

# Humanism and the Renaissance in Recent Histories of Ukrainian Literature

Giovanna Siedina

1. The goal of the present article is to try and give an assessment as to how the reception of Humanism and the Renaissance is reflected in the history of Ukrainian literature of the post-Soviet period. As is well known, and as I briefly summarized in a previous article (Siedina 2018), in the last decades the study of the influence of Humanism and the Renaissance in Ukrainian literature has significantly increased. This is due in large part to political changes that have made a thorough reevaluation of the cultural past of Ukraine more possible.

In order to analyze how the new approach to Ukrainian cultural heritage is reflected in literature manuals, I examined two major histories of Ukrainian literature that were published after 2000, namely *Muza Roksolans'ka<sup>1</sup>. Ukrajin's'ka literatura XVI-XVIII stoliť* by Valerij Ševčuk (Kyiv, "Lybid'", 2004-2005), in two volumes, and *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury* in twelve volumes (2014-) published by the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine Naukova Dumka. Thus far, only volumes 1-4 of the latter have been completed.

The two histories of Ukrainian literature differ in several respects. In the first place, the former is the work of only one author, and is devoted solely to early-modern Ukrainian literature, from the 16th to the 18th century. The latter on the other hand, has been conceived as a collective work that should embrace the entire history of Ukrainian literature, from its beginnings in the 10th century to today. Moreover, there is a ten-year gap between the two histories. However, as studies in this area have not made much progress from 2004 to 2014, the gap

---

<sup>1</sup> The name *Muza Roksolans'ka* is taken from a book by the poet Ivan Ornovs'kyj.

does not constitute an obstacle to comparing their approaches.

2. The first volume of *Muza Roksolans'ka* bears the title *Renesans. Rannje Baroko*; the title is not followed by an indication of the time frame. Therefore, the whole of the examined period is characterized as Renaissance and subsequently Early Baroque. In order to verify this and to understand the chronological division of the examined period, let us turn to the *Introduction (Vstup)* (Ševčuk 2004-2005, 1: 8-19). In it, nowhere does Ševčuk define his work a history of literature. On the contrary, he states that he does not consider his work to be a history of Ukrainian literature of the academic type. He rather views his work as a history-reflection on a period in which he did extensive research on his own, in the form of retrieving manuscripts and publishing (at times after translating them), writing articles and essays on single authors and/or works. Nonetheless, he links *Muza Roksolans'ka* to previous histories of Ukrainian literature and expresses his critical opinion of the works of several of his predecessors.

As is to be expected, the space devoted to the Renaissance is very little, as Ševčuk himself notes (“the Renaissance captured us less and entered our mentality less”<sup>2</sup>), while the Baroque period occupies most of the introduction. The author then turns to the history of early-modern Ukrainian literature, particularly the Baroque period, and reconstructs the main stages of its ‘rediscovery’ and study. In the first place he provides a brief outline of Dmytro Čyževs'kyj's *History of Ukrainian literature*. I will only focus on a few points here. As is known, Čyževs'kyj viewed the history of art as a history of styles, that is, of the changes that each epoch has brought about in the systems of artistic ideals,

---

<sup>2</sup> “ренесанс менше захопив нас і менше ввійшов у нашу ментальність” (Ševčuk 2004-2005, 1: 8). Here and elsewhere, translations are mine unless otherwise indicated (GS).

tastes and creations. The alternation of styles reminded him of the waves of the sea, and on this basis, he elaborated the theory of cultural waves, since the nature of styles changes, fluctuating between two different types that oppose each other<sup>3</sup>. Čyževs'kyj himself recognized that such a scheme could not be applied without correctives, taking into account the historical material and the existence of transitional forms and styles that do not fit this mechanical schematization. This is especially true in the case of Ukrainian literature.

Acknowledging various stylistic and formal characteristics of literary production, Čyževs'kyj calls the literature of Kyivan Rus' to the end of the 11th century the age of the 'monumental style', while the 12th-13th century is defined as the age of the 'ornamental style'. Ševčuk partly agrees with this division, but stresses the need to consider the literature of the Kyivan state as a whole. Therefore, he makes some corrections to Čyževs'kyj's periodization of Ukrainian literature into cultural-stylistic epochs. According to Ševčuk, the literature of Kyivan Rus' should be divided into three phases: the early period (11th century), the period of developed literature (12th century-beginning of the 13th century), and the period of attenuation (13th century) (ucr. *zahasannja*). And since Čyževs'kyj calls Ukrainian literature up to the 15th century medieval, Ševčuk proposes to divide it into three periods: early medieval (9th-11th century), developed medieval literature (12th-13th century), and the period of attenuation (14th-15th century).

Ševčuk correctly observes that little attention has been devoted to the Renaissance and the Reformation also due to the fact that Čyževs'kyj did not consider that in the 16th and first half of the 17th century, when Ukrainian literature opens to Renaissance influences and the ideas of the Reformation, it

---

<sup>3</sup> Therefore, the Middle Ages are opposed to the Renaissance, the Renaissance is opposed to the Baroque, the Baroque to Classicism, Classicism to Romanticism, the latter to Realism, and Realism to Neo-Realism, that is Modernism.

is no longer mono-confessional, and, as Ševčuk states “it was its multi-confessional nature that stimulated both multilingualism and multidimensionality”<sup>4</sup>. Čyževs’kyj refuses the definition of “Cossack baroque”. Ševčuk, instead, stresses that the authors of 17th-18th century Ukrainian literature were not only clerics, but also Cossacks, burghers, representatives of the nobility, and they wrote in high Ukrainian (literally in bookish Ukrainian language), in Latin, in Polish, in a low language near to Russian and in Russian<sup>5</sup>. The author does not define or specify further what literary variety he means when speaking of ‘bookish Ukrainian language’ and ‘close to Russian language’. However, he devotes attention to the linguistic situation in a chapter titled *Mova i vytvorennja kul’turnych ta duxovnych cinnostej (XVI-XVIII st.) (Language and the creation of cultural and spiritual values (XVI-XVIII centuries))*. Here he tries to give an assessment of the linguistic situation in the mentioned period, and states that it was precisely in the 16th century that bookish Ukrainian language formed on the basis of Ruthenian (Ukrainian and Belarusian) chancery language, with admixtures of Church-Slavonic and Ukrainian spoken language. This language is known as *prosta mova*, and it has been the object of various scholarly analyses<sup>6</sup>: though Ševčuk does not mention it, Polish elements played an important role *in prosta mova* (see Mozer 2002).

Leaving aside the multifaceted relationship between religious confession and

---

<sup>4</sup> “саме її різноконфесійність стимулювала й неодномовність, і неодновимірність” (Ševčuk 2004-2005, 1: 11).

<sup>5</sup> “Ця література творилася и козаками, й духовними, і міщанами, і шляхтою; вона творилася книжно-українською, латинською, польською, народною українською і наближеною до російської, чи й російською (в другій половині XVIII мовами)” (Ševčuk 2004-2005, 1: 11).

<sup>6</sup> Cf., among others Mozer 2002, Danylenko 2006. Ševel’ov’s seminal study on Ukrainian phonology, published in 1979, also contains important information on *prosta mova*.

language use in early-modern Ukrainian literature, I deem worthy of note the fact that Ševčuk stresses the need to take into account Ukraine's belonging to this or that state structure in the study of its cultural and literary development (the Halyč-Volyn' principality, the Kyivan principality, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and subsequently the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth). Different sub-literatures, as Ševčuk calls them, originated from this diversity, and precisely, the Lithuanian-Belarusian-Ukrainian, Polish-Ukrainian, Russian-Ukrainian literatures. Moreover, the author underlines the importance of studying the literary centers of Ukraine (L'viv, Ostroh, Kyjiv, Černihiv, Xarkiv, Novhorod-Sivers'kyj, Zakarpats'kyj), which, as he states, Čyževs'kyj did not do, while Mychajlo Voznjak had begun to do.

As to the Soviet period, Ševčuk briefly analyzes the treatment of ancient and early-modern Ukrainian literature in the 1967 *Istorija ukrajins'koj literatury. U 8 tomach*, Kyiv 1967 (*History of Ukrainian literature. In 8 volumes*). Taking into account the ideological framework within which the authors had to set their narration, which defined the language and concepts and set the parameters of their discourse, a scholarly dispassionate and unbiased look at Ukraine's literary history was inevitably impossible. Furthermore, one should also bear in mind that many literary texts from the 16th to 18th centuries were unknown, inaccessible and, in any case, mostly unpublishable for ideological reasons.

A watershed occurred in the 1980s when, as Ševčuk records, hundreds of new texts were published either in the original or in translations into modern Ukrainian in several anthologies. And thus, the 1980s and 1990s were characterized by a noticeable interest in the early modern period of Ukrainian culture, which manifested itself in the publication of articles, monographs, collections of essays, and new editions of literary and philosophical works. They testify to the relevance accorded to the relationship of Ukrainian literature with its past (i.e. the literature of Kyivan Rus'), as well as with Western European and

other Slavic literatures<sup>7</sup>. In the 1990s the Baroque was at the center of scholarly attention. Among the research devoted to this artistic current, Ševčuk devotes some attention to A. Makarov's *Svitlo ukrajins'koho Baroko* (1994). Indeed, he is particularly attuned to Makarov's culturological approach to the Baroque, since the latter is considered not only as a stylistic-literary phenomenon, but also as a system of arts and as a social and psychological phenomenon.

As we have seen, Ševčuk adopts Čyževs'kyj's division of the literary process into historical-aesthetic periods, but without renouncing historicism, that is, considering every work within its time context. Distancing himself from the 1967 *Istorija ukrajins'koj literatury*, in which literary genres seemingly existed apart from the creative personality of their authors, Ševčuk stresses that the literature of the Renaissance and the Baroque, especially the latter, was particularly inserted into the life and historical processes of its time, to which it actively reacted.

Ševčuk divides Ukrainian literature of the 16th through 18th centuries into three periods: the early Baroque, the developed Baroque, and the late

---

<sup>7</sup> It is worth mentioning a few of them: *Literaturna spadšyna Kyjivs'koji Rusi ta ukrajins'ka literatura XVI-XVIII st.*, Kyiv 1981; *Ukrajins'ka literatura XVI-XVIII st. ta inši slov'jans'ki literatury*, Kyiv 1981; *Ukrajins'ke literaturne baroko*, Kyiv 1987; *Pisemnist' Kyjivs'koji Rusi i stanovlennja ukrajins'koji literatury*, Kyiv 1988; *Jevropejs'ke Vidrodžennja ta ukrajins'ka literatura XVI-XVIII st.*, Kyiv 1993. The numerous anthologies published in the 1980s reveal a heightened desire to spread Ukraine's rich literary production of the 16th and 17th centuries, largely still unknown at that time. I will mention among them: *Apollonova ljutnja: Kyjivs'ki poety XVII-XVIII st.* (Kyiv 1982), *Ukrajins'ka literature XVIII stolittja* (1983), *Antolohija ukrajins'koji poeziji*, t. I (1984), *Ukrajins'ka literatura XVII st.* (1987), *Ukrajins'ka poezija XVI stolittja* (1987); *Marsove pole. Herojična poezija na Ukrajinu X – peršoji polovyny XVII stolit'* (two books, 1988 and 1989), *Ukrajins'ka poezija XVI-XVII st.*, *Ukrajins'ka poezija XVII st. Seredyna* (1992).

