

Introduction

The establishment in 1631-1632 of the Kyiv Mohyla Collegium with a curriculum modeled on that of contemporary European Jesuit schools, marked the beginning of a hybrid institution: indeed, while adopting Catholic educational philosophy and practice, and Latin as the language of instruction, the Collegium preserved an orientation strictly observant of Orthodox confessional purity¹.

Because of the cultural context in which the KMA arose, its curriculum required some adjustment: for instance, while in Jesuit schools new beginners were required to know how to read and write, so that teaching could begin not below the rudiments of grammar, this was probably not a prerequisite for admission to the Mohyla Collegium. Be that as it may, as in most Jesuit schools and academies, written and oral Latin, and its use in both poetry and prose, was taught in the first three classes of the curriculum (*infima, grammatica, syntaxis*). They were preceded by an introductory class, called *analog* or *fara*, which covered reading, writing and basic Latin, Polish and Church Slavonic, and were followed by the so-called *humaniora* classes, that is poetics and rhetoric, the former (a one-year course) also constituting a preparation for the latter (a two-years course). In the *humaniora* classes the pupils, who were already proficient in Latin grammar, learned to compose different kinds of poetical works and speeches for various occasions of public and private life. They also received extensive teaching in secular and biblical history, mythology, geography and other subjects.

In short, the poetics and rhetorics courses taught in Latin at the KMA contained the knowledge deemed indispensable for the pupils to master the rules of refined composition in Latin poetry and prose. During the poetics course pupils were exposed to writings of Latin authors such as Ovid, Sallust, Seneca, Claudian, Martial, Virgil, Horace and others, as well as contemporary Neo-Latin au-

¹ See Charipova 2006: 8ff. The Collegium, which officially acquired the status of an Academy at the turn of the seventeenth century, will be referred to hereinafter as the KMA (that is Kyiv Mohyla Academy; on the differing opinions concerning the time of acquisition of the academic status, cf. Sydorenko 1977: 61 ff.). For a synthetic, yet very clear and informative, reconstruction (in English) of the cultural-historic background of the genesis and the subsequent development of the KMA, see Charipova 2006: 39-65.

thors and outstanding Polish writers of the Renaissance and the Baroque such as Jan Kochanowski, Samuil Twardowski and Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski. With the two-years rhetoric course, the program of the secondary school was complete. Philosophy and theology, which constituted something similar to graduate education, were taught irregularly due to limitations on their teaching imposed by the Polish authorities, and especially, as indicated by Sydorenko, the lack of qualified teachers. Only in the late 1680s did full philosophy and theology courses become permanent features of the KMA curriculum².

Each poetics teacher was expected to write his own manual (the same is true also for the subsequent classes). The structure of the poetics course might vary, but as a rule, it consisted of two parts: the first, usually called general poetics, provided information on the origin, the nature, the object, the function (utility and dignity) and the purpose of poetry, as well as the necessary teachings on prosody and metrics³. The so-called particular poetics, on the other hand, contained detailed information about single poetic genres of Latin poetry, namely epic poetry, tragedy, comedy, satire, epigrammatic poetry, lyric poetry, elegiac and bucolic poetry, and others. Epic poetry was given a preeminent place, and this was in line with the importance attributed to it in Western European literatures since the Middle Ages and until the late Baroque⁴. Poetics courses also generally provided a basic understanding of tropes, rhetorical figures and the first rudiments of rhetoric. Moreover, quite often they also included a chapter on *eruditiones*, which were deemed part of the *subsidia poetica*, and were a sort of encyclopedic exposition on Greek and Latin mythology from which the budding poet could and should draw material for comparisons, similes, metaphors, allegories and the like. Some manuals also featured an appendix entitled *Flores*, a sort of anthology of *apophthegmata* of Latin and Neo-Latin writers. The sections on metrics was hosted in the general poetics, although some manuals provided information on metrics both in the general poetics and when dealing with single poetic genres in the particular poetics (e.g. epic poetry and its meter, i.e. the hexameter, elegy and the pentameter to form the elegiac distich, lyric poetry and the different metrical systems it used, especially in the poetry of Horace and M. K. Sarbiewski, and so on). The composition of Latin poetry was a mandatory exercise for pupils studying poetics. Therefore, the teachers themselves provided poetic samples in different

² See Sydorenko 1977: 125-131; Charipova 2006: 55-56.

³ In the general poetics authors also dealt with the subject matter of poetry and its characteristics, such as *imitatio*, *inventio*, poetic language.

⁴ The expansion in Mohylanian poetics of the topic of epic poetry, to consider all activities involving the intellect as noble and as worthy of celebration as military feats on the battlefield, reflected the Renaissance approach to the *heroicum carmen*, which was called to go beyond the celebration of “*res gestae regumque ducumque et tristia bella*” (“the exploits of kings and captains and the sorrows of war”), as Horace had defined the topic of the heroic poem (*Ars poetica*, l. 73). All translations of quotations from Horace’s *Satires*, *Epistles* and *Ars poetica* are taken from Horace 1970. In the case of quotations cited with some modifications I modified the translation accordingly.

poetic genres that their pupils could take as models. However, it was only with the appearance of Teofan Prokopovyč's *De arte poetica libri III* (academic year 1705-1706) that poetical exercises were treated in detail in a separate section inserted in the manual⁵.

