

BIBLIOTECA DI STUDI SLAVISTICI

— 38 —

DIRETTORE RESPONSABILE

Laura Salmon (*Università di Genova*)

SEGRETERIA DI REDAZIONE

Maria Bidovec (*Università di Udine*)

REDAZIONE

Rosanna Benacchio (*Università di Padova*)
Maria Cristina Bragone (*Università di Pavia*)
Giuseppe Dell'Agata (*Università di Pisa*)
Claudia Olivieri (*Università di Catania*)
Francesca Romoli (*Università di Pisa*)
Laura Rossi (*Università di Milano*)

COMITATO SCIENTIFICO INTERNAZIONALE

Maria Di Salvo (*Università di Milano*)
Alexander Etkind (*European University Institute*)
Lazar Fleishman (*Stanford University*)
Marcello Garzaniti (*Università di Firenze*)
Lucyna Gebert (*Università di Roma "La Sapienza"*)
Harvey Goldblatt (*Yale University*)
Mark Lipoveckij (*University of Colorado-Boulder*)
Jordan Ljuckanov (*Balgarska Akademija na Naukite*)
Roland Marti (*Universität des Saarlandes*)
Michael Moser (*Universität Wien*)
Ivo Pospíšil (*Masarykova univerzita*)
Krassimir Stantchev (*Università Roma Tre*)

Giovanna Siedina

**Horace in the Kyiv Mohylian Poetics
(17th-First Half of the 18th Century)**

Poetic Theory, Metrics, Lyric Poetry

Firenze University Press
2017

Horace in the Kyiv Mohylian Poetics (17th-First Half of the 18th Century) : poetic Theory, Metrics, Lyric Poetry / Giovanna Siedina. – Firenze : Firenze University Press, 2017.

(Biblioteca di Studi slavistici ; 38)

<http://digital.casalini.it/9788864536606>

ISBN 978-88-6453-660-6 (online)

ISBN 978-88-6453-659-0 (print)

The series of publications known as Biblioteca di Studi Slavistici (<<http://www.fupress.com/COLLANE/biblioteca-distudi-slavistici/47>>), founded by the Italian Association of Slavists, works in synergy with the journal Studi Slavistici (<<http://fupress.com/riviste/studi-slavistici/17>>).

Editing and Graphic Design: Alberto Alberti.

This volume has been published with the contribution of Verona University's Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures.



Front Cover: Drawing by Sofia Gamba, freely inspired by the statue of Horace at Venosa and by the image of the Kyiv Brotherhood Monastery (Kyjevo-Brats'kyj Monastery).

Peer Review Process

All publications are submitted to an external refereeing process under the responsibility of the FUP Editorial Board and the Scientific Committees of the individual series. The works published in the FUP catalogue are evaluated and approved by the Editorial Board of the publishing house. For a more detailed description of the refereeing process we refer to the official documents published on the website and in the online catalogue of the FUP (www.fupress.com).

Firenze University Press Editorial Board

A. Dolfi (Editor-in-Chief), M. Boddi, A. Bucelli, R. Casalbuni, M. Garzaniti, M.C. Grisolia, P. Guarnieri, R. Lanfredini, A. Lenzi, P. Lo Nostro, G. Mari, A. Mariani, P.M. Mariano, S. Marinai, R. Minuti, P. Nanni, G. Nigro, A. Perulli, M.C. Torricelli.

This book is printed on acid-free paper

© 2017 Firenze University Press

Università degli Studi di Firenze
Firenze University Press
Via Cittadella, 7, 50144 Firenze, Italy
www.fupress.com

Printed in Italy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Introduction	7
Chapter 1.	Horace's Teaching on <i>Poema – Poesis – Poeta</i> in the General Poetics	23
Chapter 2.	The Reception of Horace's Poetry in the Teaching of Metrics	85
Chapter 3.	The Teaching of Lyric Poetry. The Legacy of Horace in the Neo-Latin Poetry of Mohylian Teachers and Students of Poetics	129
	Conclusions	185
	Bibliography	191

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 Ukrajinu (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 Kiowo-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 Ukrajinu 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. Łużny 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 on 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 Mohylian 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 Mohylian 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 Mohylian 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 Mohylian 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. Mohylanian teachers, however, did not generally conceive their manuals on the model of AP, as poetry on poetry: this is what emerges from the extant Mohylanian 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 Mohylanian 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, Mohylanian 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 Mohylanian 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.

Chapter 1. Horace's Teaching on *Poema* – *Poesis* – *Poeta* in the General Poetics*

1. The knowledge of the content, the structure, the goals of the Mohylian poetics that we have today, allows us to assert that they were primarily manuals of a poetic language, the teaching of which occupied the grade that preceded the two-years course of rhetorics. Their goal was to instruct pupils in Classical (Latin) language and versification and to teach them the basic rules for composing poetry for every public occasion. Inasmuch as their use was limited to the school, these manuals were scholastic poetics¹. The closest models of the Mohylian poetics can be taken to be the manuals of poetics used in the Jesuit schools, both in Western Europe and in Poland, a typical example of which is J. Pontanus's *Poeticarum institutionum libri III*². They adapted for the school use the acquisitions of Renaissance treatises on poetry and reduced them to precepts for composing poetry for every occasion and for each genre in particular, that were ready to be used by would-be poets. Chronologically, the Mohylian poetics are a late phenomenon, and by and large they display what we could call a syncretic character, i.e. the conflation of different streams of thought and attitudes toward the art of the word (rhetoric and poetics), particularly Platonic,

* Every quotation from the poetics cited in this and the following chapters is accompanied by an indication of the manuscript in which it is found, along with the relative folium; where the same quotation is provided by several manuscripts, however, the folium number has been omitted so as not to overburden the reader. The manuscript numbers refer to the list provided in the *Bibliography*.

¹ Therefore, as N. Pylypjuk has argued, it is useless to try to show that their authors were guided, for instance, by different principles from those of Western European and Polish authors of poetics, or to try to confute their 'scholasticism'. The Mohylian poetics can be called 'scholastic' inasmuch as they were conceived and used as school manuals. Indeed, the term is used many times in the poetics themselves with reference to their school use (cf. for instance *Idea artis poeseos* (ms. 13.2, f. 63 v.), in which the author calls "scholastica expositio" ("scholastic exposition") his own short poem based on Horace's fable on the fox and the weasel in *Epist.* I, 7, 29-33).

² For a detailed overview of the manuals of poetics used in Polish schools in the period see Sarnowska-Temeriusz, 1974, in particular pp. 55-73. Pontanus's poetics treatise with all evidence was the "book of poetics" indicated by Charipova (2006: 78) among the books in the second catalogue of purchases made by Petro Mohyla in Cracow in 1633.

Aristotelian and Horatian ideas, mainly received through the interpretation of their Renaissance commentators. This syncretic character is at least partly ascribable to their practical or applied function (i.e. to their didactic purpose), that prompted their authors to draw from different sources what they deemed best answered their particular needs.

In order to better understand both the character of the Mohylanian poetics and their reception of Horace, it is important to recall the main conceptions on poetry and oratory as they had been elaborated by the Italian Renaissance, since they have a direct import on the topic I am going to deal with. After that I will proceed to give a synthetic description of the surviving manuscripts of the Mohylanian poetics.

1.2. As I said in the Introduction, and as it is stated by Weinberg, Renaissance theorists and critics were inclined to consider poetry in two main ways: on one side, as close to rhetoric, and thus sharing many of its features, in the first place the role of the audience as the receiver of the poetical compositions; on the other, as a science serving the ends of moral philosophy, that could contribute to the moral instruction of good men and citizens.

Rhetoric in the Renaissance had assumed a variety of meanings, and it constituted a fusion of different arts and sciences, in origin different among themselves, but now reduced to one. In the *Nota Critica* to the first volume of his 1970 edition of the Cinquecento treatises of poetics and rhetoric, Weinberg³ provides a useful overview of the main concepts pertaining to rhetoric and poetry as they were understood in the sixteenth century. Literary criticism in the Italian Renaissance, and thus the principal conceptions on poetry current at the time, are illustrated by him in great detail in volume one of his 1961 edition. Therefore, in order to summarize the theoretical background on the art of the word (both poetry and prose), on which Mohylanian teachers based their teachings, in the next few pages I will make ample use of Weinberg's scholarly output.

Starting in antiquity and continuing through the Middle Ages, several nuances to rhetoric had accrued, depending on the aspect that was given prominence: thus, among the many nuances of rhetoric, Weinberg distinguishes four main aspects of it, that among other display a more or less marked stress on and a different interplay between *res* and *verba*, i.e. the subject matter and the linguistic means by which it was expressed. In the first place stood rhetoric as the simple art of the word, that was primarily concerned with listing and classifying tropes and figures: this type lay a particular stress on *verba*, while their link with *res* was almost absent. On the contrary, in the conception of rhetoric as a theory of styles, each style was devised to coherently express a specific subject matter: within this second understanding, Weinberg distinguishes two main types of theories: the "Ciceronian" theory of the three main styles or figures, that prevailed in the Renaissance, and Hermogenes's theory of "ideas" or modes of

³ Cf. Weinberg 1970: 546-548.

expression. In the first type, the style (expressed by *verba*) is dictated by the *res*, that is by the character of the subject matter, and it can thus be high or sublime, average or middle, and low or humble. The second type acknowledges manifold modes of expression, that in Hermogenes were the seven ideas (in Aristides the ten modes of expression), i.e. clarity, magnitude, beauty, vigor, character, truth and strength. Each of these styles can be employed, by itself or in conjunction with others, in order to treat any subject matter. Therefore, in this second theory, the styles are not so tightly linked with the subject matter, the main aim being to produce a specific effect on the audience.

In the third place rhetoric was conceived as the art of composing a speech so as to reach the goals of the three rhetorical genres, the demonstrative, the deliberative and the judicial (as it had been asserted by Cicero, who founded and gave the most authoritative formulation of Roman rhetorical tradition). In this kind of rhetoric the process of composition was made of three steps: *inventio*, that had to discover the arguments or matters useful for the specific case, *dispositio*, that determined the order of their presentation, and *elocutio*, that took care of matching words to subject matters. As Weinberg observes, it seems quite obvious that this theory was easily assimilable to that which opposed *res* and *verba*. If one separates the triad subject matter-order-words (*inventio, dispositio, elocutio*) from the notion of the rhetorical 'case' and of the 'speech' that was composed in order to treat it, it remains a sort of formula that can be applied to all compositions which use the means of language. The application of the Ciceronian rhetorical categories of subject matter-order-words to any literary composition is a legacy of the Middle Ages inherited by the Renaissance, when it became the fundamental instrument for discussions on poetics. The first treatises on poetics in France and in Italy adopted the Ciceronian distinction as the central scheme for the organization of their content. Michałowska, in her 1974 study on the theory of literary genres in early-modern Polish poetics (second half of the seventeenth-first half of the eighteenth century), among the systematization schemes adopted in Polish poetics to arrange their content, lists what she calls the "rhetorical" scheme, i.e. an arrangement of the theoretical material based on the fundamental concepts of rhetoric, that is *inventio, dispositio, elocutio*. An echo of this scheme, however rare among Polish poetics of the mentioned period, is found also in the Mohylian poetics: indeed, in most of them, the triad subject matter-order-words occupies a central place in their exposition on how to compose poetry.

Finally, with the discovery, at the beginning of the Renaissance, of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, the whole discipline was enriched by a new conception and a new orientation. For Aristotle rhetoric must be the art of finding the sources of persuasion for any subject matter, and they belong to three main categories: the character of the public, to which the speech must adapt in order to attain persuasion, the character of the orator, who must appear so as to convince the public that he is a good man and what he says is worthy of trust; and the whole of the subject matters, also conceived so as to persuade the public. Thus, rather than on *dispositio* and *elocutio*, the main stress in this theory is on the ethical, pathetic

and logical grounds of the orator's speech. The Aristotelian theory of rhetoric did not substitute centuries-long traditions, but in certain cases it added to them a different way of considering rhetoric, and it greatly enriched the discussion on poetics, this way also favoring an even greater confusion between the two arts.

As Weinberg states, in the Italian Cinquecento the truly new art of the century was poetic art, which was called to found a new literature and bring it to excellence. All other arts – aesthetics, linguistics, stylistics, rhetoric – concurred to the foundation of a new art of poetry that would break with the past. The intellectual development and the philosophical attitude of the poet or the critic, his peculiar interest in specific literary genres and ancient literary texts and authors in which he found his solutions, all this produced personal and original results. In Italy, in particular, because of the multiplication of genres and the addition of ancient genres to those that remained from the Middle Ages, and at times because of the mixing of ancient and recent forms, the problem of genres came to the center of the literary discussion. Weinberg divides treatises on poetics into three main categories: 1. the real “poetic arts”, that dealt both with poetry in general and with the poet and his qualities; 2. the discussion on single poetic genres or on peculiar issues of one of them; 3. the investigation of a peculiar rhetorical figure, as allegory or *prosopopoeia*⁴.

In spite of different focuses, all authors dealing with poetry had to face a few fundamental issues concerning it, in the first place its end, its goal. One of the main ends that were assigned to poetry in the sixteenth century was the ethical and the political one. Indeed, numerous authors considered poetics as a part of moral philosophy, that aimed both at serving the political needs of the state and at improving the character and the moral condition of the citizens. This attitude toward the arts, the result of a long medieval tradition, was reinforced by the reading of Plato's *Republic* and later on of certain passages of Aristotle's *Politics*. According to this thesis, the whole poetical composition as well as each of its parts, were an instrument to teach, to demonstrate, to impose the conclusions of moral philosophy. Thus, in the field of ethics, the fable of a tragedy could show the public the punishment that awaits those who commit serious crimes; the fable of a comedy could illustrate how are ridiculed those who obstacle the love of young people or those who, believing themselves sly, at last reveal themselves rather stupid. The reader could derive moral lessons also from the character of the personages: examples of virtue to be imitated from the hero of an epic poem; examples of vices to escape from the negative character of a satire. As for politics, poetry offered the possibility to interpret and judge. The citizen of a democracy, for instance, by being exposed to the sight of an evil tyrant could appreciate the advantages of the form of government under which he lived even better. In another instance, the subject of a good king, by seeing the actions of a less good king, could draw his conclusions on the relation between

⁴ Weinberg adds a fourth typology, represented by the analysis of the relations between poetry and politics (particularly in the treatises of Giason Denores) (cf. Weinberg 1961: 26-28).

the good or bad character of a king and the happy or unhappy destiny of his subjects. Such a conception of the ethical-political-moral end of poetry submitted this art to other philosophical disciplines, and thus both the principles for the composition of poetry and the criteria of its excellence depended upon the tenets of these disciplines, i.e. were external to poetry. Therefore, for instance, a poem would be considered good if its moral conclusion was presented in a clear and convincing manner, and if the latter corresponded to the expectations of the philosophy (or the society) that had inspired its creation. A fable that had to prove something, was forced to present the episodes in the order requested by the demonstration; a character that had to exemplify certain vices or virtues, had to be constituted with the features that were necessary for the attainment of this goal.

In a poetry so conceived, therefore, it is the audience, its need for a moral lesson and its capacity to take advantage of it that suggest the artistic means to be used. Since the moment in which theorists begin to study and take the audience into consideration, poetics comes into tight contact with rhetoric. The whole relationship between reader and 'poem' (and maybe also poet) becomes a rhetorical relationship, because the considerations of the audience on the character have an impact on the way of making poetry, just as the moral ends influence the nature of the fable, the *ethos* of the characters and the sentences. Among the ends proposed by Cicero, that of *docere* passes into the field of poetics and informs all aspects of the composition, as well as the poet's way of operating.

A second end proposed for poetry, which also belonged to the aspect of *docere*, was to instruct, i.e. to present the reader with a work containing data, facts and events that enrich his general knowledge. Just like history, poetry contains experiences, observations, examples in a greater number than one can find in human life. Many theorists, therefore, liken poetry to history: both narrate past actions with words (real or feigned/fictive), both are required to narrate in a verisimilar way. Narrative poetry and history also share a common goal, that is to instruct the reader in the comprehension of human life, and of the causes and effects that make it understandable. Although the end of *docere* is also included in this theory, the main goal of poetry-history is to inform, to teach, and thus the attainment of moral lessons from this information is a secondary, not a primary effect of poetry.

The third end of poetry in the sixteenth century, *movere*, takes us into the domain of rhetoric. In this field, the end of *movere* was the third of the Ciceronian triad, and it was directed to move the passions of the audience in order to persuade, convince, win it over. For theorists of poetry, to transfer the end of *movere* to poetry was extremely easy. It was enough to individuate the points of contact between rhetoric and poetics: the existence in poetry of the 'character', the *ethos*, that was equalled (even if ambiguously) to the character of the orator and of the audience in rhetoric; the presence in both of them, as it results from Aristotle's *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*, of the same passions; the fact that, according to some theories on poetry, the poetic effect was an effect upon passions. However, there were a few contradictions. Plato, in his *Republic*, had condemned poetry exactly because it moved the passions, and that effect was contrary to

the desired ends for the education of the future rulers of the republic. Aristotle, speaking of tragedy, had assigned it the effect of purgation of the emotions of pity and fear; and the defenders of poetry against Plato insisted on the fact that “purgation” was a useful form of *movere*, that could justify not only tragedy, but all poetic genres.

For what concerns the fourth end, that is the third in the Ciceronian triad, it is the end of *delectare*. This end was addressed to the audience’s artistic and literary sensibility, because it consisted in the pleasure of hearing beautiful words in a beautiful rhythm and in a beautiful music, that were ordered to produce a coherent and unitary style. Therefore, this end could be achieved independently of the subject matter of the speech. Some of these ideas passed into the poetic theory of *delectare*, where they were modified under the influence of the Horatian ideas on the ends of poetry.

2. Of all theoretical treatises on the art of poetry in Classical antiquity, Horace’s AP was the only one to circulate and be read in the Middle Ages and to occupy a dominant position during the Humanistic period and the Renaissance both in the formation of literary criticism and in the creation of new doctrines⁵. From the classical period two glosses survive, which constitute the point of departure of the analysis of the reception of the AP: one by Porphyrius and the other by pseudo-Acron. As Hardison has pointed out, while no manuscripts or commentaries on the AP from the fifth to the eighth century are extant, the subsequent Carolingian period witnessed a revived interest in the AP. Two of the most interesting works of this period are: *Scholia Vindobonensia ad Horatii Artem Poeticam* and the so-called *Materia* commentary, published and critically edited by Karsten Friis-Jensen. As the Danish scholar asserts, the *Materia* commentary “systematizes the rhetorical interpretations of the work found in earlier commentaries, from Acro to the twelfth century. Its most characteristic features are a list of six main poetic vices and virtues, and a determination to identify and label the doctrine of decorum in Horace’s work, not with the term *decorum*, but with the term propriety, *proprietas*”⁶.

Among the works influenced by the AP that appeared in the twelfth-thirteenth century one of the most interesting is *Poetria Nova* by Geoffrey of Vinsauf (ca. 1200), which was written in verse like the AP, but exceeded it in length by ca. 1500 lines. Other subsequent tracts on the art of poetry strongly influenced by Horace’s AP are Matthew of Vendôme’s *Ars Versificatoria* and John of Garland’s *Parisiana poetria* (cf. Friis-Jensen 1990). Friis-Jensen’s studies fill the gap that in Weinberg’s essay exists between the late classical commentaries of Porphyrius and pseudo-Acron, and the fifteenth century, that is the commentaries by Cristoforo Landino (Christoforus Landinus, 1482) and the one by Io-

⁵ For a survey of the reception of Horace’s AP starting from the late Classical period, see Golden 2010.

⁶ Friis-Jensen 1995a: 232.

docus Badius Ascensius (Joss Bade, 1500)⁷. Weinberg posits that what he calls the penchant of Renaissance literary theorists and critics for considering poetry within rhetorical categories, harks back to the two above mentioned commentaries as well as to the two late-classical grammarians Donatus and Diomedes. Friis-Jensen, however, demonstrates that there exists a continuity in the commentary tradition on the AP, and that Renaissance commentators very probably knew their medieval 'predecessors' and further pursued their 'rhetorical' approach. Therefore, as she says, "in this case, as in others, the transition from medieval scholarship to Renaissance humanism probably took the form of development rather than break"⁸.

And thus, in their penchant for considering poetry within rhetorical categories, and also as an instrumental science that served the ends of moral philosophy, Renaissance literary theorists and critics developed the ideas of their medieval predecessors. That explains why Horace's AP was so congenial to them. In fact, although the AP deals mainly with tragedy, thus adhering to Augustus' program of revaluation of dramatic poetry, the underlying idea, applicable to any work of art, is the need for the artist to conform to the expectations of the audience in all aspects of the poem: the guiding principle in order to do this is that of *decorum*. The rhetorical categories in Horace's AP, in the first place the separation of subject matter and style (with brief observations on *ordo* – arrangement), were the basis for its reception and analysis starting in late antiquity. Let us briefly recall the most relevant information on the AP and its interpretation.

2.1. Horace's AP (original title *Epistle to the Pisos*) has puzzled generations of critics for its being at once both a work of poetry (a verse epistle using a seemingly conversational tone, as a *sermo*), and a kind of literary treatise, as well as for its apparent lack of formal organization, and also for the fact that it deals with composition of epic and drama, genres which Horace himself avoided. The discussion on how the AP, that at first appears to possess no coherent or no clearly structured sequence of thought, should be divided into its component parts, is still ongoing. Modern interpretations of the AP have been expounded in detail by Brink. Following him, I will dwell here only on a few moments of it.

The appearance of E. Norden's study in 1905⁹ marked the beginning of an important stage in the analytical study of the AP, since the scholar pointed to the importance of taking into account the rhetorical tradition. Norden observed, as other scholars before him had done, a clear division of the AP into two parts (ll. 1-294 and ll. 295-476), of which the first provides technical rules concerning the writing of poetry and the second deals with the personality of the poet as the creator of a work of poetry. He linked this division into *ars* and *artifex* to

⁷ Cf. Weinberg 1961: 79-85; Moss 2008a: 66-69.

⁸ Friis-Jensen 1995a: 232.

⁹ See Norden 1905.

the traditional structure of ellenistic technical treatises¹⁰. Besides that, Norden individuated in what he thought was the first section the rhetorical distinction, “the sequence of content – arrangement – style, *inventio* – *ordo* – *elocutio*”¹¹.

In 1908 Christian Jensen started to analyze the fragments by Neoptolemus of Parium cited by Philodemus of Gadara in the parts of his treatise *Peri poiēmatōn* found among the papyri retrieved at Herculaneum¹², and thus he drew attention to Greek literary criticism. Philodemus stated that Neoptolemus displayed a tripartite division of the art of poetry, into *poema* (*poiēma*), *poesis* (*poiēsis*), and *poeta* (*poiētēs*). According to Ch. Jensen, the first critic to read and decipher the papyri, by these terms Neoptolemus indicated respectively the style, the content of poetry, and general questions of poetic/literary criticism. Therefore, Jensen and other critics after him have proposed different divisions of Horace’s treatise into sections, that attempted to reconcile Norden’s bipartite structure (*ars-artifex*), with Neoptolemus’ tripartite (or quadripartite) schema¹³. The different hypotheses and theories put forward by the specialists (among which the more probable order *poema* – *poesis* – *poeta* in Horace’s AP) have been illustrated and summarized by Brink¹⁴. The latter has also analyzed in detail the relations of Horace’s AP with both Neoptolemus’ treatise and Aristotle’s *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*.

Brink (1963) says that the AP is organized into a threefold or fourfold scheme, in which the different sections are linked by a few lines that may pertain both to the preceding and the subsequent section. Thus, as he argues, the first, technical part of the AP is exposed according to the sequence *ordo-facundia-res*, that is arrangement, style and content. Horace himself puts together *ordo* and *facundia* in line 41: “*nec facundia deseret hunc, nec lucidus ordo*” (“neither speech will fail him, nor clearness of order”). However, the space dedicated to arrangement consists of only three lines (42-44), which, as Brink avers, induces to speak of a twofold division into style and content.

Thus, the scholar individuates an introductory section (ll. 1-37) in which Horace argues the importance of unity and wholeness of poetic conception, that embrace subject matter, arrangement and style, and thus apply to the rest of the poem. It then follows the first part, that deals with order and style (ll. 40-118): here Horace invites the writer to chose a topic that is commensurate with his possibilities, that will allow him to be successful both in style and in arrange-

¹⁰ The latter constituted a literary genre in different disciplines (such as medicine, law, philosophy and above all rhetoric, also Roman, such as Cicero’s *Partitiones oratoriae* and Quintilian’s *Institutio oratoria*), which implied a first part dealing with the abstract features of the art, and then a second illustrating its realization.

¹¹ Brink 1963: 24.

¹² I will recall the gloss by Porphyryon to the line 1 of Horace’s AP: “*In quem librum congegessit praecepta Neoptolemi τοῦ Παριανοῦ de arte poetica, non quidem omnia, sed eminentissima*” (“In which book he gathered the precepts on Neoptolemus of Parium on poetic art, however not all of them, but only the most eminent”).

¹³ Cf. Brink 1963: 31.

¹⁴ Cf. the second chapter of Brink 1971.

ment (ll. 40-41). Lines 42-44 discuss the virtues of a good arrangement (*ordo*), and the rest of this section is dedicated to style (*facundia*). The subsequent part of this section is thus subdivided by Brink: ll. 45-72 are devoted to words, first as combined in a sentence, then to their choice. The combination of words in poetry equals metrical form, and thus Horace, in ll. 73-85 talks about meters, their creators and the topics apt to each one of them. Lines 86-98 are devoted to style according to the different genres, particularly comedy and tragedy, and different personages in them; ll. 99-113 argue the importance to adapt style to the emotions and the situations that are portrayed, and ll. 114-118 to age, sex, social condition, and ethnic origin. The section that goes from 119 to 294, with a possible division at line 153 deals with the choice of subject matter. Line 153 – “tu quid ego et populus mecum desideret audi” – seems to mark a break. However, as Brink has observed, the fact that both sections from l. 119 to l. 152 and lines 153-178 deal with subject matter speaks in favor of the absence of a major break. In lines 119-152 the content of epic or drama is discussed, and some precepts are given on the characters and the construction of a plot. This topic is continued in lines 153-178, which provide the would-be writer with some precepts on how to keep the audience's attention: the underlying principle here is one of coherence in the representation of characters of different ages and different temperament (disposition). Lines 179-274 deal with drama, mainly tragic, and here is inserted a section on meter, ll. 251-274; within this portion, and thus within the discussion of drama, two passages specifically address the issue of style. The first, lines 217-219, deals with the stylistic changes in the language of the chorus of drama, its acquisition of a daring tone (“*facundia praepes*” – “heady eloquence”) as a consequence of the change of tone of the musical accompaniment. The second, lines 234-250, discusses style within the context of satiric drama, together with other characteristics of that type of drama.

Lines 275-294 contain a comparison of Greek and Roman drama, in which Horace traces the Greek derivation of Roman dramatic genres and illustrates their innovation, insisting on the importance of *labor limae*, close to that of artistic discipline, a concept that underlies in different guises the whole poem, and is particularly treated in its last part.

The section that goes from 295 to the end (l. 476) is considered by all critics the last part of the poem, and is by Brink comprised under the heading “The Poet”. In it Horace undertakes the task of showing what makes a good poet and what does not. This offers him a chance to ridicule the would-be talented poets of his age. Lines 295-305 constitute a gliding passage to the new section and they contain an ironic antithesis between the Democritean concept of *ingenium* and that of *ars*. The antithesis is fleshed out in the image of the supposedly inspired poets, who display a foolish behavior and do not take care of their external appearance, and those like Horace himself, who, not being able to renounce purging in the Spring, ironically declines the title of poet. Horace therefore compares his role to that of a whetstone, that is not able to cut, but can sharpen; in the same way, pretending he cannot write poetry himself, he will commit himself to improving poetic ability in others.

And thus, says Horace in lines 306-308, he will teach the poet's job and profession, where to acquire the means to compose poetry, what nurtures and forms a poet, what is appropriate in poetry and what is not, and finally where poetic *virtus* leads and where *error*. These teachings are then developed in the last part of the poem (ll. 347-476).

2.2. Since the AP was the most authoritative as well as the most comprehensive text on poetic theory available to the humanists searching for an ancient prototype on poetics, during the fifteenth and especially the sixteenth century it was the object of a good number of commentaries, which often became sort of repositories of all knowledge on poetic art. As we have seen, the AP entered modern age furnished with two explanatory commentaries (or rather glosses) from the late classical period, those by pseudo-Acron and by Porphyrius, as well as with commentaries from the Middle Ages, the already mentioned *Scholia Vindobonensia ad Horatii Artem Poeticam* and especially the *Materia* commentary¹⁵. As Friis-Jensen cogently demonstrated, the *Materia* commentary has influenced both the mentioned treatises on poetry by Matthew of Vendôme and by John of Garland and Geoffrey of Vinsauf's *Documentum de modo et arte dictandi et versificandi*, a treatise on the same material as the *Poetria nova*. I already mentioned the pervasive feature of *proprietas* (that is *decorum*) concerning subject matter, style and characterization, that informs the *Materia* commentary. Besides it, the other most characteristic trait of the *Materia* commentary is its doctrine of the six vices and the corresponding virtues of poetry. They are¹⁶: 1. *partium incongrua positio* (incongruous arrangement of parts), 2. *incongrua orationis digressio* (incongruous digression in speech), 3. *brevitas obscura/incongrua* (obscure or incongruous brevity), 4. *incongrua styli mutatio* (incongruous change of style), 5. *incongrua materie variatio* (incongruous change in subject matter), 6. *incongrua operis imperfectio* (incongruous imperfection of a work). Except for the fourth fault, all of them have corresponding virtues, which can be obtained by substituting the adjective *incongrua* with *congrua*. As we will see, some of these vices and virtues, although with a different wording, will be similarly illustrated by Mohylanian teachers with the aid of Horace.

As I already said, Renaissance commentators, starting with the first two commentaries of the modern age, that by Christoforus Landinus and the one by Iodocus Badius Ascensius further pursued the trend of reducing the AP to a series of useful precepts for composing poetry, and thus a prescriptive reading of Horace's treatment of the poetic art. As stated by Weinberg, Renaissance com-

¹⁵ The greater influence of this commentary compared to the *Scholia Vindobonensia* is shown by the fact that in 1995 (at the time Friis-Jensen published her essay, 1995b) about twenty manuscripts of it were known, while only one of the *Scholia* was extant.

¹⁶ Cf. Friis-Jensen 1995b: 367.

mentators were to follow constantly the precedent of reducing the text of the AP to a set of fixed rules for the writing of poetry, and this trend is reflected in the Mohylanian poetics as well.

Another fundamental feature of the humanist reception of the AP, which also harks back to its earliest commentaries, was the bearing out of its rhetorical character, not only by spelling out parallels between poetic composition and rhetorical technique, but also by calling upon the authority of the chief Latin rhetoricians, Quintilian and Cicero. And thus, the fact that the AP was received as a paradigm of an essentially rhetorical approach to poetry at times also favored a certain difficulty in distinguishing a text that derived primarily from Horace from one that departed from Cicero and Quintilian and adapted their teachings to the art of poetry. Moreover, in the reception of the AP were often brought in the teachings of the fourth century grammarians Donatus, Diomedes, and Priscian (fifth century), who had served as the standard references about poetry and poetic genres throughout the Middle Ages. As the analyses by Weinberg and Moss indicate, Horace's AP becomes the channel by which commentators incorporate all useful ideas and views on poetic art available up to about 1530, and thus it is not merely "a theory of poetry, but the theory of poetry. [...] Text and commentaries, taken together as they always were, provided the Cinquecento reader an initiation to poetics"¹⁷.

The period from the early 1540s to the middle of the 1550s saw the appearance of a series of commentaries aimed at linking the AP with Aristotle's *Poetics*. The indubitably Aristotelian background of Horace's AP prompted literary critics of the Renaissance and subsequent epochs to juxtapose Horace's and Aristotle's theories. This often caused an interpretation of Horace through the prism of Aristotle's *Poetics*, and thus an obfuscation of his thought, primarily in those cases when Horace and Aristotle were made to express the same concepts. This concerned in particular such topics as nature and art, poetic imitation, the function of poetry, epic poetry and tragedy, and the dramatic rules. Especially the first three topics were at the basis of any treatise on poetry, and constituted the kernel of the general poetics in the Mohylanian classes on this subject. Next to Aristotle, Plato, Cicero and Quintilian were also often drawn into the discussion of specific issues concerning these themes, as sometimes were the fourth century grammarians Donatus and Diomedes.

It is not surprising therefore to meet in a single text, for instance, next to the Platonic concept of the poet as someone inspired by a divine fury (*furor divinus*), the statement that poetry is mainly the fruit of *ars, téchnē*. Or the treatment of poetry in terms of the rhetorical categories of *inventio, dispositio, elocutio*, as well as its subdivision into the traditionally rhetorical genres: demonstrative, deliberative, and judicial. One gets the impression that the authors often aimed at presenting their pupils with the whole spectrum of poetical theories that were available on the market, so to say. On the other side, as the quotations from Horace but also from other Latin and Neo-Latin authors show, Mohylanian teachers'

¹⁷ Weinberg 1961: 85.

selection and quotations of both sources of literary theory and ‘practical’ poetical examples do not seem to follow any other criterion but the moral usefulness of poetry, that is its serving the end of moral philosophy¹⁸. This attitude, therefore, informs Horace’s reception as well.

2.3. Besides the AP and occasional statements in the odes, three of Horace’s satires (*Serm.* I, 4; I, 10; II,1) and three of his epistles (*Epist.* I, 19; II, 1; II, 2) are devoted to poetic criticism. In the ‘literary’ satires Horace deals with the nature of satire, but his criticism implicitly has a broader extent and applies to poetry in general. In *Serm.* I, 4 and I, 10 the poet defends satire as a genre. In the former, Horace praises Lucilius for his *vis comica* and the subtlety of his invectives, but disapproves of his redundancy and lack of polish. As to his own satires, Horace argues that his sincere exposing human vices and flaws does not make him a wicked man or a police informer. He, who does not even ascribe himself to the number of poets, and prefers to read his own verses to his friends in private, should be excused for his frankness and wit. In *Serm.* I, 10 Horace resumes his criticism of Lucilius and argues the importance of conciseness, variety of tone within a literary genre, linguistic purity, and above all *labor limae*. In *Serm.* II, 1 Horace dwells on the content and the character of this genre. Having been criticized for his satires, he asks Trebatius, an old lawyer, for advice. The latter suggests him to either stop writing altogether or to sing the feats of the emperor; when Horace maintains that his satires are considered praiseworthy by Augustus, Trebatius declares him and his verses absolved of charges.

In two of the three literary epistles (I, 19; II, 1) Horace declares his intention of abandoning lyric poetry, because of the negative reception tributed to his odes. In *Epist.* I, 19 (to Maecenas), the Latin poet rebuts accusations of imitativeness and envisages his originality in having been the first to latinize the Greek meters of Archilocus and Alcaeus. What also distinguishes Horace from poetasters is his unwillingness to obtain the favor of the public with dinners or gifts and to flatter literary critics.

In *Epist.* II, 1, to Augustus, a poem that could be defined a “literary-critical and theoretical essay in epistolary form”¹⁹ Horace answers the emperor’s request for a work addressed to him by speaking to him about the “one subject that bound them together, viz. poetry and its role in the state”²⁰, and its history at Rome. The epistle touches upon topics that constituted a nodal point in the relationship between the prince and the representatives of culture: the issue of Latin theater, the antithesis ancient-modern, the defense of contemporary po-

¹⁸ That the goal of all education provided at the KMA was informed by the tenets of moral philosophy, will be later overtly stated in the drama *Mylost’ Božija* (see Grabowicz 2009-2010).

¹⁹ Ferri 2007: 129.

²⁰ Horace 1989: 4.

etry, the role of Augustus as the highest judge of poetic production, finally the attitude towards epic-celebrative poems.

Augustus is praised in a flattering way in the beginning preface (ll. 1-17) but Horace skillfully moves away towards literary history to voice his disagreement with those who extol archaic Roman poetry to the detriment of more modern writers. Horace expresses his objection (ll. 18-92) in a lively style, always weighing in a balance Greeks and Romans: while for Greek writers the criterion 'the older the better' is certainly true, it cannot be applied to Roman poetry, as the general public instead does. The fact that Ennius was the father of Latin poetry does not make him comparable to Homer. In a satiric tone Horace casts doubt on the criterion of oldness: in what year or month should one draw the boundary between what is old (and purportedly admirable) and what is new (and, according to the crowd, detestable)? If the Greeks, he asks, had opposed novelty, what would now be considered old? Horace asks for some critical discrimination: the fact that in the poems by Livius Andronicus here and there some elegant verse is found does not make all of them worthy. That is, time and antiquity do not make a good poet. Horace then again succinctly compares Greek and Roman civilization, so to say: while the Greeks, after having conquered peace and prosperity, changed their attitude and started delighting in novelty and frivolity, the Romans in the ancient times earnestly occupied themselves with law and business. However, lately, continues the poet, things have changed in that Romans have taken to writing verses to such a degree that they have become a dinner time entertainment. Everybody, whether skilled or unskilled, writes verses. This light folly, however, has some advantages. Here the tone, as Rudd notes, "becomes more serious, and some of Horace's own interests come to the fore" (Horace 1989: 5). In fact, he states, the poet does not cheat his neighbour, he educates children turning them away from morally reprehensible deeds, he comforts the poor and the suffering and provides the words for public prayers. In short, the poet's function in society is extremely valuable and unique. As we will shortly see, it is exactly this characterization of the deep civilizing and moral value of poetry (ll. 118-138) that is preferred by Mohylanian teachers.

The positive influence of Greece, which is rendered with the famous image of the victor conquered by the defeated (ll. 156-157) manifested itself firstly in the disappearance of the rough Saturnian verse, superseded by the epic hexameter. Thus Roman writers began to imitate Greek tragedy, but they have not been able to attain *urbanitas* and to submit their works to an attentive *labor limae*. Horace then goes back to the theater, but now to comedy, and the stress is on the difficulties of composition. In fact, since comedy draws its subjects from daily life, it is believed not to require much polish, says Horace, and he proceeds to elucidate his statement with the example of Plautus: although the latter carefully designs the characters of his comedies according to their own role, he does not care about their representation on the stage because of his greed²¹. Moreover,

²¹ The mention that Plautus is only interested in his fee probably alludes to the selling of comedy to the magistrates who were in charge of the *ludi*: once he had re-

Horace voices his scorn for the crowd's ignorance and low instincts. However, he makes clear that his darts are not directed to 'good' theatre: in fact, Horace expresses the highest admiration for the great tragedian who is able to rouse the spectator's emotions and carry him to Thebes or Athens (ll. 208-213).

In the last section of the poem (ll. 214-270), Horace again returns to Augustus, exhorting him to praise those poets who rely on the readers rather than on the spectators. And thus Horace appeals to Augustus as a patron of the arts: the emperor is identified with the creator of the Palatine library, and Horace recognizes his support of artists and poets, particularly of Vergil and Varius. Augustus's positive attitude is highlighted especially in contrast with Alexander the Great's lack of taste. In the conclusion Horace declines to celebrate Augustus' accomplishments; however, all the while maintaining a position of independence, he implicitly acknowledges that he has in fact praised the emperor when he imitates the style that he is disavowing.

In *Epist.* II, 2, to Florus, Horace devotes relatively little room to literary criticism per se. The poet adduces various excuses for not writing poetry anymore: he is old, tired, and has too many engagements to devote himself to the laborious linguistic work that writing poetry entails. This epistle is never quoted by Mohylian authors in the general poetics.

Generally speaking, the use that Mohylian authors make of Horace's 'literary' satires and epistles is certainly more limited than their use of the AP, and mainly concerns statements on the origin and the usefulness of poetry, on the role of poet, and advice for those who aim at composing poetry, especially good poetry. Most of Horace's statements and advice concerning poetry and poetic composition are quoted in the so-called general poetics.

The latter, that constituted the first part of the Mohylian manuals, was meant to introduce pupils to the more general issues concerning poetry and its composition. It comprised two ambits: on one side, it provided general notions about the origin, the nature, the function and the end of poetry, its subject matter, its meters (prosody). On the other, it illustrated, also through practical examples, certain general features of poetry and poetic language, such as *imitatio*, *inventio*, *dispositio*, and *elocutio*. The general poetics also illustrated the division of poetry according to different criteria (*poesis artificialis* – *naturalis*, *docens* – *utens*, *sacra* – *profana*). Finally, it usually provided a classification of the genres of poetry, and the practical illustration of their different meters. The genres of poetry were illustrated in detail in the particular or applied poetics²².

ceived his money, Plautus did not care how his comedy was staged (cf. Horace, 1991-1994, vol. II, bk. 4: 1367).

²² Michałowska (1974: 19-20) calls this scheme, which is the most frequent in Mohylian poetics, "Aristotelian", in that it displays a certain analogy with the arrangement of Aristotle's *Poetics*, as well as of many neo-Aristotelian works on poetics, such as Scaliger's first book (*Historicus*) of his *Poetices Libri Septem*, partly Sarbiewski's *De perfecta poesi*, and especially Pontanus's *Poeticarum Institutionum*...

3. A brief description of the Mohylianian faculty and subsequently of the Mohylianian poetics is called for at this point. A few words about Mohylianian faculty. The teaching staff was quite small and a single instructor was in charge of each class. Professors and teachers were all Orthodox clerics. Educational training in foreign institutions was a plus. The founder of the college himself, Petro Mohyla, had studied at foreign institutions including the college of St. Athanasius in Rome. He had started the practice of sending the best students to complete their education abroad, and at the beginning this had been dictated by the need for instructors. The schools where Mohylianian students mostly directed themselves were the Jesuit schools and academies, among which that at Zamość and Vilnius, while they did not attend Protestant schools. As Sydorenko remarks (1977: 91) Mohylianian students even attended the Basilian schools, not because their instruction was superior to that provided by the KMA, but because “it was a means to receive admission at the St. Athanasius College in Rome”²³. With time most faculty began to be graduates of the KMA.

The title of professor was generally bestowed on the instructors of philosophy and theology. The qualifications of each instructor were periodically reviewed by the rector and the prefect (that is the highest administrator after the rector and his closest assistant). If the instructor showed himself proficient, he was assigned to teach the immediate higher class. Therefore most instructors taught one given course only once and supervised the same group of students for a number of years. Once an instructor completed teaching the course of rhetoric, he did not automatically become professor of philosophy. Indeed, at this stage he had more options: he could become a preacher and meantime continue and complete his own studies of philosophy and theology; he could become prefect or rector at a minor school or he could simply leave the KMA. However, if the instructor was approved to continue his teaching profession, he would teach once more the class of rhetoric and then transfer to the philosophy course. This was the general scheme, to which however there were numerous exceptions. In fact, at times as professors of philosophy and theology were appointed persons who had not taught the lower classes and did not have higher ranks.

