

Plurilinguism in Russia and in the Ruthenian Lands in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. The Case of Stefan Javors'kyj

Giovanna Brogi Bercoff

It is my aim to present here some facts illustrating the situation of plurilingual or of mixed linguistic use in two areas – namely, the Ruthenian and the Muscovite regions – which are so similar that it is often difficult to grasp their distinctive features, and yet so different that it is almost impossible to identify them clearly. In keeping with this ironic situation, I will begin from the end.

For the coronation of Catherine I in 1724, Ioan Maksymovyč – a Ukrainian like Mazepa and Pylyp Orlyk, who had managed to return to Moscow from Istanbul in 1715 – presented for publication a *Lexikon* with a preface written in Latin and Russian-Slavonic. Two passages in the preface are worth noting.

First, Maksymovyč stated that the Russian Empire, so ancient and now so powerful, had not yet produced artistic masterpieces because the Russian people were constantly engaged in martial deeds, which made the country great and glorious but did not allow it time to use the pen. To some extent, this statement reflects reality in the age of Peter. However, it was also one of the most common topoi of Renaissance literary tradition, initiated by Italian humanist writers, well-known mainly from Renaissance historiography in a time when the German, French and Polish States were affirming their political significance as united kingdoms centered on the cultural and social pre-eminence of an ethnic entity (Franks-Gaules, Theutons-Germans, Poles-Sarmates-Slavs). In some cases this ethnic entity was represented by specific social strata, as was the case for Sarmatism in the Polish Commonwealth.¹

The consciously expressed need to join the glory of literary activity to newly acquired military glory, with the aim of making one's own people famous among the other peoples and states of Europe, makes it evident that there is at least one

¹ Rothe 1988; Brogi Bercoff 1998; cf. also the foreword by H. Rothe in his new edition of *Historia bohémica* (Rothe 2002).

aspect – be it a limited one – which justifies the definition of the baroque period in Muscovite Russia as a part of the Renaissance heritage. Lixačev attributed this endeavor to the last decades of the seventeenth century. I would, in contrast, like to stress the importance of this phenomenon for the time of the explosion of Russian imperial power under Peter the Great. It was not by chance that the well known book by Mauro Orbini, *The Reign of the Slavs* (Pesaro 1601), was translated and published with a preface by Feofan Prokopovyč in 1722. Being an exaltation of the ancient origin, immensity and importance of the peoples belonging to the Slavic ethnic community, and of the incommensurable glory of their martial activities, this book – with all its ethnic mythologies typical of Renaissance Western culture – suited the needs of the new modern Russian Empire in several aspects. I further note here that Maksymovyč certainly knew this book in its Russian-Slavonic translation.

Second, being glorious in war and political power – Maksymovyč continues in his preface – it is of primary importance to have lexical instruments which permit the learning of Latin and translation from Latin into Slavonic.

Maksymovyč's reasoning was in accordance with Peter and Prokopovyč's cultural program, and we will not describe his *Lexikon*.² However, he made an interesting observation: In order to increase the knowledge of Latin and the possibility of translating into Slavonic, Petro Mohyla had already introduced into general use Polish-Latin dictionaries, because there was no *Lexikon* at his disposal. Maksymovyč considered that the knowledge of Slavonic was not steady ("vacillating"), and seemed to wonder why no Slavonic dictionary was created. Mohyla and his followers had turned back to Polish teachers and Polish-Latin lexika, a fact which (unfortunately) brought many Polonisms into Slavonic writings. In Moscow – Maksymovyč continued – the most glorious protector of the arts, the Emperor of Russia, had made the effort to create an Academy and to promote the teaching of Latin and Slavonic. However, knowledge of Latin was still very scanty and pupils were not able to learn Latin properly or even to read it, because they lacked a Latin-Slavonic lexikon.³

Besides the obvious aim of extolling his own lexicographical work, we may detect several further aspects to Maksymovyč's statements: first, he does not seem to have held in great esteem the *Lexikon* of Pamva Berynda – was it excessively "contaminated" by Polonisms and Ruthenisms? Second, the *Lexikon* by Fedor Polikarpov was, in his opinion, useless, since its purpose was only to assist in elementary translation from Slavonic into Latin. Third, in Kiev, Ruthenian scholars and pupils had an easy solution to the lack of Slavonic dictionaries: they could use

² See Siedina 1998.