(attenuated) Baroque. The early Baroque period goes from Ivan Vyšens'kyj to the 1640s, that is, up to shortly after the foundation of the Kyiv Mohyla College (from 1701 Academy); Ševčuk states that Baroque was also cultivated in Western Ukraine and that it often 'combined' with the Renaissance. The developed Baroque, according to Ševčuk, began at the Kyiv Mohyla College, absorbed in itself the so-called Baroque classicism, and lasted until the fall of the Hetman Mazepa or even later until the fall of Hetman Skoropads'kyj and the writing of *Litopys Samijla Velyčka* in 1725. As to the late Baroque, Ševčuk rightly affirms that its European dimension, such as Rococo, did not develop in Ukrainian literature (which, as he states, was already noted by D. Čyževs'kyj), and acquired different characteristics associated with the Enlightenment and with elements of pseudo-classicism.

In the final part of his introduction, Ševčuk expounds the criteria that guided his work: they quite clearly demonstrate the progress of his approach as compared to previous literary histories. He broaches early-modern Ukrainian literature taking into account its specificities, in the first place its language(s), both literally and figuratively. As for the figurative sense, the author underlines that regarding high poetry, the language of feeling was mostly extraneous to it, while the language of intellect prevailed. As for the literal sense, Ukrainian literature of the examined period was multilingual, and if one does not consider this fact, it is difficult to comprehend its literary process in depth. Moreover, literary creation was considered as a science which could be taught and learned: hence, its creative expression was the language of the intellect, and not that of 'feelings'.

Ševčuk lists two other principles that guided his exposition: the first is related to the fact that literary production took place in definite centers (either near a patron or at an institution of higher learning, where poetics and rhetoric were studied) and from there it spread to the rest of Ukraine or to a definite region.

The following and most important principle is constituted by the criteria which guided the author in his choice of works (including anonymous ones) and authors. What unites these criteria is that they are the expression of an aesthetic approach: the author declares he has selected authors and works for: 1. their being inscribed in the living life; 2. their being characteristic of the literary process; 3. the aesthetic relevance of the literary works. In this regard, the author is keen to stress that his position is not an academic one, but rather that of an artist, i.e. he chose those works which awakened an aesthetic impression in him, and can be of interest to the contemporary reader, without aspiring to completeness in his treatment of the literary periods. Quite interesting, in this respect, is his claim that he preferred to illustrate those works which lend themselves to a double, sub-textual reading, and that he tried to provide his own version of this reading. For this reason, he also wrote short compendia with a concise overview of all the literary works of the examined periods.

Let us now turn to Ševčuk's characterization of the Renaissance mainly contained in the first volume, in the chapter *Vidrodžennja i Reformacija v ukrajins'kij kul'turi (XV-XVII st.)*. In the first place, the author gives an assessment of the past approach to the topic: the fact that only Cyrillic works were considered to be part of Ukrainian literature led to the conclusion that the Renaissance as such did not concern Ukrainian literature.

Ševčuk honestly declares that he cannot take upon himself the duty to comprehensively illustrate the issue, but that his intention is to indicate some lines of development that need to be pursued further in order to obtain a deeper knowledge of the penetration of Renaissance ideas in Ukraine. The author tries to give an assessment of all the elements at stake in this process. He reconstructs the travels of the Ruthenian youth to western European countries in order to pursue their education and their subsequent return home or to nearby countries with new ideas and concepts acquired abroad. Such travels



became so frequent that in 1457 the great prince Kazimierz Jagailowicz gave freedom of travel to foreign countries to the noble youth. Ševčuk also sketchily reconstructs the relationship of Roman-Catholics and Orthodox between the 14th and 16th centuries, and in doing this he underlines that ‘Ukrainian’ (Ruthenian or *rus’ki*, i.e. Russian)<sup>8</sup> Catholic humanists generally tried to have peaceful relationships with Orthodox. However, he does not fail to mention Polish-Catholic expansion.

Ševčuk distinguishes between Ruthenian writers who were Catholic, on one side, and representatives of Polish-Ukrainian poetry, on the other. Among the former, he lists Pavlo Rusyn iz Krosna, Mykola Husovs’kyj, Hryhorij Čuj Rusyn iz Sambora, Heorhij Tyčyns’kyj Ruteneč’, Ivan Turobins’kyj Ruteneč’, Sebast’jan-Fabian Klenovyč, Stanislav Orichovs’kyj, Ivan Dombrov’skyj, and with some doubt Symon Pekalid<sup>9</sup>. Among the representatives of Polish-Ukrainian poetry he names S. Symonid, the brothers Zymorovyč, M. Paškovs’kyj, J. Vereščyns’kyj, A. Čahrovs’kyj, S. Okol’s’kyj, V. Kic’kyj, and Jan Ščasnyj-Herbert. Ševčuk then comments both on these writers’ love for Rus’, as manifested in their poetry, comments and statements, and on their religious tolerance, a fruit of their humanism. It is exactly this part of the Catholic world in Ukraine that tried to maintain peaceful relationships with Orthodoxy, despite the problem of Polish-Catholic expansion.

As regards at least some of the mentioned writers, which could be defined as having a ‘multiple identity’ (e.g. Sebastijan Klenovyč / Sebastian Klonowic), it seems to me that Ševčuk’s approach is too simplistic and straightforward. Some

---

<sup>8</sup> For a scholarly reconstruction of the name Rus’ and related ethnonyms, see Danylenko 2004.

<sup>9</sup> As for Catholic Ruthenian writers, Ševčuk correctly states that in spite of their religious confession, they did not forget their ‘sweet Rus’ homeland,’ and they without fail stressed their Russian, that is Ukrainian, belonging.

of them certainly identified as Ukrainian as well, but the issue of their ‘ethnic’ belonging should be approached in a more sophisticated way, taking into account the multinational environment in which they developed<sup>10</sup>.

Ševčuk’s characterization of the Italian Renaissance is short and schematic: he divides it into three periods, early-Renaissance, high Renaissance and the last period, which is characterized by the violation of harmony and the gradual combination of ancient motifs and bizarre forms which characterized the Baroque style. In the first place, the terminological coexistence of the terms *Renesans* and its Ukrainian correspondent *Vidrodžennja*, which seem to be used interchangeably, should be noted. Indeed, the author uses *Renesans* to indicate the wider phenomenon, and *Vidrodžennja* to indicate the three periods into which it is divided. Moreover, he uses the term *Renesans* at times with a capital letter, other times with the lowercase, thus creating a potential confusion between the proper noun and the common noun<sup>11</sup>. Ševčuk notes that the Renaissance in Ukraine did not embrace all artistic spheres and existed only as one of the aesthetic currents: this statement, however, remains somewhat unclear since he does not specify which other currents he has in mind. Be that as it may, Ševčuk explains that the reason for this was Ukraine’s close relation to the Byzantine cultural sphere and its rejection of Western culture which reached Ukraine through Poland. For this reason, he adds, the representatives of Renaissance forms in Ukrainian literature were in the first place not Orthodox, but Catholic, belonging to the so-called Catholic Rus’. The term, which appeared

---

<sup>10</sup> To understand the complexity of the national attribution of some of these poets suffice it to say that in his essay in this volume Niedźwiedz defines Sebastian Klonowic as “one of the leading Polish poets of his time”.

<sup>11</sup> On p. 19 Ševčuk specifies that he uses the capital initial in the words “Ренесанс” and “Барокко” when they indicate the epochs, and the lowercase initial when they mean an artistic method.

in the 16th and first half of the 17th century, indicated those young men who at the end of the 15th and in the 16th century went to Western Europe to study in universities and often became Catholic. Their ethnic identity is specified by the appellation which they usually added to their name, such as *rusyn*, *rutenec*, *roksoljanyn*. However, their confessional identity did not 'coincide' with their 'ethnic' patriotism, i.e. they could and often did support the Ukrainian (Rus') cultural development and renewal although often being Catholic. The literature that some of these young men created, as Ševčuk indicates, is in the Renaissance poetics, built on Classical models and Humanistic ideas. This literature, Ševčuk recalls, evoked the reaction of the representatives of the traditional 'Byzantine' current of Ukrainian letters, in the first place Ivan Vyšens'kyj. The polemical works of the latter, the author notes, marked the transition to the Baroque, which, in the Ukrainian conditions meant the combination of what he calls Byzantinism with the Renaissance, and the assimilation of Reformation ideas. He correctly indicates the main characteristic of the Ukrainian reception of Renaissance poetics: it is rarely found in a 'pure' form, being frequently combined with Baroque elements.

Ševčuk then treats in some detail the works of the aforementioned authors. I will highlight here only a few points of his analysis, which will help us to understand his approach. As to Neo-Latin poetry, through which humanistic and Renaissance poetics mainly passed, the author mentions that the most ancient work of Ukrainian Neo-Latin poetry is considered to be the poetic introduction to the book *Prohnostyna ocinka 1483 roku* by Heorhij (Jurij) Drohobyč-Kotermak, which was published in Rome. Ševčuk recalls only a few lines, which contain a sort of poetic declaration of the author. They are devoted to his books and the poet expresses the wish that they may be useful since they are Minerva's offspring, and not written for laughter.

This distinction between high and low registers also characterizes the poetics

of Pavlo Rusyn iz Krosna, whose biography receives great attention by Ševčuk. The author shows how the different hypotheses about Pavlo's national origin, whether German, Polish or Hungarian are unfounded, and that he can only be considered Ukrainian (*rusyn*). As to his *oeuvre*, Ševčuk states that it belongs to the early Renaissance, when art had not yet experienced a break with Medieval traditions and still remained in the range of religious topics, but at the same time was expanding its repertoire to secular themes based on the imitation of ancient patterns and poetics. Indeed, one type of poetry Pavlo devotes himself to is that of spiritual poetry, concerning saints, Biblical characters and the like. Another type consists of panegyric works devoted to various important persons, written in the form of odes or elegies. And finally, the third type is constituted by meditative-didactic lyrics, in which Pavlo Rusyn expressed his attitude towards books, art, poetry, war, his homeland, the world, and life. This type, in Ševčuk's opinion, represents the most valuable part of his *oeuvre*, and I agree. Thus, the author lingers to analyze this part of Pavlo Rusyn's works; I will dwell on a few moments. They constitute, in my opinion, key motifs which are a stable legacy of Humanism and the Renaissance in Ukrainian Neo-Latin poetry. In the first place, we find the idea that poetry is a gift of the gods. In the second, the conviction that the world in general is uncertain and fragile, and that all earthly values are short-lived: states, cities, powerful rulers, ancient heroes, and material goods, such as jewelry. Only poetry is capable of maintaining the memory of these persons, events, and facts. Clearly, this thought has a long history starting from Classical antiquity, and in later Neo-Latin Ukrainian poetry it is often associated with the poetic legacy of Horace, especially in his ode to Censorinus (*Carm.* IV, 8)<sup>12</sup>. Another theme noted by Ševčuk, which will be developed by poets of later generations, such as S. Klenovyč, S. Pekalid, and S. Počas'kyj, is the invitation to Apollo and the muses to settle in the poet's

---

<sup>12</sup> See Siedina 2017: 150-153.

country. However, the first author to speak of a Ukrainian national Parnassus on the hills of L'viv, as Ševčuk remarks, will be S. Klenovyč in his poem *Roksolania* (1584). This theme, in relation to Kyiv, will be later developed by poets connected to the Kyiv-Mohylian cultural elite.