Besides teaching duties, the faculty also had various civic duties, as Mohyla had established in his directives. For instance, as Sydorenko observes, “it was obliged [...] to instruct the common folk in the virtues conducive to a pious and productive life”²⁴ from a religious point of view both at the school monastery and at parochial churches throughout the city.

As already stated, each instructor was expected to write his own manual for the classes of poetics, rhetoric and philosophy, and these manuals are the only sources we have to reconstruct the content of their teaching, as well as the

²³ The order of Saint Basil the Great, also known as the Basilian Order of Saint Josaphat is a monastic religious order of the Greek Catholic Churches (primarily of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church) founded in 1631.

²⁴ Sydorenko 1977: 91-92.

different sources that they availed themselves of. For what concerns the lower grammatical classes, instructors used widely available manuals, first of all *De institutione grammatica libri tres* by the Jesuit Emanuel Alvarez (1526-1583).

The manuals I have used for the present monograph, which are listed on the first three-four pages of my *Bibliography*, are all kept (with the exception of the second copy of the manuscript *Lyra...* n. 6.2, and of ms. 33) in the National Library of Ukraine in Kyiv²⁵. They are slightly over 30 manuals of different years, length and worth²⁶. A cursory glance at the dates of the first and the last courses known to us, 1671 and 1768, and considering that each teacher as a rule composed his own course, shows that numerous manuscript manuals are 'lacking'. We can presume that they were probably lost due to the many vicissitudes (among which several fires) that befell the Academy in the course of its existence.

As to the first course in my *Bibliography*, *Poeticarum institutionum breve compendium*, doubts have been expressed both concerning its date and its belonging to the KMA and to Ukraine in general. Indeed, the course lacks the front page, it is quite short and it looks like the sum of fragments from more than one course, given that some information is repeated more than once.

Not all the extant Mohylian poetics bear the name of their author, nor the date (year) of their composition. If they do, such details are generally cyphered. The usually long title is followed by some Latin letters in capitals: by adding up the numeric value of those letters, you get the year. In other cases, a careful reading of the manuscript can reveal both the name and the year, or at least the latter. Such is the case of the manual *Hymettus extra Atticam*, the author of which was previously unknown and the dating (1718-1719, cf. Łużny 1966a and Masljuk 1983) incorrect. Indeed, the right date of the course is the year 1699 (as we read on the f. 2 v.), and it was taught in the 1699-1700 academic year. This date is totally compatible with the person I first discovered to be its author, Josyp Turobois'kyj. I worked out his name by deciphering the griphus on f. 25 v. at the end of the poem *Entheus poeta* dedicated to Joasaf Krokovs'kyj²⁷.

²⁵ The only poetics manual of the Mohylian Academy that was not available to me was the manuscript *Helicon Bivertex* of 1689, which is now kept in Moscow at the CGADA, f. 381, n. 1769 (cf. Masljuk 1983: 226, number 300).

²⁶ I have counted manuscripts with two or more copies only once. Manuscript 31 is a compendium of Prokopovyč's *De arte poetica libri III*, while manuscript 32 mainly contains poetical exercises.

²⁷ Manuscript 315 II / 122 (n. 8 in the *Bibliography*). See Siedina 2012b: 98 ff. The *griphus* was a literal riddle in which the single letters that form the name of a person or object are described indirectly, through objects that are similar to them in shape (e.g. the letter O can be likened to the sun or to the globe, the letter C to the moon, the letter I to a column, and so on). By guessing the letters that are hidden behind the objects described in the *griphus*, and by correctly arranging them, one gets the ciphred name.

The inscription of a first and last name followed by the word “scripsit” (i.e. “wrote”), which is sometimes found on the first pages of a manuscript course, should not mislead us. Indeed, that usually indicates just the name of the student who materially jotted down the teacher's words. In fact, only a few Mohylianian poetics are written in carefully revised authorial copies, while others appear to be the students' manuscript notes, probably taken under the supervision of a tutor.

To date, we know the authors of just a few Mohylianian poetics, namely (following the chronological order in which they are listed in the *Bibliography*):

- *Hymettus extra Atticam...* (1699) by Josyp Turobojs'kyj – n. 8 in the *Bibliography*;
- *Cedrus Apollinis...* (1702) by Ilarion Jaroševyc'kyj – n. 10 in the *Bibliography*;
- *De arte poetica libri III* (1705) by Teofan Prokopovyč – n. 11 in the *Bibliography*;
- *Idea artis poeseos* (1707) by Lavrentij Horka – n. 13 in the *Bibliography*;
- *Lyra Heliconis* (1709) by Pajisij Klepyc'²⁸ – n. 14 in the *Bibliography*;
- *Via poetarum ad fontes castalidum...* (1724) by Nektarij Trojanovs'kyj – n. 19 in the *Bibliography*;
- *Officina praestantissimae artis poeticae...* (1726-27) by Isaakij Chmarnyj – n. 20 in the *Bibliography*²⁹;
- *Via ingenuos poeseos candidatos...* (1729) – by Teofan Trochymovyč – n. 21 in the *Bibliography*;
- *Hortus poeticus* (1736) by Mytrofan Dovhalevs'kyj – n. 26 in the *Bibliography*;
- *Liber de arte poetica* (1742) by Sylvestr Dobryna – n. 28 in the *Bibliography*;
- *Praecepta de arte poetica* (1743) by Tychin Oleksandrovyč – n. 29 in the *Bibliography*;
- *Praecepta de arte poetica* (1746) by Hryhoryj (Heorhij, Jurij) Konys'kyj – n. 30 in the *Bibliography*;

²⁸ At the end of f. 3 v. of this manuscript course we find the inscription “Sub Reverendo Patre Paisio Klepiec” (“under the Reverend Father Pajisij Klepyc'”), which is a probable indication of the author of the course. In fact, in other manuals, among which *Cedrus Apollinis* and *Idea artis poeticae* the words “Sub Reverendo Patre” followed by the name indicate the author of the manual. Unfortunately, I have not been able to find more information about Pajisij Klepyc' (and in the encyclopedia *Kyjevo-Mohyljans'ka Akademiya v imenach...* [Chyžnjak 2001] this name is not present).

²⁹ A. S. Eleonskaja (1974) writes, in 1725 the Kyivan hieromonk Isakij Chmarnyj was summoned to Moscow by the Holy Synod and began teaching poetics and rhetoric at the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy; she adds that he was the author of the school drama *Obraz pobedonosija* and of a Latin poetics manual. In my opinion, the latter was probably the manual *Officina...* which he used for his Moscow course. However, taking into account Chmarnyj's Ukrainian cultural background, the fact that in 1729 he went back to Kyiv, and that his poetics manual may hypothetically have been further used at the KMA, I included the poetics course *Officina...* in my analysis.

If we look at the years of composition of the extant poetics, we see that about one third of them date back to the period 1687-1709, which roughly coincides with the hetmancy of Ivan Mazepa (1687-1709) and the metropolitanate of Varlaam Jasyňs'kyj (1690-1707). This was a time when the KMA flourished thanks to the generous support accorded to it by these two influential and protectors (Brogi 2004). It was exactly then that the Kyiv College sent its envoy to the Russian tsar to ask for recognition as an academy³⁰.

It was also precisely in this period that Teofan Prokopovyč, probably the most talented Mohylian man of letters, who then became Peter I's closest collaborator in the latter's reformation of Russia, wrote his *De arte poetica libri III* (1705) and *De arte rhetorica libri X* (1706). His courses of poetics and rhetoric have been considered a watershed especially for his extensive knowledge and creative use of the literary and theoretical-critical legacy of Europe and for his attempt to make use of contemporary literary material in his poetics and rhetoric, next to the works of Classical authors generally recognized as models. Besides these, in my opinion his other merits are 1. to have systematized the section on exercises, setting an example for other authors that followed him, and 2. to have included in his course of poetics his own poetical examples in Latin, Polish and Church Slavonic: works that reflect the excellence of his creative mind.

Prokopovyč's tract of poetics, however, was not without some shortcomings. Indeed, his stark criticism of the Polish-Latin literary and sermonic tradition and his hostile attitude toward Catholicism and the Jesuit order in particular, led him to completely exclude from his treatment of poetics both the literary-theoretical and poetical output of M. K. Sarbiewski. Prokopovyč also shunned the genres, typical of the Baroque frame of mind, connected to curious and visual poetry, which he considered as puerile amusements.

Moreover, a closer look at the poetics preceding Prokopovyč's, shows that the practice of including their own works in their poetics courses had already been initiated before him. Indeed, in manuals of poetics such as *Hymettus extra*

³⁰ Joasaf Krokovs'kyj, rector of the Academy (1693-1697), in 1693-1694 was chosen to head an important delegation to Moscow on behalf of hetman Mazepa and metropolitan Varlaam Jasyňs'kyj, with a request to grant the Kyiv Mohyla College material support and recognition of its status as Academy on the part of the tsar. He obtained two tsarist charters: while the former confirmed the Bohojavljenija monastery properties, the latter granted permission to teach philosophy and theology, self government, immunity from civil and military authorities, and the right to accept Orthodox students from areas of Ukraine under Polish rule (see the provisions of the tsarist charter of January 11, 1694 in Petrov, 1895, III [9]: 51). As to permission to teach philosophy and theology, and thus implicit recognition of the Kyiv Mohyla College as an academy, the tsarist charter simply acknowledged an already existing situation (official tsarist recognition of the status of Academy came only in 1701). Therefore the 1694 and the 1701 tsarist charters recognized respectively the *de facto* and the *de jure* status of the college as an academy (Charipova 2006: 56).

Atticam (1699)³¹ and *Cedrus Apollinis* (1702)³² we find poetical works by their authors of a good artistic level.

However, as I said in the Introduction, it is only with Prokopovyč's tract on poetics that a section on exercise is included in the body of the manual³³. Quite a few authors who taught poetics after him followed his section on exercise and at times inserted, next to his, their own exemplifications of poetic exercises (e.g. *Idea artis poeseos* and *Praecepta de arte poetica* by H. Konys'kyj).

Apart from epic poetry, which was considered the most important poetic genre and was therefore given a preeminent place in virtually all Mohylian poetics, the level of in-depth treatment of theoretical issues concerning other poetic genres was varied, depending on the author's skill, on his mastery of Classical and contemporary poetry, and on his personal likings.

Generally speaking, in the Mohylian poetics several genres of poetry are listed: among them epic/heroic poems, elegies, satires, comedies, tragedies, bucolics, georgics, genethliac, epithalamia, epitaphs, epicedia, threnodies, *naenia*, epinikions, paeans, dithyrambs, centos, parodies, palinodes, and others³⁴. However, the attention devoted to different poetic genres varied from manual to manual.

Regarding the theory of the dactylic hexameter³⁵, for instance, Masljuk observes that it was treated with particular care in the courses *Rosa inter spinas*, *Cedrus Apollinis* by I. Jaroševyc'kyj, *De arte poetica libri III* by T. Prokopovyč and *Idea artis poeseos* by L. Horka, although the highest theoretical level, according to Masljuk, was reached in Prokopovyč's treatment of the dactylic hexameter and the elegiac couplet (distich).

At the same time, Prokopovyč completely omitted the poetic genres that are considered typical of Baroque poetics and of the Baroque frame of mind, usually referred to as *poesis curiosa* or *poesis artificiosa*: they also comprehended visual poetry. Because of their emphasis on pure ornamentation and

³¹ Cf. the poems by Josyp Turobojs'kyj that I analyzed in my 2012 monograph, see the poem illustrated in Chapter 3, as well as his epigrams on Mazepa, which I analyzed in Siedina 2008.

³² I particularly refer to his dialogic poem *Cupido, seu amor alatus*, and to his fragment of epic poem about Mazepa (cf. Siedina 2007b).

³³ See footnote 5 in the Introduction. The exercises proposed by Prokopovyč and by quite a few teachers of poetics after him, follow those presented by Jacobus Pontanus in his *Poeticarum institutionum libri III*, which in turn are modeled on those recommended by *Ratio studiorum*, the Jesuits' study plan. They concern different means of poetical expression and imitation, among which synonymy, paraphrases of a poetical text by using a different meter, or by lengthening or shortening the original model, descriptions, *ethopoeia*, *comparatio*, *laudatio*, and *fabula* (cf. also Farrell 1970).

³⁴ For a more detailed overview of poetic genres and the criteria of division of poetry into genres, see Chapter 2.

³⁵ This topic, however, ran across several genres, in that the dactylic hexameter was used in more than one poetic genre (although, of course, it was the meter par excellence of the heroic poem).

because of their refined ingeniousness, they were meant to strike the readers and stimulate their intellectual skills.

In his manual *Praecepta de Arte poetica* (1746), Konys'kyj follows Prokopovyč's more classicistic approach and omits dealing with the aforementioned poetic genres.

On their part, other authors devote great attention to the treatment of epigrammatic poetry and the theory of *conceptum* (or *acumen*, *argutiae*): among them *Rosa inter spinas*, *Cunae Bethleemicae*, *Lyra variis praeceptorum chordis... instructa*³⁶, *Hymettus extra Atticam*, *Epitome meditationis poeticae* and *Hortus poeticus*³⁷.

Summing up, except for copies of the same manuscript, no one Mohylanian poetics manual is identical to another, which, in itself, already attests to their authors' creative approach. Therefore, it is difficult, if not impossible, to 'classify' them according to one general criterion. In my analysis of the aforementioned aspects of the reception of Horace, I have only quoted those that displayed a 'relevant' treatment of the relative subject. Because of the length of Chapter 1, only in this chapter, when I list more than one manuscript at one time, I chose not to provide the full name of each manual quoted, but the number by which they are listed in my *Bibliography*.

4. In the general poetics, one of the first issues that Mohylanian teachers broached was the role and the relationship between nature (*natura*) and art (*ars*) in poetical creation. Mohylanian teachers essentially understand *natura* on the one hand as the *parens communis* of Cicero, "the common mother of us all"³⁸, on the other as a natural faculty, *ingenium*. However, a few authors seem to think of nature also in Aristotelian terms, as the essential moving and creative force of the universe. In this latter sense they sometimes mention Aristotle's statement that ascribes to nature the impulse to write poetry. Quite a few Mohylanian teachers, who understand *natura* as an equivalent of *ingenium*, when they speak on the subject of whether natural faculty or art (understood as skills learnable through hard work and practice), make a good poet, frequently cite the widespread axiom "Poetae nascuntur, oratores fiunt"³⁹; however, at times they

³⁶ The manuscripts of these two courses (*Cunae Bethleemicae* and *Lyra variis praeceptorum chordis... instructa*) were owned by Mytrofan Dovhalevs'kyj, as it is witnessed by an inscription on their first pages.

³⁷ For a useful overview of how the Mohylanian poetics dealt with epigrammatic and curious and figurative poetry see the corresponding chapters in Masljuk 1983, respectively on pp. 156-169 and 169-181. M. Soroka's 1997 monograph is devoted to visual poetry in the Mohylanian poetics.

³⁸ Cf. Herrick 1946: 7.

³⁹ "Poets are born such, orators become such"; cf. also Sarnowska-Temeriusz 1974: 219. The source of this saying, often attributed to Cicero, is probably the following statement by him (*Pro Archia* 8): "Atque sic a summis hominibus eruditissimisque

openly voice their disagreement with the peremptoriness of this saying, insisting on the possibility of becoming a poet through hard and diligent work, and exhorting their pupils in this sense. Thus, for instance, we read in *Camoena in Parnasso*: “Verum ego huic axiomati non assentior; nam plures sunt poetae, qui labore et exercitio quotidiano plane assecuti sunt artem et facilitatem poetices; quam illi, qui a natura habuerunt inditam sibi illam venam”⁴⁰. Subsequently, in order to prove the insubstantiality of the dictum, the author of this manual, like many others, quotes Horace's question, “inherited from Cicero and the Hellenistic rhetoricians, perhaps directly from Plato”⁴¹, whether nature or art is more important for those who write poetry. The question is followed by Horace's answer in the AP on the necessity, for the true poet, to combine natural talent with knowledge of theory (AP 408-411)⁴²:

Natura fieret laudabile carmen an arte,
quaesitum est; ego nec studium sine divite vena
nec rude quid prosit video ingenium; alterius sic
altera poscit opem res et coniurat amice⁴³.

accepimus, ceterarum rerum studia et doctrina et praeceptis et arte constare: poetam natura ipsa valere, et mentis viribus excitari, et quasi divino quodam spiritu inflari” (“And indeed we have learned from most eminent and erudite men that the study of the other sciences consisted in learning, in rules, in precepts, and in the (technical knowledge) [in the science]; but that a poet was such only because of nature, and he was moved by the vigor of his own mind, and he was as if inspired by a certain divine spirit [enthusiasm]”).

⁴⁰ “In reality, I do not agree with this axiom; indeed, there are poets who with work and daily exercise have achieved better poetic art and skill than those who have been provided by nature with that poetic vein” (ms. 4.2, f. 118 v.).

⁴¹ Herrick 1946: 8.

⁴² Other teachers are less categorical, and adhere more closely to Horace's statement, following in this Pontanus. Cf., for instance, *Fons Castalius* (ms. 2, f. 45 r.): “Quanquam maxima huius scientiae pars consistat in natura ad Praxim reducentium (nam magis nascunt quam fiunt poetae) non tamen ab ea amovendam etiam censeo Artem, vel exinde quod nulli par poetico studio lyri carminis Parens Horacius allata quaestiuncula, natura ne an Ars plus ad carminis laudem conduceret? Alteram ab altera separari, ac seiungi non posse asseruit his” (“Although most of this science consists in the nature of those who reduce it to praxis (in fact one is born a poet rather than becoming one), I nevertheless believe that art should not be removed from it; also because Horace, Father of the lyric poem, who was unparalleled in terms of poetic zeal, when asked whether it is nature or art that mostly leads to poetic praise, asserted that neither the one nor the other can be separated or excluded”). The authors of mss. 13, 23 express themselves similarly. In some manuals (mss. 2, 13, 23, 30) the quotation of AP 408-411 is followed by Pontanus's quotation: “Ars tanquam certissima dux viam demonstrat: quam si fideliter sequemur, numquam offendemus” (“Art as a most reliable guide shows the way: if we will faithfully follow it, we will never err”) (Pontanus 1594: 2).

⁴³ These lines are quoted in many Mohylanian poetics: mss. 2, 5 (ll. 409b-411), 9, 12 (ll. 409b-410a), 13, 17, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25 (ll. 409b-411), 30. For a reconstruction of the historical development of the concepts of nature and art in ancient rhetoric, see Fiske 1929: 74 ff.

Often it is asked whether a praiseworthy poem be due to Nature or to art. For my part, I do not see of what avail is either study, when not enriched by Nature's vein, or native wit, if untrained; so truly does each claim the other's aid, and make with it a friendly league⁴⁴.

Quite originally, the author of *Liber de arte poetica* (ms. 28, f. 14 r.), in order to stress the need for competence in all arts and professions, which he says is provided by the mutual support of *natura* and *ars*, draws an analogy with the carpenter (*faber*), who, despite possessing all of nature's resources, will not be able to build a house without mastering the laws of architecture⁴⁵. And to support his view (which, he says, is true of the other arts), he quotes AP 418:

Quod non didici, sane nescire fateor [sic!]⁴⁶

To confess that I really do not
know what I have never learnt.

As to the importance of combining technique with natural talent (since he says “una earum ablata altera mortua” – “one of them deprived of the other is dead”), the same author instantly quotes ll. 379-386a of AP:

Ludere qui nescit, campestribus abstinet armis,
indoctusque pilae discive trochive quiescit,
ne spissae risum tollant impune coronae;
qui nescit, versus tamen audet fingere. Quidni?
Liber et ingenuus, praesertim census equestrem
summam nummorum vitioque remotus ab omni.
Tu nihil invita dices faciesve Minerva;
id tibi iudicium est, ea mens⁴⁷.

He who cannot play a game,
shuns the weapons of the Campus,
and, if unskilled in ball or quoit or hoop, remains
aloof, lest the crowded circle break out in righteous
laughter. Yet the man who knows not how dares to

⁴⁴ All translations of quotations from Horace's *Satires*, *Epistles* and *Ars poetica* are taken from Horace 1970.

⁴⁵ Cf. *Epist.* II, 1, 114-117, where Horace lists the *fabri* among those who exercise a job having the right skills, as opposed to those who write poetry (“... tractant fabrilia fabri / scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim” – “carpenters handle carpenters' tools: but, skilled or unskilled, we all scribble poetry, all alike”).

⁴⁶ This line, to the same effect, is also quoted in mss. 6.1 (f. 5 r.), 25.1 (f. 165 v.), 25.2 (f. 143 v.), and 28 (f. 14 r.).

⁴⁷ Line 385 of AP is quoted in ms. 9 (f. 80 r.), under the heading “natura”, one of the four prerequisites for composing poetry.

frame verses. Why not? He is free, even free-born, nay, is rated at the fortune of a knight, and stands clear from every blemish.
But you will say nothing and do nothing against Minerva's will; such is your judgment, such your good sense.

These lines of Horace's are directed to the older son of either Lucius Calpurnius Piso⁴⁸, or Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso⁴⁹. The author here asserts that while in athletics and in games in general incompetence is condemned, in poetry it is not. Whoever has free status, free birth, equestrian census and is removed from crime feels he has the right to compose poetry. The apostrophe to the young man here can be taken to be implicitly directed at the Mohylanian *neovates*: it bestows upon him the capacity of judgement and the intelligence to discern whether he has natural talent or not. The duty of the teacher is to impart to his pupils everything about *ars*, since, as he says, "intellectus noster per exercitium frequens argumentationis et notitiam praeceptorum fit in quoque genere expeditior"⁵⁰.

It is worth noticing that in some of the manuals that fail to mention lines 408-411 of the AP (e.g. *Rosa inter spinas*), poetry is said to be the fruit of *ars*, *exercitatio*, and *imitatio*, while natural talent is completely excluded; this once again demonstrates how in the Mohylanian poetics learning to write poetry was considered primarily the result of skills achievable through study and diligent application. In some manuals the concept of *natura* is explained in terms of *furor divinus* of Platonic origin. However, also in the manuals that cite AP 408-411, even if nature is listed first, it occupies a subordinate position, and the stress is laid on the three above mentioned elements, in the first place *ars*. This is confirmed, among others, by what we read in this regard in *Cedrus Apollinis*: "Primum est natura et ingenita quaedam ad carmen proclivitas. [...] Neque tamen ille desperare debet, qui hanc propensionem ad poesim in se non sentit, cum infra naturam ponenda sunt subsidia. Secundum: ars sive praecepta et dicamina, principia poetica ac regulae. Tertium: exercitatio quae ipsam naturam artis praecepta frequenti usurpatione permovet. [...] Quartum: imitatio, quae ut in oratoria sic in poetica quoque facultate, magnum momentum facit"⁵¹.

⁴⁸ Lucius Calpurnius Piso, consul in 15 b.C., whose sons are unknown.

⁴⁹ Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso, who fought at Philippi under Brutus, had a son Gnaeus, who was consul in 7 B. C., and another son Lucius, who was consul in 1 b.C. (for further consideration as to the identity of Piso, see Nisbet 2000: 20).

⁵⁰ "Through frequent exercise in argumentation and through the knowledge of precepts, our intellect becomes more skilled in every genre".

⁵¹ "The first [prerequisite] is nature and a certain inborn propensity for poetry. [...] Nevertheless he who does not feel in himself this propensity for poetry should not despair, since below nature must be placed the prerequisites. The second: art, or the precepts and prescriptions, the poetic principles and rules. The third: exercise, which by its frequent application stimulates nature itself and the precepts of the art [...] The

4.1. Closely connected with the relationship between nature and art is the function of poetry. Because of the ambiguity of this term, some Kyiv-Mohylanian teachers, like Western European sixteenth century critics, make a distinction between the purpose or the end of poetry (*finis*) and the office or the business (*officium*) of the poet.

As to the ends of poetry, the great majority of Mohylanian teachers⁵², in order to epitomize the twofold function of poetry, to profit and delight, quote Horace's well-known lines (AP 333-334):

Aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae
aut simul et iucunda, et idonea dicere vitae⁵³.

Poets aim either to benefit, or to amuse, or to
utter words at once both pleasing and helpful to life.

And in order to strengthen and to make their point clearer many authors subsequently quote AP 343-344:

Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci,
lectorem delectando pariterque monendo.

He has won every vote who has
blended profit and pleasure, at once delighting and
instructing the reader.

In matching these lines, the two gerunds (*delectando* and *monendo*) are connected with the two terms of the alternative presented at line 333 (*delectando* with *delectare*, *monendo* with *prodesse*).

However, the purpose of *docere* was the most important in Kyiv-Mohylanian manuals, and *delectare* (often linked with *factio*, as in Horace⁵⁴) was subordinate and subsidiary to it, i.e. it was the means by which to teach effectively and was mainly conceived as dissuasion from vice and incitement to pursue virtue⁵⁵: other authors instead stressed the usefulness of poetry (as expressed

fourth: imitation, which exerts a great influence both in the oratorical and in the poetic capacity" (ms. 10, f. 160 r.).

⁵² Namely: mss. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 (only l. 333), 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21 (only l. 333), 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 (only l. 333), 30.

⁵³ Two poetics (mss. 15 [f. 146 r.] and 20 [f. 1 r.]) quote lines 333-334 of the AP with a significant variation, cf. "Aut prodesse volunt, aut delectare poetae, / Aut simul et iucunda et idonea dicere verba" ("Poets aim either to benefit, or to amuse, or to / utter words at once both pleasing and appropriate"). Here, the substitution of "vitae" with "verba" points to a greater stress on *elocutio*, which establishes a direct link between it and the achievement of the two aforementioned ends.

⁵⁴ Cf., for instance *Praecepta de arte poetica* (ms. 29, f. 57 v.): "Medium poeseos principale delectandi est fictio verisimilis" ("The first means of poetry in order to delight is a *fictio* having the appearance of truth").

⁵⁵ Cf. *Camoena in Parnasso*, ms. 4.1, f. 86 r.

in the verb *prodesse*) and attribute this preeminence to Horace himself (cf., for instance mss. 23 [f. 3 v.] and 30 [f. 5 v.]).

Next to Horace's definition of the purpose of poetry, a few authors quote Aristotle's, and in so doing offer an illustration of the blend of Aristotelian and Horatian theory so typical of the Renaissance critics and commentators. Thus, for instance, the author of *Cedrus Apollinis...* states that the purpose of poetic art, according to Aristotle is "utilitas et morum correctio" ("usefulness and the correction of morals"), while the purpose of the poet is defined in the Horatian terms illustrated above. The author of *Via poetarum ad fontes castalidum*⁵⁶ expresses himself similarly.

Even in the few manuals that do not quote lines 333-334 of Horace's AP, the purpose of poetry is identified as the source of usefulness and delight at once, i.e. in its being morally useful through its being enjoyable for the readers or the listeners.

The author of *Arctos in Parnasso* goes even further, and at line 334 has the verb "reddere" instead of "dicere", as if the poet had a duty to give back to life its usefulness and delight. Moreover, he asserts that instead of using the coordinating conjunctions *aut... aut* Horace should have used *et... et*, so as to stress the necessity of pursuing the two aims together, of conjoining them in the action of composing poetry. To make his thought clear, he establishes a parallel between the poet and the doctor who makes the medicine sweeter for the sick. He bends Horace's words to his own purpose. Thus we read: "Quod exprimeret finem paulo melius poetae si sonaret et prodesse volunt et delectare. Nisi forte voluptas congruentius a non nullis putatur quam ad finem pro medio consequendum a Poesi adhiberi dicas. Nam porrigitur egrii absinthium, mel saepius medica inspergit manus, sic medica haec ars ut prosit delectat carmen Lectorem delictando [sic!] pariterque movendo"⁵⁷.

The last word of this quotation shows how a few Mohylanian authors, in order to add the end of *movere*, transform the Horatian *monendo* into *movendo*, and thus alter the meaning of the line. This way, the *utile* does not have the function of admonishment and teaching, but combined with the *dulce*, is meant to move. It is worth noticing how in a few manuals the addition of *movere*, and thus the 'rhetorization', we could say, of poetry and of Horace's dictum, went hand in hand with another modification of lines 343-344 of the AP:

⁵⁶ Cf. ms. 19.2, f. 5 r. As Herrick states, "by 1555 [...] Aristotle's emphasis upon the aesthetic function of poetry had been absorbed in the dual function advocated by Horace and suggested by Cicero. After 1555, both pleasure and instruction are supposedly authorized by both Horace and Aristotle; any deviation from this dual function of poetry is exceptional" (Herrick 1946: 45-46).

⁵⁷ "This line would have expressed the poet's aim better if it sounded 'they want to be useful and to delight'. Except that some consider pleasure more congruous than you say, as a means that poetry should use to reach its aim. In fact the sick man is given the absinth upon which the doctor's hand has often sprinkled honey; just as this medical art, the poem delights with the aim of being useful" (*Arctos in Parnasso*, ms. 12, f. 94 v.). The substitution of "monendo" with "movendo" is found also in *Via poetarum ad fontes castalidum* (ms. 19.2, f. 5 v.).

Omne tulit pulchrum, qui miscuit utile dulci
lectorem delectando pariterque movendo⁵⁸.

He has achieved true beauty
who has blended profit and pleasure, at once delighting
and moving the reader.

In these lines, Horace's 'electoral' metaphor (*punctum* is to be considered equivalent to *suffragium*) is transformed into the achievement of the beautiful (*pulchrum*). The latter, however, is considered not as an aesthetic, but rather as a moral category. This is suggested by the sentence that introduces the quotation, in which the authors state that he who diverts men from evil and vicious actions, deserves Horace's praise⁵⁹. And thus, the beautiful is obtained by the simultaneous attainment of the useful and the pleasant, and while the *dulce* is connected to *delectando*, the *utile* derives from *movendo*. In fact *movere* is explained as an appeal to man's passions in order to exhort the audience to accomplish good, honest, and useful deeds. In spite of this accent on the beautiful and on the need for poetry to move the audience, no teacher, as far as I could observe, quotes lines 99-100 of Horace's AP, where the poet stresses that poems must be more than beautiful, they must also bring delight, have passion and move the feelings of the audience in the direction intended by the poet ("non satis est pulchra esse poemata; dulcia sunt / et quocumque volent animum auditoris agunt") – "Not enough is it for poems to have beauty: they must have charm, and lead the hearer's soul where they will").

After listing the three purposes of poetry, some authors proceed to explain the practical ways to achieve each of them (cf. mss. 14, 16, 20, 25, 26); at times their theoretical prescriptions for each purpose are followed by a practical demonstration in the form of a poetical composition (cf. ms. 26, *Hortus poeticus*).

In some manuals (e.g. mss 7.1 and 7.2, *Rosa inter spinas*) each of the three purposes of poetry is linked to a particular style: *docere* to the low style (*infirmus*), *delectare* to the middle style (*floridus*), *movere* to the high or sublime style

⁵⁸ This modified quotation of ll. 343-344 of Horace's AP is found in *Lyra Heliconis* (ms. 14, f. 181 r.) and *Epitome meditationis poeticae* (ms. 25.2, f. 147 r.). The many similarities between the two manuals prove that the author of the latter undoubtedly knew and used the former manuscript. It has not always been possible to ascertain whether a modified quotation from Horace was drawn from some source or was independently modified by Mohylanian teachers of poetics.

⁵⁹ Cf. *Lyra Heliconis* (f. 181 r.): "Movemus tandem affectu aliquo excitante homines ad id ut quae sunt bona, honesta et utilia sequantur. Quae vero mala et vitiosa effugiant, atque sic meretur illud Horatii encomium: Omne tulit pulchrum, qui miscuit utile dulci / Lectorem delectando pariterque movendo" ("Finally we move with some emotion that excites men to accomplish good, honest and useful actions, so that they may keep away from evil and vicious actions. This way Horace's praise is well-deserved: he has accomplished the beautiful who has blended profit and pleasure, at once delighting and moving the reader").

(*sublimis*). This distinction clearly harks back to Cicero's *Orator*, 69, where he describes the three styles of the orator borrowed from Hellenism: the plain or subdued (for proof), the middle (for delight or pleasure), and the grand or vigorous (for stirring the emotions, i.e. for persuasion). Similarly, Quintilian had characterized the purpose of rhetoric as to inform, to move, to please (*Institutio Oratoria* I, III, ch. V, 2). And thus, from the very beginning, Kyiv-Mohylian manuals of poetics display a tendency to spell out parallels between poetic composition and rhetorical technique that are only implied in Horace.

4.1.1. As to the *officium* (office, business, duty) of poetry or of the poet, some authors identify it with the ends of poetry⁶⁰. Other authors state that the business of poetry is to feign and to express the feigned things in verse (“*ingere [...] et ficta carmine exprimere*”)⁶¹. Still others state that the *officium poetae* consists in knowing the different genres of poetry, in being capable of poetic diction, and in the exercise on the composition of poetry⁶². To these requirements, in order to illustrate other *officia* of poetry, the author of *Via poetarum ad fontes castalidum* adds the following lines from Horace's AP, and thus emphasizes what we could call poetry's ‘enlightening’ role:

tulit haec sapientia quondam publica privatis discernere sacra profanis	(AP 396b-397)
[...]	
Oppida moliri leges incidere ligno sic honor et nomen divinis vatibus atque carminibus venit.	(AP 399-401a)

In days of yore, this
was wisdom, to draw a line between public and private
rights
[...]
to build towns, and grave laws on tables of wood;
and so honour and fame fell to bards and their
songs, as divine.

These lines of Horace's, quoted by more than one author (see below), are part of a famous passage eulogizing the glories of poetry, which since ancient times has taught men wisdom, has made savage men civilized, has favored the establishment of laws and other positive achievements.

⁶⁰ Cf. *Epitome*... (ms. 24, f. 4 v.).

⁶¹ “To feign [...], and then to express the invented things with a poem”. Cf. mss. 6.1 (f. 6 r.), 25.2 (f. 145 v.), and 29 (f. 57 r.). For the discussion of fiction in poetry cf. § 4.3 below.

⁶² Cf. ms. 10 (f. 75 r.), 19.2 (f. 5 v.).

4.2. And thus, these lines of Horace's on the many good things that poetry itself causes take us into the domain of the *dignitas* of poetry (closely related to its *utilitas* and *praestantia*), which Mohylian authors, like their Western European colleagues, illustrate in the first part of their manuals. This explanation recalls the Medieval, Humanistic and then Renaissance practice of beginning the exposition on a particular discipline by illustrating its place in the general scheme of arts and sciences.

As to the origin of poetry, its divine inspiration, commonly stressed by Mohylian teachers, is often exemplified by the concepts of *furor divinus* or *enthusiasmus* of Platonic origin (also defined *calor poeticus* or *vena poetica*). In order to explain the meaning of *enthusiasmus* for Christian poets (i.e. as an abstraction of the mind from familiar things effected with divine aid), Mohylian authors often recur to Ovid's verses (*Ars Amatoria* III, ll. 549-550⁶³; *Fasti* VI, ll. 5-6⁶⁴). On the other hand, the different understanding of this concept in pagan and Christian poets is stressed: for the former often compared *enthusiasmus* to wine. This comparison is borne out by Horace's lines, *Epist.* I, 19, 7-8a: "Ennius ipse pater numquam nisi potus ad arma / prosiluit dicenda" ("Even Father Ennius never sprang forth to tell of arms save after much drinking"). In this epistle, addressed to Maecenas, Horace polemicizes against ill-disposed critics and claims the profound originality of his own poetic creation. The line quoted fits into the recollection of the tight bond that exists between wine (and inebriation), and poetic creation since the time when Bacchus decided to accept poets into his suite, traditionally formed by satyrs and fauns. The line is a parodic⁶⁵ resumption of Ennius's words on his own way of making

⁶³ These lines of Ovid are quoted in the manual *Rosa inter spinas* (ms. 7.1, f. 7 r.): "Est Deus in nobis, sunt et commertia Caeli / Sedibus aethereis Spiritus ille venit" ("There's a god in us, and our dealings are with the heavens: / this inspiration comes from ethereal heights"). Translations of quotations of Ovid's *oeuvre* are by A.S. Kline, and taken from the website <http://www.poetryintranslation.com>. Translation of other Latin quotations, when not otherwise indicated, are mine.

⁶⁴ In this case, Mohylian authors at times quote Ovid's lines correctly, other times instead they insert line 550 of *Ars amatoria* III after line 6 of *Fasti* VI. Ovid's original lines from *Fasti* V, 5-6 are: "Est deus in nobis, agitante calescimus illo; / impetus hic sacrae semina mentis habet:" ("There is a god in us: when he stirs we kindle: / That impulse sows the seeds of inspiration"). This is instead is the Mohylian authors' modified version: "Est Deus in nobis agitante calescimus illo; / Sedibus aethereis, spiritus iste venit" (There is a god in us: when he stirs, we kindle: / this inspiration comes from ethereal heights").

⁶⁵ Here and further on in this book I use the adjective 'parodic' with reference to the contemporary understanding of the term, as a synonym of mocking, with the meaning of ridiculing an author's or performer's work by imitating its language and style for comic effect. Therefore the adjective parodic does not coincide with the understanding of the term parody (as a literary genre or a form of imitation) by Mohylian teachers of poetics. For a more detailed illustration of the concept of parody and of the content infused into it in the Mohylian poetics, see Chapter 2.

poetry (*Serm.* 64 V): “numquam poetor nisi si podager”⁶⁶. Horace, however, is preoccupied with differentiating Homer and Ennius from bad poets who confuse poetic possession with drunkenness proper, while he recognizes the validity of Dionysiac inspiration.

Horace's lines, however, are quoted by Mohylanian authors with significant (intentional) variations. Cf. *Arctos in Parnasso* (ms. 12, f. 111 v.):

Ennius ipse Pater numquam nisi cum bene potus
dicere verba parat

The father Ennius unless he was drunk never
prepares to utter words;

in which “dicere verba parat” can be considered a simplification of the much more elaborate “ad arma prosiluit dicenda”, where “ad arma prosiluit” makes one think of Ennius who, after having drunk abundantly, rushes to bravely take up arms as the many heroes he sang about in his *Annales*. “Prosiluit”, separated from “ad arma” by an enjambement, gives the idea of a jump proper toward arms. However, while one would expect “sumenda” after “prosiluit”, Horace has “dicenda”, thus making it clear he is talking about a poetic, and not a military enterprise.

On his part, the author of *Camoena in Parnasso* (ms. 4.1, f. 84 v.) conflates Horace's lines with the words of Martial in *Epigrams*, XI, 6, 12a:

Ennius ipse Pater numquam nisi potus ad arma
prosiluit dicenda. Et possum nil ego sobrius,

Even Father
Ennius never sprang forth to tell of arms save after
much drinking. And I cannot (say) anything more sober,

thus making Horace a worthy successor of his glorious poetic forefather.

Mohylanian teachers do not mention AP 295 ff., where Horace derides those who follow Democritus' idea that all sober poets should be excluded from Helicon, and thus dissociates himself from the Democritean exaltation of inspiration (*ingenium*) over *ars*. Instead, in order to describe the qualities of he who deserves to be called poet, a few teachers of poetics recur, among others, to one distich by Horace, that harks back to the Aristotelian rhetorical concept of natural talents, here indicated by the term *ingenium*, that is taken to define natural poetic talent; the latter could thus be defined as the naturalistic parallel of the concept of divine inspiration. He who, besides natural talent, possesses divine inspiration, is the perfect poet (cf. *Camoena in Parnasso*, ms. 4.1, f. 85 v.) and by his own singing is able to reach sublime heights, as Horace states in *Serm.* I, 4, 43-44:

⁶⁶ “I never poetize except when I have the gout”.

Ingenium cui sit, cui mens diviniore atque os
magna sonaturum, des nominis huius honorem.

If one has gifts inborn, if one has a
soul divine and tongue of noble utterance, to such
give the honour of that name.

Other authors who quote this distich, link the qualities here described with the ability to achieve a successful *factio*, i.e. with the ability to teach, be delightful (mss. 9, 22) and also to move (ms. 18). That is, they stress in the first place the desirable ability of the poet to combine *res* and *verba* so as to move the soul of the listeners. Cf. for instance, in ms. 18 (f. 6 r.) the words that introduce this distich: “res omnes potest Poeta carmine exponere adhibendo ingeniosas fisiones, admiscendo diversos animi motus, quibus spectantes alliciat, rapiat, et delectet”⁶⁷.

It is precisely divine inspiration that confers to poetry a feature of exceptionality over all other sciences, which were, on the contrary, invented or discovered by men: thus asserts the author of *Rosa inter spinas* (ms. 7.1). He then moves on to stress the antiquity of poetry, its remote origin, the mythical character of the latter and the supernatural power of poetry to civilize primitive and brutal men⁶⁸, as well as to dissuade listeners/readers from abominable actions and to incline them to virtuous deeds. And as a witness to this, he quotes Horace’s lines (AP 391-396):

Sylvestrae [sic!] homines sacer interpresque Deorum
caedibus et victu foedo deterruit Orpheus;
dictus ab hoc lenire tigres, rabidosque leones,
dictus et Amphion, Thebane [sic!] conditor arcis [sic!].
Saxa movere sono testudinis et prece blanda
ducere quo vellet⁶⁹.

While men still roamed the woods, Orpheus,
the holy prophet of the gods, made them shrink from
bloodshed and brutal living; hence the fable that he
tamed tigers and ravening lions; hence, too, the fable
that Amphion, builder of Thebes’s citadel, moved stones
by the sound of his lyre, and led them whither he
would by his supplicating spell.

The author of *Rosa inter spinas* (ms. 7.1) omits the subsequent lines, in which Horace argues the civilizing work of *sapientia*, i.e. of philosophy, of

⁶⁷ “The poet can publish anything in verse, using ingenious fiction, blending different emotions of the soul, to entice, captivate and delight the spectators”.

⁶⁸ On Horace’s allegorization of the Orphic myth, cf. Brink, 1971: 387.