To date, the bulk of the surviving manuals of the Mohylian poetics (slightly more than 30, most of which in manuscript form)⁶ is housed in the Institute of Manuscript of the National Library of Ukraine in Kyiv⁷ (hereinafter NBU), and they are the subject of my analysis. Masljuk (1983) lists them at the end of the Bibliographical References, together with a few other manuscripts kept in the libraries of Moscow and L'viv⁸: some of the latter are related to the Mohylian Academy, others apparently are not⁹. The content, the sources and the aims of the Mohylian poetics have been reconstructed in their general outline in the works of a few Ukrainian, Russian and Polish scholars.

⁵ The importance of exercise in the learning process is stressed in the *Ratio studiorum* (1599), the study plan that regulated the pedagogic and didactic work of the Jesuits, on whose school system the curriculum of the KMA was modeled. The rhetorical and poetic exercises for the students, to which *Ratio studiorum* assigned great importance, included imitating certain passages by a poet or orator, inventing descriptions, transforming one kind of poem into another, composing epigrams, inscriptions and epitaphs, translating from Greek into Latin and vice-versa, paraphrasing poetical works into prose, applying rhetorical figures to a given subject (cf. Farrell 1970).

⁶ Only two manuals have been published so far, in fact *Liber artis poeticae*, published in 1981, was wrongly believed to be the first extant Mohylian poetics course (dating 1637): in reality, it had no relation whatsoever to the KMA (see footnote 39). The manuals published are: T. Prokopovyč's *De arte poetica libri III* (written in 1705; published in Mogilev in 1786, as well as in Prokopovič 1961); Mytrofan Dovhalevs'kyj's *Hortus poeticus* (written in 1736; published in 1973: see Dovhalevs'kyj 1973).

⁷ Instytut Rukopysu (IR), Nacional'na Biblioteka Ukraïny (NBU). For the complete list see numbers 1-33 in the *Bibliography*. Taking into account the fact that the extant Mohylian poetics do not cover all the years in which poetics courses were taught, other manuals of poetics pertaining to the KMA, unknown to us today, might be housed in libraries in Ukraine and Russia and might be rediscovered in the future.

⁸ See Masljuk 1983: 225-232.

⁹ Among the former, Masljuk (1983) lists the following: *Helicon Bivertex seu poesis bipartita solutae et ligatae orationis rudimentis instructa et studiosae iuventuti in Collegio Kiovo-Mohilaeano pro praxi et doctrina data... sub reverendo Parteno Rodowicz anno 1689* (Rossijskij Gosudarstvennyj Archiv Drevnich Aktov in Moscow (RGADA, formerly CGADA), f. 381, n. 1679; n. 300 in Masljuk); *Elementa latinae poeseos in usum eorum qui Musis operantur conscripta in Kijoviensi Academia Anno D. 1768 13 Februarii. Nicolaus Kuczynski* (L'viv, Naukova biblioteka L'vivs'koho Instytutu im. I. Franka, rukopys, n. 407 I; n. 333 in Masljuk). Among the manuscripts listed by Masljuk, whose relation to the Mohylian Academy I have been unable to ascertain are: *Institutio poëtica ad mentem hujus aevi inchoata Anno Domini 1678* (L'vivs'ka Naukova Biblioteka NAN Ukraïny im. V. Stefanyka, viddil rukopysiv, Archiv Vasylian n. 335, 216 f.; n. 297 in Masljuk); nn. 313, 318, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332 which constitute manuals of poetics taught in other schools in Russia. As regards manuscripts used by me that are copies of Mohylian poetics not held in the NBU, I list them in the *Bibliography* (I. Manuscript Sources).

The first description of the manuscripts of Mohylian poetics and rhetoric courses was made by Petrov (Petrov 1875, 1877, 1879; Petrov 1891, 1897, 1904). He also penned the first important study dedicated to Mohylian poetics (Petrov 1866, 1867, 1868). In it, on the basis of some poetics and rhetoric manuals (mainly from the eighteenth century), the scholar analyzes the conceptions of literary theory taught by Mohylian teachers, both concerning general poetics, and the different poetic genres – epic poetry, drama, lyric poetry (hymns and panegyric poems), elegy, epigram and others (that were treated in the particular or applied poetics). Petrov also aimed at drawing some parallels between the precepts given in the poetics manuals for different poetic genres (especially hymns and dramas) and existing literary works of those poetic genres in contemporary Ukrainian and especially Russian literatures. This topic has never been thoroughly investigated, and although the few studies that have incidentally touched upon it, in one way or another, have shown that such a link to a certain extent existed¹⁰, comprehensive inquiries devoted to a comparison between the theory of poetics and literary practice in contemporary Ukrainian literature are needed to substantiate a strict connection between the two¹¹. Petrov underlines the dependence of Mohylian poetics on Jesuit poetics manuals, especially *Poeticarum institutionum libri III* by Jacobus Pontanus (Jakob Spanmüller), and the manuals used in Polish Jesuit schools. The scholar widely illustrates how Polish and “Russian” versification was taught and indicates examples and exercises of Neo-Latin poetry especially by Jesuit authors¹². However, like most nineteenth and twentieth century scholars, Petrov prefers to quote verses in Church Slavonic as poetic examples. In the poetics manuals, however, which principally taught Latin versification, poems in Church Slavonic and Polish (in the second

¹⁰ Cf., among others, my monograph on the Neo-Latin poetry devoted to Joasaf Krokovs’kyj (Siedina 2012b).