Ševčuk devotes much attention to S. Klenovyč and his enigmatic poem *Roksolania*, published in 1584 in Cracow. This work, as he stresses, is indeed intriguing: it is the first poem devoted to Ukraine, a land that evidently fascinated the author for its nature, its cities, and its history. Although much remains unknown (how its plan came about, how long he had been writing it, who supported its publication), the dedication to the most eminent senate of the L'viv community testifies to a probable support by the latter. Klenovyč expresses the conviction that the hills of L'viv can worthily replace the Greek Parnassus, since Apollo has already settled there. This land, in fact, is not poor; in it, agriculture and herding are well developed. If Clio was the first muse to settle in Rus' (and indeed the author makes her narrate the history of Rus'), the others soon followed. As Ševčuk remarks, however, the muses brought here by Klenovyč are learned and devout, and they came to Rus' to inspire high poetry, not lower forms of verbal expression. This is the typical Renaissance opposition of high and low, learned and popular poetry. Klenovyč's goal, as he states it, is to make this land known to the whole of Europe. This is the reason he writes in Latin. Ševčuk stresses the fact that, although being ethnically Polish, Klenovyč does not deem Rus' (Ukraine) to be a part of Poland, but recognizes its ethnic self-sufficiency, since he calls it *krajina* (but he does not specify whether the poet uses exactly this word or a Latin one). In my opinion, however, one cannot know with certainty Klenovyč's thought just by the use of a single word. Although Klenovyč writes that the land of Rus' extends to the Lithuanian borders, its woods up to the Muscovite land, includes Pskov and Novgorod, and in the north the Rus' borders reach the eternal snows and ice, he celebrates a

territory which is much smaller. It is, in fact constituted by Halyč, Podillja, Volyn' and the Kyiv region, that is by the 'Ukrainian' territory of the former Principality of Halyč-Volyn'.

Although sometimes in Klenovyč lyric feeling prevails over objective observation, and he celebrates the land that fascinates him so much, the poet has indeed provided us with a unique 'encyclopedia' of Rus' life. Indeed, as Ševčuk remarks, a wealth of extremely valuable data is scattered throughout the poem about how the Rus' people live, which are their customs, how they raise children, how they farm, how they work wood, how they make carts, wheels, plows, how they graze the cattle, their folk legends and traditions, the flora and fauna surrounding them, and much more. Ševčuk's allegorical reading of the goddess Galatea, who, having arrived in Rus', fills the udder of cows with milk when they drink from a noisy river, as the arrival to Rus' of the cultural foundations of the Renaissance originated in a maritime country, maybe Italy, seems somewhat unjustified.

Ševčuk rightly observes that Klenovyč was probably the first writer to provide a poetical description of Ukrainian cities. He observes that the cities described by Klenovyč, with the exception of Kyiv, all belong to one region, and that the city of Ostroh, although it belonged to the same region, is not included, and this exclusion is hardly accidental. The main reason, according to the author, is the fact that Ostroh at that time was a lively cultural center, led by the prince Kostjantyn Ostroz'kyj, whose cultural orientation was rather towards Kyivan Rus' and Byzantium than towards Western Europe and entailed a rejection of 'Latin' cultural influence. Although there was not much antagonism between the two factions (in Ostroh, a little later, another Neo-Latin poet, Symon Pekalid will appear, and he will be a protégé of prince Kostjantyn Ostroz'kyj), Klenovyč prefers not to mention the city. Further on, Ševčuk devotes a great deal of attention to the religious issue and debunks the vision of Klenovyč as a

supporter of Catholic expansion. On the contrary, as his work demonstrates, he felt a deep affinity with Rus'. He called L'viv 'glory of the people', the honor and purpose of his work. He furthermore praised the Rus people for their fostering of the Orthodox faith, while he judged the dissolute life of the Protestants.

This attitude not only of religious tolerance, but of open support of the Rus' faith, affirms Ševčuk, is shared also by another Polish-Ukrainian writer of that time, namely Stanislav Orichov's'kyj, and later on also by Jan Ščasnyj-Herbut. However, both these authors had or felt Ukrainian 'blood' in their veins, while very little is known about Klenovyč's origins, studies, or personal life, except that he came from a bourgeois family, spent some years of his youth in L'viv, received a solid education (judging from his poem), and moved to Lublin in 1574, where he married and worked in different posts of the city administration. Because of his interest in Ukrainian history, of his referring to the mores and the faith of the fathers', Ševčuk puts forward the hypothesis that he had some Ukrainian blood, or maybe that he was of Armenian or Armenian-Ukrainian origin, descending from those Armenians who had settled in Ukrainian lands before the establishment of the Polish domination and who always remembered that those lands were Ukrainian. Among the facts that might indicate Klenovyč's Armenian or mixed Armenian-Ukrainian origin are: in his poem he celebrates L'viv, Kamjanec'-Podil's'kyj and Zamost'; when he speaks about L'viv as the first city of Rus', the poet underlines its Ukrainian character and says nothing about the Poles; about the city's minorities, he expresses negativity about Jews while separately noting the Armenians in a positive way. Another possible indication of Klenovyč's Armenian origin is the fact that three Roman Catholic writers of Armenian origin, namely S. Symonid (Szymonovyc) and the brothers Zymorovyč, imitated Klenovyč. At that time ties between the Armenian and Ukrainian populations were close and it was often impossible to distinguish Armenians from Ukrainians since the former often had Ukrainian family names, says

Ševčuk, quoting Ja. Daškevyč, author of a work on Ukrainian-Armenian relations. Klenovyč's Armenian origin would certainly explain some facts, first of all his open demarcation from the Poles. But, what is more important, in my opinion, is Klenovyč's complaint that Renaissance ideas reached Ukraine in a weak way, reported by Ševčuk. This lament is contained in an allegorical way in a couple of lines of the poem *Roksolania*, quoted by Ševčuk unfortunately only in Ukrainian translation: "Піснею я Пієріді спровадив сюди, щоб влекшити / Жаль свій, що в нас тут нема вкритої лавром гори"<sup>13</sup> (Ševčuk 2004-2005, 1: 156).

Quite interestingly, Ševčuk observes that differently from those men of letters who belonged to the Ostroh circle, Klenovyč wished to secularize poetry, i.e. to separate it as much as possible from the Church, but that this aspiration was 'too bold' for his time. Other young Renaissance poets like him, who had studied in Western European universities, could not find a way to apply their knowledge in their motherland. Ševčuk names Jurij Drohobyč, Pavlo Rusyn iz Krosna, H. Tyčyns'kyj, and S. Orichovs'kyj, all of whom felt themselves sons of Rus', but lived most of their lives away from it. On the contrary, Klenovyč 'returned' to it, singing Rus' in his poem. His depiction of L'viv and Kyiv is quite interesting: while the former was then considered the capital of Ukraine, the latter is not compared to ancient Troy, despite the fact that it was in ruins. On the contrary, he compares Kyiv to ancient Rome, and states it has the same importance that the eternal city had for ancient Christians, probably also because in it, in the Caves Monastery, the imperishable relics of Orthodox clerics and believers were preserved. This way, Klenovyč establishes a link between L'viv and Kyiv. Indeed, as Ševčuk remarks, at the beginning of the 17th century it is to Kyiv that intellectuals from Halyč such as Jov Borec'kyj, Z. Kopystens'kyj, J. Pletenec'kyj, and P. Berynda directed themselves, pressed by Catholic

---

<sup>13</sup> "I brought the Muses here with a song to ease / my sorrow, we do not have a laurel-covered mountain here".



reaction. They will establish in Kyiv a significant cultural center, a printing house and a type of college that shortly after will become the Kyiv Mohyla College.

It needs to be stressed that Ševčuk tries to objectively analyze the contribution of those representatives of the so-called “Catholic Rus’”, who, in Soviet times were collectively marked as men who only wanted evil for their people, who betrayed the Rus’ and moved away from their roots. In reality, as Ševčuk asserts, the picture was more variegated, especially for what concerns the 16th century, which was generally characterized by religious tolerance. This picture will change sharply in the 17th century as a consequence of the Catholic Counter-Reformation when the ‘voices of dissent’ will become increasingly rare. One of them in the 17th century, who espoused humanistic and Renaissance ideas was Ivan Dombrovs’kyj, author of the poem *Camoenae Borysthenides* (published ca. 1619)<sup>14</sup>. Ševčuk aptly defines Dombrovs’kyj as continuing the literary tradition of Catholic Rus’, however “Kyiv-based”, so to say, since the main thought of his work was the revival of the Ukrainian state building<sup>15</sup>. For this reason, he provides a long historical description of his homeland from the time of Kyivan Rus’, and underlines that despite having been the object of foreign invasions, it did not succumb. In his analysis of Dombrovs’kyj’s *Camoenae Borysthenides* and Klenovyč’s *Roksolania*, Ševčuk highlights

---

<sup>14</sup> That Dombrovs’kyj’s patriotism did not fit into the narrow Soviet schemes, which identified national and confessional belonging, was demonstrated already by Jaremenko in his introduction to the 1988 anthology *Ukrajins’ka poezija XVII stolittja* (Jaremenko 1988: 14).

<sup>15</sup> Ševčuk considers Dombrovs’kyj a continuer of Josyp Vereščyns’kyj, the Catholic bishop of Kyiv (1592-1598). Vereščyns’kyj cherished projects of organizing public life in Ukraine through the creation of a military force able to repel armed attacks; he also dreamt of renewing the importance of Kyiv as the capital of Ukrainian lands. It is for his focus on the restoration of the Ukrainian state-building, which he shared with Vereščyns’kyj, that Ševčuk deems Dombrovs’kyj his continuer.

similarities and differences. Just like Klenovyč, Dombrovs'kyj does not include in the history of Rus' the people of *moschy*, the ancestors of Russians, considering them a northern tribe which Rus' kept in submission. However, for what concerns the borders of Rus', they differ in that Dombrovs'kyj makes them coincide with those of ancient Scythia. Therefore, for him, Rus' is bordered by the river Dnister, the northern coast of the Black Sea, further on by Colchis, that is Caucasus, and by the Caspian Sea. The northern border was constituted by the Ural Mountains and by the 'Persians'; the western border was constituted by the river Wisłok, a tributary of Vistula (Wisła). The interest of these borders, as it is noted by Ševčuk, resides in the fact that they coincide with those of ancient Scythia. Thus, the successor of the latter is deemed by Dombrovs'kyj Rus'-Ukraine, and not Muscovy, and this opinion is shared by the Ukrainian chroniclers of Cossack tradition.