⁶⁹ Lines 391-393 are instead quoted by the author of ms. 13 in his illustration of the remote origins of poetry.

which the poets are the bearers⁷⁰. Instead, he illustrates how poetry constitutes the compendium of all other sciences, and it is “mater et magistra eruditionis” (“mother and instructress of erudition”) with a crescendo of similes (“Deorum dearumque talentis predivitem [...], aevo Saturni⁷¹ perenniorem, ore Mercurij facundiolem, fortitudine Martis robustiolem, decore Veneris venustiolem, sapientiam [sic!] Minervae versatiolem, ubertate Cereris faecundiolem” (f. 8 r., “Well endowed with the talents of gods and goddesses [...] longer-living than Saturn’s age, more eloquent than Mercury’s mouth, tougher than Mars’s strength, more charming than Venus’s beauty, more versatile than Minerva’s wisdom, more fruitful than Ceres’s abundance”). To these praises the author then adds an encomium of poets, delight and ornament of princes and kings, who have relied on their lyre as the only one capable of transmitting their glorious feats to the descendants, and thus render them immortal. And to support his long reasoning on the *dignitas* of poetry, he quotes Horace’s lines (AP 400-401a):

Sic honor et nomen divinis vatibus atque
carminibus venit.

And so honour and fame fell to bards and their
songs, as divine.

Already these first quotations from the AP display an instrumental use of Horace’s work that is not always faithful to the intention of the Latin classic. Even if elsewhere Horace speaks of poetry as the only thing capable of preserving and transmitting the memory of ancient heroes’ glorious deeds (cf. *Carm.* IV, 9), here he is speaking more specifically of philosophy, which gives poetry the ability to civilize men and by this gives it honour and fame. With this quotation, however, the Mohylanian author insists rather on the functional, didactic and political significance of poetry, and remains tied to a more particular, regional or proto-national rather than historical and philosophical sphere.

What also appears in the analysis of the use of quotations from Horace by Mohylanian teachers is their relative independence in the approach to the Horatian text, which induces them to avail themselves of different verses to express similar concepts. In this case Ilarion Jaroševyc’kyj (*Cedrus Apollinis*, ms. 10, f. 75 v.), in answer to the question “Quis effectus poeticae” (“Which is the effect of poetry”) responds: “Enumerat Horatius loco supra citato. Sylvestres homines etc.” (“Horace lists [the effects] in the above-mentioned place. Men living in the woods, etc.”), thus taking knowledge of the above-mentioned lines for granted and deeming it unnecessary to quote them in their entirety⁷². However, he also

⁷⁰ A little earlier Horace had invited the poets to turn to philosophy as “scribendi recte [...] fons” (“of good writing [...] the fount”). Cf. also Quintilian, for whom Orpheus and Linus were “musici et vates et sapientes” (*Institutio oratoria*, I, 10, IX).

⁷¹ The golden age, when Saturn reigned.

⁷² In spite of what the author states, in the text preceding this quotation there is no trace of the quotation of AP 391 ff. And thus, the quotation of only the first two words

adds here lines 404-406, although he quotes them incorrectly: “usus [sic!] et gratia Regum pigerijs [sic!] tentata [sic!] modis Ludusque repertus et longorum operum finis”⁷³. And thus, the virtue of poetry (here the words “pieriis ... modis” stand for lyric poetry) would be not only to civilize men, but also to gain the intimacy and the favor of the mighty, and thus it would have an effect of persuasion. As far as “ludus” is concerned, here it refers to drama, but the author does not comment on this fact, and adduces it to illustrate the peculiarity of poetry in general to bring delight. After this, in order to illustrate what he calls “alia [...] particularia officia finesque Poetae” (“other [...] particular tasks and ends of poetry”), Jaroševyc’kyj chooses precisely those lines of Horace’s that the author of *Rosa inter spinas* (ms. 7.1) had omitted, even if he quotes them in an imprecise and incomplete way. Cf.:

tulit [sic!] haec Sapientia quondam,
publica privatis secernere, sacra profanis
[...]
oppida moliri, leges incidere ligno.
Sic honor et nomen divinis vatibus atque
carminibus venit⁷⁴.

The citation of these lines is a sign of the type of selective use that Mohylanian teachers made of Horace, as of other Classical writers. Here the author, just like Horace, wishes to underline the civilizing character of poetry. However, he omits line 398, “concupitu prohibere vago, dare iura maritis” (“to check vagrant unions, to give rules for wedded life”) which, if misunderstood, would have introduced a concept not in accordance with the function of foundation of the institutions of civilized life that is attributed to poetry, or could have induced few devout thoughts.

on the one hand may be attributed to the haste of the writer, while on the other it testifies to widespread knowledge among the pupils, presumably by heart, of selected corpora of Classical Latin poets, which often did not require the quotation of a whole stanza or sequence of lines. As to the mistakes in the quotation of AP 404-406, they are probably due to the transcriber’s poor knowledge of Latin.

⁷³ Cf. AP 404-406: “et vitae monstrata via est et gratia regum / Pieriis temptata modis ludusque repertus / et longorum operum finis” (“The way of life was shown; the favour of kings was sought in Pierian strains, and mirth was found to close toil’s long spell”).

⁷⁴ Ms. 10, f. 76 r. Cf. Horace’s lines (AP 396-401): “Fuit haec sapientia quondam, / publica privatis secernere, sacra profanis, / concupitu prohibere vago, dare iura maritis, / oppida moliri, leges incidere ligno. / Sic honor et nomen divinis vatibus atque / carminibus venit” (“In days of yore, this was wisdom, to draw a line between public and private rights, between things sacred and things common, to check vagrant unions, to give rules for wedded life, to build towns, and grave laws on tables of wood; and so honour and fame fell to bards and their songs, as divine”). Lines 400-401 of AP are also quoted in *Liber de arte poetica* (ms. 28, f. 16 r.).

T. Prokopovyč stresses the unique ‘didactic’ role of poetry – which, by handing down to posterity the valiant and wise actions of the ancestors, embellished with praises – is crucial in inciting the descendants to their emulation. Only poetry, he says, can give immortality by glorifying “*prisca gesta*” (“ancient [glorious] deeds”) and “*heroicas virtutes*” (“heroic virtues”) of the ancient. And to support this view, he quotes Horace’s lines from *Carm. IV, 9, 25-28*:

Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona
multi: sed omnes illacrimabiles
urgentur ignotique longa
nocte: carent quia vate sacro⁷⁵.

Many the heroes who flourished before
Agamemnon, but all are lying unknown
and unmourned in endless night
for lack of a holy bard⁷⁶.

These same lines are quoted in *Idea artis poeseos*, which follows Prokopovyč’s manual in many respects, in the section dealing with the usefulness of poetry (ms. 13.1, f. 180 r.; ms. 13.2, f. 6 r.).

With a similar didactic view, the author of *Lyra Heliconis...* (ms. 14, f. 181 v.), sees the *utilitas* of poetry, here particularly of epic poetry, in providing models that may spur virtue. And to support his assertion, he quotes Horace’s ll. 17-18 of *Epist. I, 2*: “*Rursus, quid virtus et quid sapientia possit, / utile proposuit nobis exemplar Ulixen*” (“Again, of the power of worth and wisdom he has set before us an instructive pattern in Ulysses”).

Other Mohylanian teachers illustrate the worth of poetry in various ways. Some of them, such as the authors of *Arctos in Parnasso* (ms. 12, f. 96 r.) and that of *Via Lactea* (who follows the former; ms. 25.1, f. 167 r.), among other virtues of poetry, list its capacity to cause joy not only to the souls of humans, but also to inanimate things. And to demonstrate their thought, they quote l. 133 of Horace’s *Epist. II, 1* in a strikingly modified way:

Diceret unda preces, si vatem Musa dedisset,

The wave would sing hymns if the Muse had given a poet,

where the wave (*unda*) is taken as the inanimate object that would rejoice in poetry. In turn, the author of *Fons Poeseos* quotes this modified line when speaking of the necessity of poetry in order to corroborate his assertion that poetry is necessary to cheer human souls, and is a source of delight for inanimate beings as well with Horace’s authority.

⁷⁵ Prokopovyč seems to be the first to quote these lines (Prokopovič 1961: 236).

⁷⁶ Translations of quotations from Horace’s *Odes* and *Epodes* are taken from Horace 1994.

The way the Mohylanian authors bent Horace's words to their own needs is remarkable. In fact, the line, which needs to be read with the previous one in order to make sense, reads thus: "Castis cum pueris ignara puella mariti / disceret unde preces, vatem ni Musa dedisset?" ("Whence, in company with chaste boys, would the unwedded maid learn the suppliant hymn, had the Muse not given them a bard?"). In lines 126-131 of this epistle Horace listed a series of merits of poetry, particularly of lyric poetry, that attest to its uniqueness: the poet instructs children from a young age, he corrects their flaws with friendly teachings, he narrates exemplary actions and gives consolation to the poor and the sick. Moreover, as indicated in lines 132-133, thanks to poetry, young people learn to pray and choruses can turn to the gods with the prayers taught by the poet. The function indicated by these lines up to line 138 is precisely that of providing the hymn in religious ritual. Horace himself fulfilled this function of poetry in his *Carmen Saeculare*, and there is no doubt that he has this fact in mind here; at the same time Horace is hinting at a poetry that accompanies all the moments of the vegetative cycle to invoke the assistance of the gods⁷⁷.

Line 133 of *Epist.* II, 1, together with the preceding and the following ones (except for l. 132) is correctly understood and rightly quoted in a later manual, *Regia regis* (ms. 27), which displays a more in-depth treatment of different issues regarding poetry. The author of this manual does not limit himself to presenting the reader with definitions; he prefers to explain them, as he does, for instance, when defining the essence of poetry, which many authors take from Pontanus' manual ("[Poesis est] ars hominum actiones effingens easque ad vitam instituendam carminibus explicans"⁷⁸). Thus he explains that in order to "instituere vitam" ("institute life"), the writer first has to narrate his subject matter, then he should make clear its utility and finally he should delight. From the delight should follow the imitation of good actions and the abhorrence of bad ones, and in this consists the "institutio vitae" ("institution of life"). In order then to detail the many utilities of the "bonum" ("good") originated by poetry, he quotes Horace's lines (117-119a, 127-131, 133-138) from *Epist.* II, 1, where the author first alludes to the restless passion for composing poetry that seems to have embraced learned and unlearned men (i.e. those who have talent and those who do not). Subsequently, he lists the positive sides of this poetical 'mania', and thus expounds his conception of the poet as master and educator of his people. However, he omits lines 119b-126, which contain the characterization of the poet as a man free of avarice, far from the material preoccupations of everyday life and inept as a soldier. Instead, he focuses his attention on the moral education of souls that poetry achieves. Cf.:

scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim.
Hic error tamen et levis haec insania quantas
virtutes habeat, sic collige: (*Epist.* II, 1, 117-119a)

⁷⁷ Cf. Fraenkel 1993: 533.

⁷⁸ "Poetry is the art that represents human actions, and that explains them with verses for the institution of human life" (Pontanus 1594: 5).

But, skilled or unskilled, we scribble poetry, all alike.
And yet this craze, this mild madness, has its
merits. How great these are, now consider.

torquet ab obscenis iam nunc sermonibus aurem,
mox etiam pectus praeceptis format amicis,
asperitatis et invidiae corrector et irae,
recte facta refert, orientia tempora notis
instruit exemplis, inopem solatur et aegrum⁷⁹.
(*Epist.* II, 1, 127-131)

Even then, he turns the ear from unseemly
words; presently, too, he moulds the heart by
kindly precepts, correcting roughness and envy and
anger. He tells of noble deeds, equips the rising
age with famous examples, and to the helpless and
sick at heart brings comfort.

Disceret unde preces, vatem ni Musa dedisset?
Poscit opem chorus et praesentia numina sentit,
caelestis implorat aquas docta prece blandus,
avertit morbos, metuenda pericula pellit,
impetrat et pacem et locupletem frugibus annum;
carmine di superi placantur, carmine Manes.
(*Epist.* II, 1, 133-138)

Whence would [he]⁸⁰ learn the suppliant hymn,
had the Muse not given [him] a bard?
Their chorus asks for aid, and feels the
presence of the gods, calls for showers from heaven,
winning favour with the prayer he has taught, averts
disease, drives away dreaded dangers, gains peace
and a season rich in fruits.

It is no coincidence that the author omits line 132 (“Castis cum pueris ignara puella mariti” – “chaste boys, unwedded girls”), which contains the subject(s) of the action described in line 133. The reason probably lies in the stress on the

⁷⁹ Ms. 27, f. 10 r. Lines 128 and 130-131 are quoted also by Sylvestr Dobryna, author of *Liber de arte poetica* (ms. 28, f. 10 v.), in his preface, where he expounds on the many virtues (“officia et beneficia”) of poetry. Quite revealing of the function of moral instruction attributed to poetry is Konys’kyj’s quotation of a modified variant of line 128 in his preface (ms. 30, f. 2 r.): “pectus praeceptis format honestis”. This modified quotation is found in M.A. Muret’s *Oratio XI* of vol. II of his *Orations (M. Antonii Muretii Orationes volumen alterum)*, from which Konys’kyj probably drew it.

⁸⁰ The addition to Rushton Fairclough’s translation of “he” in this line and “him” in the following one is mine: for an explanation, see my text following the quotation of these lines.

chastity of the boys and girls that sang in choirs, who precisely for their chastity were deemed the most effective mediators between human wishes and divine will. This way the subject of learning the prayers appears to be the poet himself, who is also the object of the giving by the Muse. As to the following lines, more than focusing his own attention on the chorus, the author probably quotes them to mention the divine qualities and powers of poetry, after having used Horace's words to illustrate the human side of the poet's action of moral perfection of men's souls and minds and consolation of the sick and the poor.

The author of this manual also illustrates the many qualities of poetry in his *Proloquium ad Neovates (Introduction to the novice poets)*. Interestingly enough, he chooses lines 196-201 of Horace's AP that provide a series of precepts on the attitude of the chorus in tragedy, and reflect the moralistic conception that informs the AP. The chorus should take the part of good men, should advise them and soothe the furious; moreover, it should praise frugality in eating, justice, laws, and peace. Finally, in Greek tragedy, the chorus had the function of keeping the secrets of the characters, and of praying to the gods, asking that the goddess Fortune come back to the humble and abandon the haughty. Out of their specific context, however, these lines, could apply to poetry in general and illustrate its many human and 'superhuman' qualities; cf.:

Ille bonis faveatque et consilietur amice
et regat iratos et amet peccare timentis;
ille dapes laudet mensae brevis, ille salubrem
iustitiam legesque et apertis otia portis;
ille tegat commissa deosque precetur et oret,
ut redeat miseris, abeat Fortuna superbis.

It should side with the good and give friendly counsel;
sway the angry and cherish the righteous. It should
praise the fare of a modest board, praise wholesome
justice, law, and peace with her open gates; should
keep secrets, and pray and beseech the gods that
fortune may return to the unhappy, and depart from
the proud.

An analysis of the selective use of Horace in the first part of the general poetics shows an understanding of poetry characterized by the interference, or rather the conflation of two conceptions, which is typical of the Baroque: on one side that of the Christian poet, whose duty is to serve God; on the other that of the Platonic *furor divinus*⁸¹. According to the latter, the poet, being endowed with almost supernatural capacities, is able to move the soul of the listeners, so as to induce them to accomplish good and wise actions. The accent on the role of *persuasio* in poetry assimilates the latter to rhetoric, under whose dominion it indeed is. In the same manuals, this conflation causes Horace's twofold aim of

⁸¹ Cf. also Hnatjuk 1994: 53.

poetry to be transformed into a threefold aim, in which the *utile* (i.e. the ultimate goal of *docere*) is achieved with an appeal to man's passions. At the same time, the didactic role of poetry can be fulfilled by its illustrating the brave and glorious deeds of the great men of the past. Implicitly, the education of devout men (i.e. the duty of the Christian poet) can be pursued also by showing the wise and noble actions of illustrious men of the present, with whom it is easier to identify. The didactic function of praise is pursued mainly with panegyric poetry. It is indeed the latter (that belongs to the *genus demonstrativum*) to be prevalent both in contemporary Ukrainian poetry and in the poetic compositions of Mohylian teachers. The closeness of poetry to rhetoric in contemporary perception is also shown by the negation of the common axiom "Poetae nascuntur, oratores fiunt", which is understandable also taking into account the applied destination of poetics. Thus, poetry is an art that can be mastered by means of diligent study and by applying the rules in the different rhetorical ambits that were applied to it: the choice of the subject matter, its disposition, the stylistic-linguistic aspect (*inventio, dispositio, elocutio*). The apparent contradiction between the conception of the poet as a divinely inspired man and the poet as an 'artisan' (a sort of verse-maker) is often resolved in the poetics by invoking divine aid, i.e. (the Christian) God and the Saints.

4.3. The concept of imitation, closely connected with the critical issue of the relationship between nature and art, was given a central place in Mohylian poetics. Generally speaking, for the authors of the manuals it had two meanings and was applied to two aspects of the art of composing poetry: on one side, it consisted in studying and in likening one's own work to that of a writer considered exemplary (*imitatio in opere, imitatio operis* or *imitatio auctorum*)⁸²; on the other, it concerned, included, and was made to coincide with *fictio*, which was at the basis of the poetic work, and it was to be understood in substance as the imitation of nature, that is of reality (*imitatio in natura* or *imitatio naturae*). This second meaning, paramount in Renaissance theories of art, was inherited by Mohylian teachers, as it had been by Western European theorists of poetics, from Plato and Aristotle, by way of Cicero, Horace and Quintilian⁸³.

The attitude to *fictio* is an important part of the conception of poetry prevalent in the Mohylian poetics, and thus deserves some attention. In their treatises on poetry, Mohylian teachers synthesize the different positions elaborated by

⁸² This is how the author of *Lyra variis praeceptorum chordis... instructa* (ms. 6.1, f. 10 v.) defines it: "Imitatio in operando est similitudo inveniendi aut disponendi aut eloquendi" ("Imitation in the mode of writing is the similarity of invention, disposition or of elocution"). For some authors, this was the only meaning of *imitatio*.

⁸³ On the different interpretations of the concept of imitation by Renaissance critics, see Baldwin 1959: 175, 188-189. On Renaissance theories of imitation of model authors, see also Moss 2008b. On the theory of poetic imitation as artistic creation in the sixteenth century, cf. Herrick 1946: 28-38.

Western European literary critics during the sixteenth century⁸⁴. On the one hand, Plato's charge to poets that they were liars had given rise to a lively discussion on the role that history (as a source of 'truth') should play in poetry. On the other, Plato had excluded the poetry of praise from his ban on poetry, since by arousing emulation in youth through the desire for fame, it could reinforce the state by fostering virtue. At the same time, sixteenth century commentators of Aristotle had emphasized the centrality of praise and blame in his *Poetics* and had elaborated their theories of genres accordingly. Moreover, "didactic criticism assimilated the *Poetics* by assuming that the idealization of forms based on praise creates edifying pictures of virtue, while the forms based on denigration make vice seem unattractive"⁸⁵. Aristotle had stated that the poet was a creator of fables, and thus he had laid stress on *factio* as the essence of poetry, rather than on history. However, as Hardison asserts, since not many critics were willing to defend *factio* per se, and Christian authors did not consider it a virtue, the two positions were generally conciliated in a compromise: the poets could choose their material from history, but then they could "'exercise' invention to create new episodes, digressions, and other ornamental embellishments"⁸⁶. And thus, Mohylanian authors stress that imitation or fiction is the soul of poetry, that which distinguishes it from other arts. However, following Aristotle, they emphasize that poetry should not be a versified history, but should rather distinguish itself for a *factio* that represents in a verisimilar way what could have or ought to have happened⁸⁷. A few Mohylanian teachers follow Aristotle in contrasting Homer and Empedocles, who both wrote in verse lines, however the former was a poet since he used *factio*, while the latter can be considered simply a versifier⁸⁸. Some also quote Herodotus as an example of a historian writing in verse lines, but no poet⁸⁹. Finally, like sixteenth century commentators of Aristotle, a few Mohylanian teachers substitute Lucan for Empedocles and Herodotus, or add his name next to them⁹⁰.

4.3.1. To express the principle of verisimilitude, a few Mohylanian teachers couple Aristotle's words just quoted with Horace's statement that fiction intended to please should be close to the truth:

⁸⁴ Cf. Hardison 1962, in particular 43-67, and Weinberg 1961.

⁸⁵ Hardison 1962: 28.

⁸⁶ *Ibidem*: 48.

⁸⁷ Cf., e. g., *Hymettus extra Atticam* (ms. 8, f. 3 v.-4 r.): "Hoc enim proprium est poeseos, iuxta Aristotelem dicentem: praecipuum est opus poetae non facta esse dicere sed quemadmodum fieri debuerant et fieri possunt secundum verisimile et necessarium exprimere" ("Indeed, this is peculiar to poetry, according to Aristotle, who says: the poet's principal function is not to relate the things that have happened, but to express in which way they should have happened or can happen according to verisimilitude and necessity"). Cf. Aristotle's *Poetics* 9.1451^a36-1451^b7.

⁸⁸ Cf. mss. 3, 13, 14.

⁸⁹ Cf. mss. 3, 14, 18.

⁹⁰ Cf. mss. 5, 13, 14.

ficta voluptatis causa sint proxima veris⁹¹ (AP 338)

Fictions meant to please should be close to the real

as well as with his praise of the poet who is able to successfully mingle truth with fiction and to compose a poem whose parts together constitute a harmonious and uniform whole:

atque ita mentitur, sic veris falsa remiscet
 primo ne medium, medio ne discrepet primum [sic!]⁹²
 (AP 151-152)

and so skillfully does he invent, so closely
 does he blend facts and fiction, that the middle is
 not discordant with the beginning, nor the end with
 the middle.

In order to stress the importance that the invented thing, whether verisimilar or false, in any case be commensurate with real proportions, the author of *Cedrus Apollinis* (ms. 10), I. Jaroševyc'kyj quotes line 339 of the AP:

Nec quodcumque volet poscat sibi fabula credi.

So that your play must not ask for
 belief in anything it chooses.

To understand the meaning of this line, however, one needs to read it together with the preceding one, “Ficta voluptatis causa sint proxima veris” (“Fictions meant to please should be close to the real”), in which, among others, Horace links *fictio* with *delectare*. In this way you can understand that here the Latin poet uses *fabula* to mean *falsum*⁹³; the Mohylanian teacher, on his side, thus explains the cited line (f. 82 r.-82 v.): “quamvis ipsae fabulae careant veritate, certe similitudine virtutis carere non debeant. Non debent item pro veris habere et ut talia putari” (“although the fables themselves lack truth, they should nevertheless not lack the virtue of resemblance. Besides, they should not be seen as true and should not be considered as such”).

The same line is quoted further on in the manual, in the section on the virtues of poetry, where Jaroševyc'kyj explains with great clarity the essence of *fic-*

⁹¹ Cf. ms. 17, f. 6 v. (*Fons poeseos*).

⁹² Cf. ms. 10, f. 84 r. (*Cedrus Apollinis*).

⁹³ As Brink asserts (1971: 354), Hellenistic and Roman doctrine distinguished literary forms according to their presumed degree of factual truth: “istoria (*fama, verum*), *plásma* (*fictum* or *argumentum, verisimile*), and *mýthos* (*fabula, falsum*), where *plásma* and *mýthos* inevitably get entangled, and may be conflated”. Indeed, as Brink states, Horace does not distinguish clearly between the two genres that are not true (*non vera*): *fictum* and *fabula*.

tio: “Quo ad res fictio, [...] nomine fictionis non intelligitur mendacium aliquod mortale et vitiosum, sed imitationem rei verae seu fictae personae. Unde Poeta cum ficta narrat, non dicit ut vera, sed supponit ab auditoribus supponi se ficta narrare, iuxta Horatium

Nec quodcumque volet poscat sibi fabula credi” (f. 158 r.)⁹⁴.

At other times Mohylanian authors, even if not mentioning Horace, express a conception of *fictio* that certainly harks back to his AP. Such is the case of the author of *Regia regis*, when he explains to his pupils the meaning of *effingens* as referred to poetry. *Fictio*, he asserts, should not be just of any sort or produced in any way you may think of, but should have its foundation in the thing that is to be represented. Otherwise it would obtain a “*fictio vel absurda vel disordinata, vel sine apparatu debito facta*”⁹⁵, which “non movebit auditorem, consequenter neque instituet vitam humanam, sed tanquam ridicula, probrosa, et monstrum horrendum avertet auditoris animum a se” (ms. 27, f. 8 r.)⁹⁶. In this manual, Horace is mentioned a little later, when the author speaks of what makes a poet a good poet, and what, on the contrary, should prevent this name from being bestowed on him. In particular, he warns his pupils against indecent *fictio*, which lacks elegance and excellence of expression, and dishonors the name of the poet as well as offending the ears of the listeners. Thus, the poet-novice, he says, should always have Horace’s admonition before him (AP 87):

cur ego, si nequeo ignoroque, poeta salutor?

If I fail to keep and do not understand
[these well-marked shifts and shades of poetic forms,]
why am I hailed as poet?

In this line, however, Horace is referring to the inability to respect poetic genres and their different styles, due both to ignorance (“ignoro”), i.e. lack of knowledge and unwillingness to learn, and to a defect of nature, due to the lack of natural talent (“nequeo”).

At other times, Mohylanian teachers seem to conceive of *imitatio* in Platonic terms, or at least they mention Plato’s theory, although mostly understood superficially, as was the case in the Italian Renaissance. Thus, the author of *Arc-tos in Parnasso*, as the author of *Lyra...*, states that imitation has been correctly defined by Donatus, who said it to be the representation of something, following

⁹⁴ “With regard to fiction [...] the word fiction should not mean some mortal [i.e. human] or vicious lie, but the imitation of a true thing or of an invented person. Therefore, when a poet tells of invented things, he does not say them as if they were true, but he supposes listeners to suppose that he is telling invented things, according to Horace, ‘so that your play must not ask for belief in anything it chooses’”.

⁹⁵ “An absurd, disorderly fiction, or improperly prepared”.

⁹⁶ “It will not move the listener, and consequently will not even institute human life, but as a ridiculous, shameful thing, as a horrible monster, it will turn the soul of the listeners away”.

Plato, who stated that imitation is the effect of images. Already this statement shows a misinterpretation of the Platonic philosophical conception. Indeed, this definition is not followed by the explanation of what this meant for Plato, i.e. that every material or spiritual creation was an 'imitation' of the idea of the same thing existing in God's mind. As to poetry, imitation for Plato had different levels: the first imitation of the idea was in the natural object; the second imitation, of this natural object, in the concept of the poet; the third imitation, of this concept, in the thing created by the poet. In addition to Plato's and the Platonists' conception, which entailed a rejection of poetry for its being collocated to a third level of distance from the truth, towards the end of the fifteenth century came Averroës' conception, which saw poetry as an "imitation of nature", and the latter was easily mixed up with the Platonic theory. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, both theories were easily confused and identified with the Aristotelian conception (expounded in the *Poetics*) of poetry as 'imitation of men in action', i.e. of human actions; most frequently the three were conflated and taken as one and the same. Thus, the authors of *Arctos in Parnasso* and *Lyra... instructa* simplify Plato's idea and interpret it by saying that imitation is the effect of images, and therefore to imitate is to make something in the image of another thing. In fact we imitate not the thing itself, but the image that is formed from that thing and represents it in our mind. The Platonic concept, however, is often reduced to simply an imitation of nature, which is generally synthesized by Mohylanian authors in the prescription that every poetical work be verisimilar.

Moreover, generally speaking, the Mohylanian poetics feature two ways of explaining the concept of *imitatio naturae*. In a few manuals (such as *Camoena in Parnasso* and *Cytheron bivertex*) this type of *imitatio* is defined as *effictio*, and it is when the poet depicts an object in the likeness (*ad similitudinem*) of another object. This *similitudo* is said to be of three types: simple, metaphorical and poetical. The first occurs when one thing is simply described by comparing it with another thing; the second occurs when you describe one thing by comparing it to another metaphorically or allegorically. Finally, poetical *similitudo* occurs when the poet describes an invented thing by comparing it to an existing one: the latter is defined as the basis (*fundamentum*) of the imitation of nature. To explain these definitions to their pupils, Mohylanian teachers usually provided poetical examples. The first type of *similitudo* is thus practically explained in *Camoena in Parnasso* with the quotation of Horace's *Serm.* I, 1, 30-35 "ubi comparantur laboriosi per similitudinem cum formica" (ms. 4.1, f. 82 v.; ms. 4.2, f. 114 r.)⁹⁷. Cf.:

⁹⁷ "Where hard-working men are compared to an ant by means of a simile". The author of *Cytheron Bivertex* (ms. 5) evidently hints at these same lines when he writes "Simplex similitudo est quando aliqua res confertur cum altera per comparisonem v.g. quando hominem laboriosum rescribimus [sic!], comparando illum cum formica" – "We have a simple simile when one thing is compared to another by means of a comparison, or when we describe a hard-working man by comparing him to an ant" (f. 134 r.).

per omne
 audaces mare qui currunt, hac mente laborem
 sese ferre, senes ut in otia tuta recedant,
 aiunt, cum sibi sint congesta cibaria: sicut
 parvula (nam exemplo est magni formica laboris)
 ore trahit, quodcunque potest, atque addit acervo
 quem struit, haud ignara, ac incauta futuri, etc;

the sailors
 who boldly scour every sea, all say that they bear
 toil with this in view, that when old they may retire
 into secure ease, once they have piled up their provi-
 sions; even as the tiny, hard-working ant (for she
 is their model) drags all she can with her mouth,
 and adds it to the heap she is building, because she
 is not unaware and not heedless of the morrow.

The theme of this satire is human insatiability and greed. People are never satisfied with their own condition and envy that of others', but no one would agree to exchange their condition with that of another, if they had that chance. Avarice induces men to accumulate money and not touch it, and to place it before anything else in life. Horace states that a limit must be set to human desire for riches. This does not mean that people should live squandering their goods. There has to be a happy medium, states Horace in lines 106-107⁹⁸, beyond whose boundaries one should not venture. In this distich Horace formulates his ideal of *metriotes*, which pervades all of his poetic legacy and which was certainly extremely congenial to Ukrainian poetics teachers. By comparing those who toil hard (peasants, innkeepers, soldiers, and merchants, of whom only the latter appear in the quoted lines) with the ant, Horace wished to underline a substantial distinction⁹⁹. While the ant after having accumulated enough goods, stops to enjoy them during the winter, humans continue to be moved by an insatiable desire for riches. Mohylian teachers, however, rather than dwelling on avarice, are interested in stressing the example of industriousness that the ant personifies.

Other authors provide their pupils with a much more detailed explanation of the concept of *imitatio naturae* (also called verisimilitude). They stress that it can be of two types: in things (*in rebus*) or in words (*in verbis*). As to the former, they usually distinguish twelve types: the type presented in *Arctos in Parnasso* (ms. 12, f. 108 v.) (which figures as the second in *Lyra...* (ms. 6.1, f. 8 r.) and *Liber de arte poetica* – ms. 28, f. 28 v.) occurs “when irrational things are given rational actions or poetic speech” (“cum rebus irrationalibus tribuitur actio ra-

⁹⁸ “Est modus in rebus, sunt certi denique fines, / quos ultra citraque nequit consistere rectum” (“There is a measure in all things. There are, in short, fixed bounds, beyond and short of which right can find no place.”).

⁹⁹ Comparisons with animals are frequent in the diatribic tradition, to which this satire harks back. The parallel between human greed and the ant is also in Plutarch.

tionalis aut locutio ita poetica”). And they exemplify this type of imitation with different examples taken from Horace. One is Horace's *Serm.* II, 3, 314-320 (ms. 6.1, f. 8 r., ; ms. 12, f. 108 v.) in which the author reproaches arrogance and stupid emulation with a fable (“arrogantiam quandam et stultam emulationem hoc redarguit apologo” – “with this fable he reproached a certain arrogance and stupid emulation”). It is the fable of the frog and the calf, which is of Aesopian origin and appears also in Phaedrus. In the absence of the mother frog, the little frogs are crushed by a calf; the only one to survive tells her that an enormous beast had crushed his brothers underfoot. In order to understand the size of the beast, the mother frog starts to swell more and more, until the baby frog interrupts her by telling her that even if she had swollen large enough to burst, she would not reach the size of the beast. Cf.:

Absentis ranae pullis vituli pede pressis
 unus ubi effugit, matri denarrat, ut ingens
 belua cognatos eliserit: illa rogare,
 quantane? num tantum, sufflans se, magna fuisset?
 ‘maior dimidio.’ ‘Num tanto?’ cum magis atque
 se magis inflaret, ‘non, si te ruperis,’ inquit,
 ‘par eris.’ Haec a te non multum abludit imago.

A mother frog was away from home when her young brood were crushed under the foot of a calf. One only escaped to tell the tale to his mother, how a huge beast dashed his brothers to death. “How big was it?” she asks; “as big as this?” puffing herself out. “Half as big again.” “Was it big like this?” as she swelled herself out more and more. “Though you burst yourself,” said he, “you’ll never be as large.” Not badly does this picture hit you off.

In this satire Horace reproduces a conversation between himself and Damasippus in his own Sabine villa: he apparently retired to the countryside in order to revive his poetic inspiration, far away from the noise of the city. Damasippus embraced Stoicism after having gone bankrupt because of his exaggerated passion for artworks, and as he wanted to commit suicide, he met the Stoic philosopher Stertinius, who dissuaded him, and demonstrated him that all men are fools, except for those who practice philosophy. The satire is almost wholly occupied by Stertinius's words to Damasippus, and Horace's caricatural intent toward the former and the Stoic precepts is manifest. After an introductory section containing a dialogue between Damasippus and Horace that moves from the determination of the causes of poetic sterility to the definition of the concept of foolishness (ll. 1-40), the satire moves on to Stertinius's speech; in the first part (ll. 41-81), the latter defines *insania*, speaks of everybody's foolishness, except for the wise's, and lists different forms of foolishness. This is followed by a few examples of avarice – the worst form of *insania* (ll. 82-159) – of ambition

(ll. 159-223), of lust (ll. 224-280), and of superstition (ll. 281-295). In the conclusive part the author takes up the dialogue with Damasippus again, in which Horace tries to find out from his interlocutor why he himself is a fool, and after Damasippus has levelled quite a few accusations against him, the poet loses his patience and defines himself *minor insanus* compared to someone, like Damasippus himself, who is *maior insanus*. The fable quoted fits into the part where Damasippus accuses Horace of wanting to imitate and compete with those who are superior to him, in particular his patron Maecenas. An implicit moral message on knowing one's own limits and one's own place and not trying to emulate things and people superior to us is what probably attracted the Mohylian teachers.

The same applies to the second fable from Horace that the authors of *Lyra...* and *Arctos in Parnasso* adduce to exemplify this type of verisimilitude¹⁰⁰. Rightly the author of *Lyra...* introduces the quotation of lines 29-33 of Horace's *Epist.* I, 7, saying that "sic Horatius libro primo epistola septima indicans libertatem beneficijs mancipari, inducit mustellam cum vulpe loquentem"¹⁰¹. Indeed, in this epistle Horace turns to Maecenas, responding to the latter's reproach about Horace's excessively long stay in his Sabine villa. Because of the solicitation of his illustrious patron, Horace should go back to Rome. However, his intentions are different and in order to carry them out, he uses a wise technique: first he adduces as an excuse his weak health; then the poet expresses his gratitude for the gifts received from Maecenas and reminds him of the reciprocal praise that has always characterized their relations. Maecenas is likened to the *vir bonus et sapiens*, who is able to distinguish those people who are worthy of receiving gifts: in this category Horace places also himself. After stressing the gratitude and sincerity that have always distinguished his friendship for Maecenas, he declares that he is ready to give back all he has received from his patron, if this friendship should force him to renounce his freedom of movement. And to prove this he makes the example of a thin fox¹⁰² who had squeezed through a narrow space into a basket full of wheat. However, after having stuffed herself with it, she wanted to get out, but was unable to do so. A weasel then suggested that, to be able to get out, she would have to become as thin as she was before. Cf.:

¹⁰⁰ The author of *Liber de arte poetica* (ms. 28) simply mentions this fable without quoting it.

¹⁰¹ Ms. 6.1, f. 8 r. ("Thus Horace in his first book of Epistles, seventh epistle, to show that freedom is acquired through benefits, presents a weasel talking to a fox").

¹⁰² There have been different interpretations as to the identity of this animal. Bentley argued that taking into account the small dimensions needed to creep through a narrow gap into a corn bin and the fact that foxes are carnivorous, the correct name of the animal here was *nitedula*, a dormouse. Giangrande 1966 cogently suggests that the right name of the animal would be *cornicula*, that is a small crow: indeed, this animal would also explain the presence of the *mustela* (weasel) and its keeping far away, since the crow is traditionally hostile to the weasel. Shackleton Bailey in his text (2008: 265) has *cornicula*.

Forte per angustam tenuis volpecula rimam
 repererat in cumeram frumenti, pastaque rursus
 ire foras pleno tendebat corpore frustra;
 cui mustela procul: 'Si vis' ait 'effugere istinc,
 macra cavum repetes artum, quem macra subisti'.

Once it chanced that a pinched little fox had
 crept through a narrow chink into a bin of corn, and
 when well fed was trying with stuffed stomach to
 get out again, but in vain. To him quoth a weasel
 hard by: "If you wish to escape from there, you
 must go back lean to the narrow gap which you
 entered when lean".

If this example applies to himself, Horace says, he is ready to renounce all he received from Meacenas. Indeed, the dynamics of gifts and of the obligations they impose on those who receive, runs through the whole epistle. The gift has produced a radical change in Horace's life condition, but it is obvious that he who receives a gift expects a change for the better, an improvement. However, there are cases in which a gift can lead to a worse life, as is the case of Volteius Mena, who was convinced by Lucius Marcius Philippus, a famous lawyer, to buy a plot of land and become a peasant, and thus to abandon his life as a public town-crier. When a series of misfortunes ruins his harvest and decimates his animals, he would like to go back to his prior condition. Hence Horace's moral admonishment not to bite off more than you can chew, and to go back quickly to your previous condition if you realize the new one is worse than the old one. "Metiri se quemque suo modulo ac pede verum est" ("Tis / right that each should measure himself by his own / rule and standard"), is Horace's wise conclusion.

A similar moral is present in Horace's famous fable on the city and the country mouse, to which the success of *Serm.* II, 6 is mainly due. Part of this fable (ll. 80-87) is quoted by Sylvestr Dobryna, author of *Liber de arte poetica* (ms. 28, f. 28 v.), to exemplify the second type of *imitatio in rebus*. Horace's satire praises the advantages of country life over city life. Life in Rome, noisy, hectic, and full of boring duties, no longer holds any attraction for Horace. The countryside that the poet longs for is where he can recover his peace of mind and which he can enjoy thanks to his Sabine villa, Maecenas's gift. There, together with a few friends, free from the rigid rules of city banquets, they can talk about life's true values, whether it is money or virtue that brings true happiness, whether it is the search for an advantage or a sincere feeling to induce men to make friends, which is the essence of true good. And here Horace, through the mouth of his neighbour Cervius, introduces the fable of the two mice, which represents the culminating point of the satire. In it Mohylanian pupils found the juxtaposition of two types of life: one, in the city, characterized by abundance of food and riches, but also full of dangers and snares; the other, in the countryside, more modest and humble, but also safe and genuine.

Evidently, the pupils were already acquainted with this fable of Horace's, and Dobryna was mainly interested in showing how two 'irrational' beings were conferred rational actions and speech. In fact, the quotation concludes with the notation "etc."; cf. *Serm.* II, 6, 80-87:

olim

rusticus urbanum murem mus paupere fertur
 accepisse cavo, veterem vetus hospes amicum,
 asper et attentus quaesitis, ut tamen artum
 solveret hospitii animum. quid multa? neque ille
 sepositi ciceris nec longae invidit avenae,
 aridum et ore ferens acinum semesaque lardi
 frustra dedit, cupiens varia fastidia cena
 vincere tangentis male singula dente superbo etc:

Once on a time – such is the tale
 – a country mouse welcomed a city mouse in his
 poor hole, host and guest old friends both. Roughly
 he fared, frugal of his store, yet could open his thrifty
 soul in acts of hospitality, in short, he grudged not
 his hoard of vetch or long oats, but bringing in his
 mouth a dried raisin and nibbled bits of bacon he
 served them, being eager by varying the fare to
 overcome the daintiness of a guest, who, with squeam-
 ish tooth, would barely touch each morsel.

Indeed, the fable contained in *Serm.* II, 6 had been 'circulating' in the Mohylian poetics at least since 1705 and Prokopovyč's *De arte poetica libri III*. In fact, in the chapter on fable he cites this example and precedes it with a shorter version that is the fruit of an exercise by Prokopovyč himself (Prokopovič 1961: 267-268). Both versions will subsequently be provided as exercise by Lavrentij Horka (ms. 13.2, f. 61 v.-63 r.), Konys'kyj (ms. 30, f. 63 r.-64 v.), and others.

4.3.2. As regards *imitatio operis*, Horace's 'prescriptions' are adduced in all the three contexts to which it could be applied, that is *inventio*, *dispositio*, and *elocutio*, as the authors of mss. *Camoena in Parnasso*, *Lyra variis...*, *Rosa inter spinas*, and *Liber de arte poetica*, among others, recall; the author of *Camoena in Parnasso* also adds the *elaboratio* of an exemplary poet to *elocutio* as an object of imitation, but without explaining this in detail.

In order to illustrate to his pupils the risks of excessive imitation, especially that of copying the defects of a bad exemplar, Prokopovyč quotes AP 359, "quodque bonus dormitat Homerus" ("[I also feel aggrieved] whenever good Homer 'nods'"), where the Latin classic warns not to 'trust' even great poets, for they also may err and fall into contradictions, although minor flaws in a long

poem may be excusable¹⁰³. He agrees with Horace, who dealt with the topic of a bad imitation and bad imitators more than once, and quotes Horace's line (*Epist.* I, 19, 19-20) "O imitatores, servum pecus, ut mihi saepe / Bilem, saepe iocum vestri movere tumultus!" ("O you mimics, you slavish herd! How often your pother has stirred my spleen, how often my mirth!"¹⁰⁴), although he erroneously ascribes these lines to the AP, and so does Lavrentij Horka (ms. 13.2, f. 64 v.) after him. This same distich is quoted as a warning against *servilis imitatio* also by the authors of *Officina* (ms. 20, f. 60 r.) and *Liber de arte poetica* (ms. 28, f. 24 v.), although in the former manuscript the author deals with imitation not in the general poetics, but within the long chapter on epic poetry. Both authors for *imitatio* intend to follow the example of most eminent and erudite writers, and they dwell at length on the conditions of a good and successful imitation. The author of *Officina* stresses to his pupils the importance of loving what they read: this, together with dedication and perseverance in reading, arouses the desire to create something worthy. This teacher calls good *imitatio*, "ingenua imitatio" ("naïve imitation") which novice poets should practice, and it consists of not reproducing the chosen model word by word. Instead, they should know the subject matter to be imitated so well that they can express it so that it sounds like their own work. And to support his view, he quotes Horace's AP (ll. 131-134a), although with some slight changes:

Publica materies privatis ius erit si
nec circa vilem patulumque moraberis orbem,
nec verbum verbo curatis reddere firmum
interpretis¹⁰⁵.