³ I am grateful to Giovanna Siedina, who permitted me to read her copy of the preface, taken from a manuscript different from the one published by Horbatsch in a facsimile edition (Joannis Maximowicz. *Dictionarium Latino-Slavorum* (1718–1724). Facsimile Olexa Horbatsch curavit. Pars I. Ukrajins'kyj katolyč'kyj universytet im. Klimenta Papy. T. 81. Rim 1991).

without difficulty a Polish-Latin dictionary, and they mainly had recourse to Cnapius. This final statement is the crucial one for us, since it testifies to the fact that the existence of Polish-Latin dictionaries effectively eliminated the need to have a Latin-Slavonic dictionary in the time of Mohyla and later on.

Actually, there is nothing substantially new in this observation: the knowledge of Polish was prestigious and common in the Ruthenian lands and many important works were written in Polish. Ioannikij Galjatovs'kyj had in mind to translate his work *Mesija pravdivyj* into Latin as well, to make it known as far afield as Rome. One should remember that Simeon Polockij translated the *Akafist* into Polish, certainly to match the needs of Orthodox people who were used to singing religious texts in Polish.⁴ By the end of the seventeenth century Stefan Javors'kyj was writing long and highly rhetorical panegyrics for Mazepa and for Metropolitan Varlaam Jasyns'kyj alternating poems and prose sections in Latin and Polish. His first homiletic work (1696) was in hybrid Church Slavonic, inclining to "rus'ka mova" with many Polish words simply transliterated into Cyrillic. As far as the learning of Slavonic is concerned, this was made possible by the reading (and certainly the learning by heart) of many Church texts, in conjunction with the use of Smotryc'kyj's *Grammar*. Thus, Latin could be easily learned and read thanks to the dictionary of Cnapius (or Calepinus or others). Slavonic could be learned by reading the texts and the *Grammar*. Polish was known by many scholars who studied in Jesuit schools, and by everybody who had some cultural background, as a common literary means of expression and communication. If one takes into account that Jesuit colleges, especially the one in Wilno, had regular courses for future priests and preachers in elementary Lithuanian, Estonian, Ukrainian and also German, and – during certain periods – specialized courses in Greek and Hebrew for the advanced students in philosophy and theology, one gets an idea of the polylinguistic situation of the Ruthenian lands and the Lithuanian principality.⁵ Intermedia were written not only for high rank people, but also for burghers and even peasants: it is a well known fact that the use of several languages was a common comical device and reflects not only the Classical tradition, but also the ability of many spectators at least to understand the texts.⁶ Certainly, not everybody could speak and read several languages, and even fewer people could write or use them with any degree of literary skill. However, the amount of people having passed at least two or three cycles of the school curriculum was great enough to make the consciousness of polylinguism a "normal" situation. The existence of the Ruthenian language, used for administration, codified and made valuable as a means of literary expression in poetry, didactic and exegetic literature, homiletics etc., makes the situation in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania rather unique. Ecclesiastical literature in Church Slavonic coexisted with many genres – both ecclesiastical and laic –

⁴ Marinelli 1995.

⁵ Piechnik 1984; Brogi Bercoff 1996, 1999a, 1999b.

⁶ Lewin 1967.

written in Ruthenian (literary) "rus'ka mova": "high" Church Slavonic did not exclude nor supplant a rhetorical and refined literary usage of the Ruthenian language, as it had been codified by such authors as Radyvylovs'kyj or Galjatsovs'kyj. At the same time, these authors and some of their colleagues could write in high Slavonic, in Polish or in Latin, depending on the needs of the situation, on the addressee, the subject, etc. In spite of the ecclesiastical unification with the Muscovite Patriarchy in 1686, this polylinguistic situation continued until the middle of the eighteenth century.

