, the woods, and the land, come, bow before me and I shall fulfill your will. I shall bring you a wife, I shall give you a house, I shall make you a present of land... only seek me and long for me and bow to me, then I shall give you all these things." The Pilgrim answers the Devil in the name of all mankind: "What profits me this gift, if I accept this distinction from you, the Devil, who was cast down from heaven for your pride, and not from the Lord above? What profits me this ecclesiastic power when I, a serf, a slave, am tied down forever with a sin for which I shall go to hell eternally? What profit is there in this small luxury when I shall fry and bake for all time in the fire? What profit from the worldly title, if I forfeit the title to the heavenly kingdom? What profit from a kingdom, the office of a secretary, or even the rank of a general, if I forfeit the privilege of being a son of God, an immortal title? What profit shall I have from the glory and respect of my neighbor if I am not glorified among those who have pleased God? What advantage shall I obtain from the many houses and ornaments of the house if I do not look upon the beautiful courts of New Jerusalem... What good will a wife be to me

if I am not able to see Christ, the bridegroom in the chamber of my heart, to calm and rest himself there? What benefit shall I have from that small piece of earth and ground if I do not receive rewards a hundredfold in the heavenly kingdom which Christ has promised to those who forsake earthly possessions, and if I am not the heir and successor to eternal life? Know, therefore, Satan, that I do not desire from you a wife, a house, and a transitory piece of land. I do not want to bow down before you; I shall worship only the Lord God and him alone will I serve."

To be a "wanderer," a "pilgrim" (a word which Vyšenškyj used frequently) this was the only possible attitude of the Christian on this earth. Vyšenškyj would have liked to say about himself the same thing which Skovoroda said: "The world seized me but it did not catch me." The world, according to Vyšenškyj, not only "lies in sin," but is in the complete and total power of the Devil. This short dialogue shows us his attitude toward the "world" most clearly, indeed towards worldly culture in general.

9.

Vyšenškyj's Christian ideal was certainly high. The attitude he proposed towards one's neighbor shows this best. Here again, scholars have attempted to see "social protest"; yet he did not require any rules, "statutes," for the lowest classes, but a Christian brotherhood of all. "Good! Let him be a serf, a tanner, a saddler, and a shoemaker! But remember that he is like you, just like a brother in all things ... because he was christened in the same name of the Holy Trinity, in the same way as you ... and marked with the seal of the Holy Ghost for Christianity." It is true that Vyšenškyj sought to eliminate the differences, but he wanted to establish other, new ones: "Through his effort and by means of an active faith the tanner can be better and more valuable than you." "There is no great difference between a serf and a nobleman. Who is a serf and slave? Only he who serves this world like a muzhik, a serf and a hireling, like a slave." "Who then is a nobleman? He who turns from the slavery of the world towards God and lifts himself up to become a relative of the Holy Ghost."

The only nobility Vyšenškyj recognized was nobility of the spirit, of the soul; a mystic nobility of self-purification and enlightenment, just as the "Hesychasts" on Mount Athos discovered it in the tradition of ancient mysticism. The mystic "cleansed his soul-bearing origin and washed his spiritual vessel with tears, and polished it by fasting, prayers, mourning, miseries, labor, and effort, and sowed the new seed of theology." Purification leads to the "enlightenment of the mind, through which in turn the body becomes bright... after which an ineffable joy comes upon those who have become perfect, a consolation, peace, glory, celebration and triumph, as it does upon the angels." Without a doubt the ideal type of human being for Vyšenškyj was the man who had become "perfect," that is, the mystic.

"Social injustice" and "the higher learning," both are obstacles which the nobleman must overcome to achieve inner perfection. Therefore Vyšenškyj fought against them. It is unfair to portray him in each case only as a social radical and a cultural reactionary. The "radicalism" as well as the "conservatism" originated in deeper motives, the only important ones for Vyšenškyj himself, that is, from a mystical ascetism.

10.

In giving quotations to illustrate Vyšenškyj's Weltanschauung, we have simultaneously presented materials which characterize his style. He had the same rhetorical style as his contemporaries, the other polemicists. Only—we find in him considerably greater ornament. He gathered epithets, comparisons, questions, appeals. His great linguistic skill causes these accumulations to strike us in no unpleasant manner. The nouns and verbs which Vyšenškyj used are always adequate, colorful, pithy. His language is extraordinarily near to the "simple" speech. It has been pointed out already that this rhetorical quality is part of the tradition of the spiritual literature of the Renaissance. Vyšenškyj is close not only to his Ukrainian contemporaries, but also to the Polish preachers Rej, Wujek, and Skarga. Some places, moreover, remind us almost word for word of the writings of the Czech Protestant Havel Žalansky and even

more instances are stylistically similar to the works of Komensky.⁷ Yet the problem of how Vyšenškyj with his attitude of complete negation of all modern phenomena, especially of secular science, could yet be so much a part of his time, and could approach the rhetorical style of the Renaissance and Reformation, still remains. For he says quite clearly: "Let us leave Latin altogether... and let us not listen to their science! Let us not learn their devices for our refinement! Let us, before their very eyes, according to the Gospel, be— simple, witless, and peaceable!"

The spirit of the time seemingly conquered Vyšenškyj, at least as a stylist. But he is for us one of the best examples of a writer who could surpass his time, the limits of the style of his age, and his own personal outlook on the world. By the splendor of his style, by his originality, by the combination of verbosity and lightness, he typifies the best in the baroque.

⁷ Cf. the two essays by V. Peretc mentioned in footnote 2 about the likeness of Vyšenškyj's style to that of the Polish theological writers. Concerning Žalansky and Kornensky cf. my note in *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie* XVIII, 1943, *Lesebruch* no. 82, pp. 382-384.