In ground open to all you will win private rights,
if you do not linger along the easy and open pathway,
if you do not seek to render word for word as a
slavish translator.

In these and the following lines Horace faces a key issue of Roman literary discussions, i.e. the originality of subject matters inherited from tradition and from models. Using juridical terms, he states that if the topics dealt with are of public domain, that is already known to the public (*publica materies*), they can

¹⁰³ Prokopovič 1961: 270. The statement "quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus", as a proverbial expression on the fallibility of even great poets, is quoted in some of the *Florilegia* that were compiled with an aim of moral edification and often appended to the poetics manuals. Cf. *Lyra variis praeceptorum chordis... instructa* (ms. 6.1, f. 198 v.).

¹⁰⁴ *Ibidem*.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Horace's lines: "Publica materies privati iuris erit, si / non circa vilem patulumque moraberis orbem, / nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus / interpretis." Horace is here speaking of translation proper, while the Mohylian teacher is illustrating imitation: this would explain the substitution of "fidus" that agrees with "interpretis" with "firmum", that agrees with "verbum", and can thus be rendered as "valid word(s)".

still be treated with originality, thereby entering the private domain (*privati iuris*). In order to do this, the poet should comply with a series of prescriptions that Horace illustrates in lines 131-135, and that are partly taken up and explained by the author of *Officina*¹⁰⁶. He then adds his own advice on how to achieve a successful imitation, by following a variety of sources and mainly imitating the things that give a poem “excellence”, i.e. figures of speech and epithets.

At times, despite not explicitly mentioning Horace’s name in their advice to the fledgling poets, the Mohylian teachers, do echo his words. Such is the case of Sylvestr Dobryna (ms. 28), who, after pointing out the risks to be avoided when emulating the work of a poet, suggests ways of accomplishing a successful imitation. Among them, once a would-be poet has found a good model for his own works, he should turn it over by night and turn them by day¹⁰⁷, with enthusiasm, so that they may become familiar to him. There is no doubt that these words echo Horace’s exhortation to those Roman poets wishing to excel in the dramatic genres to turn over the Greek models by night, turn them by day (“Vos exemplaria Graeca / nocturna versate manu, versate diurna” – AP 268b-269 – “For yourselves, / handle Greek models by night, handle them by day”). Here Horace is dwelling on the subject of meter, but his advice, sparse and couched as an imperious precept (through the anaphora of *versate* and the chiasmus) was certainly appealing to Mohylian teachers and applicable to poetry in general.

The imitation of an exemplar poet is illustrated in detail by a few teachers. The author of *Lyra...* (ms. 6.1) divides it in *imitatio rei* (that concerns *inventio* and *dispositio*) and *imitatio verborum* (i.e. *elocutio*). The imitation concerning *inventio rei* is thus defined: “*inventio rei, vel actionis vel acuminis, ab una persona vel actione ad aliam personam vel actionem transfertur*”¹⁰⁸. The author then proceeds to give practical examples of this expedient, and the first one is an epigram by Bernardus Bauhusius¹⁰⁹ (epigram 12 of the fourth book of his *Epigrammatum selectorum libri quinque*) on a fasting virgin, in which the au-

¹⁰⁶ Horace’s arguments hark back to Aristotle, who in chapters VIII-IX of his *Poetics* had contrasted Homer with the poets of the cyclic epic, and had praised the former for his ability to expound his subject matter in a dramatic way, which the latter were not able to do. According to Brink (1971: 117), the terms of the exordium *publica materies privati iuris*, which feature a combination of juridical language and literary terminology, echo Philodemus’ words, attested in two fragments combined by Jensen (cf. *Herculaniensia volumina*, second edition, IV 195; VII 87), and in his turn Philodemus depends upon a critic that may be indentified with Neoptolemus of Parium.

¹⁰⁷ Cf.: “*Quem imitandum nobis sumpsimus, eum summa cum alacritate feramus, et nocturna manu et diurna versemus*” (ms. 28, f. 25 r.; “Let’s work enthusiastically on whatever we have chosen to imitate, both by night and by day”).

¹⁰⁸ “The invention of any thing, action or *acumen*, is transferred from one person or from one action to another person or action” (ms. 6.1, f. 10 v.).

¹⁰⁹ Bernardus Bauhusius (Bernard van Bauhuysen or Bauhuis or Bauhuys), 1576-1619, was a Jesuit poet especially known for his *Epigrammatum selectorum libri quinque* (1616).

thor connects the sweetness that one usually associates with wine and good food with the hunger the fasting virgin endures for Jesus Christ, who is himself defined sweeter. In the conclusion she states that the hunger for Jesus is as sweet as His future heavenly table will be. The author of *Lyra variis...* stresses the affinity between Bauhusius's epigram and Sarbiewski's epigram 104, *Puer Iesus totus desiderabilis*, which lies in the idea that corporal hunger is overcome by spiritual nourishment, in that spiritual contemplation of the divinity can satiate man more pervasively than material food. He also calls attention to the conclusion of Sarbiewski's epigram, which contains an *acumen* (a pun, a play with words)¹¹⁰. Cf. the final two lines:

O Iesu, mea sola fames, mea sola voluptas
Quam sapis ipse, tui si sapit ipsa fames!

O Jesus, my sole hunger, my sole pleasure,
how much you yourself taste, if hunger itself tastes of you!¹¹¹

The following example chosen to exemplify this type of imitation, both in this manual and in Josyp Turobojs'kyj's *Hymettus*, is Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* I, 10, whose exordium harks back to the exordium of Horace's *Carm.* II, 20, ll. 1-3a. Rightly, the author of *Hymettus* differentiates it from the preceding example: "Quando poeta actionem alicuius alterius poetae vel sibi vel alteri alicui applicat"¹¹². In this ode, which serves as a farewell to the public, Horace addresses himself to Maecenas as well as to his readers: he entrusts them with his work, and expresses before them his hope for immortality, according to a tradition of poetic apology typical of proems (in this case the poem closes the second book of the odes). The poem can be divided into two parts that deal respectively with the presentiment of immortality and metamorphosis (lines 1-8) and metamorphosis into a swan proper (lines 9-20). The ode is the conflation of different literary *topoi* and poetical traditions; however, the main model is ancient Greek lyric poetry, from which Horace drew the likening of the poet to a bird. Cf.:

Non usitata nec tenui ferar
penna biformis per liquidum aethera
vates.

¹¹⁰ For the definition of *acumen* and *argutia* in Sarbiewski, see Chapter 3.

¹¹¹ This same example of *inventio rei* is provided by the author of *Apollo musaeo Rossiacae Palladis Praesidens...* (ms. 18, f. 49 v.-50 r.). Unfortunately, in the recent edition of Sarbiewski's epigrams (*Epigrammatum liber / Księga epigramatów*, wydały i przełożyły M. Piskała i D. Sutkowska, "Biblioteka Pisarzy Staropolskich", t. 26, Instytut Badań Literackich PAN – Stowarzyszenie "Pro Cultura Litteraria", Warszawa 2003; accessible also online: <http://ibl.waw.pl/26bps.pdf>, accessed 30 November 2017) the link between Bauhusius's epigram and Sarbiewski's is not recorded.

¹¹² "When the poet applies the action of some other poet either to himself or to some other" (ms. 8, f. 6 r.).

Borne on streams of air by neither
a weak nor a common wing, a hybrid
bard.

In the first lines the poet is speaking of his poetry, stressing its novelty (“non usitata”) and its sublimity (“nec tenui”: the adjective *tenuis*, i.e. unimportant, is how Horace usually calls the poetry he chooses to write). As to *biformis*, it probably means that he has taken a second form, alluding to the metamorphosis that has already taken place. Next to Horace’s, Sarbiewski’s exordium of *Lyr.* I, 10 is quoted:

Non solus olim præpes Horatius
Ibit biformis per liquidum aethera vates¹¹³.

Not only the once winged bard Horace
will fly with a double shape through the flowing air.

It is worth noting that these same two exordia are cited beside each other, although with a different aim, in the manual *Rosa inter spinas*, in the section dedicated to lyric poetry, which will be treated in greater detail in Chapter 3. In this manual, the treatment of lyric poetry is quite extensive and provides a detailed illustration of this poetic genre. The third section of this chapter on lyric poetry deals with the ways of embellishing the odes, which in their turn have been divided according to the genres of oratory into encomiastic (*genus exornativum*), ethical or moral (*genus deliberativum*), and execratory (*genus iudiciale*)¹¹⁴. For each of this type of odes, the author provides and illustrates various kinds of exordia, so as to present ready-made models that his pupils can analyze and imitate. Here the presence of Horace’s poetic legacy is indeed overwhelming, and rightly so. As for the above-mentioned verses, they are cited as an example of exordium “per fictionem, quando Poeta dicit se ab Apolline, seu Musis iussum laudes enarrare”¹¹⁵. Horace’s exordium, next to Sarbiewski’s, is thus quoted as an example in which the poet acknowledges his high poetic inspiration, which makes him immortal. Indeed, the other model cited is the

¹¹³ This ode features one of the ways in which Sarbiewski echoes Horace, which will be illustrated in Chapter 3. Besides the alcaic meter, the two odes have a common literary theme; however, their position in their poetical collection, and their function is different. In fact, in Sarbiewski’s poem the remaking of Horace’s *Carm.* II, 20 is followed by a long panegyric to pope Urban VIII, which constitutes the center of the ode (cf. Budzyński 1975: 99-100).

¹¹⁴ The division of poetry (and its different genres) according to the categories of oratory is a feature that characterizes a few Mohylian poetics, for instance mss. 9, 24, 26, and others.

¹¹⁵ “By a fiction, when the poet says he has been ordered by Apollo or the Muses to tell [someone’s] praises” (*Rosa inter spinas*, ms. 7.1, f. 30 v.) The author of this manuscript quotes entirely lines 1-3 of Horace’s *Carm.* II, 20.

exordium of *Carm.* IV, 15 where the poet says that Phoebus has wanted him to poetically sing battles and victories.

4.4. Besides imitation, Horace's authority was turned to for help in a 'legislative' function when dealing with *res* and *verba* in poetry in their relation toward the conventional rhetorical distinction into *inventio*, *dispositio* and *elocutio*. As Weinberg remarks, "the fact that, in Horace's theory, the internal characteristics of the poem are determined largely, if not exclusively, by the external demands of the audience, brings his theory very close to specifically rhetorical approaches"¹¹⁶. Therefore, according to such a theory, the work must contain those elements that are capable of producing the desired effect on the audience, disposed so as to obtain that effect to the maximum degree. This rhetorical tendency certainly rendered Horace's prescriptions, as well as the rest of his poetic works, appealing and useful to Mohylanian teachers: for them the composition of poetry had to pursue definite rhetorical strategies, and thus was directly dependent upon the knowledge of rhetoric. This, among other things, is shown by the fact that the basic rhetorical teachings on tropes and figures in some Mohylanian poetics precede the manual of poetics proper, that is they are considered preparatory and indispensable to the composition of good poetry.

One of the precepts that the Mohylanian authors impart to the novice poets regarding *inventio* is to search for a theme that may be suitable for their skills. With this aim, a few Mohylanian teachers quote in a 'legislative' function, so to speak, Horace's lines in which the aspiring poets are advised to choose a subject matter that is appropriate to their skills (AP 38-40a). Cf.:

Sumite materiam vestris qui scribitis aequam
viribus, et versate diu quid ferre recusent,
Quid valeant humeri.

Take a subject, ye writers, equal to your
strength; and ponder long what your shoulders
refuse, and what they are able to bear.

In the different manuals these lines are quoted in various sections. The author of *Cunae Bethleemicae* (ms. 3, f. 42 r.) quotes lines 38-40 of AP in the section on epic poetry, which he considers the most perfect kind of poetry. He first proceeds to explain in detail the four qualities that make the epic poem good and enjoyable to the reader, and after that, as a final exhortation, invites his pupils to choose a poetical composition of smaller dimensions to start with, so that, once they prove their skills and acquire practice with exercise, they will be ready for the larger epic poems. In the quotation of Horace's lines, he adapts the final words to his purposes, cf.: "Sumite materiam vestris qui scribitis aquam [sic!]

¹¹⁶ Weinberg 1961: 71.

/ Versibus, et versate diu quid ferre recusent / Quid valeant humeri, cui aequa potentia res est” (“Take a subject, ye writers, equal to your verse lines; and ponder long what your shoulders refuse, and what they are able to bear; for whom the [chosen] theme equals his own skill”). The author chooses not to quote exactly Horace’s line “quid valeant umeri. Cui lecta potenter erit res,” (“what your shoulders are able to bear. Whoever shall choose a theme within his range,”) the second part of which would have required him to quote also line 41 (“nec facundia deseret hunc, nec lucidus ordo” – “neither speech will fail him, nor clearness of order”), since that would have introduced the topics of style and arrangement, which the poet illustrates elsewhere. Instead, “cui aequa potentia res est” stresses precisely his intent to warn about the choice of a poetical ‘size’ suitable for beginners. At the same time, the substitution of “viribus” with “versibus” lays stress on *elocutio*, or more precisely on the necessity to choose a *res* that is commensurate with the *verba* of a beginner, presumably not very refined.

In *Cedrus Apollinis* (ms. 10, f. 157 v.) these lines are quoted in the chapter devoted to the faults of poetry, in particular in the part concerning the faults of the poet¹¹⁷. They are adduced by the author as a warning to his pupils: the risk, he comments, is that the young poet, instead of perfecting his talent and his style in simpler poetic compositions, more suitable to the literary abilities of a beginner, such as epigrams and elegies, decide to venture upon more difficult literary works, such as odes and tragedies, the composition of which demands a poetic and linguistic competence superior to his. Whence the teacher’s invitation to prudence and his warning about temerarity and excessive confidence in one’s own poetic talent.

Prokopovyč quotes lines 38-41 of the AP in Book I, chapter 4, point II, on *exercitatio* and style. He gives three precepts concerning style, following Quintilian; Horace’s lines instead constitute the fourth precept. Following Prokopovyč, some authors introduce a section on *exercitatio* and the four precepts concerning it, of which the fourth is Horace’s advice just quoted (AP 38-41)¹¹⁸. They are Lavrentij Horka (ms. 13), and the authors of *Fons poeseos* (ms. 17) and *Praecepta de arte poetica* (ms. 29), as well as Konys’kyj, author of *Praecepta de arte poetica* (ms. 30). Unlike Lavrentij Horka, the authors of the other manuals, despite following Prokopovyč’s layout, do not repeat his words verbatim, but elaborate the same principles in their own words, adding different ideas and thoughts.

¹¹⁷ In order to stress the importance of the chosen subject matter and poetic genre being suitable for the pupils’ skills, Jaroševyc’kyj quotes these lines in a slightly modified version, substituting “aequam” with “aptam”.

¹¹⁸ In Prokopovyč’s manual, this section comprised exercises on different means of poetical expression and imitation of a poetical model, that partly echo those prescribed by the Jesuits’ *Ratio studiorum* (1599): among them synonymy, which was followed by the paraphrase of a poetical text by using a different meter, translation exercises, exercises of exposition of the same content in a more extended or more concise way; finally exercises on how to convert a poetical text into prose (see chapters 4 and 5 of Prokopovyč’s *De arte poetica libri III*, cf. Prokopovič 1961: 239-249).

4.5. Another context in which Horace's legacy was used concerned the poet's flaws (*vitia*). Mohylian authors do not seem to draw a distinction between errors that originate from lack of art or power of expression and those caused by lack of technical knowledge of a particular science concerning the thing described. And thus they do not quote AP 32-35, where Horace ridicules the artists of the Aemilian school, who are able to reproduce details such as hair and nails perfectly, but whose art, or rather lack of it, fails to conceive the more important whole¹¹⁹. However, also in this sphere Mohylian authors make a selective use of Horace, leaving aside whatever does not fit their aims. The flaws illustrated by Jaroševyc'kyj¹²⁰, for instance, only in part follow those exposed by Horace in AP 131-152. Indeed, the first mistake of the novice-poet is said to be temerity, against which the author warns his pupils with lines 38-40a of AP quoted earlier. The second flaw was when the fledgling poet imitates the model he has chosen in an exaggeratedly slavish way: "Secundum vitio est imitatio poetarum absurda, cum quis sine pudore aliena carmina suis ingerit, et tanquam propria iactitat, dum in suam materiam inepte detorquet multos versus, quod est vitium turpe, et furtum infame. Vitium iterum est in scrupulose imitatione alicuius auctoris, de hoc monet Horat"¹²¹ (ms. 10, f. 157 v.):

Nec desilies imitator in arctam [sic!]
Unde pedem proferre pudor vetet aut pudoris [sic!] lex
(AP 134-135)

and if in your copying you do not
leap into the narrow well, out of which either shame
or the laws of your task will keep you from stirring
a step.

In this quotation, while "arctam" (instead of the correct "arctum") is probably a *lapsus calami*, certainly "pudoris" instead of "operis" is an intentional alteration of the Horatian text (whether of the author or of its source), probably to stress the importance of this feeling, but in fact introducing a repetition that is not there in Horace, and thereby changing the original meaning.

The following flaw concerns poetic style, and consists in particular in an inflated exordium of the poetic work that does not match the rest of it, modest

¹¹⁹ As Herrick points out, although Horace's argument is ultimately Platonic, and goes back to Socrates, Renaissance commentators often linked it with the distinction between artistic and accidental errors drawn in Aristotle's *Poetics* (cf. Herrick 1946: 15).

¹²⁰ In the section *Errores seu Vitia ipsius Poetae*, which is found after the illustration of the genres of poetry (ms. 10, f. 157 v.).

¹²¹ "The second vice is when poets absurdly imitate others, shamelessly throwing another poet's verses in with their own, and appropriating them as such, while clumsily distorting numerous verses on their own subject: this is an infamous vice, and despicable plagiarism. Even scrupulously imitating another author is a vice, and Horace warns about this".

and unpretentious, that does not fulfill the promise of grandeur. To illustrate this risk, the author quotes and comments some lines from AP, integrating them with his own line:

Non fumus [sic!] ex fulgore¹²², sed ex fumo dare lucem (AP 143)
 Turgide vero exordientes admiratus agit (by the author)
 Quid toto dignum refert hic promissor hiatu¹²³ (AP 138, imprecisely quoted)
 Et irridendo respondet (by the author)
 Parturient montes nascitur [sic!] ridiculus mus (AP 139)

Not smoke after flame does he plan to give,
 truly he regards with wonder those who begin bombastically.
 What does this boaster report in keeping with the whole mouthing?
 And laughing he answers:
 mountains will labour, to birth will
 come a laughter-rousing mouse!

Here Horace scorns the pomposity and excessive emphasis of the proems of the cyclic poets, and in order to assert his intent, offers in Latin the proem of a cyclic writer (ll. 136-137)¹²⁴; he then contrasts it with the paraphrase of lines 1-3 of the first book of Homer's *Odyssey* (ll. 140-142)¹²⁵, with which Horace intends to present his readers with the ideal poetic technique. The difference between the two kinds of proems, according to Aristotle's *Poetics*¹²⁶, is that the first promises the story of a memorable event, but due to its author's lack of skill, what follows is only a boring and insubstantial story; Homer, on the other hand, who is skilled at selecting, and thus leaving out what might detract from the brilliance of the poem, is able to produce unity and variety.

The author puts together a few lines of Horace's, in part quoted imprecisely, with a non-Horatian line. The overall meaning that he gives to this mixture of quotations and interpretations, is the subsequent explanation that underlies the preference for writing the proem last, after having accomplished your story: "Hinc apparet quam errent qui se se in exordijs supra modum torquent, melius

¹²² Horace here alludes to a Latin proverb: where there is smoke, there is fire. Thus, the metaphor means that the cyclic poets in narrating their history, instead of igniting a fire, rather befuddle the reader with the smoke of their insubstantial and unclear story.

¹²³ Horace's line reads: "Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatu?" ("What will this boaster produce in keeping with such mouthing?").

¹²⁴ "Nec sic incipies, ut scriptor cyclicus olim: / 'Fortunam Priami cantabo et nobile bellum'" ("And you are not to begin as the Cyclic / poet of old: 'Of Priam's fate and famous war I'll sing'").

¹²⁵ "Quanto rectius hic, qui nil molitur inepte: / 'Dic mihi, Musa, virum, captae post tempora Troiae / qui mores hominum multorum vidit et urbes'" ("How much better / he who makes no foolish effort: / 'Sing, Muse, for me the man who on Troy's fall / saw the wide world, its ways and cities all'").

¹²⁶ Chapters 8 and 23.

nonnulli absoluto opere exordia componunt ex rei iam peractae facilius accommoda exordia eliciunt effectum”¹²⁷.

Lines 136-139 of Horace's AP are adduced by the author of *Officina* in the chapter on the fiction, imitation and subject matter of epic poetry, as a warning to aspiring poets to abstain in the *propositio* from boasting about the grandeur of their own poem (ms. 10, f. 59 r.).

Line 139 of Horace's AP (“Parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus” – “Mountains will labour, to birth will come a laughter-rousing mouse!”) is quoted by a significant number of Mohylanian poetics as an example of a faulty hexamaeter, for different reasons. Some authors (for instance, of *Camoena in Parnasso* – ms. 4.1, f. 94 v.; ms. 4.2, f. 132 v.-133 r.) call attention to the fact that two words with similar endings (“ridiculus” and “mus”) should not be placed next to each other, other authors say no line should end with a monosyllable (ms. 9, f. 90 r.; ms. 19.2, f. 37 v.), others still call attention to both these flaws (ms. 5, f. 137 r.; ms. 14, f. 187 v.).

Rightly Prokopovyč singles out Horace's stylistic intent in the quotation of this line: in order to convey the ridicule of great efforts that lead to nought, the Latin poet begins his line with polysyllabic words and ends it with a monosyllable. He is followed in this by the authors of *Idea artis poeseos* (ms. 13.2, f. 82 v.-83 r.) and *Via ingenuos poeseos candidatos* (ms. 21.2, f. 39 r.), although in the latter this line is quoted in the section on the flaws of the hexameter.

Konys'kyj (ms. 30) quotes this line three times: as an example of the figure of paradox (f. 26 v.), as a model of stylistic device as in Prokopovyč (f. 37 r.), and finally in the section on allegory (f. 15 r.): he calls attention to the verb “parturient” which is used allegorically, as a proverb, to qualify those who promise golden mountains, but produce scanty results.

4.6. As to *elocutio*, Mohylanian teachers illustrate what it consists of in detail. They stress that poetic language should not be like vulgar, everyday speech, but on the contrary should be metrically organized and display a certain sophistication, and thus contain metaphorical words, poetical phrases, and all those embellishments that are ascribed to poetical language. Thus the author of *Cunae Bethleemicae* (ms. 3), to support his assertion on the need for an elaborate poetical language, echoes Horace's words in *Serm.* I, 4, 54: “non satis est puris scribere verbis” (“'tis not enough to write with simple words”)¹²⁸ and then refers his readers to Horace's famous ode III, 1 (quoting its first words: “Odi profanum vulgus etc.” – “I hate the vulgar crowd...”), which is cited in the Mohylanian poetics in different contexts and with varying purposes. Here the author prob-

¹²⁷ “This shows what a mistake it is to worry too much about your introduction; it is far better to write the exordium once you have finished your work, when it will fit in with the already completed poem more easily and thereby achieve the [desired] effect”.

¹²⁸ Ms. 3, f. 38 r. Horace's line 54 of *Serm.* I, 4 reads thus: “non satis est puris verum perscribere verbis” (“'tis not enough to write out a line of simple words”).

ably intends to lay stress on the sacral style of the first stanza, in which Horace calls himself priest of the Muses, thus underlining the authority and dignity of his pronouncements, fends off the uninitiated crowd, asks for silence, and sings his new song (the ode serves as an introduction to the Roman odes) to a new generation of boys and girls who will supposedly be well-disposed and unprejudiced towards it.

Serm. I, 4 is one of Horace's three 'literary' satires of poetic criticism. Here the subject is restricted to the nature of satire, but the issues Horace deals with have a much wider import. Indeed, as observed by Brink¹²⁹, the poet-critic here faces two central subjects: "What constitutes a good poem? How do the poet, his contemporaries, and his predecessors, measure up to that standard?". Horace's satires had been attacked for both their form and content (in them he had ridiculed some easily identifiable personages for their defects): thus, he feels the need to defend himself and his work and clarify his point of view on the content and the character of satiric poetry. The line quoted is logically linked to the distich cited earlier about the perfect poets (from whose number Horace excludes himself). In fact, argues the poet-critic, he who writes verses so close to prose (as were satires) cannot be deservedly called a poet. For this reason, he continues, many have wondered whether comedies are really poetry, since they lack strong inspiration and differ from prose only in meter. Although a father, irate at the behaviour of his son who squanders his money with prostitutes and refuses to marry a wife with a good dowry, talks with high-faulting words and emphatic expressions, in real life probably someone in the same position would equally use a language distant from the usual and an incisive style. And thus, Horace concludes, if you take away the fixed times and rhythms from the verses of his satires and change the word order, not much is left of poetry. However, Horace leaves open the question of whether satire is poetry or not, and says he will discuss it elsewhere.

The possibility of using new words in poetry is underlined by the author of *Cedrus Apollinis* (ms. 10, f. 157 r.) by quoting lines 58b-59 of Horace's AP:

Licuit semperque licebit
signatum praesente nota producere nomen.

It has
ever been, and ever will be, permitted to issue words
stamped with the mint-mark of the day.

These lines are quoted within the exposition on the faults of poetry¹³⁰, and they constitute a warning against the risk of thinking that some poetic words are considered not Latin enough, while Horace himself encourages others to use new words.

¹²⁹ Brink 1963: 156.

¹³⁰ Ms. 10, f. 157 r.

Kyiv-Mohylanian poetics teachers follow Horace's advice to stress the importance of writers being in command of *ars* in the composition of verses, and of endeavouring to refine the style of their compositions. Thus numerous manuals, among which *Cedrus Apollinis*, insist on working on one's own poetry to reach a high degree of formal perfection (AP 292-294) (f. 78 v.-79 r.):

Carmen reprehendite quod non
Multa dies et multa litura coercuit atque
Perfectum decies non castigavit ad unguem.

Do you [...] condemn a
poem which many a day and many a blot has not
restrained and refined ten times over the test of
the close-cut nail.

Here “perfectum” instead of “praeseptum” is an alternative reading that probably derives from the edition of Horace's works used by the author. These words of Horace's are cited in *Cedrus Apollinis* in the section that provides the definition of *versus* and *carmen* and the difference between them (ms. 10, f. 78 v.-79 r.). These same lines, with the identical reading “perfectum,” are quoted in *Idea artis poeseos*, ms. 13.2, f. 14 v.) in the section on *exercitatio*¹³¹, under the first of the four precepts, partly drawn verbatim (as in Prokopovyč) from Pontanus' manual. Indeed, both the authors of the mentioned manuals probably had as their source Pontanus, who in quoting these lines reads “perfectum”. Here the author of *Idea artis poeseos* warns his pupils not to follow the example of Lucilius, who was said to write two hundred verses standing on one foot, or of other poets, who hurry and only manage to write futile things, rather than achieving success¹³².

The above mentioned lines in *Cedrus Apollinis* are followed by Horace's line 72 of *Serm.* I, 10, “saepe stilum vertas, iterum quae digna legi sint” (“Often must you turn your pencil to erase, if you hope to write something worth a second reading”) although its second part is quoted imprecisely: in it the Latin classic warns the aspiring poets to often turn their stylus, that is to often erase and correct what they have written. In fact the flat part of the stylus served to erase what had been written by scraping it off. An original interpretation of this line, or rather its first part, is provided by the author of *Camoena in Parnasso*, who quotes it in the section on verse. In fact, he establishes a parallel between the literal meaning of *vertere*, i.e. “to turn” (the stylus), and its figurative meaning “to change”, and thus he introduces the line: “Porro versus dicitur a vertendo: idque duas ob causas. Primo quod semper verti et emendari debeat iuxta illud Horatii: Saepe stylum vertas”¹³³.

¹³¹ Ms. 13.2, f. 14 v.

¹³² The author is certainly referring to Lucilius's verbosity and lack of polish as stigmatized by Horace in his *Serm.* I, 4 and I, 10.

¹³³ “On the other hand, verse takes its name from [the verb] *vertere*, and this for two reasons. First of all because you should always turn it around and improve it, or, as Horace's put it: often turn your stylus around” (ms. 4.1, f. 86 v.).

4.7. The discussion of *dispositio* in the Mohylian poetics, generally speaking, was dependent upon the structure of the manual. At times, we find rules on *dispositio* in the general, introductory part, and these precepts were given in that they had a broad application and were not referred to any genre in particular.

Instead, in those manuals that followed a division according to the basic categories of rhetoric (*inventio, dispositio, elocutio*), the part on *dispositio* comprised the division of the versified forms according to different criteria, among which *a materia*, i.e. according to their subject matter, and according to the metrical scheme that was used. Such seems to be the case, at least partly, of the manual *Regia regis* (ms. 27) which, in the chapter entitled *De dispositione poetica*, explains how to deal with the various metrical schemes of poetry¹³⁴. In this section, the author stresses the importance of *decorum* in the arrangement of the subject matter and in this he certainly follows Horace, even if he does not mention him. Thus he writes: “Ne inventa immediate dicta materia Poeseos in conficiendo opere aliquod detrimentum paciatur, quod fit cum partes, disordinate et contrario sibi aut perverso modo ponuntur, quo ipso monstrum quoddam horribile praesentatur, agendum hic est de ordine eoque bono et optimo, quomodo partes materiae inventae, sunt disponendae. In qua dispositione tota vis est imitationis”¹³⁵. These words seem to suggest the initial part of Horace’s AP, where the author compares the result of a disparate arrangement of the parts of a poem to art works that arrange disparate limbs of the human and animal body together to produce a monstrous image. This is what can happen to a poem if it lacks simplicity and unity of composition.

More often, however, Mohylian poetics follow the so-called ‘Aristotelian’ scheme¹³⁶: in this case, the teachings on *dispositio* were more frequently included in the section dedicated to a particular genre, such as lyric poetry, epic poetry, satire, and drama. For each genre the teachers aimed at showing its most salient features in the related areas of *inventio, dispositio, and elocutio*, and did so by providing examples from exemplary ancient and modern poets in support of the rules and suggestions they imparted to their pupils.

As mentioned earlier, Horace did not devote much space to *ordo* in his AP. Mohylian authors, however, do not seem to quote Horace’s lines 42-45 of the AP, which specifically illustrate the propriety of a good *ordo*. On the other hand, Ilarion Jaroševyc’kyj, author of *Cedrus Apollinis*, in the section dedicated to *fictio* in the *carmen hexametrum*, quotes lines 151-152 of AP (see above). Cf.:

¹³⁴ In this manual, however, the different genres of poetry, classified according to their subject matter, are discussed afterwards.

¹³⁵ “So that the subject of the poem, immediately expressed once found, does not suffer any damage while the work is being composed, which happens when the parts are arranged in a disorderly, incoherent or perverse fashion, thereby producing a horrible monster; here you should ensure that the various component parts of the theme are appropriately arranged in good order. The power of imitation lies precisely in this arrangement” (ms. 27, f. 13 r.-14 v.).

¹³⁶ See Michałowska 1974: 19-20.

Atque ita mentitur sic veris falsa remiscet
Primo ne medium, medio ne discrepet primum [sic!]¹³⁷.

And so skillfully does he invent, so closely
does he blend facts and fiction, that the middle is
not discordant with the beginning, nor the end with
the middle.

Here Horace is referring to Homer, although he does not mention him, and these lines constitute the conclusion of this section on the great Greek epic. He praises Homer for his narrative technique, especially for his invention and for his ability to mix what is true with what is invented. It is therefore obvious that Horace resumes the assumption that he has stated in lines 119-120: “aut famam sequere, aut sibi convenientia finge, / scriptor” (“either follow tradition, or invent what is self-consistent”). Ilarion Jaroševyc’kyj inserts lines 119-120 in the discussion on *factio*, to confirm his recommendation for a successful *factio*, i.e. one in which every part is in harmony with the rest, and what comes after is not contrary, but coherently agrees with what has preceded so that those who read achieve an impression of uniformity.

The lack of an orderly arrangement of the parts of a poem is listed by Jaroševyc’kyj as the last flaw of the poem (in the section mentioned earlier), and it occurs when the poet does not pay adequate attention to *dispositio*: “Integra quemque locum teneant sortita decenter. Cum non providet fictions, modum tractandi elocutionem similitudines caeteraque bono carmini necessaria. Curabit igitur cum bene dispositis rebus accedat prout suadet Horat:

Rem bene provisam verba haud invita sequuntur¹³⁸
(AP 311, imprecisely quoted)

This is Horace's distich:

Rem tibi Socraticae poterunt ostendere chartae,
verbaque provisam rem non invita sequentur. (AP 310-311)

Your matter the Socratic pages can set forth, and
when matter is in hand words will not be loath to
follow.

Here Horace is speaking of philosophy, and he is expressing the concept that once the poet has accumulated enough true things to say, the language,

¹³⁷ Ms. 10, f. 84 r.

¹³⁸ “All the intact parts should be properly arranged in the right place. [The fourth vice is] when [the author] does not provide fictions, the way of treating elocution, similes and other things required for a good poem. Then, with everything conveniently arranged, he can proceed as Horace suggests: Words come easily after a well proposed subject” (ms. 10, f. 158 r.).

that is, the words will come spontaneously. The author has omitted the expression “Socraticae chartae” because it would have been difficult for the pupils to understand, and it would have introduced a concept that the author was not interested in imparting to the novice poets in this context, i.e. that the subject matter of writing should be derived from moral (Socratic) philosophy. Besides this, Horace explains his words in the following lines, where he observes that poetic creation has two sources: on one side, philosophical analysis, on the other the living, concrete reality. This explanation, however, is omitted in the manual. Jaroševyc’kyj goes on quoting Horace:

Universaliter monet Poeta.
Quid deceat, quid non, quid noscat, quid ferat error¹³⁹.

Here the author rewords line 308 of the AP:

Quid deceat, quid non, quo virtus, quo ferat error

What befits him and what not; whither
the right course leads and whither the wrong.

with which words Horace introduces his observations on what constitutes the ‘mission’ of the poet, and the same definition of this mission, first presented in a positive form, and then in a negative one. Thus continues Jaroševyc’kyj: “Non debet autem adscribendo errorum formidine deterreri ab opere Poeta, modo ex parte illius fiat quid debet ubi enim multa pulchra erunt, pauca indecora transire poterunt quod promittit Horatius¹⁴⁰:

Sunt delicta tamen, quibus ignovisse velimus (AP 347)
Ast [sic!] ubi plura nitent in Carmine non ego paucis¹⁴¹
Offendar maculis quas haud [sic!] incuria fundit
Aut humana parum pavit [sic!] natura¹⁴². (AP 351-353, imprecisely quoted)

¹³⁹ Ms. 10, f. 158 r.-158 v. (“The poet generally admonishes on what is proper, what is not, what he recognizes as valid, what errors involve”).

¹⁴⁰ “However, when the poet writes, he should not be discouraged from writing his poem by the fear of making mistakes, provided he does what he has to. In fact, when numerous things are beautiful, a few indecorous things can be overlooked, as Horace promises”.

¹⁴¹ This line is not there in the manual, but at the end of the preceding folio are written the words “Ast ubi”, that is the words with which was to begin the following folio, a habit that was typical of these manuscripts; therefore, we can suppose with a good degree of certainty that the copyist was about to copy line 351, also because otherwise lines 352-353, even if quoted imprecisely, would not have been comprehensible.

¹⁴² Ms. 10, f. 158 r.-158 v. Cf. AP 351-353a: “Verum ubi plura nitent in carmine, non ego paucis / offendar maculis, quas aut incuria fudit, / aut humana parum cavat natura”. It is improbable that the perfect indicative “pavit” derives from *pasco* or *pavio*.

Yet faults there are which we can gladly
 pardon; [...]
 But when the beauties in a poem are more in number,
 I shall not take offence at a few blots which a careless
 hand has let drop, or human frailty has failed to
 avert.

This quotation by the author of the manual simplifies and changes the meaning of the Horatian dictum: here the Latin poet is speaking of excusable vices of poetry and he compares the latter with other abilities (ll. 348-350), that of playing the lyre, whose strings do not always render the sound that the player would wish, and archery, in which one does not always strike the target¹⁴³, and these comparisons have been left out by Jaroševyc'kyj. Moreover, while Horace ascribes minor flaws (i.e. those that do not invalidate the general plan of the work and therefore are excusable) either to lack of attention or to too little precaution, what we read in ms. 10 de facto contradicts both Horace (“*quas haud incuria fundit*”), and what has been stated a little earlier, that is that fear of error should not prevent the would-be poet from composing poetry. This is why the copying mistakes in this case can be almost certainly attributed to the transcriber.

5. From the analysis of the use of Horace's poetic legacy in the first part of the general poetics we can draw a few, preliminary conclusions. Kyiv-Mohylanian teachers use Horace for their specific needs, i.e. for their didactic purposes. They are concerned, on the one hand with the scope of poetry, its ends, its subject matter, its function; on the other, the ways to achieve these. Therefore, we might say that Horace's recommendations constitute the basis of the 'art of poetry' that Mohylanian teachers of poetics impart to their pupils. And thus in the first place, Mohylanian teachers borrow Horace's words to remind their pupils that poetry has first and foremost a moral end and a didactic purpose. This feature is discernible, for instance, in the explanation of the properties, or rather qualities of poetry for the 'institution' of human life. Together with Horace, the poetics' instructors explain to their pupils that poetry in the past has had a profound civilizing function which implicitly it can also have in the present time. Indeed, as in the past, thanks to poetry people have been able to keep the memory of the glorious deeds of their ancestors alive, so in the present time it is thanks to poetry that budding Mohylanian poets will be able to glorify the wise and noble actions of their illustrious contemporaries. Indeed, the poetic celebration of famous contemporary men, especially those who contributed to the welfare of the KMA and of the Ukrainian Church, besides preserving their memory for future times, had also the paramount function of stimulating pupils to emulate their noble actions (both in the military and in the moral spheres)¹⁴⁴.

¹⁴³ For the deeper meaning of these comparisons, see Grimal 1968: 154-155 and Brink 1963: 361 ff.

¹⁴⁴ See Siedina 2005, 2007b, 2008, 2012a, 2012b.

As regards the composition of poetry, the need for *studium*, about which the teachers had to constantly remind their pupils, pervades Horace's AP, although it is not specifically one of the topics of its critical discourse. As we will see, Horace's prescriptions concerning *studium* are also repeated in poetic form in the prefatory poem in the manual *Praecepta de arte poetica* (ms. 23, f. 2 r.-2 v.), and in others. Horace's enjoyment on the necessity of uniting *natura* and *ars* for the 'apprentice' of the poetic art, as well as his insistence on the need to know the rules of poetic art (as of any other art that one wants to master) and to constantly exercise oneself in order to improve one's own skills are provided by Mohylian teachers as the fundamental instruction on which to build all further teaching.

Through Horace, they also remind their pupils about the need to commensurate their ambitions to their abilities, so as to tackle poetic genres and themes that are within their means. Hence, also the prescription that every poetical work be verisimilar, that is that the fictional characters and actions may be close to the readers' / listeners' representation of the truth. A *fictio* thus conceived in good part 'overlapped' with the Mohylian teachers' conception of *imitatio naturae*. In this field too, Horace's advice to the Pisos is widely used, in full or in part, in the poetics manuals. At the same time, Horace's apologues, quoted in the section on *imitatio naturae*, provided ready models to stigmatize foolish human behaviours and flaws¹⁴⁵. As to *imitatio operis* and to the need not to slavishly follow the chosen model, but to take its best words / expressions and to make them one's own, Horace was called upon here too.

Finally, Horace's insistence on *decorum*, i.e. on the appropriateness, particularly in the related fields of *dispositio* and *elocutio*, leads Mohylian authors to make ample use of his recommendations, adapting them to their own particular needs to stress one aspect or another. The need for *decorum* in the elaboration of a style appropriate to a particular genre is restated in the particular poetics, and Horace is called on for help there as well.

In their 'appropriation' of Horace, Mohylian teachers at times alter the original text, changing single lines, omitting others, or simply rewording Horace's pronouncements, whether to stress the divine inspiration of poetry, to add *movere* to the ends of poetry¹⁴⁶, or finally to make Horace a 'champion' of Christian virtues. This process was in line with the tendency in ecclesiastical institutions of the time, whether Catholic, Protestant or Orthodox, especially after the Reformation and subsequent Counter-Reformation, to make poetry a rhetorical instrument of Christian morality.

¹⁴⁵ Medieval rhetorical tradition, and subsequently Renaissance and partly Baroque ones, did not consider fable as a separate genre, but rather as an example of rhetoric, with the help of which the orator could confirm and demonstrate the truth of a definite thesis.

¹⁴⁶ Which, once again, proves the tendency to see any art of speech in rhetorical categories. Indeed, the addition of the aim of *movere* in poetry is related to Baroque poetics and its stress on rich formal ornamentation, bold metaphors and rhetorical figures, and all those linguistic and figurative means that were meant to strike the reader's imagination. The aim of *movere* is clearly perceivable in the poetical compositions of Mohylian teachers and trainees of poetics.

Chapter 2. The Reception of Horace's Poetry in the Teaching of Metrics

1. So far I have illustrated the reception of Horace in the part of the general poetics manuals that dealt with the nature, function and purpose of poetry. In this chapter I will dwell on another sphere of such manuals which is particularly informed by Horace's poetical legacy, i.e. prosody and metrics.

Despite the different schemes used by Mohylanian authors to systematize the content of their teaching of poetry¹, all of them explained metrics in the general poetics. This was because metrics was one of the main features that distinguished poetry from prose and because understanding it was essential for anyone composing Latin poetry.

An explanation of Latin quantitative metrics was generally preceded by the differentiation and definition of *carmen*, *versus*, *pes* and *metrum*, as well as *caesura* and *scansio*. These concepts, however, were generally dealt with very briefly, which suggests that they had been explained in detail before the beginning of the poetics course. Indeed, Alvares's Latin grammar, which was used as a manual in the first grammar course, included notions of Latin prosody as its last chapter². Moreover, my assumption seems to be confirmed by a short treatise found in the same manuscript as Mytrofan Dovhalevs'kyj's *Hortus poeticus*³ course under the title *CLAVIS Gratia digni ingressus pulsantibus neoPoetis ingenti claustro Poeseos artis APPLICATA Atque ejusdem Praestantissimae scientiae Occlusa Ostia per Prosodiae 12 modos Hyeromonacho Mytrophane Dowhalewskj APERIENS anno qVo stUDIIs fiXIIt Raphael CLaVIM qVIa flat In annum Salvatoris 1737* ("Applied key for the neo-poets who knock at the mighty gate of the art of poetry, so that they may be worthy of entering there, which opens the closed doors of that same very beautiful science through the

¹ Cf. Michałowska 1974: 19-22.