One may distinguish various forms of expression of plurilinguism. The fact that works could be published in Latin, Polish, Slavonic or "rus'ka mova" is typologically similar to the coexistence of Polish and Latin literature in Poland, German and Latin in Germany or Bohemia, Italian and Latin in Italy, Latin and Hungarian in Hungary, etc. Thus, the Ruthenian lands fitted perfectly in the cultural and linguistic situation of humanistic and baroque Europe. The most curious manifestation of plurilinguism are mixed texts, which could be written either in alternating Polish and Latin sections, or in a real mixed language where Latin and Polish, or Latin, Polish and Slavonic words and locutions alternated respectively in Poland and in Ruthenia. Some of the most brilliant examples are found in private letters: The nature and rhetorical classification of letters as a "dialogue" between two persons separated by space, makes the language of epistolography an expression of spoken language, differing from the language of literature in its more spontaneous mood, but differing from spoken language by its "stylization." The most famous authors of such letters were Simeon Polockij, the metropolitan of Rostov Dimitrij Tuptalo, and Stefan Javors'kyj. One should note that the generally used term of "Macaronism" is not correct in this case: "Macaronism" is a "codified" form of Italian (or French, or Polish) words with Latin endings and syntax, aimed at producing parody, laughter, irony. The present texts alternate words and locutions following different impulses: linguistic automatism, stylistic aim, the lack of equivalents, the connection of word and object – these and other factors dictated the choice of one linguistic code or the other. It was not a codified system dictated by literary genre (parody), but the reflection of a socio-cultural situation of plurilinguism, exploited for personal communication inside a "respublica litterarum." It is not by chance that the Ruthenian poets had an equivalent in Belgian scholars: while Polish poets (the most brilliant example was Jan Kochanowski) limited themselves to Latin-Polish mixed letters, Just Lipsius wrote letters to friends in mixed Latin, French and Flemish. In Ruthenia we have many examples of the use of three languages (Simeon Polockij and Stefan Javors'kyj used Latin, Polish and Church Slavonic), or even of four languages (Dimitrij Tuptalo added words and locutions in "prosta mova"). The freedom of personal choice permitted by epistolographic theory was so extended that even two close friends and fellows like Tuptalo and Javors'kyj had a quite different approach to the use of mixed language: the former mixed words and short locutions in three or four languages, the latter alternated blocks and paragraphs in Slavonic and

Latin, recurring to Polish or Latin for quotations from poets or proverbs. I will not cite here examples, since they have been examined on various occasions.⁷ The effect was different, though the basic linguistic and literary principle was the same.

What happened in the same decades in Moscow? Foreign languages could certainly be heard in the Foreign Quarter since the time of Aleksej Mixajlovič, and at court in the time of Fedor and Sophia, when Polish was especially frequent. Latin was not unknown, but Okenfuss is not wrong when he considers that a real circulation of Latin began in St. Petersburg only in the time of Prokopovyč, and became current only later.⁸ The recent book by Liburkin gives evidence that until the mid 1720s Latin poetry was written and read by a limited elite bound to the Ruthenian milieu. Moreover, even in the second and third decennia of the eighteenth century, the linguistic situation was very different from the one in Kiev or Wilno. In St. Petersburg, Prokopovyč himself wrote a large amount of letters and many pamphlets in Latin. He also had official pamphlets and tracts translated and printed in German and French. The bilingual or plurilingual production in Petrine Russia is badly known today, but there are interesting examples of texts written in various languages. As an example, I cite three strophes from a charming poem which can easily be ascribed to the era and the entourage of Feofan Prokopovyč, the *Pesn' privetstvennaja* of the year 1721:⁹

Прежде отсюду устроен тобою
С оружием марс имел поход к бою,
Побеждал врагов, смирил шведов больно,
Отмстив довольно
Nuper armatus duce te profectus
Mars venenatis iaculis et arcu
Horridus Sueco meritasque clades
reddidit hosti.