Similarly to what Klenovyč did in his *Roksolania*, Dombrovs'kyj includes inhabitants of Novgorod and Pskov among the Rus' people. The poem is devoted to Bohuslav Radoševs'kyj, abbot of the Holy Cross church on the *lysa hora* in Kyiv, and Roman-Catholic bishop of Kyiv, and its goal, besides manifesting the glory of Rus', is to remind the addressee that in spite of his religious confession, he is called to serve the homeland of his ancestors. Therefore, in his reconstruction of the history of Rus' through legendary and historical personages, Dombrovs'kyj also inserts the Somykovs'kyj family, from whom Radoševs'kyj descended, among the Halycian-Volhynian princes. That the latter did not consider his being Roman-Catholic an obstacle to serving his people is manifested, among other things, by his tolerant attitude towards the Orthodox confession, its representatives (such as Petro Mohyla, with whom the bishop had good relations), its adherents and its shrines. Ševčuk states that the poem is written mostly in Renaissance poetics, that is, 'secularized'; it does not speak of spiritual and ecclesiastical matters. Moreover, differently from the majority

of the literature of the first half of the 16th century, which is characterized by a mixture of Renaissance and Baroque elements, in *Camoenae Borysthenides* the only feature that can be attributed to the Baroque style is the word play. For the rest, according to Ševčuk, it begins with a traditional preface with numerous Classical similarities and with the declaration of the main goal of the work: to manifest the glory of Rus'. Despite the plural in the title, Dombrovskij 'brings' to Ukraine only one muse, Clio, the muse of history. She is made to speak after the long account of the history of Rus', to glorify Radoševskij also by narrating the deeds of his ancestors and family members.

Unfortunately, Ševčuk does not provide references as to the extant printed copies of the poem or of existing manuscripts, if any. All quotations are provided only in Ukrainian translation and this, as already noted, does not allow for the appreciation of poetical reminiscences and literary *topoi*, as well as the verbal richness and metaphorical ornamentation. Another drawback of Ševčuk's narration is that he does not always argue his claims. For instance, as already mentioned, he does not provide support for his statement that *Camoenae Borysthenides* is written mostly in Renaissance poetics; the only hint is his assertion that the poem is secularized. However, a deeper analysis reveals much more. As Jaremenko had outlined in 1988, it is Dombrovskij's approach to history, his rejection of divine providence as history's driving force, as well as of the vision of history as the implementation of the divine plan of salvation foreseen in advance that aligns it with Renaissance poetics. On the contrary, in Dombrovskij's poem man is presented as an active subject of the historical process, whose actions are historically determined, and are not caused by God's providence. It is for this reason, according to Jaremenko, that in his poem God is mentioned very rarely, while princes, kings and generals are much more present and Biblical characters are virtually absent. Similarly, for Dombrovskij, dignity, talent, intellect, virtue, and valor are characteristics that can raise an

individual above others to occupy a higher place in the social hierarchy, while a person's noble origin should serve as a stimulus to serve his homeland and not as a right to rule. These and other important observations of Jaremenko's concerning Dombrov's'kyj's poem are not mentioned in Ševčuk's exposition.

Another drawback of Ševčuk's work is his approach to bibliographical sources: indeed, he mentions only Ukrainian, Russian and very seldom Polish sources. This statement concerns the last work, on whose treatment by Ševčuk I will briefly linger, that is, the poem *Evcharystyrion albo Vdjačnosť* by Sofronij Počas'kyj (1632). In his analysis of this poem Ševčuk, seems particularly interested in investigating how the author succeeds in establishing a literary Mount Parnassus and Helicon in Kyiv through his learned poetry. The interesting and important issue of the genre of the poem is not touched upon at all; nor does Ševčuk speak about how Sofronij Počas'kyj treats the addressee of the poem, that is Petro Mohyla. Instead, the author distinguishes in the poem elements that can be attributed to the Renaissance and the Baroque and lists them. Among the former he enumerates: the glorification of the sciences, Apollo, the Greek muses, the arts, the creation of Parnassus and Helicon, ancient similes, a clear style without verbal figures and subtexts, that is, double reading, the knowledge of the world, and an apology of reason and education. However, Ševčuk notes that the author, through the glorification of the one Christian God, His Church's shepherds and the Virgin Mary, denies the Renaissance, and instead adheres to a Baroque poetics. To the latter he ascribes the poet's interest in matters of faith, a vision of God as the creator of the world cycle, the one who determines time and the changes of the year's seasons, and the contradictory character of the figures he glorifies (Apollo and the Muses on one side, and Christian figures and the Virgin Mary on the other). For all of these reasons, Ševčuk says that the poem *Evcharystyrion albo Vdjačnosť* seems to be ending early Baroque in Ukraine, which originated in a combination of

Renaissance and medieval poetics, because a Renaissance poetics is both used and denied in the work.

3. The new history of Ukrainian literature, *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury*, the first volume of which came out in 2014, is a very different literary history from Ševčuk's. In the first place, according to the project, it should be a collective work in twelve volumes, of which only four have been published. It is an academic work, originated by the Institute of Literature of the National Academy of Science of Ukraine and published by the publishing house "Naukova Dumka".

The history of literature proper in the first volume is preceded by a Preface (*Peredmovna*, pp. 5-22) by Mykola Žulyns'kyj, the director of the Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. In this preface the author broadly traces the millennial literary history of Ukraine, especially concentrating on the modern period. However, the volume lacks an introduction that may set this unprecedented collective work in the framework of Ukrainian literary historiography. Such an introduction is found instead at the beginning of the second volume.

The last part of the first volume and the second volume are devoted to the period which interests us. The first volume, titled *Davnja literatura (X – perša polovyna XVI st.)*, is divided into two major sections: *Literatura Kyjivs'koji Rusi. Rannje ta zriłe Seredn'oviččja (X – perša polovyna XIII st.)* and *Literatura pizn'oho seredn'oviččja (druha polovyna XIII – perša polovyna XVI st.)*. This second section at its end contains a chapter on Latin language literature (*Latynomovna literatura*), and this is a welcome novelty compared to previous histories of Ukrainian literature. Let us now turn to the characterization of Humanism and the Renaissance in Ukrainian literature. The literary development of the Late Middle Ages, described in the chapter *Literaturnyj proces*, is characterized as the one possessing the most 'white spots' in the

Giovanna Siedina (a cura di), *Essays on the Spread of Humanistic and Renaissance Literary Civilization in the Slavic World (15th-17th Century)*, Firenze University Press, 2020

Biblioteca di Studi Slavistici; 45 - ISSN 2612-7687 (print) - ISSN 2612-7679 (online)

ISBN 978-88-5518-198-3 (PDF)

ISBN 978-88-5518-199-0 (ePUB)

ISBN 978-88-5518-200-3 (XML)

history of Ukrainian literature, a sort of ‘pause in the literary development’, following Dmytro Čyževs’kyj’s words. After a description of the literary genres which continue those of the previous epoch, in the penultimate paragraph we read: “At the end of the 15th, first half of the 16th century, poets appear in Ukraine who write in Latin and are in one way or another connected with Western European Renaissance culture”<sup>16</sup>.

3.1. The chapter *Latynomovna literatura* by M. Trofymuk, occupies pages 709-728. The author states that Neo-Latin Renaissance poetry spread mainly in Halyčyna (Galicia) at the Polish-Ukrainian cultural cross-border, which represented the border between Western and Eastern Christianity. The author divides Neo-Latin Ukrainian literature into two periods, the first, so called “rusyns’kyj” (last quarter of the 15th century, and through the 16th century), from the name ‘rusyn’, which most authors attributed to themselves, and the second “roksolans’kyj”, from the name that appears in many works and documents of the period 1632-1730, which saw the greatest flourishing of Ukrainian Neo-Latin literature. As to the long-debated and still relevant issue of the ‘national’ belonging of the cultural legacy of Neo-Latin writers who spent most of their lives outside Ukraine, and who are often called ‘cross-border writers’<sup>17</sup>, the author offers a peculiar ‘ukrainocentric solution’. He distinguishes Ukrainian Neo-Latin literature and the Neo-Latin literature of Ukraine. The former comprises authors of Ukrainian origin or ukrainized authors, whose activity took place in the territory of Ukraine and whose themes concerned Ukraine and expressed the interests of Ukrainian society. The latter embraces

---

<sup>16</sup> “Наприкінці XV – у першій половині XVI ст. в Україні з’являються поети, що творять латинською мовою і так чи інакше пов’язані із західноєвропейською ренесансною культурою” (Dončuk *et al.* 2014-, 1: 571).

<sup>17</sup> Ukrainian-Polish, Ukrainian-Belarusian, Lithuanian-Polish.

all works in Latin concerning Ukrainian ethnic territories, that is, works of Ukrainian Neo-Latin literature, works of foreign authors about Ukraine, and works of those authors who came from Ukraine, but whose activity was connected with non-Ukrainian cultural centers and whose works touched contemporary European issues. Two other factors to be considered for the selection and the attribution of the material are the self-identification of the authors (which can be inferred by the names they used: *rusyn*, *rutenec'*, *roskolan*) and the dedication of these works to Ukrainian rulers, princes, church dignitaries, as well as to cities, regions and the like.

However, it seems to me that the second category is too wide and has been devised to include into the 'literature of Ukraine' even authors (and their works) whose belonging to that literature is at best only partial, and whose manifold identity is mainly or partly shaped also by other ethnic and cultural contexts.

The author then names five authors, who identified themselves as *rusyn*, *rutenec'*, or *roskolan*. They are: Jurij Drohobyč-Kotermak, Stanislav Orichovs'kyj, Heorhij Tyčyns'kyj-Rutenec', Hryhorij Čuj-Rusyn iz Sambora, and Pavlo Rusyn iz Krosna. Before broaching their literary production, the author briefly summarizes the stylistic and thematic characteristics of the literature of the Renaissance, first and foremost the imitation of the genres and thematic peculiarities of Classical literature, especially Latin. Other characteristics he highlights are the rebirth of the Classical ideal of a harmonious personality, which coexists with the surrounding environment in an agreeable way. Actually, states the author, this ideal in the Renaissance was everybody's duty, and art and literature could help men achieve it. This ideal is linked to the concept of *altera natura*, an ideal, spiritual world without the negative sides of the real world which, according to the humanists, should bring humankind closer to the mentioned ideal. Other important features of the Renaissance outlined by the author in a few lines are: the artistic celebration of the beauty of nature and of

native places; a specific patriotism, both national and universal (humanists as inhabitants of a specific *orbis terrarum humanistici*); the stress on education (the system of the seven liberal arts, elaborated in the late Middle Ages); the emancipation of literary creation as an independent sphere of art; and the publishing of works of Classical authors. In general, the author stresses how the Renaissance became a turning point of the spiritual life of Europe. At the same time, he recalls that it is hard to separate tradition and innovation when speaking of the work of concrete authors, since their legacy shows their being rooted in the previous literary process while simultaneously incorporating new and contemporary tendencies. And thus, the synthesis of forms and means of expression which characterizes two epochs, the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, according to the author, marks the future synthesis of their worldview, artistic forms and means of expression which was realized by the Baroque style. The author attributes to this synthesis another peculiarity of the “mentioned periods” (evidently the Renaissance and the Baroque): multilingualism and macaronic word usage. The author does not illustrate this issue in detail, as would have been fit, he only exposes in short the peculiar situation of Ukraine, stressing that the “regional consciousness” of Ruthenians was manifold, depending upon their belonging to different social, confessional, and ethnic groups. Language also was a key factor, in that it was linked with a specific system and means of expression and topics. If on the territory of the Rzecz Pospolita the main means of communication was Polish, Latin had a key role as the language of the church, science, and political relations. As to Ukrainian authors, if they had received primary instruction in Ukrainian lands, they also used Church Slavonic and Ukrainian (*rus'ka, prosta*) language<sup>18</sup>.