² Cf. the words of the author of *Cunae Bethleemicae* at the beginning of the section entitled *De versu seu carmine eiusque denominationibus, et de generibus carminum*: "De versu eiusque pedibus, non est quid notandum hîc, nam fuse Alvarus" ("We should not make observations on the verse line and its feet, in fact Alvares [deals with them] abundantly") (ms. 3, f. 62 v.).

³ Here I have consulted the ms. 26.2 in my *Bibliography*. The short treatise is found on f. 229 r.-244 v.

twelve modes of prosody thanks to the hiero-monk Mytrofan Dovhalevs'kyj in the year in which Raphael [Zaborovs'kyj⁴] established the key to the studies so that it may take place [1736] to the year of [our] Saviour 1737"). In it Dovhalevs'kyj expounds the basics of Latin prosody, which are propaedeutic to the study of metrics, such as syllables and their quantity, accent and so on. Such a special short course may have been introduced by Dovhalevs'kyj himself or by some other teacher before him only for a few of the pupils who attended the poetics course: indeed at the end of each treatise (the one on prosody and the one on poetics) we find a list of the pupils that attended it, and a quick survey of the names of both lists shows that they coincide only in part.

On the other hand, in T. Prokopovyč's *De arte poetica libri III* and in some courses written after that, such as *Praecepta de arte poetica* by H. Konys'kyj, the treatment of metrics and metric systems is omitted, probably because these teachings were increasingly considered as pertaining to the lower grammar class(es), and thus there was no need to repeat them in the poetics course. In other courses after Prokopovyč's, such as *Regia regis*, teaching on metrics is reduced to a minimum⁵. This 'reduction' is probably linked to the changes brought about by Prokopovyč in the teaching of poetics, so that only the meters and metrical systems most commonly used in contemporary Neo-Latin poetry were recalled in the poetics course⁶.

1.1. As regards the sources that Mohylian teachers used, it is difficult to establish the exact ones with a good degree of certainty, since they probably drew the information they needed from more than one source, especially since the new interest in metrics, evident in Italy from the turn of the fifteenth century, had resulted in a good number of treatises on this topic. Therefore, my main concern is to investigate how and to what extent they used Horace's poetic legacy in this context.

As is well known, Horace himself in the AP (ll. 73-85) had provided a succinct illustration of meters, their inventors and the topics suitable for each of them; he was thus the 'creator' of a good number of meters in Latin poetry, which he

⁴ Raphajil Zaborovs'kyj (1676-1747) was archbishop of Kyiv and Halyč starting 1731 and Metropolitan of Kyiv, Halyč and all *Mala Rus'* starting 1743. In both positions he greatly contributed to the improvement of the scholarly level and the material welfare of the KMA.

⁵ In this manual the treatment is limited to: hexameter, 'pure' and 'impure' iambic senarii, pentameter, Sapphic strophe, phalaeceans, asclepiadeans, glyconics, and the Alcaic strophe, also called 'Horatian'.

⁶ Indeed, the author of *Regia regis* himself, after having illustrated the aforementioned metrical patterns, states: "Alia genera carminum sunt plura, sed non tam classica et usitata. Sufficiens de his aliqua innuisse, quae sunt usitatiora" (ms. 27, f. 24 v.) ("There are many other genres of poems, but not so classical or so widely used. It will be sufficient to have touched on those which are most used").

'imported' from Greek poetry. In Pseudo Acro's commentary on Horace's *Odes* and *Epodes*, each ode is provided with the relative meter⁷. Horatian metrical forms were handed down to posterity thanks to their use by Boethius and to the numerous elaborations by late Latin grammarians, such as Caesius Bassus (*De metris Horatii*), Maurus Servius Honoratus (*De metris Horatii* and *De centum metris*, end of the fourth century), the relevant section of Diomedes's *Ars grammatica*, and, of course, thanks also to the transmission of Horace⁸. Neither should we forget the treatment of Horace's meters, which Keller called *Expositio metrica*, with which the latter prefaced his edition of the aforementioned pseudo-Acronian scholia. As Boldrini has cogently argued, although the *Expositio metrica* and Servius's *De metris Horatii* have much in common, in several places the former provides a different interpretation of the meter described, as well as the explanation of metrical terms not provided by Servius⁹. These treatises were the basic source of subsequent knowledge about lyric meters. Bede's *Liber de arte metrica* (seventh-eighth century) was also quite influential. The humanistic authors of *artes versificandi* later referred to treatises by late Latin grammarians and by Bede too. Among the tracts devoted to Horace's meters in the fifteenth century a prominent place belongs to Nicola Perotti's treatise *De generibus metrorum quibus Horatius Flaccus et Severinus Boetius uti sunt* as well as his *De metris*. First published in 1471, *De generibus metrorum* together with *De metris*, was reprinted several times, on its own and together with other works on the subject, as well as, in the sixteenth century, in a volume containing various grammatical works also of ancient authors¹⁰. As for the part dealing with Horatian verses, its popularity was even greater, since, as Boldrini states, as from 1498 it was included in numerous editions of Horace's works. The fact that Perotti's metrics manuals were apparently used at Cracow university in the late fourteenth-early fifteenth century is not devoid of interest for us, since the best Mohylanian graduates, some of whom would later become teachers at their alma mater, further pursued their studies in Polish and Western academies and universities. It also seems probable that one or more editions of Horace's oeuvre provided with Perotti's metrical tract *De generibus metrorum*... was available to Mohylanian poetics teachers, because their presentation of Horace's lyrical meters reflects knowledge (whether first or second hand) both of Servius's and Perotti's treatise, and also of *Expositio metrica*.

As to treatises on Latin and Greek metrics printed until about 1600, Jürgen Leonhardt's study on Latin prosody from late antiquity to early Renaissance lists 164 of them.

⁷ Cf. Acron 1902-1904.

⁸ As for the iambic and trochaic meters of Roman comedy, particularly of Terentius, let us not forget the contribution of Priscian and Rufinus, whose works were both printed in Venice in 1471. The former, besides composing the comprehensive *Institutiones grammaticae*, was the author of the short treatise *De metris fabularum Terentii*, while the latter composed a *Commentarium in metra Terentiana*.

⁹ On this topic see Boldrini 1999: 116 ff.

¹⁰ Boldrini 1999: 105-106.

My aim here is not to find the exact sources each Mohylian teacher of poetics used, although at times I will refer to the above mentioned tracts on Horatian meters. My aim instead is first to provide a short outline of the Mohylian teachers' presentation of the teachings on prosody and metrics and then analyze how they variously use Horace's poetry to exemplify the metrical systems they explain. I will particularly dwell on the Sapphic and Alcaic metrical systems, since they are the most widely exemplified in the poetics. Alongside Horace, or in his place, Mohylian teachers willingly quote poems, stanzas or single lines by M. K. Sarbiewski, the 'Christian' or 'Sarmatian' Horace, as he was called later, especially drawn from his Christian parodies of Horace's odes. All the richness and multiformity of Sarbiewski's poetic output¹¹ cannot be summarized in just a few lines (he was the author of over 130 odes collected in his *Lyricorum Libri* (first edition 1625) and of 145 epigrams)¹². We may say that Mohylian poetics teachers were attracted by all of its main features, as briefly outlined by Urbański (2014), but what certainly appealed to them most was its Christian Horatianism, that is its adoption and adaptation of Horace's vocabulary, metric, prosody, and values to a new religious and moral content. As to the themes of Sarbiewski's lyrics, they are quite diversified, spanning from praises of pope Urban VIII and his nephew Cardinal Francesco Barberini to biblical paraphrases and Marian hymns and odes, from reflections on the fluidity of human destiny and on the vanity of human actions to thoughts addressed to his friends. They also include moral and political reflections, from anti-Turkish poems addressed to European rulers (emperor Ferdinand II, pope Urban VIII, as well as to Sigismund III and Vladislas IV) to those addressed to different social groups (Polish knights, European rulers, Italian and European princes). Particularly congenial to the Mohylian teachers' way of thinking about poetry were Sarbiewski's reflections on the fugacity and uncertainty of life, on the vanity of all human things, as couched in the two forms of parody and palinode. A brief outline of the notion of 'parody' and of the understanding of it by Mohylian teachers of poetics is required at this point. In classical poetics parody was at the margin of the spectrum of literary genres: in Aristotle's *Poetics* it was considered an intertextual genre, while in Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria* for the first time it is associated with *imitatio*. Quintilian deals with parody in two passages of his *Institutio oratoria*: in the first (6,3,97), he speaks of parody as a paraphrasis and a form of jest and says it can create wit: "seu verbis ex parte mutatis, [...] seu ficti notis versibus similes quae παρωδία dicitur" (that is "or the words slightly altered [...], or verses resembling well-known lines, a trick styled parody by the Greeks", Quintilian 1920-1922, vol. II: 493). In the second (9,2,35) he derives the word from songs sung as an imitation of others, a word however used as well to designate imitation in verse or prose. As Jorg Robert underlines (2006), the nexus between parody and imitation remained actual until the early modern pe-

¹¹ For a detailed study of Sarbiewski's literary production and its sources of inspiration see Buszewicz 2006.

¹² Cf. Urbański 2014.

riod¹³; in J.C. Scaliger's *Poetices Libri Septem* parody is linked with 'ridiculus', in that is thus described: "Est igitur Parodia Rhapsodia inversa mutatis vocibus ad ridicula sensum retrahens" ("Therefore parody is an inverted rhapsody with changed voices, that through a changed wording turns the sense into ridiculous"). Parody, particularly Christian parody greatly spread in Europe during the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries¹⁴. What were its main characteristics?¹⁵ Notwithstanding the possibility of a diverse relationship to the parodied poem, i.e. a different aim in the act of parodying, Horatian parodies take as their starting point an ode of Horace's and alter it maintaining its meter, the number and the order of the lines. The words more pregnant with meaning are generally substituted, while the sound and the syntax should be preserved as much as possible. Generally speaking, the parody was to appear not as a sort of forced imitation but rather as a natural creation of the intellect.

Christian parody was a poetic composition created by transferring semantic structures from Classical poems to Neo-Latin ones in the spirit of Christian devotion. There are many examples of such a parody in Sarbiewski¹⁶. As for the Horatian palinode, it was a poetic composition in which the author polemicized with the chosen pagan model¹⁷.

Indeed, the Christian parody, with which I will deal most extensively in the third chapter, as a form of imitation or reworking in which the linguistic-stylistic and thematic components and the metrical scheme of the original are used to express religious-Christian contents, was highly congenial to the mindset of Mo-

¹³ Robert cites as a witness of this Henri Estienne's (Henricus Stephanus's) *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (1572), which gives the following definition of the verb παρωδέω: "Canticum vel carmen ad alterius imitationem compono. Sic autem compositum canticum vel carmen παρωδή et παρωδία appellatur" (Robert 2006: 49, fn. 12).

¹⁴ For detailed information about the main authors, characteristics, subjects and editions of parodies in Germany in the seventeenth century see Niehl 2006. Quite interesting is the Appendix to this article, titled *Parodiae Horatianae im CAMENA-Corpus*, where parodies collected in the electronic corpus named CAMENA-Corpus are listed (see: <http://www.uni-mannheim.de/mateo/camenahtdocs/camena_e.html>, accessed 30 November 2017). In this appendix the said parodies are classified according to their meter, to the Horatian topic of the parodied poem, to its kind, to the author of the parody, to the subject of the parody, to the kind of the poem (e.g. Christian, casual, encomiastic, amatory, ethical, political, containing invectives), to the genre of the parody (serious, playful or *iocosarium*), finally to the theme of the parody, as related to the theme of the parodied poem, whether inverted (*inversum*), cognate (*cognatum*) or extraneous (*alienum*).

¹⁵ In the brief outline of the characteristics of parody, I have followed the exposition of Niehl 2006: 12.

¹⁶ See Budzyński 1975. Cf. among them, Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* II, 26 "Aurei regina Maria coeli", modeled on Horace's *Carm.* I, 30 "O Venus, regina Cnidi Paphique"; Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* II, 18 "Reginam, tenerae dicite virgines" modeled on Horace's *Carm.* I, 22 "Dianam tenerae dicite virgines". In both cases the place of the pagan goddess (Venus, Diana) is taken by the Virgin Mary.

¹⁷ As an example of palinode we may recall Sarbiewski's epod III *Laus otii religiosi*, in which the author refutes Horace's message of epod II *Beatus ille qui procul negotiis*.

hylanian poetics teachers, who belonged to a cultural institution and a cultural system wholly informed by Orthodoxy. As a didactic tool the Christian parody was extremely useful, in that it allowed would-be poets both to imitate and thus assimilate the stylistic and linguistic features of the chosen model, and also to imbue the new poetical composition with a morally edifying content. Indeed, the stress on parody (and centos) as very useful forms of poetical exercise for the would-be poets is already present in Pontanus's *Poeticarum Institutionum Libri III*. It is certain, as will be evidenced in the next chapter, that Mohylian teachers of poetics thought of it as an extremely effective means to learn how to compose poetry, by preserving the syntactic structure and the meter of the original while turning its content to the desired end.

2. It is not easy to systematize Mohylian preceptors' teaching on metrics, since they approach the topic and organize their exposition in diversified ways. Generally speaking, an explanation of the different poetic meters was included in the chapter on *carmen* in general: there we often find the division of *genera carminum* according to different principles, which follows the traditional exposition on metrics. And thus the criteria according to which *genera carminum* are divided are: their inventor, their subject matter, the most frequent or most important foot, the number of syllables, the number of lines; their composition or the combination of kinds of verse lines, their meter or number of feet¹⁸, the lack or the abundance of syllables, their termination. The most accurate descriptions and expositions of all these criteria are found, among others, in the manuals *Camoena in Parnasso*, *Cunae Bethleemicae*, *Idea artis poeseos*, *Rosa inter spinas*, and *Lyra variis praeceptorum chordis... instructa*, so I will give a short account of the explanation of the different criteria as featured in these manuals. And thus, according to their inventor, Mohylian teachers list phalaeceans, sapphics, glyconics, adonics, pherecrateans, alcmansians, hipponacteans, pindarics, asclepiadeans, aristophanians, anacreontics, archilochean, alcaics, etc.

2.1. According to their subject matter, teachers of poetics list the following poetic genres: epic/heroic poems, elegies, satires, bucolics, georgics, genethliac, epithalamia, epitaphs, epicedia, threnodies, panegyrics, epinikions or peans, dithyrambs, centos, parodies, palinodies, and others¹⁹.

2.2. According to the prevalent foot in the verse line, Mohylian preceptors list dactylics, iambics, choriambics, paeonics, ionics *a maiore* and *a minore* (other times ionics are cited as an example of verse *a natione*, from its "na-

¹⁸ On the division of metrical forms *a materia* (that is according to their subject matter) and their use for the distinction of poetic species see Michałowska 1974: 11.

¹⁹ Minor poetical species mentioned include: *symboleuticon*, *protrepticon*, *apeucticon*, *treseucticon*, *eraticon*, *dirae*, *saeculare carmen*, *propenticon*, *epibaterion*, *celeusma*.

tion"/provenance), anapestics, trochaics. According to the number of syllables, we find hendecasyllables, such as phalaeceans, sapphics, alcmansics, heptasyllables such as the glyconic, heptasyllables, hexasyllables, pentasyllables like the Adonic, etc.

2.3. Taking into account the number of feet, *carmina* are named respectively dimeters, trimeters, tetrameters, pentameters, hexameters, heptameters, octameters. According to the number of lines of verse, poems are divided into hemisticha, monosticha, disticha, tristicha, tetrasticha, etc.

2.4. According to the number of different metrical patterns (*a concursu generum*) or species of verse that a poem contains, Mohylanian authors list *monocola*²⁰ (one and the same species of verse for the whole ode), *dicola* (two species of verse), *tricola* (three species of verse), *tetracola* (four species of verse).

2.5. Finally, Mohylanian authors mention another series of terms devised to indicate the intervals after which the first species of verse (metrical pattern) used in any poem regularly recurs. And thus, according to this criterion, poems are divided into *distrophon*, *tristrophon*, *tetrastrophon*, *pentastrophon*, etc., which indicate respectively strophes in which the first species of verse recurs after the second, the third, the fourth and the fifth line. As it appears, such a definition is quite generic, since it does not specify the circumstances under which the first metrical pattern is repeated, i.e. it does not tell us anything about the other verse lines in the interval between the first and its repetition after two, three, four or five lines.

Usually, Mohylanian authors also provide the graphic representation of the meters they illustrate (with the sequence of long and short syllables and caesuras) to make them easily comprehensible to their pupils.

2.6. Some authors use the criteria of classification of poetry (*genera carminum*) to arrange the explanation of the different meters and metrical systems. And thus, some poetics teachers illustrate the single metrical lines, generally dividing them by the number of feet, from eight-foot lines down to three- or two-foot lines, although some of them omit octonaries on account of their infrequent use. Among them, *Fons Castalius*, *Arctos in Parnasso*, *Lyra variis praeceptorum chordis... instructa*, *Tabulae praeceptorum poeseos...*, and others.

²⁰ *Colon*, from the Greek *kôlon* (member, element), pl. *cola*. Horace's *Satires* and *Epistles*, for instance, are examples of *carmina monocôla*, since they consist only of hexameters. A *carmen monocolon* is Horace's *Carm.* I, 1, since it consists only of choriambic asclepiadics.

2.7. Other manuals display a more articulate presentation of metrics (*Cytheron bivertex*, *Lyra Heliconis*..., *Idea artis poeseos*, *Via poetarum*..., *Via lactea*, *Fons poeseos*): they start out with the number of feet, treating in the first place either eight- and seven-foot lines and then the hexameter, pentameter..., or they directly begin with the hexameter, followed by the pentameter and often by verse lines of fewer feet, and then expound their teaching on metrics following other criteria (the inventor of the meter, the prevalent foot, the frequency of use, the strophic pattern, etc.). However, some teachers (i.e. the author of *Idea artis poeseos*, and others) deal with metrics not only in the general poetics, but also list other meters and metrical systems within the treatment of poetic genres, that is in the particular poetics.

2.8. Other poetics teachers start out by grouping verse lines according to the prevalent foot in them (e.g. *Cunae Bethleemicae*, *Hymettus extra Atticam*, *Epitome meditationis poeticae*), and thus divide them into the classes of *genus dactylicum*, *genus iambicum*, *genus trochaicum*, and *genus anapaesticum*. The author of *Cunae Bethleemicae* provides a synthethic chart of the different meters, and for each one of them offers as an example one line of verse taken from various Latin authors, mainly Horace, but also from Sarbiewski. The author of *Hymettus extra Atticam* after having divided meters according to the prevailing foot in them, proceeds to explain them one at a time providing their metrical scheme and exemplifying each with a verse line. As for lyric meters, among which the alcaic, this author prefers to quote Sarbiewski, and only sporadically makes use of Horace's poetry by way of example. As to the author of *Epitome*..., besides explaining in detail all the meters that pertain to the different genres, he also provides poems that serve as examples of *carmen monocolon*, *dicolon*, *tricolon* and *tetracolon*.

2.9. Aside are to be grouped manuals such as *Cedrus Apollinis*, *Camoena in Parnasso*, *Rosa inter spinas*, in that they all illustrate the metrical systems of Horace's lyric poetry at some length: after having expounded the basic notions of Latin prosody, the author of *Cedrus Apollinis* deals extensively with epic poetry and the hexameter; then, when speaking of lyric poetry, and thus in the particular poetics, he lists and exemplifies with their metrical scheme and with examples, the nineteen *genera carminum* of Horace's poetry, the description of which clearly harks back to Servius and Perotti's tracts. Nevertheless, our author follows a different order and in his exemplifications he displays originality by making ample use of Sarbiewski's poetry alongside Horace's. The author of *Camoena in Parnasso* also gives his pupils a detailed exposition of the metrical systems of Horace's odes, but he does so in the general poetics, and following the criterion of the growing number of metrical patterns in the odes (thus listing first *monocola*, and then *dicola*, *tricola* and *tetracola*). A different order again is followed by the author of *Rosa inter spinas*, who lists first the Sapphic and the Iambic senarius.

A more synthetic presentation of metrics is provided by manuals such as *Libri tres de arte poetica*. After having illustrated two-, three-, and four-syllable feet, its author states that he will only deal with the eleven most widely used *genera carminum*, namely: “heroicum, elegiacum, sapphicum, phalecium, choriambicum, archilochium, iambicum, anapesticum, ionicum a maiore, ionicum a minore, et trochaicum”²¹.

3. And now to my analysis of the use of Horace's poetry in the explanation of metrics. I will start by briefly illustrating those manuals that offer the explanation of metrical patterns of single lines, whether they classify them by the number of feet that they contain or by the prevalent foot. After seven, six and five syllable lines, my exposition will revolve around the illustration of metrical systems, in the first place the Sapphic and the Alcaic stanzas: indeed, their exemplification with quotations from Horace's poetry and imitations thereof is more interesting than the illustration of single metrical lines. In my analysis of Mohylanian authors' poetical examples to illustrate the different metrical lines and systems, I will therefore dwell on their content rather than on their metrical form.

3.1. The authors of *Fons Castalius* and *Tabulae praeceptorum poeseos*... begin by presenting seven-foot metrical lines, to exemplify which they quote Horace only once, in order to illustrate the Archilochian dactylic catalectic heptameter (that is the greater archilochian), citing the first line of *Carm.* I, 4, 1:

Solvitur acris hiems grata vice veris et Favoni²²

Winter dissolving graciously yields to Spring and Favonius;

this verse line is the one generally adduced to illustrate the Archilochian line, since this is the only ode in which Horace uses the so-called third Archilochian system (a distich formed by an Archilochian line and a catalectic iambic trimeter). The author of *Arctos in Parnasso* provides fewer seven-foot metrical lines; however, he also quotes Horace's poetry only once in the section on eight and seven foot metrical lines, and quotes the same ode, although adding lines 3 and 5, which feature the same Archilochian metrical pattern. Cf.:

Solvitur acris hiems grata vice veris et Favoni,
 [...]
 ac neque iam stabulis gaudet pecus aut arator igni,
 [...]
 iam Cythera chorus ducit Venus imminente luna, (*Carm.* I, 4, 1, 3, 5)

²¹ *Libri tres de arte poetica*, ms. 15, f. 147 v.

²² Respectively ms. 9, f. 82 v., and ms. 22, f. 16 r.

Winter dissolving graciously yields to Spring and Favonius;
 [...]

Stables no longer please the ox nor fire the farmer,
 [...]

Venus leads the dance beneath the hovering moon.

The author of *Lyra variis*... instead prefers to quote line 15 of the same ode, with which he probably intended to warn his pupils to be mindful of the brevity of life, and consequently to make good use of it. Cf.:

vitae summa brevis spem nos vetat inchoare longam²³ (*Carm.* I, 4, 15)

The shortness of life precludes far-reaching hope.

This line, as we will see, was greatly appreciated and variously quoted by more than one Mohylanian poetics teacher.

3.2. As to six-foot metrical lines, Mohylanian teachers quote Horace's poetry in order to exemplify the so-called pure and impure iambic senarii. As to the pure iambic senarius, that is which has iambs in all places, the authors of *Lyra variis*..., *Arctos in Parnasso*, *Tabulae praeceptorum poeseos*... quote Horace's famous first line of the second epode: "Beatus ille qui procul negotiis", to which is added the second line (although being an iambic quaternary): "ut prisca gens mortalium", while the author of *Fons Castalius* cites Catullus. Mytrofan Dovhalevs'kyj, author of *Hortus poeticus*, quotes lines 1-8 of the second epode (ms. 26.1, f. 78 v.).

As to the so-called impure iambic senarius, which features a greater variety of realizations, both authors quote Horace's first epode, although in *Fons Castalius* we find lines 3 and 5 (ms. 9, f. 84 r.):

Paratus omne Caesaris periculum
 [subire, Maecenas, tuo:]
 quid nos, quibus te vita si superstite
 [iucunda, si contra, gravis:]

 [...] prepared
 to encounter Caesar's every danger
 [Maecenas, and make it your own.]
 But what about me, whose life with you
 [is joyous; without you, a burden?]²⁴.

²³ Ms. 6.1, f. 14 r.

²⁴ The sense of the quoted lines is incomprehensible without the following lines, that is why I quoted also the translation of lines 4 and 6 respectively, putting it in square brackets.

while in *Tabulae*... we find only line 5 (ms. 22, f. 16 v.). In both cases such a way of quoting is exclusively functional to exemplifying the metrical line, and does not allow us to appreciate the meaning of the quoted fragment. The author of *Lyra variis*..., on his part, prefers to quote yet another line (line 9) from the same epode (ms. 6.1, f. 14 v.):

an hunc laborem, mente laturi decet

Or display the hardy spirit of manhood.

As to the author of *Arctos in Parnasso*, as an exemplification of the impure iambic senarii, he prefers to admonish his pupils with three lines, apparently of his own, which contain an exhortation to behave in a morally correct way:

Est pravus ex virtute non veniens honor;
claris an numerari viris laus maxima
virtute honores ambias non gloria.

The honour that does not come from virtue is bad;
it is the highest praise to be enumerated among illustrious men
if you yearn for honors with virtue, not with vainglory.

The author of *Lyra variis*..., speaking of six-foot metrical patterns, mentions that the dactylic hexameter can admit spondees also in the fifth foot (that is the spondaic hexameter); however, to exemplify it he quotes line 27 of Horace's *Carm.* I, 7, which in the fifth foot features a dactyl, and not a spondee (ms. 6.1, f. 14 v.):

Nil desperandum Teucro duce et auspice Teucro

You must not despair with Teucer to lead and protect you.

Similarly, to exemplify the heroic hexameter the author of *Praecepta de arte poetica* (ms. 23, f. 4 r.) quotes Horace instead of Virgil, and particularly lines 106-107 of *Serm.* I, 1, clearly for the moral teaching they contain; cf.:

est modus in rebus, sunt certi denique fines,
quos ultra citraque nequit consistere rectum.

There is a measure in all things.
There are, in short, fixed bounds, beyond and short
of which right can find no place.

3.3. As to five-foot metrical lines, Horace is quoted to exemplify the acatalectic pentameter (that is the Sapphic hendecasyllable) by the author of *Fons Castalius*, who quotes *Carm.* IV, 2, 1 (ms. 9, f. 84 v.):

Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari,
[Iulle,]

Julus, the poet who emulates Pindar

The same line is quoted by the author of *Cunae Bethleemicae*, who exemplifies the metrical pattern of single lines in his chart, but in this case quotes the whole minor Sapphic stanza, evidently being fascinated by its profound content. Cf. ms. 3, f. 64 r.:

Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari,
Iulle, ceratis ope Daedalea
nititur pennis vitreo daturus
nomina ponto.

Julus, the poet who emulates Pindar
flies on Daedalian wings of wax
and is destined to lend his name to the glassy
sea where he drowns.

Interestingly enough, to exemplify the same metric line the author of *Arctos in Parnasso* quotes Horace's *Carm.* III, 14, 13-16, that is the whole minor Sapphic strophe, consisting of three minor Sapphic verses and one Adonic. Cf. ms. 12, f. 99 r.:

hic dies vere mihi festus atras
eximet curas; ego nec tumultum
nec mori per vim metuam tenente
Caesare terras.

For me this truly festive day
abolishes gloom and care. I shall fear
no tumult or violent death with Caesar
ruling the world.

These lines are also quoted in the manual *Via ingenuos poeseos candidatos*... to exemplify the minor Sapphic strophe (ms. 21.1, f. 11 v.; ms. 21.2, f. 32 v.). Indeed, this ode, which combines Horace's "roles as a public and a private poet"²⁵, and thus contains a crossing of genres, seems not to be quoted elsewhere in the Mohylanian poetics. The cited strophe marks the transition from the celebration of Augustus's return from Spain in the early summer of 24 B.C. to his personal feelings of safety and internal peace.

As we will shortly see, other authors quote different lines, since a great number of Horace's odes (25) feature this metrical system and offered a good variety of lines to be quoted to illustrate the minor Sapphic strophe.

²⁵ Nisbet, Rudd 2004: xxii.

On his part, the author of *Tabulae praeceptorum poeseos...* chooses the first stanza (lines 1-4) of Horace's *Carm. I, 22* to illustrate this metrical system, seemingly with moralizing intents. Cf. ms. 22, f. 17 r.-17 v.:

Integer vitae scelerisque purus
non eget Mauris iaculis neque arcu
nec venenatis gravida sagittis,
Fusce, pharetra

A man of righteous life, unstained
by evil, needs no African spears,
no bow, no quiver pregnant with poisonous
arrowheads, Fuscus

The same lines are quoted to exemplify the minor Sapphic strophe by the authors of *Idea artis poeseos* (ms. 13.2, f. 29 v.), *Libri tres de arte poetica* (ms. 15, f. 150 v.), and by Sylvestr Dobryna, author of *Liber de arte poetica* (ms. 28, f. 92 r.). The main motif of this ode, i.e. the protection from dangers that the uncorrupted man enjoys, was evidently particularly dear to the mindset of Molytanic poets. However, there seems to be no hint at the conclusion of this poem, which ends like a Catullan or a Sapphic love poem (cf. ll 23-24: "dulce ridentem Lalagen amabo / dulce loquentem" – "Lálage sweetly speaking and laughing / will still be my love")²⁶.

After quoting Horace's aforementioned lines, however, the author of *Idea artis poeseos* adds a strophe from the elaboration of Psalm 5 by George Buchanan. The latter (1506-1582) is considered the 'father' of the Baroque variant of parodistic imitation of the Horatian lyric. He is the author, among others, of *Paraphrasis Psalmorum*, a work conceived in the Horatian spirit, and in which he uses mostly Horatian meters, the first complete edition of which was published around 1565, and republished many times after that²⁷. The lines quoted (33-36), which elaborate verses 10 and 11 of the psalm, appear as an appeal that a Christian "integer vitae scelerisque purus", who does not need poisoned ar-

²⁶ As is stated in Nisbet, Hubbard 1989: 263, although in other places Horace claims to enjoy special protection, which might hark back to the ancient idea that poets were sacred, and affirm the happiness and security that poetry conferred him, here he alludes to love poetry and in the last two lines emphasis is on love rather than on poetry.

²⁷ Paraphrases of selected psalms had been published in 1556 (see Ford 1982: 77). G. Buchanan's paraphrases of the psalms inspired numerous poets, among whom Jan Kochanowski. For an overview of the influence of Latin poets on Buchanan's paraphrases of the Psalms (primarily of Horace and Catullus), see Ford 1982: 76-102. The composition of hymns and other poetical works on Christian topics using Horatian meters, which probably began with the one who is generally considered the first Christian poet, Prudentius (Aurelius Prudentius Clemens, 348-about 413), has enjoyed lasting fortune throughout the centuries. For a synthetic overview of the 'Christian' reception of Horace, see Tarrant 2007a, Friis-Jensen 2007, and also Ijsewijn, Sacré 1990: 86-91, and Ijsewijn, Sacré 1998: 108-110.

rows, addresses to God, asking the Lord to protect him from evil men, and to do justice and destroy those who commit evil. Cf. ms. 13.2, f. 30 r.:

Lingua adulatrix tacito veneno
blandiens, caecos meditatur ictus.
O Deus, rerum o Pater alme, gentem
perde nefandam.

The flattering tongue with silent poison
by alluring, meditates obscure blows.
O God, o great father of things, destroy
impious people.

Sylvestr Dobryna proceeds in a similar way in his course *Liber de arte poetica*. After quoting Horace's *Carm.* I, 22, 1-4, he adds a poem consisting of six minor Sapphic strophes, built on the sentence "boni moriuntur laeti" ("good men die happy"), which he defines as an imitation of Horace's quoted verse lines. Of course, basically all authors who quote *Carm.* I, 22 limit themselves to the first stanza: in fact, the rest of the poem diverges from the 'moralizing' incipit, and from the third stanza it becomes personal, a declaration of self-sufficiency and of love toward his Lalage, a fictional character. And thus the poem by Sylvestr Dobryna, just like the quotation of the elaboration of Psalm 5 by Buchanan, necessarily has to take only the first stanza of *Carm.* I, 22 as its starting point. The author does not specify who the author of the poem is, and so we may assume that it is his own. Here it is, followed by my translation (ms. 28, f. 92 r.-92 v.):

Qui fuit cultor pietatis almae
non sibi visit placidis sed astris
namque per spinas
ibat ad illam.

Triste non vitae miserae periculum,
nec dolor carnis tremefecit illum,
ipsa nec turpis tremebunda saevae
mortis imago.

Totus est laetus moribundus atque suavis
aspectû, placidusque vultû:
explicat linguâ, licet oris impos
verba sonora

quicquid effatur canit triumphans;
iam videt caelos patriam futuros
sperat aeternum cito ter beatum
vivere tempus.

Spiritû gaudet quia vicit hostes
carnis et mundi insidias iniqui
salvus ut passer laqueo maligni
avolat altum.

Spernit atrocis violenta fata
 mortis, est cuius medijs in umbris
 clarus ex umbris animivè compos
 currit ad astra.

He who worshipped propitious piety
 did not look at himself but at the placid stars
 and indeed he was going toward it
 through thorns.

Not the sad danger of a miserable life,
 nor the pain of the flesh caused him to tremble,
 nor the dreadful trembling image
 of cruel death.

The dying man is all happy and with an
 agreeable appearance and with a peaceful face:
 although not in control of his mouth, he
 expresses with his tongue resounding words.

Anything he says, he sings it triumphantly;
 he already sees the skies that will be his homeland
 he hopes soon to enjoy eternal life
 three times blessed.

He rejoices in spirit since he defeated the enemy
 of the flesh and the perils of an unjust world
 like a sparrow safe from the snare of the evil one
 flies away on high.

He despises the violent fates of a dreadful death,
 among whose shades he shines brightly
 and from the shadows, now in control of his own soul
 rushes towards the stars.

Horace's thought, as expressed in the first two stanzas of *Carm.* I, 22, is that the (Stoic) good man, who refrains from committing evil deeds and leads a pure life, does not need to carry weapons to defend himself from the dangers of nature, and thus it is as if he were protected by the gods. However, as is made clear in the following lines, and especially in the last stanza, the *integer vitae* is revealed as his lover, and thus, Horace "is applying to himself, not without amusement, the elegists' commonplace that the lover is a sacred person under divine protection"²⁸. A totally different, reversed idea is expressed in the poem quoted: here the man free from sin becomes the incarnation of the true Christian, the one who has overcome the temptations of the flesh and has embraced the cross and therefore is not afraid of suffering, or of corporal death. Such a man has his eyes fixed on life after death and hopes in the resurrection of the body and in life everlasting. And thus our poem definitely moves away from the affirmation of the joys of love in Horace's last stanza (see above).

²⁸ Nisbet, Hubbard 1989: 262.

4. For his part, the author of *Via poetarum ad fontes Castalidum* quotes the first stanza of *Carm.* I, 22 twice, as he organizes his exposition on meters in a peculiar way. Since he starts out by dividing odes into *monocola*, *dicola*, and so on, he lists the minor Sapphic among the *dicola* odes and exemplifies it with *Carm.* I, 22, 1-4 (ms. 19.2, f. 22 v.); subsequently, he analyzes in greater detail and provides the metrical schemes of the different metrical systems, and he again quotes the aforementioned lines in order to exemplify the minor Sapphic (ms. 19.2, f. 42 r.). As to *Praecepta de arte poetica* (ms. 29, f. 132 r.-f. 132 v.), the aforementioned stanza is quoted in the chapter on lyric poetry as an example of *dicolos tetraastrofos* ode. This manual provides only some information on metrics, dealing mainly with the hexameter and the pentameter.

For his part, the author of the manual *Parnassus* quotes Horace's *Carm.* I, 22 twice, each time with a partially different end. First he quotes the first line of the ode to exemplify the minor Sapphic hendecasyllable (ms. 16.1, f. 28 r.). Then, in the section on lyric poetry he quotes the whole ode as an example of: 1. when the meaning is not exhausted in one strophe, but is carried to the following one (an expedient that the author says one should use carefully), and 2. figures and poetic licenses²⁹. However, the most interesting assertion is the sentence with which the author concludes his introduction of *Carm.* I, 22, that is: "Sit oda pro exemplo horatiana indicans ubique tutam esse innocentiam"³⁰ ("May it be as an example a Horatian ode, which shows that innocence is safe everywhere"). This epigraph is probably taken from M. A. Muret's edition of Horace's works³¹ or from another edition which contained or incorporated the commentaries by Pseudo-Acro and Porphyrio³². The insertion of this epigraph perfectly clarifies how this ode was received by Mohylanian teachers of poetics: innocence, that is moral purity, sinlessness and humbleness of spirit was what rendered a man safe wherever he found himself, and thus was implicitly the goal that Mohylanian neo-poets were encouraged to pursue.

²⁹ Cf.: "Nota tertio: ab una stropha potest sensus trahi ad alteram, id tamen in sapphica oda aliquando cavendum. Licentiae etiam poeticae et figurae maxime in hoc genere locum habent" (ms. 16.1, f. 49 v.).

³⁰ *Ibidem*.

³¹ Cf. *Horatius M. Antonii Mureti in eum Scholia sive Annotationes*, Venetii 1582: 27.

³² Cf., for instance, *Opera Q. Horatii Flacci cum metrica carminum ratione, et argumentis ubique illustrata, tum etiam Doctissimorum virorum, Acronis, Porphyriionis*, Leipzig 1569. According to Iurilli (1998: 333), the first complete and dated edition of Horace's works with the comments by pseudo-Acro and Porphyrio and with the comments synoptically printed with the text, is *Quinti Horatii Flacci Opera cum commentariis Acronis per Lodovicum de Strazarolis Tarvisanum recogniti praecedente Porphyriionis in Horatii opera commentum per Raphael Regium castigato*, [Venezia: Michele Manzolo 3 VIII 1481: non ante].

4.1. The author of *Camoena in Parnasso* utilizes the division of Latin poetry according to the number of metrical patterns used in it and makes ample use of Horace's poetry to illustrate them.

As far as *dicolon carmen* is concerned, the author states that besides elegiac couplets, there is a great variety of realizations. He starts off with the minor Sapphic and quotes the first four lines of Horace's *Carm.* I, 2; this poem is also defined as *dicolon tetrastrophon*, i.e. one that uses two metrical patterns and in which the metrical pattern of the first line recurs after the fourth verse line³³. Cf. ms. 4.1, f. 89 v.; ms. 4.2, f. 124 r.:

Iam satis terris nivi atque dirae
grandinis misit Pater et rubente
dextera sacras iaculatus arces
terruit urbem

The father has sent our lands sufficient
snow and dire hail. His fiery
hand has stricken holy heights,
alarming the city

This same stanza is also quoted by the author of *Poeticarum institutionum breve compendium* to illustrate the minor Sapphic (ms. 1, f. 15 v.). It seems as though both authors of the aforementioned manuals quote this stanza not so much for its content, but for its being the first of Horace's odes (starting with Book I) to feature this metrical scheme, i.e. the first that came to hand in any edition of Horace's works. This ode, which has as its model the final lines of Virgil's first book of *Georgics*, speaks of Augustus (being placed right after the proemium, it is the most laudative of all odes devoted to Augustus). It expresses on the one hand the despair caused by the civil wars, and on the other the hope, tied to the figure of a saviour, of a charismatic leader, which Horace, and implicitly his generation see in the figure of Octavian Augustus. Critics such as Nisbet and Hubbard³⁴ assert that Horace's ode lacks moderation and rationality, compared to Virgil's first Georgic, in the celebration of the prince, and at the same time lacks a broader vision. In their view, this more restricted vision emerges already in the first stanza, where Horace is imitating Virgil's description of the portents that accompanied the assassination of Julius Caesar; the only portent that Horace describes is, in fact, a flood with its accompanying bad omens, such as lightning on the Capitol hill.

³³ Note that the minor Sapphic stanza contains three minor Sapphic hendecasyllables and one Adonic. This means that the metrical pattern of the first line is the same as that of the second and third verse lines.

³⁴ Nisbet, Hubbard 1989: 16-21.

4.2. In the illustration of metrical patterns, where there are plenty of examples, the moralizing intent of most quotations is evident. And hence to exemplify the minor Sapphic, the author of *Rosa inter spinas* quotes Horace's *Carm.* II, 10 instead. The ode is addressed to Maecenas's brother-in-law Licinius Murena, who was consul in 23 B.C. He was removed from that office probably early in that year and twelve months later was involved in a plot with Fannius Caepio to kill Augustus. He died while trying to escape. The core of the ode is the Peripatetic idea of the mean between two extremes, and it is carried out throughout the poem with a series of antitheses. In the first stanza Horace advises his addressee not to take bold risks in adverse conditions; the second stanza contains an opposition in terms of wealth and life-style, presented as the object of personal decision³⁵.

It is precisely the second stanza to be quoted first by the author of *Rosa inter spinas*, who provides his pupils with an example of Sapphic hendecasyllables (a few lines after he rightly adds that the fourth line is an Adonic). Cf. ms. 7.1, f. 15 r.:

auream quisquis mediocritatem
diligit, tutus caret obsoleti
sordibus tecti, caret invidenda
sobrius aula.

The man who loves the golden mean
lives secure in a house untarnished
by need, but soberly shuns a mansion
neighbors would envy.

For its anthological character, Horace's *Carm.* II, 10, 5-8 is also quoted in the final section entitled *Flores* hosted in this manual (ms. 7.1, f. 205 r.), a collection of aphorisms by famous Latin writers for the pupils' moral edification.

The third stanza takes up the same idea (i.e. the golden mean) moving from wealth to power and providing three examples of how the mighty are fallen as a warning to his friend Licinius Murena. This stanza is quoted by the author of *Rosa inter spinas* as an example of minor Sapphic metrical scheme, which he also produces graphically. Cf. ms. 7.1, f. 15 r.-15 v.:

saepius ventis agitur ingens
pinus et celsae graviore casu
decidunt turres feriuntque summos
fulgura montis.

The giant pine is shaken by winds
more often, lofty towers collapse
with a greater crash, and lightning strikes
the summits of mountains.

³⁵ Nisbet, Hubbard 1978: 157.

Like the second stanza of *Carm.* II, 10, also the third stanza is quoted in the mentioned anthology *Flores* (ms. 7.1, f. 200 v.), hosted in *Rosa inter spinas*.