¹¹ The correlation between the teachings of poetics and contemporary Ukrainian literature, in particular the influence of poetics manuals on the formation and development of the system of literary genres, has been broached in scholarly literature more than once. However, as far as I know, there is no comprehensive study based on a wide and diversified set of literary texts to demonstrate the dependence of the contemporary system of literary genres in Ukrainian literature on the genre system presented in the poetics; moreover, the latter does not comprehend or reflect all of Ukrainian poetry of the seventeenth-eighteenth century, as a brief survey of it shows (cf. also Hnatjuk 1994: 46 ff.). Furthermore, even when a poetic genre dealt with in the poetics existed in Ukrainian literature of the time, its practical realization did not always conform to the prescriptions given for that genre by the poetics. Therefore, as Hnatjuk asserts, much more should be done in the study of literary texts before one could state, as Nalyvajko does, that applied poetics “активно сприяла насадженню нової системи жанрів і стилів у східнословянських літературах” (“actively favored the implantation of a new system of genres and styles in East-Slavic literatures”), a system that is further on defined European (Nalyvajko 1981: 183) (cf. also Hnatjuk 1994: 48-49).

¹² Jacobus Bidermann, Bernardus Bauhusius; and among the Poles, Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski, Albert Ines, Andrzej Kanon.

half of seventeenth century almost exclusively in this latter language) were not very frequent.

In his study of the history of Ukrainian versification, V. Peretc analyzes a few Mohylianian poetics (Peretc 1900). The scholar stresses the fundamental role played by the Jesuit Polish-Latin manuals of the seventeenth century, to which he devotes a section in his monograph. Peretc describes some manuscripts from the libraries of Polish schools, and, comparing them with the Mohylianian poetics described by Petrov, reaches the conclusion that both Polish Jesuit and Mohylianian poetics are dominated by “the same orientation, the same thoughts. Even the definitions and modes of expression are at times without change”¹³.

Petrov’s and Peretc’s opinion on the lack of originality of the Mohylianian poetics and their total dependence on West European treatises is shared by V. Rjezanov (1931), whose main study concerning the Mohylianian poetics is dedicated to the theory of drama expounded in them (1925-1929). The scholar states that the theory of drama taught by Mohylianian teachers was based on Pontanus’s manual of poetics, and in some cases the authors also used the treatises by A. Donati¹⁴ and J. Masenius (Masen)¹⁵.

In his 1931 article (the second part of which investigates the influence of N. Boileau’s *Art poetique* on A. Sumarokov’s *Epistola o stichotvorstve*), the scholar, after briefly illustrating the content of the principal Western European poetics (the treatises by G. Vida, F. Robortello, G. C. Scaliger, Georg Fabricius, J. Pontanus, A. Donati, G. Jo. Vossius (Voss)¹⁶, J. Masenius) and some Polish Jesuit manuals, explains the reason for the development of Orthodox schools in Ukraine on the model of the Jesuit ones and the importance that the study of poetics and rhetoric had in the social-political conditions at the time. Because of the ‘derivative’ character of the KMA and other Ukrainian schools of the same type, Rjezanov concludes that the poetics manuals used at the KMA could not be the autonomous work of Mohylianian teachers, but depended heavily on their Western European and Polish sources. In order to prove this, Rjezanov compares the manual *Hortus poeticus* (1736)¹⁷, on the one hand with its local sources, mainly the manuals *Lyra variis praeceptorum chordis... instructa* (1696), *Parnassus* (1719-1720), and partly T. Prokopovyč’s *De arte poetica libri III* (1705-1706) and Lavrentij Horaka’s *Idea artis poeseos* (1707). On the other, the scholar shows how both Dovhalevs’kyj and the authors of the first two aforementioned manuals drew many of their ideas on poetry from their West European sources (Pontanus, Donati, Scaliger).

¹³ Peretc 1900: 58.

¹⁴ *Ars poetica sive Institutionum artis poeticae libri III*, Romae 1631.

¹⁵ *Palaestra eloquentiae ligatae*, Coloniae Agrippinae 1654.

¹⁶ *Poeticarum institutionum libri III*, Amstelodami 1647.

¹⁷ Mytrofan Dovhalevs’kyj, author of *Hortus poeticus...*, was the owner of both the manual *Lyra variis praeceptorum chordis... instructa* (1696; ms. 6.1) and *Parnassus...* (1719-1720; ms. 16.2), as is testified by the annotation “Ex Libris Hyeromonachi Mytrophanis Dowhalewski” on f. 2 v. of the former manual and on f. 2 r. of the latter.

On the other hand, the stated aim of the authors of the two main studies, specifically on Mohylian poetics in the second half of the twentieth century (i.e. H. Syvokin' and V. Masljuk), is to prove their originality. The underlying assumption is that the Mohylian poetics were treatises of literary theory that enjoyed an autonomous status, and that their authors had direct knowledge of Classical literary theories, which made the contribution of more contemporary authors superfluous.

In his study Syvokin' links the Mohylian poetics (in particular those from the seventeenth century), besides their Polish models, with the European tradition that starts with the treatises of Vida and Scaliger, and continues with the school manuals of Pontanus, Masenius, Donati, F. Strada, Vossius. The author's goal is to provide a systematic description of the content of seventeenth century Mohylian poetics (both in the general and in the particular or applied poetics) and to show the creative adaptation by Ukrainian teachers of their sources. Syvokin' illustrates how Mohylian poetics dealt with poetic creation, the nature and the purpose of poetry, its object, and its features such as *inventio*, imitation, poetic language, the different genres and species of poetry. The author devotes a chapter to the theory of Polish and Slavic versification, and indeed, the usefulness of Syvokin''s study lies mainly in this investigation, which also throws light on the fact that Mohylian teachers did to some extent regard their manuals as *sui generis* compendia of literary theory. However, some of Syvokin''s assertions seem somewhat ideologically biased and dictated by the desire to confute the notion of the scholastic character of the Mohylian poetics and to prove their originality with respect to their Jesuit sources. Among the assertions that would need further investigation are the supposed patriotic character of Mohylian poetics, allegedly proved by an epigram against Bohdan Chmel'nyc'kyj (in the manual *Cunae Bethleemicae*, ms. 3, f. 52 r.)¹⁸, and the stress on the merits of 'curious' Ukrainian poetry with respect to Western European and particularly French poetry.