Не единою возвращался славно,
Ведя в торжестве шведскаго льва явно,
Повелевая землям побежденным
и учрежденным.
Nec semel Victor rediit triumphans
Sueticum ducens domitum Leonem,
Sanciens victis populis tributa,
jura subactis.

Градам, езерам, народом подбитым,
Островам многим, синусам разлитым

⁷ Šljapkin, *passim*; Fedotova 1995; Brogi Bercoff 1996.

⁸ Okenfuss 1995.

⁹ Pekarskij, II, 530.

И балтицкому, чтоб не изливалось,

В берегах бы стало.

Urbibus, terris, sinibus recuruis

Insulis nec non lacubus Freatisque

Balticum fraenans mare ne insolescat

littora versus.

However, the social context and the situation of communication of this and other texts written in Russia in Latin or German was completely different with respect to those circulating in Ruthenia: they did not grow out of a natural cultural context where writers and readers/listeners were used to a constant “switch off” of linguistic code depending on a different context of communication; rather they grew out of the needs arising from the official contacts of the new Russian Empire with European countries. In other words, they grew out of the historical situation described by Ioan Maksymovyč: until the 1720s the Russian people had no chance or need to sit down and exalt through literary work the military deeds which made the new state powerful and glorious. Now, however, the time had come to let others know what the great Russian state had achieved. Thus, poems and tracts were written in Russian or Slavonic and translated for foreigners. The panegyrics by Javors’kyj written in several languages did not translate the same passage, they alternated languages with the consciousness that everybody could understand all of them. The poems and tracts translated by Prokopovyč and his fellows were addressed to people who knew either Russian/Slavonic, or Latin and other Western languages: the authors were aware that very few people knew Latin in Russia, or Russian in the West. For the purpose of state and religious propaganda in the West, Peter and his men organized a sort of press agency where plurilingual usage was compulsory: this, however, did not represent the common socio-cultural situation.

One may recall that in the time of Simeon Polockij and Sil’vestr Medvedev, Polish was written and probably chanted at court. Also in this respect, a new field of investigation has supplied excellent results, thanks to the efforts of H. Rothe and the group working in the *Patristische Kommission* and the Center Rothe directs, supported by the Westphalian Academy of Sciences. Specifically, I mention the publication and examination of seventeenth and eighteenth-century manuscripts containing spiritual songs, written in Polish or translated and/or simply transliterated from Polish into Ukrainian or Russian Church Slavonic. Resuming, interpreting and continuing the work that A. V. Pozdneev could only partially fulfill and publish, Rothe and his collaborators have demonstrated that the spiritual songs of Polish origin had a very different circulation in the Ruthenian and the Russian milieux. The translation and/or transcription of those texts in Russia were limited to the years of the reign of Fedor Alekseevič and Sofja. The first center where they were beloved and written was certainly the New Jerusalem Monastery founded by Nikon, as Pozdneev has pointed out. The second was probably – in

Rothe's opinion – the Novodevičij Monastery near Moscow. After the fall of Sofja and the elimination of S. Medvedev, this center of Polish culture no longer had any serious influence. Moreover, the way manuscripts are composed and songs are organized – in alphabetic order versus the liturgical order of Polish and Ukrainian manuscripts – shows that in the Russian Church the songs remained outside the Church and ecclesiastical life (in a rank similar to the songs of the *kaleki pere-xoże*), while in Ukraine, Polish spiritual songs, as part of the general popular piety (Volksfrömmigkeit) had entered the very system of liturgical and ecclesiastical life becoming a structural component of its culture.