Lines 9-12 of Horace's *Carm.* II, 10 are quoted to exemplify the minor Sapphic also by H. Konys'kyj, author of *Praecepta de arte poetica* (ms. 30, f. 32 v.); before him, they had been quoted by the author of the earlier manual under the same title *Praecepta de arte poetica* (ms. 23, f. 5 r.). The repeated quotation of lines from this ode in Mohylanian poetics is no coincidence: this ode, dedicated to Licinius Murena, contains philosophical motifs of Horatian lyrics which were dear to Mohylanian professors. They revolve around the concept of *mesótēs*, that is *aurea mediocritas*, i.e. measure, eschewing excesses. The analogy between a ship that manages to avoid both the tempest and complete calm and the man who follows the right path is suggested by the initial and the final metaphors, drawn from the field of navigation. In the aforementioned stanza the comparison is between a tall pine and high towers, suggesting that those who want to elevate themselves too high often end up by collapsing miserably.

4.2.1. The novelty in *Praecepta de arte poetica* (ms. 23) is that after the quotation of Horace's lines, the author presents his pupils with a remake of this strophe, in the key of parody, which is introduced by the following note: "Ad imitationem Horatiani accipe aliud sapphicum [sic] carmen pro exemplo" ("Receive another Sapphic ode as an example of imitation of Horace's [ode]"). Although the poetics teacher does not mention its author, I found out it is David Hoppius (David Hopf, 1600-1660) a German Neo-Latin poet, author of *Parodiae in Libros Odarum et Epodon Quinti Horatii Flacci rebus sacris maximam partem accommodatae a M. Davide Hoppio [...]*, Brunsvigae 1690. Nine editions of this book were published between 1655 and 1690, which witnesses to the popularity of this genre. It is the third stanza of the tenth parody of the second book of Horace's odes, with the title *Ad Ecclesiam, ut in cruce constans sit* (To the Church, so that it may be constant in carrying the cross). Cf.:

Saepius plagis agitur insons
Coetus et tristes graviore damno
Imminent casus, feriuntque Sanctos
Tela malorum.

More often the innocent assembly is shaken
by wounds, and sad blows threaten
with more serious damage and the arrows of evil men
wound holy ones.

Both in the quoted stanza and in the whole parody, which faithfully reproduces the syntactic construction, and the meter, of the original, Horace's allegorical intent is neither reproduced nor reflected. It is an exhortation to the community of the Christian believers to not forsake their faith because of the cross, but to patiently endure trials and persecutions in the hope of a future heav-

only reward. Instead of a tall pine we find the innocent assembly, presumably the community of Christian believers, threatened and persecuted by evil and powerful forces. Taking into account the apparently devout content, if Horace's allegorical background had been reproduced, this would have created a mocking intent, as if to say that the blows received and the adversities endured were the consequence of the vain ambition of power and of the supposed presumptuousness of Christians. The author of the manual, however, probably intended to point out this type of learned exercise, this re-reading and re-writing of a classical author in a Christian key to his students.

As for the last part of Horace's poem (*Carm.* II, 10), it also focuses on extremes of fortune and it becomes a consolation. Indeed, as the poet says with another series of antitheses that focus on a change from bad to good and thus reverse the pattern of ll. 9-12, good fortune can easily be changed into bad fortune and vice versa, and thus he exhorts his addressee to try and hold the balance in the face of both good and bad conditions and in the end warns him against pride.

4.3. As an exemplification of the Sapphic strophe *Elementa latine poeseos* quotes Horace's *Carm.* II, 2, 9-12. This ode is addressed to C. Sallustius Crispus, great-nephew of Sallustius the historian, and Maecenas's successor as Augustus's most trusted minister. The poem is a panegyric of a man who was munificent and also a generous supporter of literature; his praise is couched very subtly as a denunciation of materialism. As Nisbet-Hubbard note, "already in the first eight lines there are hints of moral philosophy, and from the third stanza this element dominates the poem"³⁶. As is often the case in Horace, Epicureanism and Stoicism appear intermingled with each other, although Nisbet-Hubbard state that in this ode the Stoicism of the last two stanzas informs the whole poem. We may summarize the main motifs of the ode with the words of Nisbet-Hubbard (*ibidem*): "The value of riches depends on their use [...], posthumous fame is true immortality, avarice must be subdued not merely modified [...], a personified Virtus teaches the correct use of language [...]"³⁷, the only true thing is the man who disdains wealth". The stanza quoted contains the Stoic paradox according to which the wise man is rich, which is combined with the Epicurean thought that wealth consists in being able to limit one's wishes. Cf. ll. 9-12:

latius regnes avidum domando
spiritum, quam si Libyam remotis
Gadibus iungas et uterque Poenus
serviat uni.

³⁶ Nisbet, Hubbard 1978: 34.

³⁷ The personification of virtue derives from the moralists' discourse. It is identified with wisdom, which is far from the common people. For the wise and virtuous man the rich man not only is not happy, but is not even rich since the only true rich one is the wise man. The Stoics proclaimed the need to restore to things their true name and to words their true meaning.

You gain dominion by taming your eager
spirit, not by uniting Libya
and distant Gades, thus conquering both
Carthaginian realms.

As we can see, Horace gives the Stoic paradox a typically Roman content, by couching the idea of wealth through the image of an immense landed property, which would hyperbolically include Libya and the mythical Gades, located beyond the pillars of Hercules, and would join the Carthaginians of Africa with those of Southern Spain.

The author of *Elementa latine poeseos* did not choose this stanza by chance; on the contrary, the idea that dominion over one's own senses and passions is worth more than military might and conquests was quite widespread among the Mohylanian élite and it was firmly inculcated in the pupils in different ambits and forms of teaching. And of course, it was infused with a Christian meaning and fashion. Cf., for instance, the poem *Entheus poeta* dedicated to Joasaf Krokovs'kyj (then Archimandrite of the Caves Monastery in Kyiv) by his pupil and admirer Josyp Turobojs'kyj, who offered it to his pupils in his own manual of poetics (*Hymettus extra Atticam*, 1699) as an example of *silva* (which is defined as "Carmen epicum brevius tractans vel Historiam veram vel fictam, vel Laudem vel Vituperationem, alicuius, Caeteraque his similia")³⁸. The idea underlying the whole poem is that epic poetry is required to celebrate not only the glorious military enterprises of the past, but also those who have distinguished themselves for moral and spiritual merits, which testifies to a peculiar comprehension of the perfect hero and an expansion of the heroic theme to characters traditionally not taken into consideration. In this poem by Turobojs'kyj, one of the ways the poet uses to underline the superiority of a moral rather than a military victory is by matching words with the root of "victoria" (victory), such as "vincere," "victor," "victrix" and the word "virtus" (virtue), which creates a powerful association between virtue and victory over one's senses that the former affords. Moreover, the author states that only those who are able to govern the reins of a curbed soul are able to obtain military victories. The similarity with the concept expressed in Horace's quoted lines from *Carm.* II, 2 is quite evident, although such ideas of moral self-perfecting in the Mohylanian context were reinterpreted in a religious key, as virtues of the perfect Christian that education at the KMA was supposed to shape. Poetry, along with the other disciplines, was required to participate in this duty, and therefore the models proposed to the students as exemplifications of metrical patterns also had their part in this process.

³⁸ "An epic poem that briefly treats either a true or a feigned story, or someone's praise or blame and similar things". As one can see, this definition recalls the abundance and variety of themes dealt with by this poetic genre; such a thematic richness is underlined by Scaliger and Sarbiewski after him (see Niedźwiedz 2003: 174-175).

4.4. The stanzas chosen by Josyp Turobojs'kyj to exemplify the minor Sapphic strophe have a clear moralizing content. They are drawn from two odes by Sarbiewski, respectively *Lyr.* III, 23 (ll. 29-32) and *Lyr.* II, 7 (ll. 17-20). The central idea of *Lyr.* III, 23, addressed to the fictional character Iulius Ariminus, is expressed in the short sentence placed before its beginning: “Solis animi bonis nos belluis praestare” (“We excel over beasts only for the goods of the soul”). This idea is then recapitulated in the last stanza as the conclusion of an ode, the central theme of which is the concept that virtue, not material riches, makes man good and brings him happiness. Virtue at the same time frees men from greed for material riches. And this is Sarbiewski’s conclusion, quoted by Turobojs’kyj (ms. 8, f. 14 r.):

Una mortales numero ferarum
Eximit virtus, volucerque notas
Siderum sedes, animus solutis
Visere pennis.

Only virtue differentiates mortals
from beasts, and the winged soul
flies heavenwards to join the stars, on
free wings.

As to *Lyr.* II, 7, the last strophe of which is quoted by Turobojs’kyj right after, it dwells on the theme of the brevity of human life and the fugacity of happiness. Therefore, Sarbiewski exhorts his fictional addressee, a certain Publius Memnius, described as being close to death, to spare the Gods his blasphemous complaints, and concludes with an exhortation to those who wish to live long (ll. 17-20); this conclusion is quoted by Turobojs’kyj (ms. 8, f. 14 r.):

Quae tibi primum dedit hora nasci
Haec mori primum dedit. Ille longum
Vixit, aeternum sibi qui merendo
Vindicat aevum.

The hour that first gave you life
this one first gave you death. Whoso by his merits
claims time for himself, has lived
a long eternity.

And thus, the author of *Hymettus*, in order to exemplify the minor Sapphic strophe, offers his pupils carefully selected examples, so that besides learning the metrical pattern of the Sapphic strophe, they may be edified by the moral teaching that the cited lines offer.

4.5. Interestingly and originally, Mytrofan Dovhalevs’kyj, author of *Hortus poeticus* (1736), exemplifies the minor Sapphic strophe by quoting the first strophe of the famous hymn to God, “Dicimus grates tibi summe rerum Conditor”,

by P. Melancthon (1539), one of the leaders of the German Reformation, its first systematic theologian, and the main author of the famous *Confession* presented to the Diet of Augsburg in 1530. Here it is (ms. 26.1, f. 80 r.):

Dicimus grates tibi summe rerum
 Conditor, gnato tua quod ministros
 Flammeos finxit manus, angelorum
 Agmina pura.

Thanks unto Thee, O highest Lord, Creator,
 we for Thy faithful ministers now render,
 whose host Thine hand as flames of fire created,
 holy and blameless³⁹.

4.6. As to the author of *Lyra Heliconis* (1714), in his manual he exemplifies the minor Sapphic strophe twice. The first time he quotes the first three stanzas of Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* I, 1, the famous poem which opens his *Lyricorum libri IV*, and in which the author uses the myth of the golden age to portray the present time of the beginning of pope Urban VIII's pontificate. The subtitle of the poem, "Cum infestae Thracum copiae Pannonia excessissent" ("When the enemy's troops of Turks withdrew from Hungary") refers to the suppression of the 1619-1621 insurrection led by the protestant prince of Transylvania Gabor Bethlen (supported, although not directly, by the Ottomans) against the Habsburg monarchy. Beyond the classical antecedents in the description of the golden age, like Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (I, 97-150) and Virgil's fourth book of the *Eneid*, the most direct reference is Seneca's tragedy *Thyestes*: indeed the initial lines of Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* I, 1 are modelled on ll. 573-576 of Seneca's tragedy. Cf. the aforementioned lines and Sarbiewski's initial stanzas (I quote *Lyr.* I, 1, 1-12 like the author of *Lyra Heliconis*, ms. 14, f. 194 r.-194 v.):

THYESTES, ll. 573-576

Iam minae saevi cecidere ferri,
 iam silet murmur grave classicorum,
 iam tacet stridor litui strepentis:
 alta pax urbi revocata laetae

Already the threats of the cruel sword have ceased
 the oppressing roaring of the military trumpet is already silent,
 the whistling of the resounding horn is already silent,
 when ancient peace has been revived for the joyous city.

³⁹ The translation is by Matthew Carver (2011) and it is to be found at <<http://matthaeusglyptes.blogspot.it/2011/09/dicimus-grates-tibi.html>> (accessed 30 November 2017).

LYR. I, 1, 1-12

Iam minae saevi cecidere belli:
 Iam profanatis male pulsa terris
 Et Salus, et Pax niveis revisit
 Oppida bigis:

Iam Fides et Fas, et amoena praeter
 Faustitas laeto volat arva curru:
 Iam fluunt passim pretiosa largis
 Saecula rivis.

Candidi soles, veterisque venae
 Fontibus nati revocantur Anni:
 Grandinat gemmis, rigoque caelum
 Depluit auro.

Already the threats of cruel war have ceased
 already salvation, badly driven out from the profaned
 lands, and peace have returned to visit the cities
 on white two-horse chariots:

Already faith and divine law and beautiful
 prosperity fly over the plowed fields on a joyful chariot:
 already everywhere rich times flow with
 abundant rivers.

The bright suns and the years begotten from
 the springs of the ancient vein are revived:
 the sky hails with buds, and rains down with
 abundantly flowing gold.

Buszewicz⁴⁰ recalls that in Seneca's tragedy the lines quoted, sung by the chorus, depict the happy and tranquil time that follows the apparent reconciliation between the two brothers Atreus and Thyestes, but at the same time doubt is cast on the duration of such calm, since, as it is said (ll. 596-597): "Nulla sors longa est: dolor ac voluptas / invicem cedunt; brevior voluptas..." ("No fate is long: sorrow and pleasure / make way reciprocally for each other; pleasure is shorter..."). We do not know whether Sarbiewski also implicitly meant to cast doubt on the quality of Urban VIII's pontificate. Certainly, it was the depiction of the golden age which attracted Mohylanian teachers of poetics⁴¹.

Indeed, the first strophe of Sarbiewski's *Lyr. I,1* is quoted to exemplify the minor Sapphic also by the authors of *Officina* (ms. 20, f. 30 r.) and *Fons Castalius* (ms. 9, f. 85 r.). The author of the latter manual also adds another Sapphic stanza, the author of which I have been unable to trace. As we will shortly

⁴⁰ Buszewicz 2006: 221.

⁴¹ For a concise outline of the concept of the golden age in Latin literature and in Sarbiewski, see the chapter "*Aureum saeculum*: Tęsknota za utraconą harmonią" in Buszewicz 2006: 218-231.

see, these lines could be an ideal continuation of Sarbiewski's depiction of the golden age. Here they are:

Et Janus vastus famuletur Orbi
secla Saturni renoventur alma
et Ceres totis dominetur annis
cessat ab armis.

And may mighty Janus serve the world,
may the propitious Saturn's ages revive,
and may Ceres dominate for years to come,
and remain free of weapons.

Sarbiewski's poem *Lyr. I,1* enjoyed particular popularity among Mohylanian teachers of poetics. Indeed, the author of *Cedrus Apollinis*, who, as I noted above, makes ample use of Sarbiewski's poetry, exemplifies the minor Sapphic strophe by citing lines 49-52 of this ode, in which, by using typical Classical metaphors and images to designate death, the author wishes the Roman pontiff a long life. Cf. ms. 10, f. 127 v.:

Laurus annosum tibi signet aevum:
Fata te norint, properentque Parcae
Nescium carpi tibi destinatos
Stamen in annos.

May the laurel tree designate a long life to you,
that the Fates may learn to know you, that the Parcae may hasten
the thread of life that cannot be broken
for the time fixed for you.

4.6.1. As for the author of *Lyra Heliconis*, as I have said above, he exemplifies the minor Sapphic stanza a second time. At the beginning of the chapter on lyric poetry, he explains the terms *monocolon*, *dicolon*, *tricolon*, *tetracolon*; *distrophos*, *tristrophos*, *tetrestrophos*, and provides samples of poems to illustrate them. And in order to exemplify the *dicolon carmen*, he quotes lines 45-48 of Horace's *Carm. I, 2*, of which other authors quoted lines 1-4 to exemplify the minor Sapphic. However, he omits quoting the beginning of line 49, that is the verb "tollat", which concludes the hope expressed in lines 47-48. This suggests that the author was interested in these lines exclusively for their metrical pattern, but did not pay much attention to their content and meaning. Cf. ms. 14, f. 215 r.:

serus in caelum redeas diuque
laetus intersis populo Quirini,
neve te nostris vitiis iniquum
ocyor [*sic*] aura
[tollat;]

(*Carm. I, 2*, 45-48)

defer your return to the sky; happily
linger among Quirinus' people.
Let no sudden breeze [deliver]
you from our noxious
faults.

To understand these lines, remember that in the previous stanza the poet had turned to Mercury (called "ales [...] almae filius Maiaë" – "gentle Maia's winged son"). And thus, the object of the invocation in ll. 45-48 may still be Mercury, who is asked to return to the sky as late as possible. Naturally, since the god has taken the guise of Augustus, this is an expedient to wish the latter a long life. The author of *Lyra Heliconis* probably picked these lines as an example of a ruler's praise (panegyric poetry was the genre most widely practiced by the poets and budding poets of the Mohylanian circle).

4.7. As we have already seen, there are cases in which the poetics teachers, probably to set a model, choose to illustrate a metrical pattern by composing their own short or long poem. Such is the case of the author of *Regia regis*. In fact, after having provided the metrical scheme of the minor Sapphic, he exemplifies it with what sounds like his own poem, titled *De vere* (On spring). Here it is (ms. 27, f. 23 v.):

Iam sua extollit iuga Phaebus ardens
igneos mittit radios in orbem
frigidum pellit Boream, nocere
vim negat illi,

quem cupivit terra, calor redivit,
vinculis absolvitur in gelatis,
ver paratur fructificare nobis
commoda plura.

Already flaming Phoebus raises his horses
and sends ardent rays to the world
he drives away the cold north wind, and denies it
the force to do harm.

The warmth that the earth longed for has returned,
freeing itself from its frozen fetters,
spring is preparing to burst into leaf
with numerous gifts for us.

We might define this short poem as a conventional depiction of spring; in the first stanza the images of warmth and of cold are expressed respectively by the metonymic images of Phoebus and of Boreas. In the second stanza, instead, warmth is named directly, as *calor* and is represented as being released from *gelata vincula*, which had restrained it hitherto. The author probably knew Hor-

ace's *Carm.* I, 4 and IV, 7, and Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* IV, 35, odes which contain images of the onset of spring after a bitterly cold winter.

4.8. The author of *Via lactea*... exemplifies the minor Sapphic by quoting two stanzas of some author hitherto unknown to us, who may be the author of the manual itself, writing in imitation of some more famous poet. These lines contain an appeal to the god of war to help the fighters and an exhortation to the combatants to resume military confrontation and not to lose heart. Cf. ms. 25.2, f. 157 r.:

Surge tunc Mavors, age tela viva,
nox citis sese, tulit hinc quadrigis,
hostium technae tibi crede tanta
luce patebunt;

stringe mucronem, pharetram resume,
austriacae bello recinunt alaudae,
classicum an laeti magis oriuntur
voce triumphi.

Rise then, o Mars, conduct living darts,
night has vanished on swift four-horse chariots,
believe, the enemy's artifices will be revealed to you
with so much light;

graze your sword, take up your quiver again,
the southern crested larks are singing once more
the military trumpet-call for war, maybe that more joyous triumphs
originate from the voice.

5. Regarding four-foot metrical lines, the most exemplified metrical system is the alcaic, also called *carmen horatianum* by nearly all Mohylanian teachers of poetics due to its being the most widely used metrical system in Horace's odes. And indeed, in the exemplification of this metrical pattern Mohylanian authors display a great variety of modes.

5.1. After having explained this metrical system, the author of *Camoena in Parnasso* chooses the first two stanzas of Horace's *Carm.* II, 3 (lines 1-8) by way of example (ms. 4.2, f. 128 r.):

Aequam memento rebus in arduis
servare mentem, non secus in bonis
ab insolenti temperatam
laetitia, moriture Delli,

seu maestus omni tempore vixeris
 seu te in remoto gramine per dies
 festos reclinatum bearis
 interiore nota Falerni.

Remember to keep a level head
 when the road is steep and likewise temper
 your glee when times are good,
 Dellius, destined to die

whether you constantly grieve or celebrate
 festive days on your back in a hidden
 meadow enjoying Falernian
 wine from deep in your cellar.

Indeed, the fact that he quotes two stanzas of this ode, and not just one (which would have been enough by way of exemplification, and which other poetics teachers do) is probably due to their content. In fact, as we will shortly see, the frequency with which this ode was mentioned tells us that it was particularly dear to Mohylanian authors. The ode is split into three structural blocks: the first (lines 1-8) contains a more general admonition (ll. 1-4) which despite the use of the imperative, as Nisbet-Hubbard observes, “fulfils the same purpose as an opening *sententia*”⁴². Quintus Dellius, the addressee, was a man known for his problematic, incident-prone political career. He actually was an opportunist politician, and Marcus Valerius Messalla Corvinus called him *desultor bellorum civilium* (horse changer of the civil wars). He was given this name because of his many desertions: indeed, he deserted Publius Cornelius Dolabella for Gaius Cassius Longinus in 43 B.C., Cassius for Mark Antony in 42 B.C., and lastly Antony for Octavian in 31 B.C.

The gnomic motif of the first part is that of the imperturbability of the human soul faced with the adversities of life as well as a warning about the hybris generated by prosperity. The central part (ll. 9-16) contains an invitation to a banquet and marks the gradual passage from the first part to the last, which contains reflections on the universality and the ineluctability of death.

As already remarked, most Mohylanian lecturers display first-hand knowledge of Horace’s poetry, which in some cases makes them choose for exemplification those lines of Horace which, besides serving their didactic purposes, were consonant with their aesthetic tastes. And thus the author of *Rosa inter spinas* exemplifies the *carmen horatianum* by quoting lines 21-24 of this same ode by Horace (*Carm.* II, 3). Cf. ms. 7.1, f. 16 r.:

Divesne prisco natus ab Inacho
 nil interest; seu [sic!] pauper et infima
 de gente sub dio [sic!] moreris,
 victima nil miserantis Orci.

⁴² Nisbet, Hubbard 1978: 52.

Whether the poorest pauper beneath
the sky or a wealthy descendant of ancient
Inachus, still you belong
to Orcus void of pity.

The stanza quoted, the penultimate, is the second of the last three, which are centered on the theme of death. In the previous one the poet had reminded his addressee, the hedonist Dellius, that he would have to relinquish all his luxury possessions one day and that an heir would subsequently benefit from them. In this stanza, instead, the theme is that of the equality of all human beings before death, regardless of their origin or wealth. Inachus was the earliest king of Argos, and thus here he symbolizes antiquity from time immemorial. Finally, although it was not possible to analyze this course in detail, I point out that the last stanza of this ode is used to exemplify the Alcaic metrical system by the author of *Elementa latinae poeseos*, a course of poetics which is now kept at the L'viv National Library, although it belonged to the KMA⁴³. And thus, his pupils through this example (ll. 25-28), were masterfully reminded of death, of its ineluctability whatever one does in life and whatever their station in this world. The last strophe concludes the poet's reflection on the theme of death, which is developed in the two previous stanzas, and had been foreshadowed in the beginning by the future participle *moriture* of line 4, referred to his addressee Dellius. Cf.:

Omnes eodem cogimur, omnium
versatur urna serius ocuis
sors exitura et nos in aeternum
exilium impositura cymbae.

All of us face the same necessity.
Our lot eventually rolls from the urn
that holds them all and we board
a raft to eternal exile.

The popularity of this ode among Mohylanian and other authors is also testified by its manifold use, since it is variously quoted also when they deal with lyric poetry.

5.1.1. As mentioned above, the author of *Camoena in Parnasso* provides a second example next to Horace's ode quoted above. Indeed, he adds the first stanza (lines 1-4) of Sarbiewski's ode *Lyr. II, 11*, written in the same Alcaic metrical system, and dedicated to the Blessed Virgin (*Ad D. Virginem Matrem*). Cf. ms. 4.2, f. 128 r.:

⁴³ This manuscript course is kept at the Scientific Library of L'viv National University I. Franka, Manuscript section, no. 407 I (see also footnote n. 9 in the Introduction); the lines quoted are on f. 10 r. (ms. 33).

Huc o beatis septa cohortibus
 Regina mundi, sidereos, age,
 Molire passus, huc curuli
 Nube super Zephyroque præpes
 [Descende].

To this place, o Queen of the world, surrounded
 by the blessed retinue, come, lead your starred
 steps: to this place from the curule cloud and
 flying straight ahead over Zephyr
 [Come down].

This ode has as its ‘starting point’ Horace’s *Carm.* III, 4, of which it constitutes a type of parody⁴⁴. Horace’s ode is the first of the second trilogy that forms the cycle of the Roman odes (as the first six odes of Book III are called), the proemial function of which is underlined by the invocation to the Muses and by the autobiographical theme of its first part. The ode can be divided into two major parts: the first (ll. 9-36), preceded by the two proemial stanzas with the invocation to the Muses, is dedicated to the protective power of the Muses, which the poet experienced both in his childhood and in his adult life and which he will probably experience in the future. At line 37 Horace shifts his discourse from personal to political themes: ll. 37-42 constitute a sort of link between the first and the second part and expound on the concept of *consilium* (that is the benign influence of the Muses), which is necessary for physical strength and might (*vis*), because the latter without the former would be disastrous. The second part thus contains the myths that exemplify the victory of *consilium* over *vis*, that is the power of poetry to civilize and pacify. Among the mythological exemplifications we find “the most systematic account of Gigantomachy that has survived in Augustan literature”⁴⁵.

Sarbiewski’s ode *Lyr.* II, 11 is a prayer to the Virgin Mary, queen of the earth and the sky. Sarbiewski does not intend to imitate Horace’s *Carm.* III, 4 either in length or in the treated themes. As Buszewicz states, the incipit of Horace’s ode “Descende caelo [...] regina” seems to suggest the possibility of a Christian imitation, with a few changes, of this expression. And thus in the first two stanzas of his ode Sarbiewski borrows the words from Horace’s first stanza: “regina” – in the same position, at the beginning of the second line, “age,” “descende”. However, while in Horace “dic” refers to the wish for creative inspiration, in Sarbiewski the accent is first of all on the fact that the Virgin Mary governs the world, then on her protective powers, and subsequently on the act of invocation “Huc, [...] huc [...] Descende”. Cf. Horace’s and Sarbiewski’s first stanzas, in which Horace’s invocation to the muse Calliope becomes Sarbiewski’s invocation to the Virgin Mary⁴⁶:

⁴⁴ Cf. Budzyński 1975: 98-99.

⁴⁵ Nisbet, Rudd 2004: 55.

⁴⁶ For the other similarities between this ode Horace and Sarbiewski’s *Lyr.* II, 11, in particular the similarity between Sarbiewski’s sixth stanza and Horace’s second stanza, see Buszewicz 2006: 327-329.

Descende caelo et dic age tibia
regina longum Calliope melos,
seu voce nunc mavis acuta,
seu fidibus citharave Phoebi. (Carm. III, 4, 1-4)

Descend from the sky and play a lengthy
tune on the tibia, Queen Calliope,
or use your lilting voice
or the strings of Apollo's cithara.

Huc o beatis septa cohortibus
Regina mundi, sidereos, age,
Molire passus, huc curuli
Nube super Zephyroque praepes
[Descende]. (Lyr. II, 11, 1-4)

To this place, o Queen of the world, surrounded
by the blessed retinue, come, lead your starred
steps: to this place from the curule cloud and
flying straight ahead over Zephyr
[Come down].

The reception of Horace through the prism of his Christian interpretation and adaptation, already seen in the poetry that takes Horace as its starting point in the Mohylanian poetics, is manifest throughout the courses, and it constitutes the constant mode, as we have seen, of the reception of the Classics. In this, Mohylanian poetics do not stand aside from the selective approach and reading of the Classics practiced in Western European Christian schools⁴⁷.

5.2. Almost all teachers of poetics choose examples from Horace's poetry or from his imitators to exemplify the Alcaic system. And thus, the author of *Cytheron Bivertex* on his part exemplifies the *carmen horatianum* by quoting lines 9-12 of Horace's *Carm.* II, 11; cf. ms. 5, f. 144 r.:

Non semper idem floribus est honor
vernīs, neque uno Luna rubens nitet
vultu: quid aeternis minorem
consiliis animum fatigat [sic!]?

Eternal honors escape the blossoms
of spring; the ruby moon has several
smiles. Why weary your feeble
soul with plans for eternity?

⁴⁷ Cf. Waquet 2004: 58-62.

This ode is addressed to a certain Quintius, about whom little is known and whose identification is not certain⁴⁸; however, the unfolding of the ode is independent of its addressee. The ode is structurally divided into two parts: the first (ll. 1-12) contains a paraenesis to Quintius: the poet enjoins him not to worry about events happening far from him or concerning distant times. The second part (ll. 13-24) constitutes the preparation of the symposium and the poet's tone suggests he is urging his addressee to hurry since there is little time left to enjoy life.

In the quoted stanza, the initial words "non semper" introduce a comparison between human and natural events: unlike *Carm.* I, 4 and IV, 7, where there was a tragic gap between the two, here man and nature share the same destiny of temporality and decay. The comparison between the brevity of youth and that of flowers is one of the commonest in Greek and Latin poetry. The second comparison is with the moon, whose phases are an indication of the law of natural changes; the adjective *rubens* could metaphorically refer to the bloom of youth. As Nisbet-Hubbard assert, verbs, adjectives and substantives used in this stanza to define phenomena of the natural world can also be applied to human beings, such as the adjective *rubens*: "similarly *honor* is applicable to people as well as flowers, *nitet* reminds us of human *nitor* (I. 5. 13, I. 19. 5), and the personified *voltu* is preferred to the scientific *facie*"⁴⁹. And thus, if both man and nature are subject to constant change and final decay, why trouble our minds with thoughts of eternity as if our lives were everlasting? The concept expressed here by the locution *aeterna consilia* is the same as *spes longa* of *Carm.* I, 4, 15 and as the exhortation "inmortalia ne speres" of *Carm.* IV, 7, 7, both of which are quoted by Mohylanian authors to exemplify other metrical patterns.

The lines that reminded pupils about the brevity of life and the mortality of man, interpreted in a Christian key, as a *memento mori* implicitly urging them to repent of their sins and to lead an irreproachable life, were among the greatest favorites of Mohylanian poetics teachers. The fact that words that were interpreted as ethical recommendations and moral principles had been expressed by a Classical authority greatly reinforced their message. And thus the same lines 9-12 from Horace's *Carm.* II, 11 are quoted by the author of *Lyra Heliconis* to exemplify the Alcaic metrical pattern. Next to these lines, however, this same author also quotes another Horatian Alcaic stanza depicting the cold winter around mount Soracte in Sabine, which opens *Carm.* I, 9 (cf. ms. 14, f. 201 v.):

Vides ut alta stet nive candidum
Soracte, nec iam sustineant onus
silvae laborantes, geluque
flumina constiterint acuto.

⁴⁸ Cf. Nisbet, Hubbard 1978: 167-168.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*: 172.

You see Soracte's summit white
with snow. The forest's laboring branches
bend to their burden. Rivers
come to an icy halt.

This stanza, together with the next one, is modeled on an ode by Alcaeus (338), and by the 'new' Sappho⁵⁰. Horace, however, varies its models, introducing typically Roman elements, and particularly experiencing the winter landscape as a state of the soul, a metaphor, a symbol. Indeed, the ode is centered around the fundamental epicurean motif of enjoying the present, in this case one's youth, and not worrying about what the future will bring. And thus the poet passes from the oppressive winter atmosphere of the beginning to the vitality of the last scene, from the sadness caused by a winter day to the serenity and joy of the last stanza. Mohylanian authors, however, also regarding this ode, were both aware of and attracted by its main motif as expressed in line 13:

Quid sit futurum cras fuge quaerere [et]

Flee attempts to learn the future!

This invitation not to worry about tomorrow, and implicitly to enjoy the present day is quoted by the author of *Lyra variis*..., who lists it as its fifth example in the section on four-foot lines (see ms. 6.1, f. 16 r.). Other authors refer to the Alcaic metrical pattern by quoting only the first line of this poem (*Libri tres de arte poetica, Arctos in Parnasso*..., *Via lactea, Fons Castalius, Fons poseos, Parnassus*). The author of *Poeticarum institutionum breve compendium*, on his part, quotes lines 1-2 of this ode.

5.3. A different picture of nature is chosen by the author of *Via poetarum ad fontes castalidum*, who exemplifies the Alcaic metrical system by presenting Horace's *Carm.* I, 17, 1-4: these lines are not quoted by other authors. Here they are (cf. ms. 19.2, f. 43 r.):

Velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem
mutat Lycaeo Faunus et igneam
defendit aestatem capellis
usque meis pluviosque ventos.

Faunus is fond of abruptly exchanging
Arcadian slopes for my pleasant Lucretilis
and guarding my she-goats from fiery
heat and rainy winds.

⁵⁰ Cf. Obbink's article on the two newly found poems by the 7th-century B.C. poetess Sappho (Obbink 2014).

This ode is considered one of Horace's most original and subtle. It has a clear structure: it is divided into two groups of strophes (ll. 1-12 and 17-28) with at its center one strophe (ll. 13-16) that marks the passage from the first part, in which Faunus's frequent visits to his Sabine estate are described, to the second part, which contains the invitation to Tyndaris to come and enjoy the pleasures of Horace's Sabine villa. The central theme of the ode is the Horatian conception of the unity of poetry and wisdom as well as a sincere yearning for nature, his almost religious feeling of nature, which identifies the ideal landscape of wisdom, and especially the place of his privileged relationship with the divinity, in the bucolic landscape.

5.4. Yet another exemplification and example of the Alcaic stanza is that provided by the author of *Arctos in Parnasso*: at first he provides the metrical scheme of this stanza and quotes only its first (and second) line, that is the Alcaic hendecasyllable, citing Horace's *Carm.* II, 9, 1: "Vides ut alta stet nive candidum" (ms. 12, f. 101 v.). Then he exemplifies an Alcaic hendecasyllable which in the last position instead of a dactyl, features a spondee. Finally, he provides the metrical scheme of the whole Alcaic stanza and gives a sample thereof by quoting Horace's *Carm.* III, 6, 45-48. Cf. ms. 12, f. 102 r.:

Damnosa quid non imminuit dies?
aetas parentum peior avis tulit
nos nequiores, mox daturos
progeniem vitiosiore.

What can survive our days of loss?
Our parents were worse than theirs, and we,
their degenerate offspring, will bear
a brood more vicious still.

The lines quoted constitute the last stanza of an ode pervaded by an atmosphere of anxiety and dominated by a pessimistic attitude, an obscure foreboding of decay that is also found in a few epodes. At the same time, the prevailing feeling is that of a sin to be expiated, of a generational curse, of moral decay progressing from age to age, and this motif had been a commonplace of poetry since Hesiod. The ode has a tripartite structure: in ll. 1-16 the central theme is that of *pietas*, that is the prosperity of Rome is linked to her obedience to divine will, while its decay is linked to the decline of religion; these statements are in line with Augustus's program of reasserting traditional Roman beliefs. The second part (ll. 17-32) links national decline with the corruption of mores, especially envisaged in the adultery of married women but not in that of married men. In the third part (ll. 33-48), Horace delineates the contrast with the customs of archaic Rome, particularly underlining the peasant virtues of former times, which are implicitly contrasted with the urban corruption and immorality of his

time. Finally, the last stanza depicts Rome in constant and continuous decline in which each generation is worse than the one before.

This same stanza is cited as an example of *carmen horatianum* (alcaic) also by the author of the course *Via ingenuos poeseos candidatos...* (ms. 21.2, f. 34 v.): evidently through the mouth of Horace Mohylanian poetics teachers intended to warn their pupils against corruption of mores, and to urge them not to disregard the moral principles they had received, lest the same worsening from one generation to the next, of which Horace's speaks, happens to them.

5.5. It is precisely with such an aim that the author of *Liber de arte poetica* exemplifies the Alcaic metrical pattern by quoting lines 1-12 of Horace's *Carm.* III, 3. The structure of this ode is quite complex and not easy to summarize: its central part is occupied by Juno's speech (ll. 17-68), the central theme of which is the concept of the supremacy of Rome as the center of power vis-à-vis the Eastern world (cf. the prohibition to rebuild Troy), which was one of the main lines of Augustan culture. The core of the ode is articulated in three parts: Romulus's ascension to the sky (ll. 17-36); Rome's ecumenical dominion (ll. 37-48); the conditions on which Rome's empire will prosper further (ll. 49-68). The central part is preceded by two strophic couples, respectively on the righteous man (ll. 1-8) with a Stoic colouring, and on Augustus's apotheosis (ll. 9-16), and it is followed by a final strophe containing a *recusatio* (ll. 69-72). Here are the quoted lines (cf. ms. 28, f. 94 r.):

Iustum et tenacem propositi virum
 non civium ardor prava iubentum [sic!],
 non vultus instantis tyranni
 mente quati [sic!] solida neque Auster,

dux inquieti turbidus Hadriae,
 nec fulminantis magna Iovis manus [sic!]:
 si fractus illabatur orbis,
 impavidum ferient ruinae.

Hac arte Pollux et vagus Hercules
 innixus [sic!] arces attigit igneas,
 quos inter angustus [sic!] recumbens
 purpureo bibit ore nectar.

Neither the angry citizens' twisted
 demands, nor a menacing tyrant's face,
 nor a gale from the south (the disorderly
 lord of the Adriatic),

nor thundering Jupiter's fist disturbs
 a man who is just and determined. The sky
 could burst and fall; he would calmly
 endure, though pelted by fragments.

Thus Pollux and wandering Hercules, ending
their struggles, attained the fiery heights,
where Augustus reclining will moisten,
his purple lips with nectar.

It is precisely the depiction of the righteous man, whose steadfastness cannot be broken either by men (the people, the tyrant), or by natural and supernatural forces (the wind, Jupiter's force) that appealed to the ethically-didactic stance of Mohylanian teachers of poetics and rhetoric. The reference to justice links this ode to the preceding one, the central theme of which is *virtus*: indeed, justice is the utmost virtue; as to the man of the first stanza, Horace probably alludes to Socrates, who refused to commit the unjust deeds required of him by a people's regime and the thirty tyrants. The Stoic image of the wise man's imperturbability when threatened by tyrants as well as his certainty amidst a collapsing world probably hints at Cato. In ll. 9-12 Horace resumes the eschatological theme of the preceding ode, and presents a review of heroes who have been deified thanks to their virtue: Pollux, one of the Dioscuri, who according to tradition was a model of virtue, justice and *pietas*; Heracles, who represented not only the man able to endure any labour, but also epitomized the struggle against tyrants; and finally Augustus, whose apotheosis had been affirmed by the new constitutional order of 27 B.C.⁵¹

The popularity of the initial lines of this ode among Mohylanian lecturers is testified by the frequency with which they are quoted, particularly in the section on lyric poetry (by the authors of *Cunae Bethleemicae* and *Rosa inter spinas*), or as an example of *amplificatio* (in the course *Idea artis poeseos*), or as an example of *carmen polycolon* (which is constituted by more than one species of verse or metrical pattern) in *Parnassus*. And thus these lines lent themselves to being used as an example of more than one precept of poetics, in addition to being taken as an illustration of the steadfastness of righteous men. Therefore, I will go back to these lines in the next chapter.

5.6. A different Roman ode is chosen by the author of *Via lactea*: he exemplifies the Alcaic metrical system by quoting Horace's *Carm.* III, 1, 1-8, which he defines as follows: "Exemplum sit ex Horatio libro tertio oda prima in qua dicit non odibus [sic!]⁵² aut honoribus, sed animi tranquillitate vitam beatam effici" ("As an example may it be the first ode of the third book of Horace, in which he says that a happy life can be accomplished not by riches and honours but by the tranquility of the soul"). Indeed, the core of this ode, which has both an ethical and a political import, is the theme of luxury and the fear of death that is strictly linked to it, since according to Epicurean morals, such fear leads to ambition and greed. In tackling these themes, Horace recalls traditional Roman attitudes that were also at the basis of Augustan ideology; and thus, he gives Ep-

⁵¹ Cf. Nisbet, Rudd 2004: 41-42.

⁵² Probably a *lapsus calami* for "opibus".

icurean motifs a political resonance, since they assume a particular value in the light of Augustus's program of ethical re-foundation of *res publica*. However, the first two stanzas have both a different tone and content, and for the sublimity of their style they differ from the rest of the ode, which appears as a gnomic reflection on themes of private ethics. Probably the author quoted them in order to refer his pupils to the whole ode. Here they are (cf. ms. 25.1, f. 179 v.):

Odi profanum vulgus et arceo;
favete linguis: carmina non prius
audita Musarum sacerdos
virginibus puerisque canto.

Regum timendorum in proprios greges,
reges in ipsos imperium est Iovis,
clari Giganteo triumpho,
cuncta supercilio moventis.

I hate and shun the vulgar crowd.
Control your tongues. A priest of the Muses,
I sing for boys and maidens
such songs as have never been heard.

Nations are separately ruled by dreaded
kings; the kings themselves, by Jupiter,
the giants' illustrious victor
moving the world with his brow.

In the first stanza Horace uses a variation on a sacred formula with a sacral-mystic language to frame the image of the poet-*vates* who has been invested with his mission by the Muses (according to a tradition that harks back to Hesiod). As to the words “*carmina non prius / audita*”, they refer to the Roman odes in general, in that this ode is the first of the cycle and has the function of a proemium. Moreover, as Nisbet-Rudd stress, “in the religious context *carmina* suggests sacred chants, and the assonance of *carmina . . . canto* suits the sacral style”, and “*sacerdos* [...] emphasizes the authority and dignity of the poet's pronouncements”⁵³. Also the fact that Horace is addressing himself to young girls and boys is not only due to their aptness to receive a new discourse and to carry out the moral and political renewal that the Roman odes want to promote, but needs to be seen also in the context of a cult. The second stanza marks the beginning of the gnomic reflection, full of literary echoes⁵⁴: Horace states that even dreaded kings have to submit to the power of Jupiter, who rules over everything. The sense is that no mortal can escape fear, since for everybody there is someone to fear, so even the rich and the powerful have to submit to the laws of the universe.

⁵³ Nisbet, Rudd 2004: 7-8.

⁵⁴ Cf. Horace 1991-1994, vol. 1, bk. 2: 724-725.