---

<sup>18</sup> The author broaches the theme of the linguistic situation of Ukraine in quite a superficial way. For the sake of clarity, we will recall that Moser thus defined *prosta(ja) mova*: “The *prosta(ja) mova* was based on the Ruthenian (Ukrainian or Belorussian)

Giovanna Siedina (a cura di), *Essays on the Spread of Humanistic and Renaissance Literary Civilization in the Slavic World (15th-17th Century)*, Firenze University Press, 2020

Biblioteca di Studi Slavistici; 45 - ISSN 2612-7687 (print) - ISSN 2612-7679 (online)

ISBN 978-88-5518-198-3 (PDF)

ISBN 978-88-5518-199-0 (ePUB)

ISBN 978-88-5518-200-3 (XML)



The author then goes on to illustrate the work of the five mentioned authors to which he adds a sixth, less known, Ivan Turobins'kyj Ruteneč'. He also provides the Latin name of each author. They are respectively: Georgius Drohobicz de Russia, Paulus Crosnensis Ruthenus, Georgius Ticzensis Ruthenus, Ioannes Turobinus Ruthenus, Czuj Vigilantius Samboritanus Ruthenus, Orichovius Stanislaus (Orzechowski Stanisław). Greater attention and space are devoted to Pavlo Rusyn iz Krosna and Stanislav Orichovs'kyj because of the breadth and depth of the issues dealt with in their poetry, a direct effect, besides their natural talent, of the high level of the education they received in the best European universities of the time.

The treatment devoted to the works of Pavlo Rusyn iz Krosna seems somewhat scanty compared to Ševčuk's, and contains some contradictory statements, which are not further explained or clarified. The presentation of Pavlo Rusyn's work is more an enumeration of features than an active interpretation by the author. He states that Pavlo Rusyn's poetry is a phenomenon of a period of transition: in spite of the fact that his works fully express all the themes, genres and motifs of the Renaissance, "much of his literary heritage belongs to the previous epoch in terms of genre and theme, where spiritual poetry, works of the Mariological cycle, panegyrics to saints, descriptions of church matchmakers, peculiar poetic motifs imbued with subtle sadness predominate"<sup>19</sup>. Earlier, however, the author

---

chancery language and developed into a literary language because of its growing polyfunctionality, its increasingly superregional character, and its stylistic variability" (Mozer 2002: 221). See also Shevelov 1979: 576 ff. and footnote n. 6 above.

<sup>19</sup> "значна частина його літературної спадщини жанрово й тематично належить попередній епосі, де переважає духовна поезія, твори маріологічного циклу, панегірики святым, описи церковних сват, свозерідні віршовані мотиви, просякнуті витонченим сумом" (Dončyk *et al.* 2014-, 1: 716).

had stated that ““the poet actively uses the ancient tools of poetry, typical of post-Renaissance poetry”<sup>20</sup>. And thus, Pavlo Rusyn’s poetry belongs to the Renaissance; however, a significant part of his poetic legacy ‘belongs to the previous epoch’, while he uses ‘Classical tools’ (“античний інструментарій”) typical of post-Renaissance poetry. Indeed, from such a presentation, it is quite a puzzle to try to understand how one should comprehend and interpret the poetry of Pavlo Rusyn.

The author adds that the legacy of Pavlo Rusyn is also constituted by panegyrics devoted to ecclesiastical and lay persons, to his friends and pupils, and moral-didactic poetry. His use of Classical authors and Classical *topoi* is noted, as well as addressing his books as living creatures, as little children very dear to him. The motif of the power of poetry to give eternal life and glory to states and cities, which of course has a long history, is remarked in Pavlo Rusyn’s poetry. However, the author here too does not say anything about the long history of this *topos* in ancient and more modern poetry.

As to Orichovs’kij’s literary and cultural legacy, it is illustrated in greater detail, since it is said to be the manifestation of his belonging to European culture and at the same time his being rooted in the Polish-Ukrainian reality of his time. His coming from a two-confessional family (his father was catholic, his mother orthodox) certainly made him a participant of two worlds; his wide education, acquired in the best European universities, allowed him to interpret the surrounding reality in a wider perspective. His multifaceted writer’s talent found expression in literary works of different genres: epistles (*Epistola de*

---

<sup>20</sup> (“Поет активно використовує античні інструментарій віршописання, властивий для постренесансної поезії” (*ibidem*).

*coelibatu*)<sup>21</sup>, *Baptismus Ruthenorum* (1544), speeches (*De bello adversus Turcas suscipiendo ad equites polonos oratio*, 1543; *Ad Sigismundum Poloniae Turcica Secunda*, 1544), tracts (*Repudium Romae*, which was not printed; *Policja królestwa polskiego*, 1565), a biography, and several pamphlets. For his oratorical skills Orichovs'kyj was variously named 'Latin/ Rus' Demosthenes' and 'contemporary Cicero'. It is not clear, however, why the author states that if one compares Orichovs'kyj's works with Classical texts, the former seem fairly adequate, despite the fact that Latin texts of the 16th to 18th century are always marked by the thinking of a particular author, and thus Classical and Neo-Latin works are quite different.

Be that as it may, the author concludes by stating that the significance of Neo-Latin literature for the development of Ukrainian culture in the mentioned period lays mainly in that it brought to Ukrainian ground the Classical-Renaissance acquisitions of European literature, and it enriched Ukrainian literature with new themes and poetic means, "paving the way for such a unique phenomenon as the culture of Ukrainian Baroque"<sup>22</sup>.

3.2. In the second volume, in the section *Oryhinal'na literatura*, among the chapters on the different literary genres, two chapters are devoted respectively to poetry in Polish (*Pol's'komovna poezija*) and poetry and literature in Latin (*Latynomovna poezija* and *Latynomovna ukrajins'ka literatura*).

At the beginning of the second volume one finds an introduction with the title *Davnja literatura (druha polovyna XVI – XVIII st.)* by Mykola Sulyma. The

---

<sup>21</sup> To this theme, dear to him, Orichovs'kyj also dedicated the work *Pro Ecclesia Christi* (1546), and the brochure *De lege coelibatus* (1551), addressed to the participants in the Council of Trent.

<sup>22</sup> "торуючи шлях до такого унікального явища, як культура українського бароко" (Dončyk *et al.* 2014-, 1: 728).

period is divided into three chronological sections, titled respectively: *Literatura nacional'noho vidrodžennja ta rann'oho Baroko (druha polovyna XVI – perša polovyna XVII st.)*, *Literatura zriloho Baroko (druha polovyna XVII – perša polovyna XVIII st.)*, *Literatura pizn'oho Baroko (druha polovyna XVIII st.)*. Each of these sections is divided into five subsections: *Istoryko-kul'turni obstavyny*, *Usna slovenist'*, *Literaturnyj proces*, *Oryhinal'na literatura*, *Perekladna literatura* (this latter subsection is absent in the third section). This uniform organization of the literary material exemplifies the fact that the editors consider the literary process of the period as possessing similar characteristics.

As is customary for literary histories, the introduction is devoted to the analysis of histories of Ukrainian literature, starting from the scholarly beginnings in the 19th century and ending with *Muza Roksolans'ka* by Valerij Ševčuk. A good deal of attention is devoted to the literary histories by Mychajlo Hruševs'kyj (first volumes 1923-27; the sixth volume remained manuscript; the whole work was republished in 1993) and Mychajlo Voznjak (1920-24). Among the merits of the latter are listed the analysis of Ukrainian elements in Polish literature and of the literary output of Polish writers of Ukrainian origin, as well as the attention devoted to the publication of Ukrainian songs in Polish and Russian editions. Voznjak is also praised, among other things, for having investigated the awakening of Ukrainians' interest in their past and culture in the 18th century. Voznjak's greatest merit, however, and the goal he set himself, is that of having revealed the texts of ancient literary works and having presented them to the wide academic community.

Further on in the introduction it is asserted that a new stage in the understanding of the early modern period starts with the creation of the Taras Ševčenko Institute of Literature of the Academy of Sciences in 1926. In the first place, this was reflected in the appearance of new methods. In addition to the philological approach, we see the development of historical, sociological,

stylistic, and Marxist approaches. The work of the *Commission of ancient Ukrainian literature* was quite important. Created in 1927, the members published important works and texts of the literature in question. However, the onset of the darkest period of the Soviet regime put an end to the free development of literary studies (as happened in all branches of human sciences, and not only). However, even during the Soviet period, useful studies continued to be carried out in this field. For instance, Oleksandr Bilec'kyj, director of the Institute of Ukrainian literature from 1939 to 1941 and from 1944 to 1961, while on the one hand adhering to Soviet parameters for Ukrainian literature<sup>23</sup>, continued fruitful research activity in the field.

Sulyma then goes on to illustrate the development of Ukrainian literary history in emigration. After briefly describing the work of M. Hnatyšak<sup>24</sup>, who published his *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury* in 1941 in Prague, he lingers on illustrating the work of D. Čyževs'kyj, who declared to share Hnatyšak's approach, especially for what concerns the formal analysis of literary works. I will dwell here only on a few points. Sulyma synthesizes Čyževs'kyj's theory on the constant succession of opposite tendencies (styles) in the history of literature, that are defined by their opposed characteristics: clarity vs. depth, simplicity vs. pomp, calm vs. movement, completeness in itself vs. boundless prospects, concentration vs. diversity, traditional canonicity vs. novelty, and others. As to the Renaissance proper, as the author recalls, Čyževs'kyj

---

<sup>23</sup> They were: the treatment of the literature of Kyivan Rus' as the 'cradle' of the three East Slavic peoples, the denial of the supposedly nationalistic conceptions of Ukrainian literary process, the denial of the continuity of its development, the application of sociological parameters to literary history, and so on.