In the same context, H. Rothe formulated the hypothesis that Simeon Polockij, while in Russia, translated the Psalms into Church Slavonic verses in strong connection with (or mainly for the purpose of) the introduction of music into the Church services. If this interpretation is correct, it demonstrates that the use of Polish linguistic expression in the inner life of the Church was a limited and instrumental, not a structural, factor in the cultural system of Russia. On the contrary, the use of Polish songs in the Polish language or in transliteration and in translation was accepted in the Ruthenian culture, both Orthodox and Uniate, as an internal structural element. To use the metaphoric formulation of H. Rothe, "popular piety" (Volksfrömmigkeit) did not remain as an "apocryphal element before the Church, it entered into the Church and the liturgy".¹⁰

An analysis of the evolution of the linguistic use in the works written by Stefan Javors'kyj gives the best evidence of the gap separating the Ukrainian from the Russian linguistic situation, a gap which is at the same time of cultural nature.

The first work which we know by Stefan Javors'kyj is a panegyric addressed to Varlaam Jasyn's'kyj *Hercules post Atlantem*, written and published 1685 when the author supposedly returned from a long period spent in Polish Jesuit academies, and on the occasion of the consecration of Varlaam as archimandrite of the St. Nicholas Monastery.¹¹ As with other Ukrainian panegyrics,¹² it is a very long and complex text, where Latin prose alternates with Polish verses: the distinction is marked also by graphic elements, the prose being printed in Latin cursive, the Polish verses in Gothic characters. The text of *Hercules post Atlantem* is formed by a *Dedication*, an *exordium* (the "theme" of the composition), a *narratio-argumentatio* in three parts, and a *conclusio*. The central parts contain a description of the main virtues of Varlaam: Wisdom (Sapientia), Humility (Humilitas) and Generosity (Liberalitas) in protecting the arts and sciences. Each of the three parts contains a Latin prose text and Polish four-verse isosyllabic rhymed strophes. The Latin texts also contain parts composed as *elogia*, i.e., rhythmic prose or non-reg-

¹⁰ Rothe 2000b, 28.

¹¹ After the first edition of 1685, a few pages of this work have been published in Radyšev's'kyj 1998, 327–331.

¹² Erdmann 1999.

ular verses, a refined rhetorical feature which originated in short epitaphs that became very popular as an expression of praise by the end of the seventeenth century. The Polish parts are not translations, but elaborations and variations of the same subjects and allegories described in the Latin texts.

The second work we know of by Stefan Javors'kyj is an encomiastic composition for Hetman Ivan Mazepa *Echo głosu wołającego na Puszczę*, on the occasion of his name-day, printed in 1689 with very beautiful heraldic engravings. Polish verses and strophes dominate this text, though the *Dedication* is written in Polish prose with mixed Latin locutions (mixed prose was generally condemned by Jesuit theoreticians inspired by the Ciceronian tradition, but was expressly admitted by rhetorical handbooks for forewords and private letters). The large use of Italian Octave Rime responds to the needs of the heroic biographical accounts of Mazepa's life and deeds. Other strophes and verses are used for the heraldic description. The dominant use of the Polish language and the metric choice are in agreement with the situation of communication: the courtly life, Mazepa as a Maecenas and as state and military chief organising war against the Ottoman infidel, the lay milieu, the strong ties Mazepa had had with Polish culture, the hope to maintain a political equilibrium, hence an autonomous status, for the Hetmanate between Moscow and Warsaw – all this inspired the choice of the linguistic and poetic code of this text.

The most elaborate panegyric poem was written for the occasion of the election of Varlaam Jasyns'kyj as metropolitan of Kiev: *Arctos planet herbowych* (Kiev 1690).¹³ The highly rhetorical devices reflect the solemnity of the event: Latin prose alternates with Latin *Carmen Echiacum* (a most refined form of poetry), with solemn Polish prose and Polish verses with *akrosticha*. Biographical and historical data are reduced to a minimum; encomiastic devices are extolled to the maximum. Latin dominates, but Polish is equally elaborated and prestigious.