As well as other works that touch upon Mohylian poetics, R. Łuzny, wrote a monograph (1966a) analyzing the reception of Polish literature in a good number of Mohylian poetics and rhetoric manuals. The author identified the origin of many Polish poetic examples provided in the manuals, the quotation of which testifies to the KMA teachers' good knowledge of Polish Renaissance and

¹⁸ The famous hetman of the Zaporozhian Host of the Crown of Poland in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth who headed an uprising against the Polish Crown and the nobility (1648-1654). The uprising developed into a war, and resulted in the creation of a Cossack state. In 1654 Chmel'nyc'kyj concluded the Treaty of Perejaslav, according to which Ukraine accepted the protectorate of the Russian tsar but maintained complete autonomy and obtained Russian military and political support against Poland. However, in time the result of the treaty differed from Chmel'nyc'kyj's intentions. The liberties that were allowed to him were denied to his successors. Ukraine was separated from formerly dominant Poland, Polonization of the upper class was replaced by systematic Russification and eventually Ukraine was completely incorporated into the Tsardom of Russia and later into the Russian Empire.

Baroque poetry. Łuzny also analyzed the Polish poetic creation of three writers linked with the KMA, Symeon Poloc'kyj, Lazar Baranovyč and T. Prokopovyč.

P. Lewin has dealt with the Mohylanian poetics in a series of articles and in her 1972 monograph, which sums up the results of her research on the poetics that were mainly taught at the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy of Moscow and in other Russian schools. Lewin provides the description of several poetics manuals used in Russian schools in the period 1722-1770s. As was to be expected, considering that, at least in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, most of the teaching staff of Russian schools of higher education were teachers or graduates of the KMA¹⁹, almost all poetics manuals analyzed by Lewin are related in one way or the other to the KMA (e.g. *Officina praestantissimae artis poeticae*, *Idea artis poeseos*). The scholar's goal was to investigate the appearance of the Classical aesthetic legacy, transformed by Western European Renaissance and Baroque, and assimilated by Russian culture through the Polish mediation. She reached the conclusion that the poetics manuals taught in Russian religious schools in the eighteenth century were based on the manuals of Ukrainian schools, particularly of the KMA, and through them on Polish ones. Thus, Polish (and Ukrainian) mediation played a significant role in forming the aesthetic consciousness of Russian 'consumers' and 'producers' of literature in the eighteenth century. In her 1974 article, Lewin illustrated a 1689 poetics manual belonging to the KMA, *Helicon Bivertex seu poesis bipartita solutae et ligatae orationis*, which she found in the RGADA in Moscow. By analyzing the treatment of different theoretical issues, among which an original classification of poetic genres²⁰ and the theory of drama, the scholar reached the conclusion that *Helicon Bivertex* is not a copy of previous manuals and that its author was very familiar with contemporary Polish poetry and culture.

V. Masljuk has written several studies on the Mohylanian poetics, the principal of which is his doctoral dissertation, subsequently published as a book (Masljuk 1983), to date the most comprehensive study of Ukrainian poetics manuals of the seventeenth-mid eighteenth century, while Masljuk's contribution to the study of rhetoric manuals is more limited. The author set himself a multifold task: on the one hand to illustrate the teaching of poetry (quantitative and syllabic versification systems, different literary genres) and of oratorical prose that the Mohylanian manuals provide, and their links with ancient (Classical) theory of artistic language. On the other, to investigate the influence of the Baroque style

¹⁹ Lewin states that from 1704 and up to the time of Metropolitan Platon (1775) the teachers of the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy of Moscow were mainly teachers and graduates of the Mohylanian Academy. The same can be said for schools in other Russian cities founded on the model of the KMA and Jesuit schools (for a brief list of a few of these teachers see Lewin 1972: 7-10). Indeed, the migration of teachers and scholars from the KMA to Moscow had begun at least three years earlier, as Josyp Turobojs'kyj, author of the poetics manual *Hymettus*, had been summoned to Moscow to teach in the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy already in April 1701 (see Siedina 2012b: 98).

²⁰ In this classification epic poetry is included in dramatic poetry (and thus poetry is divided into: epic or dramatic, elegiac and lyric).

on the literary theory expounded by Mohylian teachers in the aforementioned period. Masljuk highlighted the original adaptation of Western European treatises and manuals by Ukrainian teachers. This was done mainly by illustrating the authors' original treatment of individual theoretical questions (in particular T. Prokopovyč's), the theory of 'Ukrainian' syllabic verse²¹, as well as the original poetic creation of some of them (mainly in Church Slavonic or Ukrainian redaction). Masljuk's study certainly widens our knowledge of Mohylian poetics, also by providing samples from contemporary Ukrainian literature or from the poetics themselves of the literary genres dealt with in them. By doing so, the scholar shows therefore that Mohylian poetics and rhetoric manuals did not stand apart from the course of contemporary Ukrainian literature: however, the fact that he provides these samples mainly in Ukrainian translation (and only at times also in their Latin original) and the absence of any detailed analysis of the link between the prescriptions given in the poetics and their practical realization in the examples provided weaken his analysis, and do not throw sufficient light on the supposed influence of the literary theory expounded in the poetics on contemporary Ukrainian literary practice²². Moreover, also the undoubted links of the poetic works of Mohylian teachers with classical Latin and Neo-Latin literature (through the poetics of reminiscences) remain in the shade.