<sup>24</sup> Of the ten epochs (that he called "styles") of his periodization of Ukrainian literature, he could illustrate only three: 1. Old Ukrainian style; 2. Byzantine style; 3. Late Byzantine transitional style.

characterized it as a 'discovery' and 'liberation' of the individual, as a rebirth of the ancient ideal of harmony, of balanced beauty. Sulyma does not agree with Čyževs'kyj's statement that Renaissance ideas barely and marginally reached Ukraine at the end of the 16th century from Poland, without having a significant influence. Indeed, he notes that Čyževs'kyj does not consider such representatives of Ukrainian culture as Jurij Drohobyč and Pavlo Rusyn iz Krosna. In Čyževs'kyj's opinion, the 16th century in Ukrainian culture, characterized by religious strife, represented a sort of regression, as compared to the period between the 11th and 13th centuries and to the flourishing of Baroque in the 17th and 18th centuries. Sulyma notes how, in his characterization of the Baroque, Čyževs'kyj differs from his predecessors, for example Hruševs'kyj, in that he lists the Baroque among the dynamic styles, and states that it first approached the people's culture, was looked at with sympathy among the people and had a significant influence on popular culture and art. The author goes on to illustrate in some detail Čyževs'kyj's treatment of the Ukrainian Baroque, its literary genres, poetry (learned and popular), short prose, historical chronicles, as well as the aspects which need further research (e.g., the union of old Christian traditions with Classical elements, and the constant cultivating of the form of works, also of those in which the main attention is given to content, such as sermons, chronicles, and treatises). Sulyma then briefly discusses the other two histories of Ukrainian literature written in the Soviet period. The former actually never saw the light because of a negative review in 1947, probably because of the high level and the completeness of the analyzed literary production, i.e. because of its positive qualities. Finally, the author lingers on the 1967-1971 history of Ukrainian literature in 8 volumes and lists as its merits "the complete representation of the literary process, coverage of the history of Ukrainian literature as the original literature of a great nation, and the literature

of Kyivan Rus – as a fundamental component of Ukrainian literature”<sup>25</sup>. The ideological constraints which authors encountered in their work are not openly discussed, as Ševčuk had done when describing this history of Ukrainian literature. They are only hinted at in the authors’ statement, reported by Sulyma, that they had to renounce a periodization by styles, that the theme of Russian-Ukrainian relations had to be ‘adjusted’, and so had the evaluation of the ideology of the Cossack *staršyna*, the treatment of 17th century literary works in which Ivan Mazepa was spoken of, and so on.

The last ‘Soviet’ history of Ukrainian literature of 1987 in two volumes is only mentioned. The author then turns to the post-Soviet period, and particularly devotes his attention to Ševčuk’s *Muza Roksolans’ka*, which is praised as a welcomed new reading of ancient and early-modern Ukrainian literature, especially for its attention to the multilingual dimension of Ukrainian literature and to the relationship between literary works and the “living life”.

As to their own work, about two pages (28, 29, and six lines on page 30) are devoted by the editors (*Vid redaktoriv*) to their own history of Ukrainian literature. In the first place, they stress its novelty and its own merits. In analyzing the literature of the 17th and 18th centuries, it is asserted that the authors look at Ukrainian-Russian relations in a new way, and at the aspirations to the national liberation of Ukrainians. The chapters devoted to literature written in Polish and Latin are also a welcomed novelty; the Polish and Latin texts are rightfully reinserted into Ukrainian literature. We read that the elements of the European Renaissance and the “full development of the

---

<sup>25</sup> “повнота представлення літературного процесу, висвітлення історії української літератури як самобутньої літератури великого народу, а література Київської Русі – як основоположного складника української словесности” (Dončuk *et al.* 2014-, 2: 26).

universal baroque style in Ukraine”<sup>26</sup> are illustrated in a series of chapters. It is evident that the editors lay stress on the purported objectivity of their analysis, which, it is said, is free from Soviet ideological strictures. Thus, it looks in a new way at the many aspects involved in the development of Ukrainian literature, first and foremost at the literary and cultural relations with Russia. The new approach stated in this sort of ‘declaration of intent’ was also made possible by a long ‘preparatory’ work of study and publication of literary works of early modern Ukrainian literature. A long list of such publications (both dedicated to single literary genres and anthologies), divided into volumes of literary works published in the original language and books of literary works originally written in Church Slavonic, old Ukrainian, Polish or Latin, translated into modern Ukrainian is given (chronologically, the earliest mentioned edition is a 1959 book edited by L. Machnovec’, *Davnij ukrajins’kyj humor i satyra*). The list contains only works by Ukrainian scholars, which is quite understandable since they are the ones who did most of the editorial and publication work for the edition of old texts. However, scrolling the index of names at the end of the book, one is struck by the almost complete absence of the names of Western European scholars, who made an important contribution to Ukrainian literary scholarship of the early modern period.

The literature of the second half of the 16th and first half of the 17th century is characterized in the chapter *Literaturnyj proces*. The period is called one of profound renewal and marked development in all cultural fields, including literature. In order to characterize this phenomenon, which the author defines as commensurate with the cultural shifts of the European Renaissance, she uses the definition of “the first national Revival” (“перше національне Відродження”) (Dončuk *et al.* 2014-, 2:

---

<sup>26</sup> “повноцінний розвиток універсального стилю бароко в Україні” (Dončuk *et al.* 2014-, 2: 28).



80)<sup>27</sup>. However, as the author hastens to add, they were not so much Renaissance ideas that influenced this development, as the ideas of the Reformation. Indeed, it is in this period that Ukrainian culture begins its transformation from a closed culture into a ‘modern’, secularized one. This process is reflected in the gradual secularization of literature, in the growing ‘multifunctionality’ of the *prosta mova* and the decreasing use of Church-Slavonic (in this the author sees the influence of the Reformation), the gradual emergence of the author’s personality, and finally in the development of the social function of literary styles. Regarding Ukrainian society, the author refers to the opinion of V. Lytvynov<sup>28</sup>, who has identified four groups in late 16th and early 17th century Ukrainian society: the first were conservative orthodox; then came the utraquists<sup>29</sup>, among which “both Renaissance-humanistic and Reformation ideas were formed”<sup>30</sup>; the third group was in favor of the church union with Rome; the fourth group is defined as “Renaissance-humanistic” (“ренесансно-гуманістичне”), however its representatives are said to have almost all subsequently dissolved in the ‘Polish sea’. This expression, which the author probably took from Lytvynov, since it is in quotation marks, is not further explained. What does it mean to dissolve in the Polish sea? Does it refer to ethnic Ukrainians (Ukrainian-Polish, Ukrainian-Belarusian,

---

<sup>27</sup> The adjective *peršyj* is used to distinguish this renewal from the one that took place in Ukrainian culture at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries.

<sup>28</sup> The quoted source is: V. Lytvynov, *Ukrajina v pošukax svojeji identyčnosti. XVI–počatok XVII stolittja. Istoryko-filosofov’kyj narys*, Kyiv 2008, p. 515.

<sup>29</sup> The utraquists (from the Latin expression *sub utraque specie*, “under two kinds”) were a moderate faction of the Hussites, who supported the laity’s right to receive communion of both bread and wine during the Eucharist.

<sup>30</sup> “були сформовані і ренесансно-гуманістичні, і реформаційні ідеї” (Dončuk *et al.* 2014–, 2: 81).

Ukrainian-Belarusian-Lithuanian-Polish), authors of the so-called *porubižžja*, who in one way or another identified themselves as Ruthenians and wrote (also) in Latin and/or Polish? The author does not specify, and the following exposition is rather organized according to the different literary genres, starting with the different varieties of prose. The author observes that while the latter remain more or less the same of the previous period (epistles, tracts, sermons, saints' lives, annals, pilgrimage accounts) and preserve an established ideal-thematic religious discourse, their content and genre forms experience a radical renewal under the influence of the new challenges of the *nacional'ne vidrodžennja* epoch. Polemical prose is defined as the most vital prose genre of the period for the lively interconfessional debate that characterized it. About this the author quotes the Ukrainian scholars D. Nalyvajko and V. Krekoten'; they state that this literature "echoing the actual Renaissance Humanism, 'in its typology, in its functions and in its genre composition is very close to the literature generated by the Western European Reformation'"<sup>31</sup>. Unfortunately, in the subsequent synthetic but circumstantial overview of Ukrainian polemical literature the author does not indicate in which aspects and in which ways such literature echoed Renaissance Humanism. Here, as elsewhere, the lack of more in-depth studies on the reception of Humanism and the Renaissance is felt. Until this gap is filled, it will be difficult to have a clear picture of those elements which harken back to the Renaissance and those components that pertain more specifically to the new Baroque taste.

### 3.3. Evidence of the discrepancy of approach can be found in the chapters on

---

<sup>31</sup> "перегукують із власне ренесансним гуманізмом, 'за своєю типологією, за своїми функціями і за своїм жанровим складом дуже близька саме до літератури, породженої західноєвропейською Реформацією'" (Dončuk *et al.* 2014-, 2: 82).

Polish-language poetry and Latin-language poetry respectively on pages 260-280 (by R. Radyševs'kyj) and 281-295 (by M. Trofymuk). In the former, Polish-Latin cultural bilingualism is set on the background of Ukrainian Baroque, which is characterized, among other things, by the tendency to “to harmonize the national content of culture with linguistic means of expression”<sup>32</sup>, a phenomenon which in most European countries, took place during the Renaissance. The author underlines that the Ukrainian Baroque took upon itself the functions of the Renaissance, besides devoting particular attention to Medieval themes and motifs, theocentrism, genre normativity, the spiritual element, and the union of Christianity with antiquity. The author then mentions a series of issues generated by the Polish-Ukrainian coexistence, first and foremost the encounter of the two traditions of Eastern (Orthodox) and Western (Catholic) Christianity. However, the treatment of these issues is set only on the background of the Baroque. For instance, it is said that it was the Sarmatian ideology, “on the basis of the baroque cult of respect for antiquity”<sup>33</sup>, that had the important function of spurring the Ukrainian elite to search for their ancestors in Kyivan Rus’.

However, no mention is made of the role that the rediscovery of Classical antiquity during the Renaissance may have had. The author does not elaborate on the issue of multilingualism, noting only that the existence of two literary languages (Latin and Polish) slowed down the development of the ‘national’ language, and that the use of the Polish language by the cultural elite of the time was then explained with the need to expand the circle of readers. It is not very clear what the author has in mind when he states that multilingualism, i.e. an

---

<sup>32</sup> “узгодити й національний зміст культури з мовними засобами вираження” (Dončuk *et al.* 2014-, 2: 261).

<sup>33</sup> “на ґрунті барокового культу пошани до старовини” (Dončuk *et al.* 2014-, 2: 263).

author's freedom to choose the language that best suited his genre and thematic needs, complicates the criteria of attribution of authors and texts to more than one literature, Ukrainian, Polish, Belarusian. It is certainly true, however, that the historical condition in which Ukrainian literature developed requires special criteria to be adequately and correctly framed.