The last poetic work of the Kievan period is a curious religious poem, *Pełnia nieubytowanej chwały* (Kiev 1691), dedicated to Varlaam, describing the hagiographical deeds (*Vita*) and exalting the glory of three saints bearing the name of Metropolitan Varlaam: Varlaam the Anachoret, Varlaam the Martyr and Varlaam of the Kievan Cave Monastery. This literary polyptic is very long (a sort of spiritual poem in the tradition of Johannes Pontanus): Polish isosyllabic rhymed verses are used for the hagiographic narrative, Latin elogium prose (or "free verse") fits the highly encomiastic passages.

The last literary work we know from this period (before 1700) is a sermon, written for and delivered at the wedding of a nephew of Mazepa, Jan z Obiedowa Obiedowskiego, in Baturin 1698. It bears the title *Vinograd Trema Letoroslami... procvetajuščij*. The author, of course, follows the common rhetorical rules for homiletics. The linguistic code – better to say codes – are not uniform. The first,

doctrinal part devoted to theological explications concerning the state of virgins, widows or married people may be defined as Hybrid Church Slavonic: the paragraph concerning virginity (monastic life) is almost pure Slavonic, the others contain several phonetic and lexical Ruthenisms, and many Polonisms. The syllabic verses preceding the homily and commenting on the title are also Slavonic. The long and violent anti-protestant polemic seems to lead the orator towards a more colloquial linguistic use, as if the author was pulled by his passion against heresy to the expressivity of spoken language. The last part contains an exaltation of the marriage blessed by God and recommendations to the bride and groom on how to live a common life as good Orthodox believers. Here language becomes more and more similar to "rus'ka mova" as if the preacher spoke directly to the couple in a familiar and persuasive manner. Thus, the variative linguistic use of the homily seems to reflect closely the situation of communication, ranging from Slavonic to spoken language. Rhetorical ornamentation is scanty. The images and theological messages are rather simple. The linguistic and stylistic choices might be suggested both by the subject of the three parts (theology, polemics, paraenesis), and by the public to whom the sermon was addressed: the family and friends of the "pułkownik" and "stolnik" Jan Obiedowski, the military milieu of Nežin and Baturin, probably members of the court of Mazepa. In any case, it was addressed to lay people, for a liturgical situation whose purpose was – as stressed by the preacher himself – to join heaven with earth, soul with body, the laical and ecclesiastical spheres.

One should not forget that in this period Stefan wrote also two Latin theoretical treatises on rhetoric and poetics. They were not published until the nineteenth and twentieth centuries respectively, but they were well known among scholars and pupils in Kiev (and later on, probably also in Moscow). Latin was obviously the language of teaching and of academic communication.

At the beginning of 1700, as is well known, Stefan was sent to Moscow as an envoy of Metropolitan Varlaam. The funeral homily for Šejn decided his fate: He could never return to Kiev. From this year on, one may divide his writings in "private" and "public" literature. The linguistic use responds to this differentiation. It is self evident that theological treatises and polemic tracts were written in Slavonic. Certainly it was a hybrid Slavonic as was usual in Petrine times. A linguistic study of Javors'kyj's language remains to be done – the main problem is to read the works in the manuscripts, because nineteenth century publications may not always be fully trustworthy. A preliminary examination of the main autograph we possess of his sermons, however, shows that he generally wrote his homilies in Slavonic; the degree of its hybridization is not yet established. He made use of titles, quotations and corrections in Latin and Polish: this indicates that the basic processes of thinking and classification (title, indication of the *thema*, finding the argumentation, examples, figures, metaphors, anecdotes, etc. (i.e., the *inventio*) were often in Latin and Polish (probably Latin more frequently than Polish). However, he wrote the main text in Slavonic and adapted phonetics and morphology to Russian

use, as suggested by Peter. One may imagine that, when enunciating his homilies, Ukrainian inflection and accent may have been present: Stefan was famous for his theatrical way of preaching and his gesturality. Two sermons in Polish may be aimed at some special occasion.