Other authors touch upon single aspects of the Mohylian poetics (for instance, Krekoten' studied the genre of the fable (1963); Muščak (1960) investigated the presence of Ovid's literary legacy in Prokopovyč's *De arte poetica*), or single manuals (Popov 1959, Łužny 1966b, Lewin 1974, Smirnov 1971), or their relationship with contemporary Ukrainian literature (Nalyvajko, Ivan'o): for a more detailed bibliography of the Mohylian poetics see Masljuk²³. Also worth mentioning, although the topic is not exactly within the main focus of our research, is O. Cyhanok's recent monograph (2014) on funerary literature, in which the scholar analyzes both theoretical teachings and their practical realization in the poetics. Similar studies are also needed for other literary genres in order to establish the correct picture of the relationship between theory and practice in early-modern Ukrainian literature.

The reception of Classical (Latin) literature has only been touched upon in some of the aforementioned works, although the need to study the link between Mohylian poetics and Horace's *Ars poetica* (hereinafter AP), already indicated

²¹ Masljuk stated that the first manual to contain an explanation, albeit brief, of Ukrainian syllabic verse, was *Hymettus* (315 Π / 1722, ms. 8). However, the dating 1718-1719, which he probably took from Łužny, is wrong. Indeed, I was the first to establish the correct dating of this manuscript, the year 1699, by reading the sentence at the end of f. 2 v., after the ode dedicated to the Virgin Mary: "Ad M: D: T: O: M: G: Bque: M: V: Sine: Labe: Ori: Conc: Honorem Initium Poeseos nostra esto. Anno 1699. Die 6 Octobris" ("To the great glory of the three times best and greatest God and of the Blessed Virgin Mary conceived without original sin, may the beginning of our poetry be. In the year 1699, the 6th of October").

²² Cf. footnote 11.

²³ Masljuk 1983: 9-24.

in Busch's 1964 monograph²⁴, has not yet been satisfied. The only study seemingly devoted to the reception of a few Classical (Latin) authors in the Kyivan poetics is Myroslav Trofymuk's dissertation (Trofymuk 1989a), and his few articles on quotations of Martial's and Virgil's works in some Mohylian poetics.

The ambitious task that Trofymuk set himself in his dissertation was to retrieve the quotations and/or the conceptions expressed by some Classical Greek and Latin writers²⁵, whose works the Ukrainian authors used in their manuals, as well as to investigate the ways and methods of their application in comparison with Western European poetics courses. However, Trofymuk analyzed only a few poetics, and mainly focused on the most famous among Ukrainian poetics, *De arte poetica libri III* by T. Prokopovyč.

Trofymuk started out with Horace (65 B.C.-8 B.C.), taking into account that his prescriptions in the *Epistle to the Pisons* (*Ars poetica*) were widely used to expound theoretical issues of general and applied poetics. The quotations from Horace were divided according to the function they performed in the poetics, i.e. 1. as prescriptions concerning literary theory and literary genres, and 2. as illustrations of lyric meters. Trofymuk's work, however, is severely flawed in many ways. First, the author took into account a very limited number of the poetics taught at the KMA²⁶; second, he did not investigate the existence of possible criteria of choice among quotations from Horace, for instance in the exemplification of lyric meters, and did not consider at all the role of M. K. Sarbiewski's poetic legacy in the reception of Horace, nor of his tract on poetics (*Praecepta poetica*)²⁷. Finally, by also dealing with Prokopovyč's manual of rhetoric, Trofymuk mixed planes, in that the teaching of poetics and rhetoric had a partly different content, although similar aims, and thus entailed a diverse use of classical literature and literary theory.

Unfortunately, in his recently published monograph (Trofymuk 2009), the chapter on the legacy of Horace as "the basis for developing a knowledge of literary theory in Ukraine" (pp. 98-123)²⁸, does not add much to the aforementioned chapter of his dissertation of twenty years earlier.

²⁴ Busch 1964: 18.

²⁵ He lists: Homer, Hesiodus, Plutarch, Ennius, Tibullus, Catullus, Horace, Virgil, Ovid, Martial, Seneca, Plautus and Terentius.

²⁶ As for the reception of Horace, besides Prokopovyč's tract on poetics, Trofymuk analyzed it only in the following manuals: *Liber artis poeticae* (1637), *Fons Castalius* (1685), *De arte rhetorica libri X* by Prokopovyč, *Hortus poeticus* by Mytrofan Dovhalevs'kyj. However, his exposition was mainly based on Prokopovyč's tract of poetics. Moreover, Trofymuk did not explain the criterion that guided his selection of the aforementioned manuals and the exclusion of all the others, which are the overwhelming majority of the extant manuals. Taking into account that *Liber artis poeticae* did not belong to the KMA (see footnote 6) Trofymuk's selection is even more meager.

²⁷ I will deal with M. K. Sarbiewski's role in the reception of Horace in the second and third chapters.

²⁸ Its full title reads: "Творча спадщина Горація – ґрунт для розвитку літературно-теоретичних знань в Україні" ("Horace's creative legacy: the basis for developing a knowledge of literary theory in Ukraine").

More recently, O. Cyhanok has written a brief article devoted to the reception of Horace in the Kyivan poetics (Cyhanok 2000). By analyzing six Mohylanian poetics²⁹ and two anthologies of quotations (the so-called *Florilegia*)³⁰, the author has tried to establish which of Horace's works were most popular among Mohylanian teachers of poetics, and why. Her conclusion that, in their choice of quotations from Horace, the authors of the poetics were guided mostly by ethical and moral principles, should come as no surprise to us, and it is directly linked to the type of instruction provided at the KMA.