Further on the author analyses prose and poetic genres written in Polish: polemical poetry by Ipatij Potij and Meletij Smotryc'kyj and various examples of epicedia. In the latter the author underlines the baroque characteristics of the genre. Subsequently, the discourse shifts to the revival of Kyiv and the role of the Mohyla College / Academy is highlighted in the formation of a new generation of men of letters and representatives of the cultural elite. Through the Polish language, the new writers could assimilate the best models of the Polish Renaissance and early-Baroque culture, the author asserts. However, in the subsequent analysis of the most interesting Polish language works, only the elements pertaining to the Baroque are mentioned and they are all analyzed against the background of Baroque aesthetics. If the author's claim is correct, the picture would be more complete if the Renaissance roots of ideas, themes and motifs were highlighted. For instance, when analyzing the love for the past of Ukraine and especially of Kyiv in Tomasz Jewlewicz's *Labirynt, albo droga zawikłana* and in other poetic and prose works, one should bear in mind that the rediscovery of one's own past had its roots in the Renaissance period. The same can be said about different poetic genres, such as epicedia, which certainly harken back to their rediscovery by Humanism in the Renaissance period. Also, the images of a reborn Kyiv, whose hills are likened to mount Helicon and Parnassus and whose river Dnipro is said to recall the Castalian springs of inspiration, so frequent in the poetry of this period, undoubtedly have their roots in the migration of the muses *topos* of Renaissance poetry.

This said, it is certainly true that Ukrainian literature of this time span is under

the influence of the Baroque, since its main tenets, love for contrasts, striking contradictions, refined ornamentation, studied visual and intellectual complexity and many other features of this cultural mode, were certainly congenial to the 16th and 17th century Ukrainian elite's frame of mind.

Other poetic works analyzed are devoted to the figure of the metropolitan Petro Mohyla, whose role in the development of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church and Ukrainian culture can hardly be overestimated<sup>34</sup>. Also, the insistence on the importance of culture, which characterizes various Polish-language literary works devoted to Petro Mohyla analyzed in the text, certainly has its roots in the humanistic movement. One cannot but recall the repudiation of all Classical pagan authors and contemporary European scholarship, together with the rhetorical devices and embellishments that they used, by the Athos monk Ivan Vyšens'kyj (ca. 1550- after 1621) of just a few decades earlier. A clear break with Vyšens'kyj's attitude can be seen in two works of religious content, the *Paterikon* (1635) edited by Silvestr Kosov at the request of Petro Mohyla, and *Τερατουργημα, lubo cuda...* (1638) by Afanasij Kal'nofojs'kyj, in which were gathered legends and accounts related to the Monastery of the Kyivan Caves and the miracles that happened there. Its goal was to contribute to the reinforcement of the Kyivan Church and its supporters, past and present. As is underlined by the author, in *Τερατουργημα, lubo cuda...* particular attention was devoted to the panegyric glorification of learning, which was in line with the concept shared by the circle of Petro Mohyla's supporters on the usefulness of education and the light of science. Kal'nofojs'kyj goes so far as to affirm that the

---

<sup>34</sup> Some of these works are: the collection of panegyric verses *Mnemosyne slawy* (1633), whose author was probably Oleksandr Tyškevyč, the poetic and prose Polish-Latin panegyric “Sancti Petri Metropolitanæ Kijoviensis thaumaturgi Rossiae... Petrus Mohyla” (1645) by Teodosij Bajevs'kyj, and *Żal ponowiony* by Josyp Kalimon, a mourning response to the death of Mohyla.

eternal gates of glory will be opened to the people who devoted themselves to these noble deeds. Although the praise of learning and science certainly harkens back to the Renaissance, for its fascination with medieval mysticism and its exquisite and aphoristic writing, the author stresses this work's connection with the Baroque style.

Further on, in the last four pages of his essay, the author analyzes Polish-language emblematic poems written to praise the local nobility which continue to develop the traditions of Baroque panegyric poetry of the Kyivan circle. They are all linked to the Mohyla Collegium, which proves the centrality of this institution for the formation of the Ukrainian cultural elite. Of particular interest is an anonymous work, probably written by students of the college under the supervision of their teachers, addressed to Jeremija Vyšnevec'kyj with the aim to praise the noble Korybut-Vyšnevec'kyj family. It is a dramatized poem in four acts, divided into scenes, probably recited by students of the college, and it reflects the characteristic features of Kyivan Baroque versification of the mid-17th century. The author calls attention to the year of its composition, 1648, and underlines that at that time Bohdan Xmel'nyc'kyj had already engaged in a few battles against the Polish Crown. In the poem, however, these events are not reflected upon: learned poetry remains removed from current events. If this is true, it is to be noted, as does the author, that Petro Mohyla and the Kyivan elite, also after his death, did not share the pro-Russian orientation of Ukrainian Cossacks. On the contrary, they considered Cossack insurrections as a rebellion that troubled the peaceful development of the state. Indeed, the prince Jeremija Vyšnevec'kyj in the Cossack wars passed over to the Polish-Catholic camp and thus against Ukraine. The author concludes by stating that the literary activity of the Kyiv-Mohyla college in the first half of the 16th century offers bright poetic examples of an original Kyivan school of emblematic-panegyric Baroque versification, strictly tied to the European and particularly Polish Baroque.

Giovanna Siedina (a cura di), *Essays on the Spread of Humanistic and Renaissance Literary Civilization in the Slavic World (15th-17th Century)*, Firenze University Press, 2020

Biblioteca di Studi Slavistici; 45 - ISSN 2612-7687 (print) - ISSN 2612-7679 (online)

ISBN 978-88-5518-198-3 (PDF)

ISBN 978-88-5518-199-0 (ePUB)

ISBN 978-88-5518-200-3 (XML)

Finally, the chapter on Latin-language poetry, on pages 281 to 295. The author starts out by saying that from the 14th through 16th centuries about 60 authors of Ukrainian origin created Renaissance literature in Central and Eastern Europe. He bases his statement on the list found in Z. Florczak's work *Udział regionów w kształtowaniu się polskiego piśmiennictwa XVI wieku*, Warszawa, Wrocław, Kraków 1967, although he adds that the scholar uses the words "Ziemie Ruskie Rzeczypospolitej" without differentiating White, Red and Black Rus'. In this chapter he analyzes the work of three poets: Sebast'jan-Fabian Klenovyč, Symon Pekalid, and Ivan Dombrov'skyj. He does not stress the distinction, as Ševčuk does (see above), between Ruthenian writers who were Catholic, on one side, and representatives of Polish-Ukrainian poetry. Moreover, if Klenovyč was certainly Catholic, from the biographical information we have about him, we cannot affirm that he was Ruthenian.

Indeed, from the available biographical information, we know that Sebast'jan-Fabian Klenovyč (1545-1602) was born in the region of Poznan to Polish parents and lived most of his adult life in Lublin, where he held various administrative positions. His link with Ukraine consists of his stay in L'viv from about 1570 to about 1573 and especially of his long and fascinating poem *Roksolania*, the first printed Neo-Latin poem about Ukraine, as the author of the essay remarks. In the author's opinion, it is exactly for this poem that Klenovyč's work is considered part of Ukrainian literature.

The poem is quite accurately illustrated. The author of the essay, quoting Mychajlo Bilyk's previous study of the text, states that *Roksolania* had no analogue in Classical antiquity. He correctly lists the quotations from Classical authors, although the most probable antecedent for Klenovyč's descriptions of forests and pasture lands are Virgil's *Georgics* and *Eclogues*, also called *Bucolics*, which were quite popular during the Renaissance. However, the author, again citing Bilyk, notes that in

*Roksolanija* “so vividly reflected the creative individuality of the poet, which goes beyond the Renaissance imitation”<sup>35</sup>. This statement, indeed, betrays quite a narrow comprehension of Renaissance poets as slavish imitators of Classical antiquities, without their own individuality.

The term Renaissance is also used to define the way the poem ‘sings’ Ukraine, that is, according to the author, in a form characteristic of a Renaissance literary work. However, he does not specify of which characteristics he is speaking, or define what characterizes a Renaissance literary work in a more general sense and how *Roksolania* exemplifies this. It would also have been proper to investigate the contemporary European antecedents of *Roksolania*. One would expect a bibliography on these earlier works and other Neo-Latin literature produced by Ukrainians or about Ukraine.

Trofymuk also discusses Symon Pekalid, an interesting Neo-Latin Polish poet who, for reasons we do not know, became very close to the prince Kostjantyn Ostroz’kyj. So close that in the record of Cracow University graduates, the note “ruthenus factus” (“he became a Rusyn”) appears next to his name. He became so Rusyn, in fact, that at the beginning of the 1590s he took part in the campaign against the lower Cossacks. A witness to this, as well as to his closeness to prince Kostjantyn Ostroz’kyj and to the Ostroh Academy founded by him, is Pekalid’s poem *De bello Ostrogiano ad Piantcos cum Nizoviis libri quattuor* (Cracow 1600). The author provides a description of each of the books, underlining that Pekalid’s point of view is that of the noble elite, and thus he provides an idealized image of the princely clan and their manifold deeds for the defense and the cultural development of their land. The poem is quite interesting also as a historical source, in that, among others things, it

---

<sup>35</sup> “настільки яскраво відбилася творча індивідуальність поета, що переходить рамки ренесансного наслідування” (Дончук *et al.* 2014-, 2: 286).



provides an accurate description of the city of Ostroh, of its trilingual lyceum, and of the genealogical tree of the Ostroz'kyj family, starting from the *Rus patriarcha* up to his own time. The victorious deeds on the battlefield of the latest descendants of the Ostroh family are described as well. In the second book, Pekalid describes the Zaporo'ka Sič, and from the note on the margin (“Insula in Boristhene, ubi Nisovii delitescunt”) (“an island on the Boristhenes, where the *Nisovii* lurk”) one understands the position of the author. The description of the prince's army is also worthy of mention, which was composed of different ethnic groups, among which Tatars settled in Ostroh; their customs, manners and armament are described in detail.

Only books 3 and 4 illustrate the military events hinted at in the title, i.e. the clash of the Ostroz'kyj army with twenty thousand lower Cossacks. In the third book the preparation of the battle in the Cossacks' camp is described as well as the manifold tactic they plan to use to disorientate the enemy; the description of the battle near P'jatka is the culminating point. As to the fourth book, it contains the description of the preparation for the new battle as well as the speech of prince Janusz. The preparation is interrupted by the arrival of the Cossacks' envoys who ask prince Kostjantyn for a truce, and indeed the new battle will never take place, since, as the author of the essay states, Kosyns'kyj appears and in a short repentant speech expresses his desire for reconciliation and obedience.

Trofymuk observes that the whole poem is built on the paraphrasis of Virgil's *Aeneid*, starting from the incipit, and that three hundred verses out of 1400 are borrowed from various works by Virgil, especially his famous epic poem. He also notes that along with various reminiscences from Latin poets, such as Ovid, Statius, Lucanus, Horace, and Catullus, the poem contains allusions to Biblical motifs taken from the books of Jeremiah, Isiah, Deuteronomy and the Psalms.