Besides many sermons, he wrote epitaphs (*Emblemma* and *Symbolum*) for Varlaam Jasyn's'kyj's (1707) and later for Dimitrij Tuptalo's death (1709). The former are a clear attempt to adapt his skills in Polish verse to Church Slavonic. He makes use of the same imagery and rhetorical devices as in his Kievan panegyrics, but makes use only of the relatively simple six rime strophes. These texts, which were attributed to Prokopovyč until Eremin published them (1960) demonstrating that they belong to Javors'kyj, were written for publication,¹⁴ their language is Church Slavonic. The same may be said for the theological articles and books.

As far as I know only one important Latin work was written by Stefan in Russia, more exactly in St. Petersburg, a few months before he died. This was to be his most famous poetic work: the *Elegy* to his books, translated several times into Russian and into modern Ukrainian. This poem, however, was not written for the general Russian public. It was directed first to himself, second to the few friends he had in Russia and to those in Ukraine but mainly to posterity. In this sense Stefan was right: the *Elegy* has been appreciated mainly by subsequent generations. It is a chef-d'oeuvre of Russian-Latin literature, but one should not forget that it was written by a Ukrainian in the spirit of his first literary production, when he was a Kievan poet writing in Polish and Latin. In his time, in a Russian milieu, it remains isolated.

The most interesting documents of Stefan's linguistic use in Russia are the letters. Here too, an examination of the manuscripts is necessary. However, from the published documents it is possible to assert that the letters to Peter or to official institutions (the Senate, Ministeries, etc.) were written in a variable hybrid Russian-Slavonic, where the author seems to have tried to adapt the language to the idea the Emperor had of "prostojazyk" (simple language). In a few cases Latin words appeared: probably Stefan knew that Peter could understand this kind of mixing.

The most evident phenomenon is the correspondence with Tuptalo quoted above. Here the familiar use of mixed language gives evidence that in their friendly letters, both metropolitans found a place for the intimate exchange of ideas and feelings, a sort of mental and metaphoric Ukrainian island in everyday Russian reality.¹⁵ Thus we may conclude that in official life Stefan made use of Church Slavonic or Russian-Slavonic, while in correspondence and literary works addressed to his friends or to himself, he used also mixed language and Latin. This kind of separation, on all the available evidence, had no reason to exist in Kiev.

¹⁴ In fact, they were not printed until the twentieth century.

¹⁵ Fedotova 1995; Brogi Bercoff 1996.

There is one case which seems to contradict this statement. It is a letter written to the Holy Synod at the end of his life (December 29, 1721), evidently as an attempt to insure that there were sufficient numbers of “friends” in the Synod to make Stefan’s influence effective. The letter is a recommendation to the members of the Synod to elect Feofan Prokopovyč metropolitan of Kiev, Tixorskij bishop of Nežin, and to elect as members of the Synod Archimandrite F. Lopatynskij, and the monks Vyšnevskij and Krolik.¹⁶ The letter is astonishing for its many Latin expressions and variability of linguistic code: it is similar to the letters to Tuptalo, though much shorter and not personal. However, though written to an official institution, it was probably “confidential”; in my opinion, by this letter, Stefan addressed his Ruthenian “friends” in the Synod, asking them – through the use of a mixed linguistic code – to maintain the Ruthenian coalition by increasing the number of friendly members. The manoeuvre was not successful. The persons recommended by Javors’kyj were not elected. The victory of Prokopovyč was complete. A few months later the old metropolitan died. With him died an epoch and a cultural world, which was two centuries old in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and had lasted in Ukraine until the eighteenth century, but which could not be transplanted to Russia. The Russian baroque and the Petrine Russian culture, though belonging to the same European stream, present many differences in comparison with the Ukrainian baroque and the Ukrainian culture, differences which concern not only partial forms or superficial aspects, but important elements of the very structure of the intellectual life and its linguistic expression.