5.7. Other examples of the exemplification of the Alcaic metrical pattern remind us once again of the Christian character of the teaching of poetics, as well as of all other subjects. Lavrentij Horka, author of *Idea artis poeticae*, chooses a very curious way to exemplify the *carmen horatianum*. At first he selects the first stanza of Horace's *Carm.* I, 35, which is a hymn and a prayer to the goddess Fortune together with Faith, Hope and Necessity, asking her to assist Augustus in his impending campaign against the Britons⁵⁵; then, right after these lines come another three Alcaic stanzas that constitute an elaboration on the theme of Psalm 49 (50) by the Scottish poet George Buchanan. However, they are preceded by the words "Item Psal 50" ("Similarly psalm 50"), which indicate that the first Alcaic stanza and the subsequent ones are not to be considered as a whole text. Let us look at the quoted stanzas (cf. ms. 13.2, f. 32 r.-32 v.):

O diva, gratum quae regis Antium, (*Carm.* I, 35, 1-4)
 praesens vel imo tollere de gradu
 mortale corpus vel superbos
 vertere funeribus triumphos,

Fortune, queen of congenial Antium,
 quick to raise a mortal frame
 from the bottom step or change
 triumphs to funeral marches,

Item Psal 50
 Et arbitraris me similem tui
 Quod perpetrata haec dissimulaverim?
 Ne crede: tecum expostulabo,
 Ante oculos tua facta ponam.

Considerate haec, vos quibus excidit
 De mente caeca mentio Numinis:
 Ne, quum praehendam, nemo sit qui
 De manibus mihi praensa tollat.

Si victimam vis magnificam mihi,
 Mactare, laudes canta, age gratias.
 Hac itur ad certam salutem
 Haec superos via pandit axes.

Similarly psalm 50
 And you have considered me to be like you
 for I have concealed the accomplishment of such things?
 Do not believe: I will demand you;
 Before [my] eyes I will place your actions.

Do consider these things, you from whose blind mind
 all mention of the divinity has vanished:

⁵⁵ For the chronology of this ode see Nisbet, Hubbard 1989: 387-388.

Lest, when I will take, there be no one who
 May take away from my hands the things I have taken possession of.

If you want to sacrifice for me a sumptuous
 Victim, sing the praises, give thanks:
 Through this way one reaches a sure salvation
 This way opens the lofty skies.

The author has picked the first stanza very attentively: indeed, apart from the specification “*quae regis gratum Antium*”, it could easily be the *incipit* of a prayer to the Virgin Mary. Horace conveys the topical motif of the unpredictability and violence of Fortune's changes. In the image of the goddess's power to raise mortals from humble positions, critics see a clear allusion to Servius Tullius, the son of a slave who became king of Rome and the founder of many of the Fortuna cults. On the other hand, in the image of the goddess's power to transform proud triumphs into funeral rites, critics see a reference to the two sons of Aemilius Paullus, who died precisely during the celebration of the latter's triumph over Perses. Indeed, the image of the goddess who is able to raise the humble and overthrow the powerful from their positions very closely reminds us of the canticle from the first chapter of the Gospel according to Luke, better known as the *Magnificat* (Luke 1, 46-55), in which the Virgin Mary praises and gives thanks to God because he has freed His people.

Horace's aforementioned stanza is followed by G. Buchanan's elaboration of lines 21-23 of Psalm 49 (50). In the next chapter I will dwell more extensively on the concept of imitation in Renaissance and post-Renaissance Neo-Latin poetry, of which parody is one manifestation.

In his 1982 monograph, Ford broadly identifies the three groups of psalms in Buchanan's collection – “those praising God, those outlining the righteous life, and those expressing the particular feelings of the psalmist”⁵⁶. It is not easy to attribute Psalm 49 (50) to any of these three categories. In fact, in this psalm God is depicted speaking to his people and expressing a judgment on them. In particular, in the lines quoted, God is addressing a wicked man, recalling his evil deeds, which contrast starkly with the words that come out of his lips, which proclaim God's decrees and His alliance, but then are not matched by a behaviour that complies with God's laws. Quite the contrary. And thus, after having reproached him, God turns to those who behave likewise and urges them to abandon their evil ways and come back to Him, so that they be saved from His wrath. The last verse contains a recollection of the men who are pleasing to God: those who sing his praise and who behave righteously; to them God promises his salvation.

And thus, because of its stress on the contraposition of what is pleasing to God and what is not, Psalm 49 (50) may be said to be closer to the second category identified by Ford. So, through the mouth of the psalmist and the pen of

⁵⁶ Ford 1982: 82.

Buchanan, Lavrentij Horka reminds his pupils of the conduct they should follow to be true Christians and to pursue the road to salvation.

Let us for now look closer at the quoted lines⁵⁷. Each verse of the psalm is elaborated in one stanza by Buchanan. I will quote below the original (from the Latin Vulgata) and his remake so as to facilitate a comparison. Cf.:

21 Haec fecisti, et tacui. (Vulgata)
Existimasti quod eram tui similis.
Arguam te et statuam illa contra faciem tuam.

Et arbitraris me similem tui (Buchanan)
Quod perpetrata haec dissimulaverim?
Ne crede: tecum expostulabo,
Ante oculos tua facta ponam.

22 Intellegite haec, qui obliviscimini Deum, (Vulgata)
ne quando rapiam, et non sit qui eripiat.

Considerate haec, vos quibus excidit (Buchanan)
De mente caeca mentio Numinis:
Ne, quum praehendam, nemo sit qui
De manibus mihi praensa tollat.

23 Qui immolabit sacrificium laudis, honorificabit me; (Vulgata)
et, qui immaculatus est in via, ostendam illi salutare Dei.

Si victimam vis magnificam mihi, (Buchanan)
Mactare, laudes canta, age gratias.
Hac itur ad certam salutem
Haec superos via pandit axes.

For a comparison, this is the King James Bible version of verses 21-23 of Psalm 50:

21 These things hast thou done, and I kept silence; thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thyself. But I will reprove thee and set them in order before thine eyes.

22 "Now consider this, ye that forget God, lest I tear you in pieces and there be none to deliver:

23 Whoso offereth praise glorifieth Me; and to him that ordereth his manner of living aright, I will show the salvation of God".

As we can see, Buchanan is at once more descriptive and more explicative than the original, which is to be expected in a paraphrase, as Ford states. And thus, the simple and straightforward "qui obliviscimini Deum" ("ye that forget

⁵⁷ In the Mohylian poetics George Buchanan is particularly mentioned for his remake of Psalm 137.

God”) of line 22 has become the much more rhetorically elaborate “vos, quibus excidit de mente caeca mentio numinis” (“you from whose blind mind all mention of the divinity has vanished”). Again, the synthetic “et non sit qui eripiat” (“and there be none to deliver”) is made thoroughly clear in the sentence “nemo sit qui de manibus mihi praensa tollat” (“there be no one who may take away from my hands [the things] I have taken possession of”). *Amplificatio* is used by Buchanan to make verse 23 more explicit too: the conciseness and the semantic incisiveness of the expression “Qui immolabit sacrificium laudis”, in which the matching of “sacrificium” and “laudis” aptly conveys the positivity of the sacrifice, is ‘diluted’ and made personal by the imperatives “Laudes canta, age gratias”. At the same time, the meaning expressed by the verb “honorificabit me” is amplified in the explicative locution “Si victimam vis magnificam mihi mactare” where the positive effect of the sacrifice is conveyed by the adjective *magnificam*; however, at the same time, the adjective *immaculatus* following right after, remains unexpressed in Buchanan’s remake.

5.8. A still different example is chosen by the author of *Fons Castalius*: he presents two Alcaic stanzas, which he defines “Carmina gratulatoria alicui patrono” (“Congratulatory verses to some protector”). The author does not specify whether the quoted lines are his own or not. However, we might assume that he is their author or ‘remaker’, so to say. Indeed, the first stanza looks like a remake of the first strophe of Sarbiewski’s *Lyr.* III, 18, a poem devoted to the praise of Francis Barberini, cardinal, nephew of a more famous Barberini, pope Urban VIII. The celebratee was a quite remarkable person: he was highly cultured and in 1623 he was accepted by the famous Roman Accademia dei Lincei, founded in 1603; he was also a powerful protector of littérateurs and artists and possessed a large library. The aforementioned *Lyr.* III, 18, as Buszewicz states, “stresses or tries to stress the search for humanistic values linked to *otium*”⁵⁸. Sarbiewski illustrates the dilemma of power through the lyric fiction of navigation⁵⁹. The poet-sailor, who emerges on the wide waters of praise of the cardinal, dedicates a good deal of poetical energy to the introductory allegorical image that creates that fiction: the little boat of the pen with the eloquent Muses at the oars, should be generated in the ocean of Glory and Praise. Apollo, who governs the Pegasean waters, is invited to captain the ship. As regards the second Alcaic stanza provided by the author of *Fons Castalius*, it is either modeled on a different poem or he wrote it himself. Cf. the two Alcaic stanzas presented in *Fons Castalius*, followed by the first stanza of Sarbiewski’s *Lyr.* III, 18 (cf. ms. 9, f. 86 v.-87 r.):

⁵⁸ “Poszukiwanie humanistycznych wartości związanych z *otium* uwydatnia czy raczej pragnie uwydatnić *Lyr II 18*” (Buszewicz 2006: 233).

⁵⁹ As Buszewicz recalls, Francis Barberini had made a very quick career thanks to his influential uncle and had accumulated significant wealth in the space of just a few years.

Laudum tuarum diffluat alveus
 plenis carinis ite polaria
 per prata facundisque Musae
 carmina deproperate remis.

Huic e prophanis Echo sororibus
 carmen canoris concine vocibus,
 et plena per rerum profundo
 ore tenuis iterando vivat.

The river bed of your praises may flow
 of full ships; go through broad polar water
 expanses, and prepare hastily, o Muses,
 poems with eloquent oars.

To this one sing, o Echo, a poem among the
 prophane sisters with melodious voices,
 and by the fullness of things from the
 depth of the lips may it live [in] repeating.

Hic ille plenis Oceanus patet (Lyr. III, 18)
 Laudum carinis: ite loquacia
 Per transtra, facundisque Musae,
 Carmina deproperate remis.

Here that ocean stands open to the ships
 full of praise. Go through loquacious rower's
 seats, and prepare hastily, o Muses, poems
 with eloquent oars.

And thus in the first Alcaic stanza our teacher transformed Sarbiewski's images in a curious way: the wide ocean has become a more modest river bed (or channel). The expression "per loquacia transtra" ("through loquacious rower's seats"), which is in line with the allegory of navigation, and especially with the simile between the poet and a sailor, has been transformed into "per prata polaria" ("through the broad polar water expanses"); this maintains the image of water and the vastness of the sea, but weakens the association between the poet and a sailor, which is instead kept in the last two lines of the first stanza ("facundisque Musae / Carmina deproperate remis"), which reproduce Sarbiewski's words verbatim. As to the following stanza, the setting is not that of navigation through the sea, but a generic one, more probably the woods, because of the presence of the nymph Echo. She is chosen for her faculty of repeating the last words of every sentence: and thus through her, the poet expresses the wish that the praises of the celebratee may be repeated over and over in a sort of everlasting life.

Interestingly, the author of *Tabulae praeceptorum poeseos*, after quoting Horace's *Carm.* II, 9, 1, in order to illustrate the three different metrical lines of the Alcaic stanza, quotes single verses of the *carmen* quoted in *Fons Castalius*, that is respectively: "Laudum tuarum diffluat alveus" to exemplify the Alcaic

hendecasyllable, and “Per prata facundaque Musae” (in *Fons Castalius* it was “Per prata facundisque Musae”) to typify the Alcaic enneasyllable, and “Carmina deproperate remis” to exemplify the Alcaic decasyllable.

6. The poetical examples that Mohylian teachers of poetics present to their pupils as a practical illustration of single metrical lines and metrical systems (among which I have dwelt on the Sapphic and Alcaic stanzas, which are the most widely exemplified and used, together with the dactylic hexameter, in the Mohylian poetics and in contemporary Ukrainian Neo-Latin poetry) allow us to draw some conclusions.

For a thorough understanding of the poetics lecturers' selective approach to Horace's poetry, we first have to bear in mind the conception of poetry that they instilled in their pupils: poetry was required first of all to form and educate devout Christian believers, to imbue them with moral values, such as scorn for material goods and riches, the cultivation of virtue, the love and care for one's neighbours and so on. Therefore, what we could call the aesthetic end of poetry was totally subordinate to its moral end. In a poetry so conceived there could be no room for our contemporary conception of the poet's inner emotions and feelings, and the categories of 'originality' or 'sincerity' in our understanding of them are inapplicable. The poet's feelings were 'acceptable', so to say, inasmuch as they were the expression of those virtues or, as in the case of panegyric poetry, the expression of admiration for characters who fully embodied those virtues and were therefore proposed to the budding poets as models to be imitated. This approach will emerge also in the treatment of lyric poetry, as we will see in the next chapter.

The true nature of the poet therefore revealed itself first of all in his ability to creatively imitate one or more chosen models. Indeed, *imitatio auctorum* was one of the four indispensable elements for composing 'good' poetry, as we have seen in chapter one, and it was one of the ways in which aspiring poets could carry out *exercitatio*, which was another of the four elements for making a good poet, a key factor indeed⁶⁰. The choice of Horace and of his Christian 'interpreters', 'emulators', admirers was a natural one. In fact, there were many reasons why Horace's poetry was chosen, besides constituting a model of lyric meters. Here, L.P. Wilkinson's considerations on Horace's lyrics are very helpful⁶¹. In the first place, what certainly attracted Mohylian teachers of poetics is the fact that Horace's poetry is not 'lyric' in the common comprehension of this word, which refers directly to the sphere of feelings; indeed, Horace's lyrics are a poetry of thoughts, which spring from reflections rather than from direct emotions. This fact is also connected to the rhetorical orientation of Horace's diction, which is often addressed to a certain 'you' and takes the tone of an admonition-exhortation. This was exactly what Mohylian teachers of poetics

⁶⁰ Cf. Chapter 1 and also Pontanus 1594: 3.

⁶¹ Cf. Wilkinson 1980: 123; Buszewicz 2006: 34-35.

were looking for. What also certainly appealed to them was the fact that statements in Horace's poetry are often expressed not by means of elaborate metaphors, but rather with images simply taken from life.

Another feature of Horatian lyrics which certainly attracted Mohylian lecturers was the way he gave natural phenomena a symbolic meaning with reference to human life (cf. for instance *Carm.* I, 4; II, 3; II, 10). Moreover, at times the thoughts concerning human relationships that the poet leaves 'incomplete' are expressed through the metaphoric representation of nature⁶². Indeed, if we pay attention to the fragments quoted by Mohylian authors in order to exemplify the different metrical systems, we will see that nearly all of them display the features just mentioned. Moreover, as I explain in the next chapter, Mohylian authors were also attuned to what Wilkinson defines as the oratorical features of Horace's language, its artistry, which expressed itself in a particular sensitivity "to sounds and rhythms and to the architectural construction of sentences"⁶³.

As I mentioned earlier, Mohylian authors generally shunned anything connected to erotic love, as was to be expected. For this reason, the Christian interpretation and elaboration of Horace was extremely congenial to their mindset. Christian Horatianism has a long history, since the first Christian poet to be called the "Christian Horace", that is Prudentius (348-ca. 405). In his poetry and hymns not only does he make ample use of Horace's lyric meters, but for the first time Horace's lyric settings and his lexical resources are transposed onto a new Christian terrain. I will go back to the centuries-long Christian imitation of Horace and to its manifestations in the Mohylian poetics in the next chapter, where I will also illustrate and analyze poetical samples by Kyiv-Mohylian authors which in one way or the other refer to Horace's poetry.

⁶² Wilkinson argues his point of view with the analysis of the ode to Dellius (*Carm.* II, 3): the image of the trees intertwined in a hug and of the murmuring brook, that tries to rush down from its river-bed, suggests among the 'remedies' for the shortness of life the act of love, although this is not expressed patently in the text. Such a suggestion is clearly visible in the ode to Thaliarchus (I, 9).

⁶³ Wilkinson 1980: 134.

Chapter 3. The Teaching of Lyric Poetry. The Legacy of Horace in the Neo-Latin Poetry of Mohylanian Teachers and Students of Poetics

1. This chapter is divided into two parts. The first will deal with the teaching of lyric poetry and its style, and it will investigate how Horace's poetry is put to use. The second will investigate the use of Horace's poetic and theoretical-literary legacy in the composition of poetry by Mohylanian poetics teachers and their pupils. This aspect of Horace's reception, as far as I know, has not been studied before, except by myself.

2. In most Mohylanian poetics, lyric poetry is dealt with in a specific chapter, the length and depth of which varies greatly, depending on the author's approach to literary genres (and to their hierarchy) and on his personal likening. A brief, albeit for now superficial examination of the treatment of literary genres in the poetics manuals, will also help us better understand the issue of their correspondence with, or divergence from, the system of literary genres in contemporary Ukrainian literature, quite often debated in scholarly literature on this subject¹.

For a clearer understanding of the hierarchy of literary genres in the Mohylanian poetics, it will be expedient to briefly recall the conception of poetry propounded in them. Poetry was required to contribute to the education of devout men and loyal subjects by encouraging virtue and dissuading from vice. Its fundamental purpose was to perfect the moral stature of those who practiced it. The best way to achieve this was to represent exemplary human actions, which were therefore considered the main object of poetry. Given this point of view, it is easy to understand the preeminence accorded to the species of epic poetry, the main aim of which was to arouse a desire for virtue². Indeed, in the particular

¹ Cf. Nalyvajko's assertion of the influence of Mohylanian poetics on the implantation of a 'new' system of literary genres in Ukrainian literature, and on the opposite side, N. Pylypjuk's claim that Mohylanian poetics were not tracts of literary theory but served the purpose of teaching Latin. On this topic also see the Introduction.

² Epic poetry (*epos, carmen heroicum*) since antiquity and until late Baroque in reflections on literary theory was considered as the model poetic genre, the perfect poetry (*perfecta poesis*, according to M. K. Sarbiewski's formulation), and starting from the

poetics, which illustrated in detail the different poetic genres of Latin poetry, epic poetry ranked first. In a few Mohylian poetics, after a detailed illustration of the subject matter and composition of the heroic poem, together with an explanation of the merits and faults of its meter, the dactylic hexameter, their authors ascribe to epic poetry other poetic species that focus on the illustrious actions of illustrious men in different contexts. Among them we find the genethliac, the epithalamic, the encomiastic, the eucharistic poems, the epicedium and a few others³. This is a clear indication that the Mohylian poetics were not extraneous to the expansion of the themes of epic poetry that had led to consider all activities of the intellect noble and as worthy of being celebrated as the military feats on the battlefield⁴. Such a comprehension of epic poetry reflects the Renaissance approach to *carmen heroicum*, which was required 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 heroic poem (AP 73).

2.1. In some manuals we find a detailed explanation of the author’s theoretical approach to literary genres: this is the case of the author of *Cunae Bethleemicae* (1687). I will briefly summarize it because it effectively epitomizes the Mohylian authors’ teaching of literary genres. The author states that neither Horace’s *Epistle to the Pisos* nor Aristotle’s *Poetics* are sufficient as regards their treatment of poetic species, and thus he will only partly refer to them. However, as to the number of poetic genres, he refers to Horace’s AP, stating that there are six of them, namely epic, lyric, elegiac, satyric, comic, tragic. Pontanus had stated as much in his 1594 treaty, which, as we know, was one of the Jesuit scholastic poetics most widely followed and frequently quoted by Mohylian teachers. He starts out by affirming that since poetic art consists of imitating human actions or things, expressed in verse, it follows that perfect poetry is that which displays a perfect imitation, that is epic, tragic, comic. Indeed, epic and tragic poetry imitate illustrious actions (the difference between them being in their form, or mode), while comic poetry imitates ignoble actions. On the other hand, lyric and elegiac poetry do not feature any perfect imitation of

beginning of the Middle Ages it was greatly requested in the poetry of the new European States. Cf. the definition that we find in the manual *Hymettus extra Atticam*...: “*Epopeia quo ad rem est imitatio illustrium actionum virorum illustrium carmine hexametro per narrationem ad amorem vel desiderium virtutis excitandum ordinata*” (“Epic poetry is actually the imitation of the illustrious deeds of illustrious men, arranged so as to arouse love and the desire for virtue through the narration in hexameter verse”) (ms. 8, f. 16 r.).

³ The most detailed list is that provided by the author of *Fons Castalius*, who enumerates and briefly describes up to twenty species of epic poetry (cf. ms. 9, f. 142 r.-142 v.).

⁴ On the faintness of the boundaries between epic and encomiastic poetry that has its roots in the Renaissance didactic theory of art, see Hardison 1962: 43-67 and 71-72.

things or actions which can be sufficiently differentiated from oratory: in fact, as to the medium of imitation, they do not imitate men in action or in speech, but imitate actions only through arguments (reasoning). In the second place, they lack fables, which are the soul of poetry, i.e. they lack the *inventio* of one great human action wholly linked together with a probable event, such as in Virgil's *Aeneid*. As to epigrammatic poetry, following Sarbiewski, our author defines it as imperfect since it has no poetic portion whatsoever. Etymologically, the epigram is nothing more than a *subscriptio*, describing not the way in which a thing could be or should be, but the way a thing already was⁵.

And thus, epic poetry in virtually all Mohylanian poetics ranks first among poetic genres. Such a hierarchy was certainly influenced by contemporary European literary criticism; however, although I do not plan to dwell any further on this topic here, it was probably also influenced by contemporary Ukrainian literature. Indeed, even a cursory glance at seventeenth-eighteenth century Ukrainian literature gives one the impression that the noticeable preeminence of the species of epic poetry in it, especially the encomiastic species, was, at least in some measure, influenced by the poetics and rhetoric teaching that their authors had been exposed to.

It is precisely the notion of praise that epic and lyric poetry share with each other, as we will shortly see. Indeed, the idea of praise, especially praise of God / the gods, is central to the conception of lyric poetry that most poetics teachers present to their pupils, and this is in line with the conception of lyric poetry upheld by Renaissance literary theorists⁶. Indeed, "the natural tendency of lyric expression to assume the form of praise"⁷ at least partly explains why Renaissance lyrics were strongly influenced by epideictic rhetoric. The centrality of praise in lyric poetry is stressed in Western European poetics, as for instance in Pontanus 1594⁸, in Voss (Vossius) 1647⁹, and in Masen 1654¹⁰. On the subject matter of lyric poetry, Pontanus quotes first lines 1-4 from Horace's *Carm.* I, 12 and then AP 83-85. He introduces the quotation of *Carm.* I, 12, 1-4 by saying that Horace assigned to this genre the praises of gods and heroes, the celebration of Olympic games (*olympionicas*) or the victories of boxers and horsemen, and that also Pindar in *Olympians* 2, whom Horace

⁵ The author moreover observes that epigrammatic *acumen* is common also to orations, epilogues and satires, and that epigrams were initially written in prose. However, epigrams should not be excluded from the species of perfect poetry when they feature some apt fiction or imitation of characters (*imitatio morum*), as Martial's epigram *Lib:* 6, 8 or epigrams by Sarbiewski.

⁶ Speaking of lyric poetry, all Mohylanian authors state that in antiquity its subject matter was praise of the gods, but as time passed, it became customary to use it for any subject matter, although it is especially suitable for expressing important, lofty and noble subject matter.

⁷ Hardison 1962: 95.

⁸ Pontanus 1594: 137-138.

⁹ Vossius 1647: 65.

¹⁰ Masenius 1654: 326-327.

imitates in *Carm.* I, 12, had stated that these were the subject matters of lyric poetry. Indeed, the influence of the “swan of Dirce”, as Horace called him, is especially marked in the incipit of this ode, which recalls how “Pindar swiftly and splendidly asks and answers his own questions”¹¹. The mention and quotation of this ode testifies that the practice of extrapolating Horace’s words from their context and using them as precepts of literary theory was not limited to the AP and Horace’s other ‘literary’ epistles, but extended to the whole of his oeuvre. Here are the quoted lines:

Quem virum aut heroa lyra vel acri
tibia sumis celebrare, Clio?
quem deum? cuius recinet iocosa
nomen imago

What hero or man do you choose to celebrate,
Clio, with lyre or piercing tibia?
Which of the gods? Whose name will a jocular
echo repeat

Indeed, Horace’s *Carm.* I, 12 is not about lyric poetry, although it is a celebration of Roman history that culminates in the praise of Augustus, which is opened and closed by the glorification of Jupiter. The question of the first stanza, drawn from Pindar, but also from Theocritus¹², is meant to rhetorically introduce the object of praise. Horace answers this question in the reverse order, that is by praising first gods, then heroes and finally men, and each category is represented by a group and contains allusions to Augustus and to the functions of the *princeps*. Indeed, the main aim of the ode is to link Augustus both with the republican tradition of historical *exempla* and with the Hellenistic kingship theory¹³. However, Pontanus provides no further information about the ode.

The German Jesuit states instead that Horace afterwards stretched the boundaries of the genre to encompass love, banquets, drinking parties and cheerful and joyful things¹⁴. And he adds lines 83-85 of the AP, in which Horace, following a prescriptive generic taxonomy, stated the topics of lyric poetry that corresponded to the subject matter of the genres of classical lyric, namely hymns, encomia, *epinikions*, love songs and convivial songs. These lines are also quoted by Masenius when he speaks of the subject matter of lyric poetry (Masenius 1654, Pars II: 326). Cf.:

¹¹ Nisbet, Hubbard 1989: 143.

¹² *Ivi*: 143-144.

¹³ *Ivi*: 144.

¹⁴ “Atqui postea terminos protulit, et complexum est amores (quales celebrarunt Alcman, Sappho, Anacreon) conuivia, comotationes, et res hilaritatis plenas” (Pontanus 1594: 138; “And then he shifted the boundaries and embraced love (as it was celebrated by Alcman, Sappho, Anacreon), dinner and drinking parties and fun and games”).

Musa dedit fidibus divos puerosque deorum
 et pugilem victorem et equum certamine primum
 et iuvenum curas et libera vina referre.

To the lyre the Muse granted tales of gods and children of gods, of the victor in boxing, of the horse first in the race, of the loves of swains, and of freedom over wine.

Both sets of lines of Horace's are quoted to the same end also by the author of *Officina artis poeticae*, apparently the only Mohylanian poetics teacher to make use of them. In introducing Horace's aforementioned lines he follows Pontanus's words, although he does not reproduce them verbatim. And thus, like Pontanus, he introduces into his manual the idea that Horace broadened his conception of poetry to encompass also (the description of) symposia and love topics ("Postea extensus odarum usus ad convivia et amatoria quam utramque materiam complexus Horatius his versibus"; ms. 20, f. 63 v.)¹⁵. This is a rare or maybe unique occurrence of the term "love" in Mohylanian poetics, and indeed the author does not return to it again, concentrating on the strophic division and on matters of style; finally he goes back to the subject matter of lyric poetry, stating that it is "omnia sunt illa quae carmine possunt exprimi et sunt laudes, suasiones et doctrinae ad mores spectantes" (ms. 20, f. 64 r.)¹⁶.

The variety of the subject matter of lyric poetry is underlined in all Mohylanian poetics, whether they follow Horace or not. However, most of them agree that although lyric poetry imitates all actions, whether sad or cheerful, the latter are to be preferred since the main characteristic of lyric poetry is *suavitas*. Next to it we often find *varietas*, which was to be derived from a variety of lyric meters and thus of rhythm¹⁷, as well as from tropes, sentences, various verbal ornaments, and a fine and attentive arrangement of the words.

2.2. If these prescriptions were shared by most Mohylanian poetics teachers, only some of them illustrate them in any detail. I will therefore linger on those manuals that dwell on lyric poetry at some length, and thus seek to provide their pupils with basic knowledge about Latin lyric poetry, especially that of Horace and its Neo-Latin Christian interpretation in the works of M. K. Sarbiewski.

¹⁵ "Afterwards he extended the uses of odes to include banquets and love; in these lines Horace embraces the subject matter of both these topics".

¹⁶ "They are all things that can be expressed by a poem, and they are praises, persuasions, and instructions concerning morals".

¹⁷ The designation of one peculiar characteristic for each poetic genre by Mohylanian authors is probably drawn from Pontanus's manual (cf. *gravitas* for the heroic poem, *acrimonia* in tragic poetry, *iocus* in comic poetry, *teneritudo* in elegiac poetry, *acumen* in epigrammatic poetry, *simplicitas* in bucolic poetry, *acerbitas* in satyric poetry). Some times *gravitas* is also attributed to tragic poetry; other times the dominant of the latter are said to be *maerores*, while *acrimonia* is attributed to satiric poetry.

The poetics manuals that illustrate lyric poetry in some detail are: *Cunae Bethleemicae*, *Rosa inter spinas*, *Hymettus extra Atticam*, *Cedrus Apollinis*, *Arc-tos in Parnasso*, *Idea artis poeseos*, *Lyra Heliconis*, *Fons poeseos*, *Regia Regis*, *Lyra variis praeceptorum chordis... instructa*. As all the authors of these manuals are influenced to a greater or lesser extent in their exposition by Sarbiewski's treaty on lyric poetry *Characteres lyrici, seu Horatius et Pindarus*¹⁸, I will provide some information on its content and theoretical approach. Sarbiewski opens his treaty by dividing lyric poetry into the three rhetorical genres, that is the *demonstrativum* or *exornativum*, the *deliberativum* and the *iudiciale*. To the first belonged encomiastic odes and high-style odes such as hymns¹⁹; the second included odes containing some moral doctrine (*odae ethicae*), the aim of which was either to encourage virtue or to discourage vice. Finally, the *genus iudiciale* comprised complaints, invectives (execratory odes, also called *dirae*), dedications (*vota*) and supplications. And thus Sarbiewski's divisional criterion is a thematic one, and is enthusiastically adopted by the Mohylanian poetics teachers. Indeed, their adoption of Sarbiewski's division of poetry into the three *genera* of rhetoric appears all the more comprehensible taking into account the applied character of poetry and the social-political function that was assigned to it, and therefore its role of *persuasio*. For each genre Sarbiewski lists a few of Horace's relevant poems (odes and epodes). And thus, to the *genus demonstrativum* (*exornativum*) he assigns *Carm.* I, 6, 10, 12, 21, *Carm.* III, 11, *Carm.* IV 3, 5, 6, 9, 14, 15. The authors of the above-mentioned manuals generally indicate the same examples as Sarbiewski, at times omitting some. However, a few of them show an independent approach. One such was the author of *Rosa inter spinas* who adds *Carm.* I, 20 (to Maecenas), while Josyp Turobojs'kyj, author of *Hymettus*, who had a firm grasp of poetry and contemporary literary theory, subdivides this genre further into different species and for each of them lists not only Horace's, but also Sarbiewski's odes. And thus he divides the *genus demonstrativum* into the *epeneticon*, which is an ode written to praise some friend or benefactor (as examples of which he indicates Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* II, 22 and 28, and III, 19)²⁰, the *gratulatorium*, in which the poet rejoices in a victory, an honor or the like (as an example of which he indicates Horace's *Carm.* I, 37)²¹, the *epinicion* in which the poet applauds the winners on account of the glory or victory gained, the *epicedium* or funeral ode in which the

¹⁸ Sarbiewski 1958: 44-317.

¹⁹ This genre also included encomia, congratulatory odes, odes of greeting (*salutatoriae*), odes of blame (*vituperatae*), descriptions of battles, of triumphs and other panegyric odes.

²⁰ *Lyr.* II, 20 is devoted to Sigismund III, according to most scholars because of his victories of 1600 over the lord of Moldavia Michael the Brave. However, a different, more convincing interpretation of the genesis of this poem has been put forward by Buszewicz 2006: 263-271; *Lyr.* II, 28 is a praise of Władysław IV probably written in 1621 on the occasion of the victory of Chocim; *Lyr.* III, 19 is addressed to the military orders of Europe, and contains an incitation to regain the region of Greece (he who aspires to have glory with his descendants, let him follow Achilles's or Hector's examples).

²¹ This ode was written by Horace to celebrate the death of Cleopatra (30 B.C.).

poet celebrates a dead hero or friend or benefactor (as example of which he indicates Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* III, 25 and 26)²², finally the *paean*, which is an ode sung to Apollo after a victory.

As for the deliberative genre, the author of *Hymettus* individuates the following species: *parenticon* (hortatory ode), which proposes some moral precepts that lead to virtue and honesty, supported by different sentences, examples and arguments²³; *oda suasoria* and *dissuasoria*, in which the author urges his pupils to perform good actions and to avoid evil ones²⁴; *propempticon* (*oda valedictoria*), in which the poet sends a friend or a benefactor or other departing person on his way with wishes of good omens, or addressing a ship, a horse or a chariot, so that the traveler may reach his destination safely, or expressing to his friend the dangers of travel, and the difficulties²⁵; *oda consolatoria*, in which the poet consoles someone who is saddened by another person's death or by some other misfortune or harm or by the absence of friends²⁶; *proseuticon* (*oda petito-*

²² *Lyr.* III, 25 was written on the death of Jan Rudominy father; *Lyr.* III, 26 is titled *In funere Ernesti Veiheri, Palatini culmensis filii*, and commemorates the premature death of the addressee.

²³ As examples of this species the author indicates Horace's *Carm.* II, 14; III, 1, and Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* I, 3, 4, 12, and III, 4. Horace's *Carm.* II, 14, addressed to a certain Postumus, was particularly dear to Mohylanian poetics teachers, especially for its lingering on the flight of time and the unavailability of death. Indeed, the latter motif, which is the destiny of death that is common to all human beings, is almost obsessively present in this ode from the very first lines. Also the Epicurean inspiration of *Carm.* III, 1 drew it close to the Mohylanian authors' mindset: indeed here the central theme is that of luxury, which is strictly linked to that of the fear of death. In fact, according to Epicurean morals, excessive ambition and greed originate from the fear of death.

²⁴ As examples of this species he indicates Horace's *Carm.* II, 6 and 11.

²⁵ As examples of this species Turobojs'kyj indicates Horace's *Carm.* I, 3 to Virgil and *Epode* 10, the reverse *propempticon* to Mevius. Indeed, this epod, which looks like a sort of learned exercise based on an Archilochian model, contains a reversal of the traditional motifs of the *propempticon*: and so Horace wishes his addressee (almost certainly identified by scholars with the poetaster Mevius) that winds from all directions may strike his ship with terrible waves, that no friendly star may guide its way and that the sea may not be gentle at all while it sails.

²⁶ As examples of this species the author points to Horace's *Carm.* II, 9, III, 7, and Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* II, 3. The three odes are quite diversified as to their topic and their addressee. Indeed, only Horace's *Carm.* II, 9 can be properly defined a *consolatio*, in that the poet tries to soothe Valgius's (Gaius Valgius Rufus's) grief for the loss of his beloved Mystes. *Carm.* III, 7, refers rather to the elegiac genre (cf. the theme of the separation of lovers): in fact, its addressee with the fictional name Asteria ("starry") is jealous because her husband, a merchant, has left because of his trades. However, it seems that Horace's main aim was to provide a depiction of the amorous life of Rome, offered with his usual irony and suitable distance from passions (see Horace, 1991-1994, vol. 1, book 2: 758-759). Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* II, 3, on its part, is a short ode addressed to his own lyre, a melancholic meditation on the brevity of human joy, that is usually disturbed and surpassed by grief.

ria), in which people ask for someone's assistance or help²⁷; lastly *eucharisticon* (*gratiarum actoria*), in which the poet thanks his benefactor for a favor, help or other gifts received (no examples are provided of this species).

For the adjudicating genre (*genus iudiciale*) too, the author of *Hymettus* shows an original approach. In fact while most poetics teachers only include *dirae* in this genre, as Sarbiewski himself does²⁸, Turobojs'kyj lists two other species: the accusatory ode (*oda accusatoria*), in which the poet blames something, complains of it or accuses and reprimands it²⁹, and the excusatory ode (*oda excusatoria*), in which the poet excuses himself or someone else of something that he has been or may be accused of³⁰.

Finally, the last species of the adjudicating genre is *dirae*, that is a poem of imprecation in which the poet invokes curses and imprecations. As an example of this genre both Sarbiewski and most Mohylian authors who teach this division of lyric poetry cite *Carm.* II, 13, the ode against the falling tree that nearly killed Horace in his Sabine estate, and *Epode* 3 against garlic³¹.

However, as an example of *dirae*, the author of *Fons poeseos* also indicates *Carm.* II, 2, providing the indication "in Salustium", which should be read here as "ad Salustium", that is "to Sallust" (addressee of the ode), and not "against Sallust". It is not clear why this ode is listed among *dirae*, since it does not contain imprecations or curses. Indeed, C. Sallustius Crispus, great-nephew of Sallustius the historian, is praised for his wise use of the fortune he has inher-

²⁷ As examples of this species the author selects Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* II, 26 and IV, 28. In *Lyr.* II, 26 Sarbiewski turns to the Virgin Mary and wishes she may bring his own land peace, prosperity and abundance. *Lyr.* IV, 28 is instead an appeal to Holy Wisdom so that amidst the conflicts and strife that constantly divide peoples and countries, the poet may enjoy a serene state of mind.

²⁸ Cf. Stawecka 1989: 95.

²⁹ As examples of this species, the author indicates Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* I, 5 and I, 6 and Horace's *Epodes* 15 and 16. Interestingly enough, these two epodes of Horace contain respectively what we could call a 'private' and a 'public' reprimand, which also points to Turobojs'kyj's accurate selection. While in *Epode* 15 Horace blames Neera for having been unfaithful to him, in *Epode* 16 Horace turns as a poet-vates to the whole Roman community, tired of civil wars (there is no complete agreement on the time of composition and thus on the wars Horace is referring to: most probably the epode was composed in 38 B.C., right before or right after the war against Sextus Pompeius). It is unclear why of Sarbiewski's odes the author indicates *Lyr.* I, 5 that is an ode which praises the Pope Urban VIII as the bearer of a golden age in which there is no trace of wars, sorrow, cruelty, but where justice, happiness and abundance reign. As for Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* I, 6, it appears more in line with this species, in that it is addressed to the princes of Europe and contains an exhortation to them to regain the regions under the Ottoman yoke.

³⁰ As an example of this species Turobojs'kyj points to Horace's *Epode* 14. Indeed, in this epode, which Horace addressed to Maecenas, the author justifies himself for not being able to finish the iambs he had promised his patron-friend because he is in love with a woman named Phryne.

³¹ Next to these two poems, Turobojs'kyj also indicates as an example of this species Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* II, 24 "in Herodem".

ited³². And thus, this ode, for its execration of greed for material riches, was in tune with the Mohylanian teachers' moral approach. They certainly particularly prized the third stanza of this poem, which espouses the Stoic idea that the true rich man is the one who is able to subdue his passions, and particularly avarice. This stanza, however, also contains the Epicurean thought that wealth consists in being able to limit one's wishes, which was also particularly dear to the Mohylanian teachers' mindset.

Yet, this ode can hardly be classified as *dirae*, especially if you compare its tone with the tone of indignation of both *Carm.* II, 13 and *Epode* 3. In the former poem the great indignation against the tree, and especially against the unknown man who planted it, is perceivable from the very first line³³, although the reader is also struck by the humorous exaggeration of the poet's accusations.

As for *Epode* 3, as I have said, it is addressed to Maecenas and features a playful tone and a humorous intent. The occasion is linked to a garlic-based country-style dish that Maecenas had prepared for Horace and that the latter had found stodgy.

As to Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* II, 24 it is entitled *Dirae in Herodem*, and it is Sarbiewski's only poem in this genre: in nineteen alcaic stanzas, the poet uses mythological images and characters to poetically retrace Herod's life from his birth to his death and describes it as accursed from beginning to end.

2.3. Interestingly enough, however, Sarbiewski's classification of lyric poetry was not the only one among the Mohylanian poetics teachers. Indeed, the author of *Cytheron Bivertex* (1698) adopts a slightly different one, although in the background the above-mentioned division is present. He is followed very closely a few years later by the author of *Lyra Heliconis* (1709). The species of odes they mention, with a few slight differences, are the same as those of the manual *Hymettus*: however, as shown above, the examples they provide for the different species do not always coincide, which once more indicates that the knowledge of Horace's and Sarbiewski's poetic legacy was first hand, and authors of poetics felt free to choose the examples that they considered best suited to a particular genre or species. And thus the author of *Cytheron Bivertex*, and after him the author of *Lyra Heliconis*, divides lyric odes into ethical or moral, panegyric and historic ones. As we can see, this division partly reproduces the 'rhetorical' one, but with an important difference: the *dirae* odes (*genus iudi-*

³² C. Sallustius Crispus, who was Maecenas's successor as Augustus's most trusted minister, was a munificent man and also a generous supporter of literature. His sobriety also manifested itself in the fact that Sallust was content to remain in the equestrian rank, in which he was born and had declined the offers of advance that Augustus had made him.

³³ As Nisbet-Hubbard (1978: 202) states, "Though Horace's misadventure was a real one, his account of it is written within a literary tradition. Death from falling objects made one of the innumerable possible topics of sepulchral epitaph", as well as of satires and epigrams.

ciale) are considered together with ethical odes, and the place of the *genus iudiciale* has been taken by the *odae historicae*. From their description, the latter look like something in between epic poems and panegyric odes: and thus they are said to describe notable events, such as wars, victories or triumphs. They should be written using “honest” fiction, having the appearance of truth; and in order to provide an example of a *verisimilis fictio*, the author says that, e.g., if one describes the war of Azov, one may devise Mars to have supplied the brightest tsar with strength and courage³⁴. Likewise also Bellona can be depicted as having shed the enemy’s blood, and this should be done especially through personifications and lively and pictorial descriptions in narrating military events³⁵. The author then adds that these odes can be written using all strophes, by which he probably meant all metrical systems; however, he adds that strophes ought to be either *dicolae*, or *tricolae*, or *tetracolae*³⁶. As to the way of composing odes, he enjoins his pupils to consult Horace and Sarbiewski; however, he provides no examples of historical odes, stating that it would be too long to do so.

As far as ethical odes are concerned, they are said to be those containing some doctrine on public or private morals. For this reason, continues the author, these odes should contain elevated, sententious meanings, be adorned with erudition, with which they may persuade students to accomplish virtue and honest customs and dissuade them from vice. Such odes can be found in Sarbiewski and Horace. The author of *Cytheron Bivertex* then proceeds to a further division of this group into *odae invitatoriae*, *consolatoriae*, *petitoriae*, *hortatoriae*, *dirae*. The first subgroup contains odes which should describe whatever the poet is inviting someone to, after which he should compose the petition, addressed to a person or an object: as an example of this, he quotes Horace’s *Carm.* I, 4. This ode was particularly esteemed by Mohylian authors for its content, especially for its reminder about the brevity of human life and impending death. It is an enchanting meditation on the temporality of human life, as opposed to the circularity of the time of nature. It is the return of spring, masterfully described by Horace together with the dance of Venus and the Graces and the enjoyment of nature’s beauty, that leads the poet by contrast to think about death, and thus about the fugacity of human life. Hence the invitation to L. Sestius to live and enjoy the present day and not to cultivate any distant hope.