Indeed, when approaching the theme of the reception of classical and Neo-Latin literature in the Mohylanian poetics, we should remember that the criterion that guided the educational curriculum of the KMA was the same as that of the Jesuit schools, that is the criterion of *pietas litterata* (learned piety), originally devised by Desiderius Erasmus as Natalia Pylypjuk has cogently pointed out (Pylypjuk 1989 and 1993). This concept had been framed as a compromise between Humanism and the Church, to structure pagan scholarship in order to conform it to the needs of a Christian society.

Therefore, in humanistic schools, and consequently at the KMA, the education provided was to be in the first place a moral instruction. This fact, in turn, entailed an accurate selection of the Classical texts to be read, as well as the allegorical interpretation, for instance, of pagan myths, in order to reconcile their authors with Christian doctrine. That is why, for instance, we will hardly find any love poems or more intimate lyrical expressions in the quotations of Classical authors. In the Mohylanian poetics, among which Prokopovyč's, we often find criticism of Classical authors (for instance Plautus, Catullus, Ovid, Martial) for their treatment of 'indecent' themes. Such a selective reception of Classical authors, however, is not exclusive to Orthodox schools, but informs Catholic and Protestant ones as well. Indeed, as stated, among others, by Budzyński, "... także w dziedzinie nauki i kultury, literatury i sztuki protestancki program totalnej chrystianizacji życia i wywyższenia 'sacrum' nad 'profanum' nie był bardziej liberalny niż system Kościoła katolickiego [...]. Wzrost motywów i tematów sakralnych w nauce, literaturze i sztuce, a w XVII wieku zanik procesów laickich występuje w nie mniejszej stopniu w państwach opanowanych przez protestantyzm niż w krajach podporządkowanych kontreformacji"³¹. Also Wa-

²⁹ *Liber artis poeticae* (1637, see footnote 6), *Rosa inter spinas* (1696), Prokopovyč's *De arte poetica libri III, Officina praestantissimae artis poeticae* (1726), *Via ingenuos poseos candidatos in bicollem Parnassum... ducens* (1729), and Dovhalevs'kyj's *Hortus poeticus* (1736).

³⁰ They are *Gemma* (appendix to *Hortus poeticus*), *Flores* (appendix to *Officina praestantissimae artis poeticae*).

³¹ "Also in the field of science and culture, literature and art, the Protestant program of total Christianization of life and of the raising of 'sacred' over 'profane' was not much more liberal than the system of the Catholic Church [...]. The growth of sacred motifs and themes in science, literature and art, and in the seventeenth century the disappearance of lay processes, takes place in no lesser measure in countries dominated by Protestantism than in countries subject to the Counter-Reformation" (Budzyński 1985: 135).

quet expounds on this topic and reaches similar conclusions³². As is well known, one of the manifestations of such a selective approach in the field of literature were the ‘*editiones castigatae-purgatae-castratae*’ of works by Horace and other authors, both in the Protestant and the Catholic world.

Therefore, since no detailed analysis of the reception of Horace’s oeuvre in the Mohylanian poetics has been made so far, my research aims to start filling this gap.

Indeed, the profound influence that the muse of Horace exerted upon modern European literatures is well known. The stylistic and metrical refinement of his *Odes*, the character of moral meditations of his *Satires* and *Epistles*, the wise balance of *ingenium* and *ars* in the literary precepts of his *Ars poetica*, and his message of inner freedom and simplicity of life are but a few of the aspects that have attracted generations of readers and writers up to the present day. Different epochs and reading communities have ‘framed’ their own peculiar image of Horace, and no ‘true’ or ‘real’ Horace has been established once and for all. From this point of view, on the one hand the study of Horace’s reception is important for investigating the state of the ‘receiving’ literature, in my case Ukrainian literature of the seventeenth to mid-eighteenth century. On the other, its interest resides in the analysis of the ways in which Horace’s poetic legacy stimulated and influenced original poetic creation. The reception of Horace in the Mohylanian poetics thus fits into the more general topic of the history of Neo-Latin poetry in Ukraine. As stated by D. L. Liburkin, “в каждой национальной литературе функция ее новолатинской ветви по отношению к новоязычной состояла прежде всего в творческой передаче античного художественного опыта; наиболее активно и долго (вплоть до XVIII в.) это делала книжная поэзия, в сфере которой, по словам М. Л. Гаспарова, ‘в первую очередь происходит взаимодействие и взаимооплодотворение разноязычных культур’”³³. While the Neo-Latin literature of Ukrainian lands that belonged to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth (that is of the so-called *kresy*), has been studied in some detail, that of the remaining areas of Ukraine, particularly in relation to the cultural activity carried out by the Kyiv Mohyla Academy, has remained largely unknown until recent times. My study thus aims at broadening our knowledge of the type of literary teaching at the KMA, as well as glimpsing into the role that the imitation and emulation of the ancients (*imitatio et aemulatio antiquorum*), prominent among them Horace, acted as a stimulus to the original poetic creation of Ukrainian men of letters.

In order to understand the reception of Horace, we also have to try to establish the character of the Mohylanian poetics. Were they tracts of literary theory

³² Waquet 2004: 58-62.