Giovanna Siedina (a cura di), *Essays on the Spread of Humanistic and Renaissance Literary Civilization in the Slavic World (15th-17th Century)*, Firenze University Press, 2020

Biblioteca di Studi Slavistici; 45 - ISSN 2612-7687 (print) - ISSN 2612-7679 (online)

ISBN 978-88-5518-198-3 (PDF)

ISBN 978-88-5518-199-0 (ePUB)

ISBN 978-88-5518-200-3 (XML)

Except for the mentioned sources of inspiration, no other mention is made of the possible Humanistic or Renaissance sources of this long and original poem. Indeed, it is beyond doubt that Pekalid's poem is also a fruit of the Renaissance, in many respects. On one side, it reflects the Renaissance approach to the *heroicum carmen* – designed to surpass the celebration of *res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia bella*, as Horace defined the topic of the heroic poem. This approach goes hand in hand with the loose boundary between epic and encomiastic poetry that has its roots in the Renaissance didactic theory of art<sup>36</sup>. Finally, the celebration of prince Janusz Ostroz'kyj and of his clan, of their good administration of the subject territory, as well as of their caring for the development of culture and science certainly reflect the humanistic “transformation of wisdom from contemplation to action, from a body of knowledge to a collection of ethical precepts, from a virtue of the intellect to a perfection of the will”<sup>37</sup>. Not long ago, this poem was the object of a scholarly article by Natalia Jakovenko, but her scholarly insight into this first Neo-Latin poem, tied to Volyn' for its appearance and context, do not seem to be reflected in this analysis of the poem.

4. The analysis of the most relevant aspects of how two recent histories of Ukrainian literature approach the influence of Humanism and the Renaissance in early-modern Ukrainian literature allows me to draw some preliminary conclusions. Notwithstanding the differences in their conception, in the type of analysis, and notwithstanding the differences between their tastes and sensitivity in their approach to the study of literature, the authors of the two histories have the shared goal of reevaluating the material outside of the

---

<sup>36</sup> See Hardison 1962: 43-67 and 71-72.

<sup>37</sup> Rice 1958: 149.

ideological strictures of the Soviet period. However, some aspects touched upon in their analyses still need to be examined thoroughly and dispassionately. Among them the supranational character of Humanism and the Renaissance and of their reception, and the multiple identity of many men of letters in Ukraine in the examined period. At the same time the emphasis on the secular character of the 'new' literature should be properly considered. In the reality of the texts of the time, religion continues to be an integral part of mental, intellectual, political and cultural discourse.

Another advantage which has characterized the work of the two authors considered here has been the publication of many texts of early-modern Ukrainian literature that had formerly been only in manuscript form. Many previously unpublished texts appeared in print in the last decades of the 20th century and in the first years of the 21st century. This is still an ongoing process and it will probably last for a few more decades to come. Many manuscripts are still scattered in libraries and archives or in private collections across Ukraine, Belarus' and Russia. However, a drawback that has often characterized the publication of these texts is the poor quality of the editions: whether they were written in Latin, in Old-Ukrainian or in Church Slavonic, they have almost always been translated into modern Ukrainian. This is not in itself a flaw, but the lack of the original text next to its translation into modern Ukrainian is an inconvenience that should be avoided in future editions, since it does not allow one to appreciate the language in which the texts were written, and the language is an integral part of the work, which cannot and should not be separated from the content it carries. Moreover, the lack of the original language does not allow one to reconstruct the poetics of reminiscences, which is paramount to the literature of this epoch.

Hopefully, the reconstruction, as much as possible, of the full picture of the literary texts produced in Ukraine from the 15th to the 18th century will

Giovanna Siedina (a cura di), *Essays on the Spread of Humanistic and Renaissance Literary Civilization in the Slavic World (15th-17th Century)*, Firenze University Press, 2020

Biblioteca di Studi Slavistici; 45 - ISSN 2612-7687 (print) - ISSN 2612-7679 (online)

ISBN 978-88-5518-198-3 (PDF)

ISBN 978-88-5518-199-0 (ePUB)

ISBN 978-88-5518-200-3 (XML)

facilitate the analysis of their features in and of themselves, including the influence of Humanism and the Renaissance on their composition. Rather than merely viewing their language, metrics and various modes of expression as a preparatory way for subsequent currents, such as the Baroque, we might appreciate this period's literary production on its own terms and for its own characteristics.

### *Bibliography*

Brogi Bercoff 2005

G. Brogi Bercoff, *La lingua letteraria in Ucraina: ieri e oggi*, "Studi Slavistici", II, 2005, pp. 119-136.

Brogi Bercoff 2014

G. Brogi Bercoff, *Ruś, Ukraina, Ruthenia, Wielkie Księstwo Litewskie, Rzeczpospolita, Moskwa, Rosja, Europa środkowo-wschodnia: o wielowarstwowości i polifunkcjonalizmie kulturowym*, in: A. Alberti, M. Garzaniti, S. Garzonio (a cura di), *Contributi italiani al XIII Congresso Internazionale degli Slavisti. Ljubljana, 15-21 agosto 2003*, Firenze 2014, pp. 325-388.

Cyhanok 1998

Giovanna Siedina (a cura di), *Essays on the Spread of Humanistic and Renaissance Literary Civilization in the Slavic World (15th-17th Century)*, Firenze University Press, 2020

Biblioteca di Studi Slavistici; 45 - ISSN 2612-7687 (print) - ISSN 2612-7679 (online)

ISBN 978-88-5518-198-3 (PDF)

ISBN 978-88-5518-199-0 (ePUB)

ISBN 978-88-5518-200-3 (XML)

O. Cyhanok, *Do pytanja pro renesansnyj humanizm ta Vidrodžennja v Ukrajinі*, "Renesansni studiji", 2, 1998, pp. 81-90.

Danylenko 2004

A. Danylenko, *The Name "Rus"*. In search of a new dimension, "Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas", 52, 2004, 1, s. 1-32.

Danylenko 2006

A. Danylenko, *On the Name(s) of the Prostaja Mova in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth*, "Studia Slavica Hungarica", 51, 2006, 1-2, pp. 97-121.

Danylenko 2017

A. Danylenko, *On the Names of Ruthenia in Early Modern Poland-Lithuania*, in: M. Németh, B. Podolak, M. Urban (eds.), *Essays on the History of Language and Linguistics. Dedicated to Marek Stachowski on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, Kraków 2017, pp. 161-173.

Dončyk et al. 2014-

*Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury*, u 12-ty tomach, red. kolehija V. Dončyk et al., tt. 1-4, 2014-; vol. 1 (2014), *Davnja literatura (X – perša polovyna XVI st.)*; vol. 2 (2014) *Davnja literatura (druha polovyna XVI – XVIII st.)*, Kyiv, "Naukova Dumka", 2014-.

Goleniščev-Kutuzov 1963a:

I.N. Goleniščev-Kutuzov, *Ital'janskoe vozroždenie i slavjanskije literatury XV i XVI vekov*, Moskva 1963 (trad. it. *Il Rinascimento italiano e le letterature slave dei secoli XV e XVI*, I-II, a cura di S. Graciotti e J. Křesálková, Milano 1973).

Giovanna Siedina (a cura di), *Essays on the Spread of Humanistic and Renaissance Literary Civilization in the Slavic World (15th-17th Century)*, Firenze University Press, 2020

Biblioteca di Studi Slavistici; 45 - ISSN 2612-7687 (print) - ISSN 2612-7679 (online)

ISBN 978-88-5518-198-3 (PDF)

ISBN 978-88-5518-199-0 (ePUB)

ISBN 978-88-5518-200-3 (XML)

Goleniščev-Kutuzov 1963b:

I.N. Goleniščev-Kutuzov, *Gumanism u vostočnych slavjan (Ukraina i Belorussija)*, Moskva 1963.

Graciotti 1988

S. Graciotti, *Il Rinascimento nei paesi slavi. Per una definizione dei termini e dei concetti*, in: *Contributi Italiani al X Congresso Internazionale degli Slavisti (Sofia, 1988)*, Roma 1988 (= "Europa Orientalis", VII), pp. 215-258.

Hardison 1962

O. B. Hardison, *The Enduring Monument: A Study of the Idea of Praise in Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice*, Chapel Hill, NC, 1962.

Hnatjuk 1993

O. Hnatjuk, *Do pereocinky ukrajins'koho literaturnoho procesu XV-XVII st. (Ohljad publikacij davn'oji ukrajins'koji literatury)*, in: O. Myšanyč (red.), *Jevropejs'ke Vidrožennja ta ukrajins'ka literatura XIV-XVIII st.*, Kyiv 1993, pp. 239-245.

Jaremenko 1988

*Ukrajins'ka poezija XVII stolittja (perša polovyna). Antolohija*, V. V. Jaremenko (red.), Kyiv 1988.

Mozar 2000

Michaèl' Mozer, *Čto takoe «prostaja mova»?*, "Studia Slavica Hungarica", 47, 2002, 3-4, pp. 221-260.

Rice 1958

Eugene F. Rice, Jr., *The Renaissance Idea of Wisdom*, Cambridge, MA, 1958.

Ševčuk 2004-2005

V. Ševčuk, *Muza roksolans'ka. Ukrajins'ka literatura XVI-XVIII stolit'*. U dvoch knihach. Knyha perša: *Renesans, Rannje Baroko*, Kyiv, Lybid', 2004; Knyha druha: *Rozvynene Baroko, Piznje Baroko*, Kyiv, Lybid', 2005.

Shevelov 1979

G.Y. Shevelov, *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language*, Heidelberg 1979 (= *Historical Phonology of the Slavonic Languages*, G.Y. Shevelov (ed.), IV).

Siedina 2017

G. Siedina, *Horace in the Kyiv Mohylanian Poetics (17th-First Half of the 18th Century). Poetic Theory, Metrics, Lyric Poetry*, Firenze 2017.

Siedina 2018

G. Siedina, *Echi dell'Umanesimo-Rinascimento nell'Ucraina della prima modernità. Note a margine*, in: M.C. Ferro, L. Salmon, G. Ziffer (a cura di), *Contributi italiani al XVI Congresso Internazionale degli Slavisti. Belgrado, 20-27 agosto 2018*, Firenze 2018, pp. 315-327.

Giovanna Siedina (a cura di), *Essays on the Spread of Humanistic and Renaissance Literary Civilization in the Slavic World (15th-17th Century)*, Firenze University Press, 2020

Biblioteca di Studi Slavistici; 45 - ISSN 2612-7687 (print) - ISSN 2612-7679 (online)

ISBN 978-88-5518-198-3 (PDF)

ISBN 978-88-5518-199-0 (ePUB)

ISBN 978-88-5518-200-3 (XML)

## Abstract

In this article, the author analyzes how the broad theme of the reception of Humanism and Renaissance is treated in two important histories of Ukrainian literature, respectively *Muza Roksolans'ka. Ukrajins'ka literatura XVI-XVIII stolit'* by Valerij Ševčuk (Kyiv, "Lybid'", 2004-2005), in two volumes, and *Istorija ukrajins'koji literatury* in twelve volumes (2014-) published by the publishing house of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine Naukova Dumka. The disappearance of Soviet ideological constraints has brought about the emergence of various aspects of this theme: the multilingualism (especially as regards literature written in Latin), the multiple identity of writers of the so-called *Pohranyččja*, the literature written in Latin, are just a few. However, some aspects still need to be addressed: among them the supranational approach should be adequately considered when dealing with the spread of Humanism-Renaissance.

## Keywords:

Reception of Humanism-Renaissance; Early-modern Ukrainian literature; Neo-Latin literature, multilingualism; multiple identity.