References

- Brogi Bercoff, Giovanna. 1996. “Zum literarischen Gebrauch der Mischsprache im ost-slavischen Bereich im 17.–18. Jh.” *Ricerche slavistiche* 43:183–208.
- . 1998. *Królestwo Słowian*. Warszawa.
- . 1999a. “O jazykovej situácii v Velikom knjažestve Litovskom i v Rossii (konec XVI–načalo XVIII veka).” *Studia Russica* XVII:11–21.
- . 1999b. “Plurilinguismo, retorica, e teoria della comunicazione nell’area slava orientale (XVII secolo).” *Plurilinguismo letterario in Ucraina, Polonia e Russia tra XVI e XVII secolo*, a cura di M. Ciccarini e K. Żaboklicki. (Accademia Polacca delle Scienze – Biblioteca a Roma, Conferenze 111). Varsavia-Roma, 117–134.
- Erdmann, Martin. 1999. *Heraldische Funeralpanegyrik des Ukrainischen Barock. Am Beispiel des ‘Stol’p cnot Syl’vestra Kossova.’* München.
- Eremin, I. P. 1960. “K voprosu o stichotvorenijax Feofana Prokopoviča.” *TODRL* XVI:506–510.
- Fedotova, Marina A. 1995. “Pis’mo Dimitrija Rostovskogo Iovu, Mitropolitu Novgorodskomu.” *Novgorod v kul’ture Drevnej Rusi*. Novgorod, 102–111.

- Lewin, Paulina. 1967. *Intermedia wschodniosłowiańskie XVI–XVIII wieku*. Wrocław.
- Liburkin, Dmitrij L'vovič. 2000. *Russkaja novolatinskaja poezija: materialy k istorii XVII–pervaja polovina XVIII veka*. Moskva.
- Marinelli, Luigi. 1995. "Akafist Naświętszej Pannie – pierwszy utwór Symeona Polockiego." *Ricerche slavistiche* 42:239–280.
- Opisanie dokumentov i del xranjaščixsja v arxive Sv. Pravitel'stvujuščego Sinoda*. 1869. I. St. Peterburg.
- Okenfuss, M.J. 1995. *The Rise and Fall of Humanism in Early-Modern Russia*. Leiden-New York-Köln.
- Pekarskij, P. 1862. *Nauka i literatura pri Petre Velikom*. II. St. Peterburg.
- Piechnik, L. 1984. *Rozwój i rozkwit Akademii Wileńskiej*. 2 volms. Rzym.
- Radyševs'kyj, Rostysław. 1998. *Roksolański Parnas. Polskojęzyczna poezja ukraińska od końca XVI do początku XVIII wieku*. Kraków.
- Rothe, Hans. 1988. "Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini über Böhmen." *Studien zum Humanismus in den böhmischen Ländern*. Hg. v. H.-B. Harder u. H. Rothe. Köln-Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 141–156.
- . 2000a. "Im Gedächtnis der Kirche neu erwachen." *Studien zur Geschichte des Christentums in Mittel- und Osteuropa*. Festgabe für G. Adriányi zum 65. Geburtstag, Köln: Böhlau Verlag, 359–372.
- . 2000b. "Paraliturgische Lieder bei den Ostslaven, besonders Ukrainern (Östliche Liturgie und westliches Kirchenlied)." *Sprache und Literatur der Ukraine zwischen Ost und West – Мова та література України між сходом і заходом*, Hg. v. J. Bester-Dilger, M. Moser, S. Simonek. Bern: Peter Lang Verlag, 17–29.
- Siedina, Giovanna. 1998. "Il 'Dictionarium Latinoslavorossiacum' di Ivan Maksymovyč: il contributo lessicografico." *L'Ucraina del XX secolo*. L. Calvi and G. Giraudo (eds.). Padova: E.V.A., 217–240.
- Šljapkin, I.A. 1891. *Sv. Dimitrij Rostovskij i ego vremja (1651–1709 g.)*. St. Peterburg.