³³ “In every national literature the function of its Neo-Latin branch in relation to the literature in the new [national] language, consisted first of all in the creative transmission of the ancient (Classical) artistic experience; learned poetry did this for a longer time and more actively (up to the eighteenth century); in its sphere, according to Gasparov’s words ‘first of all takes place the interaction and the mutual fertilization of cultures of different languages’” (Liburkin 2000: 7).

that enjoyed an autonomous status, as they have been understood by some Ukrainian scholars (in particular Syvokin', Masljuk, Nalyvajko), or did they constitute the structural basis for the learning of Latin, as stated by N. Pylypjuk (1993)?

The answer is not so simple and straightforward. On the one hand, it is true that, as N. Pylypjuk states, the teaching of Latin was a fundamental goal of the Mohylian poetics. However, they were manuals of a poetic language that entailed the study and the assimilation of the system of genres mainly of Classical Latin poetry, revived by Renaissance poetics. Provided each manual contained a definite set of knowledge on Latin poetry, each author could dwell at various lengths upon different poetic genres and/or theoretical issues, depending on his tastes and orientations³⁴. Moreover, the fact that, just like Polish poetics manuals, the Mohylian poetics contained sections on Polish versification (and subsequently also on 'Slavic' versification) speaks in favor of the fact that their authors, at least partly, intended them as manuals of literary theory, both ancient and early-modern, designed to teach pupils how to compose poetry for every occasion, especially public ones³⁵. Further proof of this are the different kinds of poems composed by the authors of the poetics and inserted in their manuals as exemplifications of a particular rule, poetical genre, rhetorical figure, stylistic strategy or the like³⁶. Poetics teachers also willingly quoted the works of their predecessors if they deemed them particularly well written (as was the case, e.g., for a few poems and translations by Prokopovyč)³⁷.

This said, it seems nevertheless an overstatement to assert that the Mohylian poetics contributed to implanting a new system of genres and styles in East-Slavic literatures, as Nalyvajko does³⁸. Instead, what is needed is a comparative study of the theoretical model presented by the poetics with contemporary literary practice; the latter at times was reflected in the poetics, which suggests interaction between the two.

The study of the poetic creation of the authors of the manuals, especially their Neo-Latin poetry, which would contribute to a better understanding of the assimilation of literary genres and styles, has only recently taken its first steps forward. In this context, the investigation of the reception of Classical authors, mainly Horace, can start throwing new light on the whole process of the assimi-

³⁴ Even a cursory comparison of the particular poetics in the different manuals testifies to the diversified treatment of various poetic genres by the teachers of poetics.

³⁵ Indeed, some authors of poetics also quote works of contemporary poets as exemplifications of their own teachings and/or outstanding models of a particular genre (e.g. T. Prokopovyč, who extensively illustrates in his 1705 course Torquato Tasso's poem *La Gerusalemme Liberata – Jerusalem Delivered* in the Polish translation by P. Kochanowski: see Łużny 1966b).

³⁶ Cf. Łużny 1966b. Cf. also Siedina 2005; Siedina 2007a and 2007b; Siedina 2008; Siedina 2011; Siedina 2012a and 2012b.

³⁷ I refer to the Polish and Slavic translations of Ovid's *Elegy I, 7*, to Prokopovyč's poems *Laudatio Borysthenis*, *Elegia Alexii*, *Comparatio vitae monasticae cum civili*, *Epinikion*.

³⁸ Nalyvajko 1981: 183.

lation of Classical legacy, particularly through Neo-Latin poetry with its ‘poetics of reminiscences’.

My present study explores the key aspects of the reception of Horace’s literary legacy in those extant Mohylian poetics, written and used as manuals at the Kyiv Mohyla Academy between the seventeenth and mid-eighteenth century (the first manual of poetics available to us dates from 1671)³⁹, which are kept at the NBU⁴⁰. I will investigate the reception of Horace taking into account that since the Mohylian poetics were mainly didactic manuals rather than treatises of literary theory, greater emphasis was placed on their normative rather than on their cognitive-evaluative function.

Indeed, the conception of poetry presented in the Mohylian poetics was founded on an understanding of art as *téchnē*, governed by a set of rules, and in this sense opposite to nature, to natural talent. Thus, such a conception of poetry was above all that of *poesis artificialis*, that is poetry resulting principally from the theoretical knowledge of the rules that governed its creation (both regarding *fictio* and prosody). *Poesis naturalis*, that is poetry created without the participation of art, under the influence of inborn talent, was not rejected, but was given a lesser role.

Poesis artificialis could assume two hypostases: *poesis docens* and *poesis utens*⁴¹. The duty of the former was limited to explaining and teaching poetic rules. *Poesis utens*, on the other hand, incorporated rules in the poetic work itself, and therefore it constituted the quintessence of the ideal of poetry founded on art.

Besides talent and theoretical rules, Mohylian poetics list two other requirements for becoming poets, that is *exercitatio*, also called *labor* (i.e. acquiring the practical skill of applying the rules through exercises), and *imitatio*, in

³⁹ Unfortunately the manual under the title is *Liber artis poeticae* (1637), the original manuscript of which was found and published in Ukrainian translation by Krekoten’ in 1981 (cf. Krekoten’ 1981), did not belong to the Mohylian Academy. Indeed, as we read in *Encyklopedia wiedzy o jezuitach na ziemiach Polski i Litwy, 1564-1995* / Opracował Ludwik Grzebień SJ (Kraków 1966), its author, the panegyrist Jan Kołoszwarski, was teacher of poetics and rhetorics in the Jesuit school of Luc’k (and not Kyiv!) in the school year 1637-38. As regards the manual *Poeticarum institutionum breve compendium* (1671) its attribution to the KMA is not certain: the two main reasons for this are the conciseness of this manual, which is characteristic of poetics manuals used in Jesuit schools and untypical of poetics manuals used in Orthodox schools, and the absence in it of any apparent connection to the KMA (see Cyhanok 2014: 11-12).

⁴⁰ I could not access and analyze the single Mohylian poetics that are kept in other libraries (see footnotes 8 and 9 above): however, also taking into account their extremely limited number, I assume that their content would not change the findings of my present study. Indeed, the analysis of Parthenius Rodowicz’s *Helicon Bivertex* by P. Lewin bespeaks of a manual quite similar to the other Mohylian poetics for structure and content. The retrieval and study of the few extant Mohylian poetics not kept in the NBU and of poetics manuals at other schools in Ukraine in the same time span is a task for the future.

⁴¹ Cf. also Michałowska (1974: 33); Sarnowska-Temeriusz (1974: 80).

this context understood mainly as a literary method of carefully reading and recreating the work of authors taken as models.

The interest of the reception of Horace lies in the fact that his literary legacy lends itself not only to fulfilling the function of *poesis utens*, especially in lyric poetry (i.e. to play a meta-poetic role), as that of other Latin classics, each one in a particular poetic genre, but also that of *poesis docens*, in particular in the form of prescriptions drawn from his AP and his other literary works. Mohylian teachers, however, did not generally conceive their manuals on the model of AP, as poetry on poetry: this is what emerges from the extant Mohylian poetics (for the relevant list see the *Bibliography*). This fact seems to attest that the reception of AP had more a didactic than an aesthetic purpose.

Roughly speaking, the reception of Horace can be divided into three closely interconnected aspects: the first consists of theoretical recommendations useful to would-be poets; these are taken mainly from Horace's AP, used as *poesis docens*, and approximately follow the conceptual triad *poema – poesis – poeta*, which is ascribed to Neoptolemus of Parium, but since it was adopted by Horace, is commonly defined 'Horatian'. This first aspect of the reception of Horace is mainly found in the general poetics.

The second aspect consists of the use of Horace's poetry as a model of *usus verborum*, tropes, rhetorical figures, and metrical schemes, thus in the form of *poesis utens*: the discussion of these issues is normally part of the general poetics, although it may also be found in its applied part. As to the particular poetics, the presence of Horace is understandably prominent in the discussion of lyric poetry, and to a lesser degree in the form of prescriptions for other literary genres (epic, tragedy, comedy, satire). For this reason, in this analysis, I have left aside the function of Horace's prescriptions concerning these literary genres, which may be the object of a separate study⁴². Indeed, although Horace's AP also deals with the composition of epic and drama, he himself avoided these genres. As to satire, it is a genre that generally occupies a secondary place in the Mohylian poetics.

The final important aspect of the reception of Horace was how his works were imitated or how his words or dicta were borrowed in the composition of poetry, in which students were supposed to exercise as part of the poetics course: indeed, this was a necessary condition for learning Latin, and it was based on imitating poetical models that were deemed exemplary. In their turn, Mohylian teachers often composed their own Neo-Latin poetry and included it in their manuals, generally to illustrate theoretical issues that they dealt with in their courses.

In investigating the aforementioned aspects of the reception of Horace, whenever possible and useful I will take into account, on the one hand, the centuries-old Western European tradition of interpreting and commenting on

⁴² As even a brief overview of the chapters on epic poetry shows, in their treatment Mohylian poetics teachers mainly refer to Classical authors of epic poems, first of all Virgil, but also Lucan and Statius.

Horace and the treatises of poetics that were used by Mohylian teachers when writing their own manuals; on the other, the Polish mediation, in particular the role of Horace's brilliant 'interpreter' Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski (1595-1640), the so-called "Christian Horace". Sarbiewski's mediation is particularly important in the imitation of Horace by Mohylian teachers and students.

The reception of Horace is also set within the close parallelism between rhetorical and poetical theory on the one hand and the consideration of the art of poetry as an instrumental science that served the ends of moral philosophy on the other, both features that characterized Renaissance literary criticism and the Mohylian teachers' own views of poetry.

Thus, the organization into chapters will be thematic. CHAPTER 1 will investigate the reception of Horace's teaching on *poema – poesis – poeta* in the general poetics. CHAPTER 2 deals with the reception of Horace's poetry in the teaching of metrics: I will particularly dwell on the Alcaic and Sapphic metrical systems.

CHAPTER 3 analyzes the teaching of lyric poetry, and the legacy of Horace in specimens of Neo-Latin poetry composed by Mohylian poetics teachers and students.

I have opted for this thematic division rather than a chronological division of the Mohylian poetics according to the time of their composition (seventeenth or eighteenth century). Indeed, such a distinction would be in many ways unjustified, as testified, among others, by the fact that the first illustration of so-called 'Slavic' verse is already contained in manuals of the last decades of the seventeenth century, and that M. Dovhalevs'kyj, for instance, whose poetics manual dates 1736, used, among his sources, a manual of the previous century (*Lyra variis praeceptorum chordis... instructa*, 1696; see footnote 17).

In the CONCLUSION I will sum up the interpretation of my findings, in particular on the following issues: 1. Which aspects of Horace's 'literary-theoretic' and poetic legacy especially interested Mohylian teachers and why; 2. How the examined aspects of the reception of Horace correlate with the breadth and depth of the theoretical issues dealt with in the Mohylian poetics, and how they fit into the frame of an ecclesiastical institution such as the KMA; 3. How Horace's poetic legacy stimulates and is used in the original poetic creation of Ukrainian teachers of poetics, and how it is bent to serve the moral-didactic function that was assigned to poetry in the *curriculum studiorum* of the KMA.