The group of *odae consolatoriae* is succinctly described as comprising odes in which the poet first ought to propose those things in which he consoles someone, and then he should remove all sadness, grief and sorrow, in order to finally

³⁴ Interestingly enough, here the author of *Lyra Heliconis* substitutes the war of Azov with the war with the Swede. The indication of two different historical events is comprehensible taking into account the years of the two manuals: *Cytheron Bivertex* was written in 1698, while *Lyra Heliconis* in 1709.

³⁵ These prescriptions seem to have been followed verbatim by Ilarion Jaroševyc’kyj, author of the manual *Cedrus Apollinis* (1702) and of a poem included in it describing the military events that led to the conquest of Azov, and celebrating hetman Ivan Mazepa: see Siedina 2007.

³⁶ For an explanation of these terms see Chapter 2, paragraph 2.4.

assuage the person's sad feelings with suitable phrases. As an example the author cites Horace's *Carm.* I, 24 in which the poet consoles Virgil for the death of his friend Quintilius. As Nisbet-Hubbard affirm³⁷, although the first two stanzas make no mention of Virgil, this poem should rather be regarded as an *epicedium*, and because of this it is natural that it includes some themes of *consolatio*. Indeed, as our author has said, as a rule, in the *consolatio*, the person who comforts (the poet) should first show that he shares the other man's grief.

As for the *odae petitoriae*, in them the poet first ought to declare the necessity of the petition and then compose the praise of the thing that one requests or of the person from whom one requests. Finally, the author concludes with an attestation of affection and gratitude. No examples are provided for this species of ode.

As regards hortatory odes, they are designed to exhort and thus need to exaggerate whatever it is that someone is being exhorted to do. They require sentences formed by useful, honest, agreeable ideas. The example provided by both *Cytheron bivertex* and *Lyra Heliconis* is Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* I, 6 and I, 9. The former is addressed to the princes of Europe, while the latter, as Buszewicz argues, has as its model Horace's *Carm.* IV, 5 (and it is written in the same meter, the third Asclepiadean). Horace's ode is addressed to Augustus and was written in 13 or 14 B.C., shortly before the emperor's return from Gaul and Spain: it sounds like a prayer to the *princeps* that he may come back and it abounds in encomiastic *topoi*, first of all the assimilation of the emperor to the sun. Sarbiewski's ode is addressed to Mikołaj Wejher, Sarbiewski's schoolmate and sponsor of the Cologne edition of his works. As Buszewicz maintains, and as a cursory comparison reveals, Sarbiewski borrows from his model the image of the homeland that nostalgically awaits the conqueror introducing the figure of the mother who awaits her son on the seashore. However, the Polish poet quickly turns away from his model, and shows his addressee how to conquer glory, which resides especially in the cultivation of virtue: the latter in fact, asserts the poet, is the true treasure and the best companion of the true wise man.

As to panegyric odes, the author of *Cytheron Bivertex* provides his pupils with some important information about their composition: remember that this was the poetic genre most widely practiced by Mohylanian novice poets. And, the poetics teacher says that panegyric odes are those that celebrate someone's praise, and they are written in different ways: 1. through a paradox or a hyperbolic sense; 2. through similes, comparisons and the like; 3. through one or more fictions, so that the poet may imagine that Bellona had cherished the praised hero since childhood. The poet, on his part, may imagine himself flying or dreaming something, or say that he is inspired by a divine spirit to sing someone's praise: the author refers his pupils in this regard to Horace and Sarbiewski: the latter imagined being turned into a swan that flew through the clouds. The author is here referring to Horace's *Carm.* II, 20, in which the poet imagines he is transformed into a swan, and Sarbiewski's recalling this metamorphosis of Horace's in his ode *Lyr.* I, 10 (see Chapter 1).

³⁷ Cf. Nisbet, Hubbard 1970: 280-281.

The poet can also concoct the idea of having been forbidden by Apollo or the Muses to sing the praise and the strength of anybody else except a definite person, or the poet can entrust the Muses with that duty, by proposing to them all the merits, deeds and virtues of the person to be praised. Interestingly, the author then says that panegyric odes can be written with a thesis or a hypothesis. For instance, in the thesis the writer can insert political doctrines, opinions, eruditions, and the like, and then the apodosis, or conclusive part, should contain an explanation of the thesis with praise of the person to whom the ode is addressed. And as an example of such an ode, the author of *Cytheron Bivertex* indicates Sarbiewski's *Lyr. III, 3, De clementia principum*, that is "On the clemency of princes".

2.4. An interesting variation on the division of odes according to the genres of rhetoric is provided by the author of *Epitome meditationis poeticae*. At first he states that lyric poetry is a poem of either praise or reproach or that describes sad or joyful things. He therefore singles out four species: *laudativa*, which sings the praise of virtuous acts; *reprehensiva*, which blames the depravity of morals; *descriptiva*, which describes places and persons, and *docilis*, which teaches and informs with precepts. As can be seen, this scheme partly reproduces that of rhetoric. For each of these species the author provides an example, also from Sarbiewski's and Horace's poetry. Indeed, as an example of *docilis oda* he quotes Horace's *Carm. I, 22* ("Integer vitae scelerisque purus..."), often and variously quoted by Mohylanian authors for its perceived content of moral instruction.

2.5. As regards the ways in which the odes were composed, Sarbiewski distinguishes two modes: *simplex et expositivus* (that is simple and expository) and *obliquus*, which is characterized by the presence of fiction or of another indirect way of presenting the thought (*sententiam*). The *modus obliquus* is then further divided into eight different 'submodes' according to the type of fiction they contain. Sarbiewski then outlines a third mode, called *medius*, which is further divided into two ways, and which is defined as very suitable for arousing enthusiasm. For each of these modes and 'submodes' the author provides one or more examples, mainly drawn from Horace's poetry.

Many Mohylanian authors follow Sarbiewski's exposition on lyric poetry, although, as we will shortly see, they do not limit themselves to quoting the same examples as he does, but add others as well, among which those drawn from Sarbiewski's poetry itself. I will illustrate the mentioned exposition in the manuals *Rosa inter spinas*, *Cunae Bethleemicae*, *Lyra variis praeceptorum chordis... instructa*, and *Lyra Heliconis*, since they feature a more independent approach compared to other poetics courses.

2.5.1. All the aforementioned manuals follow Sarbiewski's treatment of lyric poetry. As to Sarbiewski's distinction of the mode of the odes into *simplex et ex-*

positorius and *obliquus*, the authors of *Rosa inter spinas* and *Cunae Bethleemicae* state that the former is when “cum sententiae tractantur directe, sine ulla peculiari inventione” (“when the thoughts/sentences are treated directly without any particular invention”)³⁸, while the latter requires the thoughts/sentences to be treated indirectly in some ingenious way, either through a fable or through an allegorical fiction that can embrace the whole poem or only some stanzas. Sarbiewski distinguishes eight modes and Mohylanian authors follow him: among these modes we find the one when the poet does not himself praise someone, but orders someone else to praise, as Horace did in *Carm.* I, 21 and IV, 6; or when one treats his subject matter indirectly through a *prosopopoeia*, like Horace did in *Carm.* I, 14. Lastly, the mode expressed by means of an allegory, which in some cases embraces the whole ode, like in Horace’s *Carm.* I, 14; III, 30; II, 10. To these examples then the author of *Cunae Bethleemicae* adds Sarbiewski’s own ode *Lyr.* III, 11. This ode is devoted to the cardinal Francis Barberini, and it is dominated by the allegorical motif of the high flight that he uses for panegyrics. And thus the poet will search for an adequate place to sing the praise of the cardinal among the stars, and all the constellations will somehow request the new hero.

Sarbiewski divides odes into three parts, respectively the beginning (*ingressum seu proemium*), the central part (*digressum*) and the final part (*regressum*). The Mohylanian poetics teachers focused especially on the exordium of the ode, and in this they display good knowledge both of Sarbiewski’s and of contemporary Polish poetry. Sarbiewski himself in *Praecepta poetica* devotes great attention to this topic, and Mohylanian authors somehow synthesize his exposition while exhibiting a diverse approach. Thus, at first he divides exordia into “in actu signato” and “in actu exercito”: the former contains a statement or declaration on what the poet is going to sing in the ode; the latter does not. Mohylanian authors borrow this division, but not its terminology: indeed, the author of *Lyra Heliconis* calls them more simply *exordium explicitum* and *exordium implicitum*. Sarbiewski distinguishes seven explicit exordia and seven implicit ones, and is followed by the author of *Cunae Bethleemicae*, who however, shows originality in the quotation of examples. And thus to exemplify the second mode of the explicit exordium, when the poet invokes the muse or Apollo, that is the divinity, coherently with the principle that Christian authors should call upon Christian protectors, next to Horace he quotes as an example Sarbiewski’s *Lyr.* II, 11, *Ad D. Virginem Matrem*, which has as its starting point Horace’s *Carm.* III, 4 (see Chapter 2). Interestingly enough, the author of *Cunae Bethleemicae* as the seventh mode of the explicit exordium has a completely different exordium from Sarbiewski’s. While the latter describes it as “VII modus, cum poeta suum genus poeseos laudat aliquem illo laudaturus, qualis est tota lib. IV 8”³⁹ (that is Horace’s *Carm.* IV, 8, to Censorinus), our author describes it as “septimo cum alloquitur aliquam idealem personam, v.g. virtutem, famam,

³⁸ Ms. 7.1, f. 33 v.; ms. 3, f. 57 v.

³⁹ Sarbiewski 1958: 138 (“seventh mode, when the poet praises his own genre of poetry, having to sing someone’s praises in it; such is the whole [Horace’s] *Carm.* IV, 8”).

amorem⁷⁴⁰. Therefore also the examples provided by the two authors are different: while Sarbiewski quotes Horace's *Carm.* IV, 8 and IV, 9, as well as numerous examples from Pindar, the author of *Cunae Bethleemicae* mentions Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* III, 14 and IV, 28. Indeed, *Lyr.* III, 14 is addressed to honor, while *Lyr.* IV, 28 to Divine Wisdom.

2.5.2. As regards the *exordium implicitum*, called by Sarbiewski "in actu exercito", the author of *Cunae Bethleemicae* follows Sarbiewski's exposition⁴¹. Then our author also adds other exordia that are constituted by figures of speech, that is *ab interrogatione* (with an interrogation), *ab allocutione* (with an exhortation), *ab exclamacione* (with an exclamation), and for each of those he provides examples from Sarbiewski's and other Polish poets. The author of *Lyra Heliconis* also partly follows Sarbiewski in the exposition of *exordia implicita*, although in several places he shows independence and an autonomous judgement (particularly evident in the selection of poetic examples, but not only).

Other courses, such as *Lyra variis praeceptorum chordis... instructa* present all the exordia together, without mentioning Sarbiewski's distinction, and providing examples from Sarbiewski's and Horace's poetry that do not always coincide with other courses (eg. *Cunae Bethleemicae*).

Still other manuals, such as *Rosa inter spinas*, divide exordia according to the genre of rhetoric to which each ode belongs. And thus, the encomiastic odes, which belong to the *genus exornativum*, may begin in different ways: by the description of the thing that is praised with a direct address, or by a fiction, when the poet states he was ordered by Apollo or the Muses to sing praises. The exordium of encomiastic odes can be with a suitable simile, or with a question, when the poet asks, since the one that he praises is unknown to him or asks who it is that he is going to praise. Lastly, encomiastic odes can begin with a fiction in which the poet addresses the praises that are to be sung by him, to fame, or Apollo or the Muses. For each of these exordia the author provides examples from Horace, Sarbiewski and other Polish poets, each time quoting the first lines of the ode mentioned.

As to the odes belonging to the *genus deliberativum*, since they deal with some moral doctrine, they "need to have propositions and reasonings that may pithily prove that very same proposition. The orations should succeed one after the other without transitions, and they should convey thoughts, similes, allegories and at times acumens"⁴². Such odes can begin with a fiction, by which the poet declares himself to have been snatched, so that he may create another

⁴⁰ "The seventh [mode] is when one speaks to some ideal person, e.g. virtue, fame, love" (ms. 3, f. 58 v.).

⁴¹ See Sarbiewski 1958: 144-150.

⁴² "Debent habere propositiones et rationes, quae probent sententiose eandem propositionem, horationes una post aliam subgeruntur, sine transitionibus, traduntur sententias, similitudines, allegorias, et acumina quandoque" (ms. 7.1, f. 32 r.).

fiction, or by some sentence (thought). Moral odes can begin with a narrator, introduced by the poet, who gives a moral doctrine. The author asserts that such odes are frequently found both in Horace and Sarbiewski. Among the odes that can begin with a sentence (thought) (*a sententia aliqua*), the author of *Rosa inter spinas* quotes the first stanza of Horace's *Carm.* II, 3 ("Aequam memento rebus in arduis / servare mentem, non secus in bonis / ab insolenti temperatam / laetitia, moriture Delli," – "Remember to keep a level head / when the road is steep and likewise temper / your glee when times are good, / Delli, destined to die")⁴³ which was so extremely popular among Mohylanian novice poets, as we have seen. Lines 1-2 of this ode, instead, are quoted by the author of *Lyra Heliconis* as an example of the first type of *exordium implicitum* of the ode, i.e. when the poet, without any statement or premise, starts to deal with his subject; in this specific case, the truth which the poet has chosen to address is introduced by the *gnoma* itself, i.e. by a universal truth, which brilliantly conveys the subject matter and the gravity of lyric poetry.

Finally, the author of *Rosa inter spinas* asserts that both encomiastic and moral odes can begin with a *locus communis*, a common place, which he defines as some subject matter that can serve many human beings, sometimes all, or else kingdoms, through words and things animate and inanimate, such as virtues, vices, morals, human customs, and the like (he refers his pupils to his treatment of *loci communes* a little later). He states that such exordia by means of a common place can be easily found, and as an example he quotes Horace's *Carm.* III, 3 ("Iustum et tenacem propositi virum..."), which as we have seen in Chapter 2, was particularly admired and therefore often quoted by Mohylanian authors of poetics, first for the image of the just and steadfast man who is not shaken either by human beings or by nature or superhuman powers. Interestingly, the author of *Cunae Bethleemicae* quotes this ode as an example of the first implicit exordium, the one that begins with a *gnoma* or universal virtue.

Before dealing with the exordia of the *genus iudiciale*, the author of *Rosa inter spinas* adds that odes can begin with an allegoric definition, such as Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* III, 14⁴⁴ on honor, written when Francis Barberini was appointed cardinal by Pope Urban VIII. Interestingly, this same exordium had been quoted by the author of *Cunae Bethleemicae* as the seventh mode of the explicit, exordium, "when one speaks to some ideal person, e.g. virtue, fame, love" (see above). Here is the first stanza of *Lyr.* III, 14 (lines 1-5a), as quoted in *Rosa inter spinas* (ms. 7.1, f. 33 r.):

Te clara divum progenies, Honor,
Marsae canemus carmine tibiae,
te, meta votorum, et laboris
 dulce lucrum, volucrisque vitae
 formosa merces.

⁴³ Ms. 7.1, f. 32 v.

⁴⁴ The manuscript gives ode 13, but this is clearly a *lapsus calami*.

You, bright divine progeny, Honour,
 we celebrate with a song of the Marsian flute
 you, goal of pledges, and sweet
 reward of effort, and beautiful goods
 of fleeting life.

Indeed, this stanza can 'serve' both exordia, since they are not mutually exclusive.

Finally, the exordium of *dirae* can be expressed either by addressing the one against whom the poet is writing his ode, as in Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* II, 14 in *Herodem* or by showing the effects caused by the thing against which the poet is writing his ode, as in Horace's *Carm.* II, 13. The content and the structure of *dirae* are quite well described by the author of *Lyra Heliconis* (ms. 14, f. 223 v.-224 r.).

2.6. Interestingly, the author of *Hymettus* synthesizes his exposition on the 'modes' of lyric ode in a short chapter entitled *De modis seu inventionibus odarum scribendarum*. He divides the composition of odes into five modes, which partly recall Sarbiewski's modes, but have the merit of providing a useful summary of the compositional modes of the odes without going into the slight nuances and differences which at times risk confusing and overwhelming the budding poet. Moreover, as we will shortly see, by constantly referring his pupils to the poetry of Horace and Sarbiewski, he not only reveals his first-hand knowledge of the two poets' oeuvre, but also effectively facilitates his students' understanding of the many features of *elocutio* and *dispositio* as well as *inventio*.

And thus, the first mode that we find in *Hymettus* follows Sarbiewski's first mode, *simplex et expositorius* and is when the poet amplifies the meaning of some thought in a simple way, without any particular fiction or invention, through synonymic meanings. According to the author of *Hymettus*, Horace's *Carm.* I, 1 and Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* I, 2 and IV, 26 are written in this mode. Horace, says our author, simply demonstrates how other groups of people are occupied with various life activities, while his own calling is to lyric poetry. In Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* I, 2 the general sense that hostile fortune is followed by consolation is amplified with no particular fiction through synonymic meanings.

The second mode is when the poet who is going to write a panegyric ode does not sing someone's praises himself but encourages someone else to do so. Such are Horace's *Carm.* I, 21⁴⁵ in which the poet exhorts young girls to sing praises to Diana and boys to sing praises to Apollo. On his part, in *Lyr.* II, 18 Sarbiewski, parodying Horace's *Carm.* I, 21, exhorts young girls and boys to sing praises to the Virgin Mary.

The third mode is when the poet neither praises someone himself nor urges someone else to praise, but promises that someone else will sing praises while

⁴⁵ The copyist here made a *lapsus calami* erroneously writing I, 12.

he introduces the topic of the praise. Such is Horace's *Carm.* I, 6 where the poet turns to Vipsanius Agrippa, who had invited him to sing his own praises, excusing himself for not being up to the task and stating that Varius Rufus, who was then considered Rome's most outstanding epic poet, will, with Homer's art, worthily celebrate Vipsanius Agrippa's victories over the enemy. This is a *recusatio*, a trope.

The fourth mode of composing odes is when the poet who is going to deal with some subject does not speak in the first person but introduces with a *proso-popoeia* some other person, true or feigned, who illustrates the theme. The author provides two examples of this mode. The first is Horace's *Carm.* I, 15 where the poet introduces Nereus. Nereus then reveals to Paris (who abducted Helen from Greece to Troy), the outcome of the Trojan war, and the fact that Paris will be slain by Ajax and that Troy will be totally destroyed. Similarly, says the author of *Hymettus*, in Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* IV, 4 which deals with the victory at the battle of Khotyn (1621), the poet introduces Galez, a Moldavian farmer who sings the victory of the Poles over the Turks.

Lastly, the fifth mode is when the poet includes a fable and deals with this throughout the ode. Such is Sarbiewski's *Lyr.* I, 10 where he pretends that Calliope has endowed him with feathers and wings, so that he may carry the name of Pope Urban everywhere, even to the farthest and the highest places. The beginning of this ode harks back to Horace's *Carm.* II, 20 (see Chapter 1). The author of *Hymettus* quotes here also the exordium of Horace's *Carm.* IV, 15, in which the poet imagines that he has been deterred by Apollo from singing Augustus's praise: this exordium therefore contains a *recusatio*.

2.7. With regard to the other two parts of the ode, that is its central and final part, Mohylanian authors generally provide a quite succinct description of them or do not provide it at all. As to the *elocutio* of lyric poetry, its style and verbal ornamentation, Mohylanian authors usually limit themselves to a few observations and prescriptions, at times corroborating them with examples.

And so the author of *Rosa inter spinas*, following Sarbiewski, ranks Horace first thanks to the polish and originality of his poetry. Among other things, the uncommon quality of Horace's poetry lies in his choice of epithets, in his skillful use of metaphors, similes, synecdoches, allegories, and other figures of speech and of thought.

Horace is presented as the model *par excellence* to be imitated: his *labor limae* and his studied lexical usage are unequalled in Latin poetry. And the author of *Rosa inter spinas* then quotes Sarbiewski almost verbatim, when he declares: "Nescio, an quisquam Horatio limatior [...] et elaboratior in verborum delectu tam simplicium, quam compositorum, uti legenti cuivis passim praestantissima verba et phrases occurrent facile")⁴⁶.

⁴⁶ "I do not know anyone who is as polished and elaborate in the selection of both simple and compound words as Horace, so that he who reads everywhere meets excel-

Following Sarbiewski, he instructs his pupils on how to confer grace and dignity to lyric expression: they should not use new words that are not found in Horace, they should admit the substantival adjective only in lyric poetry and at the same time they should not disdain using common words, as Horace did in the verse “*nec prata canis albicant pruinis*” (*Carm.* I, 4, 4) (“nor meadows blanch with frozen dew”). Horace’s *ornatus* needs to be followed also in adding adverbs that confer particular elegance to one’s speech (e.g. *Carm.* I, 9, 5-6a: “*dissolve frigus ligna super foco / large reponens*”, that is “Disintegrate winter! Cover the hearth / with kindling completely”).

Other authors are even more concise. For instance Ilarion Jaroševyc’kyj, author of *Cedrus Apollinis*, apparently undertakes to describe the central part of the ode, but he gives only a few recommendations. And thus he speaks of a triple way of dealing with odes, but then apparently speaks of only one, that is by means of commonplaces, with thoughts, precepts, examples, etc.; the commonplaces should be illustrated with fictions, allegories and the like. Odes should be embellished with thoughts (*sententiae*), proof, examples, without which odes are rough.

2.8. As regards the conclusion of the ode, if Mohylanian poetics teachers speak about it at all, they generally say that the conclusion is not compulsory. For instance, the author of *Cedrus Apollinis* (Ilarion Jaroševyc’kyj) states that the conclusion is not mandatory, but usually when it is present it is derived from a thought, an opinion or from a recollection, as you can see in Horace and Sarbiewski. In his conclusion to *Lyr.* I,10, the latter expresses the wish that the Muse carry him to the banks of the Tiber so that he may hang his flute and lyre on a holm oak and rest peacefully. The author also quotes Horace’s conclusion of *Carm.* I, 11, which contains the famous motto “*carpe diem*”: “*Dum loquimur, fugerit invida / aetas: carpe diem, quam minimum credula postero*” (“An envious age will have fled as we speak. / Seize the day with little faith in tomorrow”). Finally, he says that odes can finish with a prayer, with votes (pledges), with prophecies and the like.

3. For a long time, the least studied aspect of the reception of Horace in the Mohylanian poetics has been the use of Horace’s poetic and theoretical-literary legacy in the composition of poetry by Mohylanian teachers of poetics and their students.

Imitation, understood as *imitatio antiquorum*, that is as a careful reading and remaking of literary models that were deemed exemplary, was a funda-

lent words and phrases” (ms. 7.1, f. 29 r.). Here is Sarbiewski’s statement (Sarbiewski 1958: 183): “*Nescio, an quisquam Horatio limatior fuerit et elaboratior in verborum delectu, tam simplicium quam compositorum*”.

mental element of the poetics of sixteenth-eighteenth centuries, and it was considered one of the three ways to acquire mastery in the versification technique, together with *ars* (i.e. the knowledge of theory, that is of rules) and *usus* or *exercitatio*. *Imitatio* could embrace not only the linguistic-stylistic sphere (*elocutio*), but also composition (*dispositio*) and the sphere of the *inventio* of the object, of poetic fiction, as well as meter.

As we have seen, the analysis of the reception of Horace in the so-called general poetics has shown that the attention of Mohylian teachers mainly concentrated on two aspects: on the one hand, his ‘precepts’ for the composition of poetry, drawn both from *Ars poetica* and from his other ‘literary’ satires and epistles, as well as his considerations on the value of poetry, in particular those contained in *Carm.* IV, 8 and *Serm.* I, 4. On the other, all those ideas, conceptions and values covered by the expression, however vague and imprecise, of ‘Horace moralizing’. This is what emerges, for instance, from my analysis, in the previous chapter, of a selection of Horace’s lines to exemplify the different meters Horace borrowed from Greek poetry and introduced into Latin poetry.

3.1. In approaching Neo-Latin poetry in the Mohylian poetics, it is important for it to be considered in the first place within the context of the manual in which it is found, where it generally has some function: for instance, it can constitute an invocation of protection from on high, an assertion of one’s own Christian faith (poems on different episodes of the Christian story of salvation or hymns in honor of Christian saints), or exemplify a poetic genre, a specific rhetorical figure, or a definite metrical system.

The use of Horace’s legacy in the composition of poetry is manifold, and its nature depends on the type of poem and on the goal that the author sets himself. I will illustrate a few examples, each of which represents a particular use of Horace’s poetic creation. The first two cases in point are poems directed to the pupils, which are found at the beginning of some manuals. When present, the poem directed to the pupils may be found in first or in second place after the dedicatory poem that was usually addressed to a celestial protector⁴⁷ (most often the Virgin Mary, but also John the Baptist and God himself). The above-mentioned poems can be considered eulogies of poetry that play the role of versified prefaces, and whose end is twofold: to illustrate the many fruits and usefulness

⁴⁷ I should stress that we never find a dedicatory poem addressed to a secular or religious contemporary dignitary, to the hetman, the tsar or the Polish king (cf. also Pylypjuk 1993: 88). By contrast, in contemporary Western European poetics, if there is a dedicatee, it is usually some contemporary dignitary, at times a patron of the author. One of the reasons is that these manuals were conceived as manuscripts for the exclusive internal use of the school, and thus with a limited circulation. Moreover, they had the function of introducing the pupils to the topic they were going to study with its peculiar religious tinge.

of poetry, and thus render its practice attractive, and to exhort the pupils to venture into this art with enthusiasm and hard work⁴⁸.

These poems are often interwoven with poetical reminiscences and literary *topoi*, and in them verbal richness and metaphoric ornamentation vary according to the conception of poetry of the author of the manual, which is also reflected in the structure of the latter. An analysis of these opening poems helps us to understand how the Mohylian teachers' 'poetic laboratory' worked. To a certain extent, one of its 'principles' seems to be what today we could call "cut and paste", that is inserting/appropriating lines of other authors. However, the ideas and poetic quotations borrowed are often originally elaborated and adapted, and creatively amalgamated with the author's own lines in order to serve his didactic purposes.

3.2. The first poem comes from the manual *Cytheron bivertex*. It is a poem in which Horace's reminiscences are interwoven with those of Ovid and of a Neo-Latin poet, the German protestant humanist Jakob Moltzer (Iacobus Micylus, 1503-1558)⁴⁹. The author of the manual uses the latter's poem *Ad Iustum* (in particular, ll. 16-20), taken from the fourth book of his *Sylvarum libri quinque*. It is a poetic composition, evidently addressed to a young man, in which Moltzer uses different examples drawn from classical mythology to explain the way to become a poet worthy of this name, and at the same time illustrates the many merits of poetry⁵⁰.

The poem can be divided into three parts: in the first (ll. 1-20) the poet explains that of all human things, material and immaterial, only poetry lasts in time. In the contraposition of material and immaterial riches the author certainly has in mind ll. 1-8 of Horace's *Carm.* IV, 8. Here Horace contrasts costly prizes and works of art (painting and sculpture) to his poetry, i.e. material objects, with quantifiable values, and the immaterial fruit of poetic talent. In the second part (ll. 21-42) he illustrates the many advantages of this art. In the final part, the poet lingers on the way to acquire the fruit of poetry. The first and third parts share the metaphor of water, source of inspiration. Water as a symbol of poetics is part

⁴⁸ The tradition of eulogies of arts and sciences already in antiquity was a *topos* in a didactic work on a particular topic. Cf. on this subject the essay *Theological Art-Theory in The Spanish Literature of the Seventeenth Century*, in Curtius 1953: 547-558.

⁴⁹ Jakob Moltzer was professor of Greek language and literature at Heidelberg and rector of the Lateinschule at Frankfurt am Main (from 1524 to 1533 and from 1537 to 1547). He was the author, among others, of *De re metrica libri tres*, Frankfurt am Main 1539, of *Luciani Samosatensis Opera, quae quidem extant omnia / e Graeco sermone in latinum... translata*, Frankfurt am Main 1538, and of *Sylvarum libri quinque*, published in 1564, in Frankfurt am Main, Brubach.

⁵⁰ The complete text of Moltzer's poem can be consulted at the following website: http://carmina-latina.com/cariboost_files/MICYL_SY_TWD.txt (accessed 30 November 2017). The poem in the manual *Cytheron bivertex* is found in ms. 5, f. 3 r.-4 r.

of the traditional repertoire of apologetic motifs used in the proems, as well as in the *recusationes* (cf., for instance, Horace's *Carm.* IV, 2), and it originates in Greek mythology. In the Mohylanian poetics this motif clearly recurs very often both in the titles and in the proems, both in prose and in poetry, and at times with its different elaborations it is used to form a metaphorical system that extends to the whole manual. Thus, in the assertion, at the beginning of this poem, that in human things nothing is more precious than poetry, the author depicts the latter with the image of the waters of Pieria, that is of poetic waters. I will present each of the three parts separately, followed by a translation and a commentary.

PRAEFATIO

De excellencia fructu poeseos
Generosae Cytheridum Iuventus⁵¹

- 1 Quantus honos sequitur vatem tum commoda quanta
 auribus haec resonant metra coacta tuis;
 rebus in humanis nil est preciosius illo
 qui sua pieredis [sic!] ora ligavit aquis.
5 Si tibi Pactolus fulvum sine fine metallum
 offert aut dites Lydius Hermus aquas
 quidquid et Eoa nudus legit Indus in unda
 ornet inauratos accumulique lares
 ni dederis (: lepido mihi crede :) decentius unquam
10 carmine non maius flumina munus habent:
 est ratio: labuntur opes, sunt frivola rerum
 omnia ab interno, carmen ubique viget,
 vere carmen opes: nam caetera carmina praeter
 fortuna instabili datque rapitque manu.
15 Exiguo reliquis quae dantur tempore restant,
 quae data sunt vati munera semper habet.
 Fallitur immerso, qui se spectabilis auro
 esse putat, nec spes invenit ista fidem.
 Carmina sola beant, sola addunt carmina famam,
20 haec metuunt magni fulmina nulla Iovis⁵².

PREFACE

On the excellence of the fruit of poetry
of the generous youth of the Muses

- 1 How much honour follows the poet and how many goods

⁵¹ Probably wrong, instead of the correct "iuventutis".

⁵² These are the corresponding lines (27-30) in Micyllus's poem: "Fallitur immenso quisquis spectabilis auro / esse cupit, nec spes invenit ista fidem./ Carmina sola beant, sola addunt carmina famam, / haec metuunt magni fulmina nulla Iovis" ("Whoever wishes to be worthy of consideration for [his] abundance of gold / is mistaken, this is a vain hope. / Only poems offer delight, only poems enhance fame, / they have no fear of great Jupiter's lightning").

make these constrained lines resound in your ears;
 in human things nothing is more precious than he
 who has bound his lips to the Pierian waters.
 5 If the Pactolus offers you its endless yellow metal
 or the Lydian Hermus its rich waters,
 and if also all that the naked Indus in the East gathers in the wave
 decorate and cover your golden dwelling,
 if you have not given them (believe me, I who am witty), for the gods
 10 no gift is more beautiful or greater than an ode.
 There is a reason: riches perish, all material things are frivolous
 from the inside; wherever a poem flourishes,
 the poem is what is really valuable: in fact, besides poems,
 fortune gives and takes away the other things with inconstant hand.
 15 The things given to others remain for a short time,
 the gifts given to the poet always maintain their power.
 He who deems himself worthy of consideration for [his] abundance of gold
 is mistaken, for this is a vain hope.
 Only poems offer delight, only poems enhance fame,
 20 they have no fear of great Jupiter's lightning.

This first part is played out by matching and contrasting material and immaterial riches. While water is the source of poetic inspiration, as are the waters of Hippocrene or Castalia, and thus dispenser of poetic fecundity, it is also symbolized by three rivers, carriers of riches. They are: the Pactolus, whose waters are full of minute particles of gold, the Hermus, the main river of Lydia, which brought golden sands, and the Indus. Water is therefore the bearer of material wealth.

However, as the author underlines, the greatest gift that water can bestow is not wealth, but poetry. Indeed, material riches can be taken away by fickle fortune at any moment, while what has been given to the poet, the inspiration, poetic vein, cannot be taken away from him. These lines seem to echo Ovid, who in *Tristia* III, 7, 41 exhorting his stepdaughter Perilla from exile not to forsake her poetic talent, asserts that all material riches are at the mercy of the changeable moods of fortune (“nempe dat id quodcumque libet fortuna rapitque” – “still fortune gives and takes away as she pleases”), while the riches of the soul and the intellect (“pectoris [...] ingenique bonis” – “the benefits of heart and mind”) will never be taken away, since they are immortal. At the same time, in order to reinforce his thoughts, the author inserts some lines of the above-mentioned poem by the German humanist poet Jakob Moltzer.

The last two lines of this first part prepare the ground for the second part, which in good substance echoes Horace's *Carm.* IV, 8. Cf.:

Gloria praeclaris Ducibus post funera vatum
 carminibus doctis non moritura venit.
 Non celeris fuga bellantis regecta [sic!] retrorsum
 Annibalis nobilis laudi ferreque minae
 25 nota ferent: forsán novissemus et ipsum
 Africa quem misit nomini victa alio

- chartae si sileant; si quid bene feceris ipse
 mercedis facti caeperis inde nihil.
 Ilion eversum quid quaeso laudis haberet?
 30 Quaeve futura tibi docta Poeta canes?
 [...] ⁵³
 Sic virtus vatuum favor atque potentia linguae
 Aeacum ab Infernis restituere locis.
 35 Dulcibus hinc epulis summi Iovis impiger adstat
 Hercules, ac una fercula grata cupit
 Dignos laude viros infernas scandere noctes
 Non fert sed sedes ponit ad aethereas.
 Carmina Caelorum possunt placare Beatos.
 40 Tartara carminibus flectere saeva potes,
 Carmina crudelis demulcent saepe labores,
 Haec magis innumeris artibus una valent.
- After death, illustrious commanders receive immortal glory
 thanks to the poets' learned poems.
 Not the quick flight back of the noble fighter Hannibal
 Nor the contempt for his threats will bring praise:
 25 maybe we would have known with a different name even that same [man]
 whom the conquered Africa sent away
 should writings be silent; in case you have done something good
 you would therefore have no prize for your action.
 Which praise, I ask, would the destruction of Troy receive?
 30 And which learned things, o poet, will you sing for yourself?
 [...]
 Thus the virtue, the favor, and the power of the poets' language
 brought Aeacus back from the infernal regions.
 35 Thus the tireless Hercules participates in the sweet banquet of
 the highest Jupiter, and in one he desires pleasing courses.
 It is not permitted that praiseworthy men mount in infernal nights,
 since their place is in celestial seats.
 Poems can placate the blessed of the skies.
 40 with poems you can persuade the cruel Tartarus,
 poems often soften hard labors,
 these only are worth more than innumerable arts.

Horace's above-mentioned ode is addressed to Censorinus and in it the poet champions the idea that only a poet's praise can grant immortality, and that therefore poetry is the only way to escape the oblivion to which mortals are condemned. This is a very complex poem⁵⁴: I will only recall its main motifs. The first part of the ode has a playful tone, which is probably due to Horace's friendly relationship with the addressee, as well as to the fact that the idea that lyric poetry was able to provide lasting fame, "though familiar to the classical

⁵³ Lines 31-32 are illegible.

⁵⁴ Cf. Thomas 2011.

age of Greece, had no roots in the life of Roman poetry as known to Horace's contemporaries"⁵⁵. Thus, the poet confesses to Censorinus that he cannot offer him bronze statues, cups or tripods, which were traditionally awarded to the winners of games in Greece, but only poems. In the second part (ll. 13-34), the poet broadens his argument and demonstrates with different examples the capacity of poetry to eternalize its subjects. Our author borrows precisely such examples, as well as the idea that only poetry will offer lasting glory to the illustrious commanders. Lines 21-28 of our author recall lines 15b-22a of Horace's *Carm.* IV, 8⁵⁶, with a few differences. Line 17 of this ode, as critics have observed, presents difficulties: on one side, it lacks the caesura; on the other, it contains a gross mistake, namely, attributing the fire that destroyed Carthage, effectively ignited by Scipio Africanus Minor (end of the third Punic War, 146 B.C.), to Scipio Africanus Major, who is undoubtedly evoked by the reference to Hannibal, whom he defeated at Zama in 202 B.C. Some critics tend to consider overall lines 15b-19a of this ode as spurious, also because they introduce an illogical comparison between two absolutely heterogeneous concepts, that is the poets' celebration of events and the events themselves. On his part, our author avoids both the confusion between the two Scipios, and the incongruity of the two planes of handing down to posterity the deeds of famous men and the deeds they accomplished. Essentially, he borrows from Horace only the examples of Scipio Africanus and of Aeacus⁵⁷, snatched from the underworld by the voice of the poets⁵⁸. There is, among others, a difference to point out: while Horace, among the characters who escaped oblivion, in ll. 22b-24 speaks about Romulus, the son of Mars and Rhea Silvia, who had been celebrated by Ennius in the first book of his *Annales*, our author speaks of the destruction of Troy, that is, of a different event, probably better known to the pupils from Virgil's *Aeneid*.

Lines 35-38 hark back to ll. 28-30 of the aforementioned ode, even if in a different order. In Horace the image of Hercules who takes his seat at Jupiter's banquet is preceded by the assertion "Dignum laude virum Musa vetat mori: / caelo Musa beat" ("The Muse prohibits the death of the man / who has merited praise and rewards him with heaven"), which implicitly leads one to consider

⁵⁵ Fraenkel 1966: 422.

⁵⁶ Cf. "Non celeres fugae / reiectaeque retrorsum Hannibalis minae, / non incendia Carthaginis impiae / eius, qui domita nomen ab Africa / lucratus rediit, clarius indicant / laudes quam Calabriae Pierides: neque, / si chartae sileant quod bene feceris, / mercedem tuleris" ("Hannibal's / hasty departure, his threats flung back / in his face, and the flames of impious Carthage / spread the fame of the man who gained / his name by conquering Africa less / than Calabrian poetry did. If books / consign your virtuous deed to silence, / you lose your reward").

⁵⁷ Aeacus, son of Jupiter and Aegina, father of Peleus, for his piety and righteousness after death was the judge of the dead's souls together with Minos and Radamanthus.

⁵⁸ Here Horace probably refers to Pindar, who often mentions Aeacus in his poetry. About Pindar, Horace says (*Carm.* IV, 2) that whoever tries to rival him, flies on waxen wings, and therefore will end up like Icarus. Horace says that Pindar rescued from the dark Tartarus, that is from death and oblivion, the heroes whose deeds he celebrated.

the acquisition of immortality as a consequence of the poetic celebration of men's glories. In Horace's *Carm.* III, 3 Hercules is one of a series of heroes deified thanks to their virtue: in fact, he was traditionally considered not only the prototype of the man able to endure every trial, but also the symbol of the struggle against tyrants⁵⁹. Horace instead here makes no distinction between the immortality of mythical or imperial apotheosis and that conferred by poetry. Our Mohylanian author places the image of Hercules who participates at Jupiter's banquet right after that of Aeacus, thereby making them similar, while in Horace's ode Hercules is placed next to Bacchus and the Dioscuri, who like the former are part of a series of deified heroes.

The last four lines of this second part are modeled on ll. 19-21 of the above-mentioned poem by Moltzer, with a few variations⁶⁰. In the case of line 19, instead of persuading the gods, our author speaks of placating the blessed of the skies, which might suggest the Christian saints. However, in Greek and then Roman mythology, since the gods did not grant mortals happiness, people preferred to invoke the dead, the *mákares*, which for Romans were the *beati*; and thus, in late Latin *beatus* was tantamount to "dead". A similar idea is also expressed by Horace in *Epist.* II, 1, 138, where among the many merits of poetry he includes its function of mitigating the wrath of heavenly gods as of the gods of the lower world: "Carmine di superi placantur, carmine Manes" ("Song wins grace with the gods above, song wins it with the gods below"). Here, following Moltzer and classical mythology, the author opposes the blessed (*beati*), who dwell in the Elysian fields, to the Tartarus, that is a part of the underworld, the place where the wicked suffered punishment for their misdeeds. The next line, which corresponds to l. 20 in Micyllus, features a significant variation: instead of "leones" in the Mohylanian poem we read "labores". In Moltzer this statement is a recall of classical mythology, in particular of the myth of Orpheus, who was said to tame lions and wild beasts with his sweet singing and lyre playing. The aforementioned modification attests quite clearly to a less mythologized and more practical, concrete conception of poetry that underlines its capacity to give relief and delight, so as to render it attractive in the eyes of the pupils. In this regard, there is also another significant difference between our author and his Neo-Latin model: whereas the latter in the following lines (ll. 23-26), includes among the merits of poetry the capacity to conquer the heart of a beautiful girl and to obtain her favors, as happened to Propertius with Cynthia, in the Mohylanian author there is no hint of such a property. This should not surprise us: at the Mohyla Academy, that is an Orthodox religious institution, love poetry was not a genre

⁵⁹ The idea of immortality of the souls who have distinguished themselves for their virtue, understood both as military valour and moral virtue, is embraced by Horace also in *Carm.* III, 2.

⁶⁰ Cf. ll. 19-21 of the poem *Ad Iustum*: "Carmina caelestes possunt adducere Divos, / Tartara carminibus flectere saeva potes. / Carmina crudeles demulcent saepe leones" ("Poems can persuade heavenly gods, / with poems you can soften the cruel Tartarus. / Poems often soothe the cruel lions").

that the students were supposed to exercise in. All moral considerations aside, poetry, like rhetoric, had to pursue definite strategies depending on its ends, the first and most important of which was *persuasio*. Poetry was divided into the three genres of rhetoric (demonstrative, deliberative, and adjudicating), and this division was applied to the different poetic genres⁶¹. The purpose of poetry so conceived was fundamentally the education of devout men, which can be inferred by the numerous declarations of the authors themselves.

Here is the last part of the poem, in which the author explains what one should do in order to honourably acquire the lofty title of poet.

Est igitur laudabile nomen habere Poetae
 Cytheridesque sacras et Cytherona sequi,
 45 quem si vis gressu facili superare Poeta
 ocia corde tuo desideasque fuga:
 [...] ⁶²
 ut capiant vicium immoveatur aquae⁶³;
 quam cupis assiduo quaerenda est fama labore
 50 quo Duce prensabis mox Cytherona tuum.
 Sunt faciles Musae ast habitant in rupibus altis:
 has superare labor, caetera plena⁶⁴ via est.
 Vince modo rupes, nec duro parce labori
 atque ultro vincent in tua fata Deae.

⁶¹ Cf., for instance, this division applied to lyric poetry in Mytrofan Dovhalevs'kyj's manual, *Hortus poeticus*: "Oda est triplex: demonstrativa, deliberativa, et iudicialis. Demonstrativa est poema in laudem alicuius decantatum, quam alio nomine vocatur panegyrica, encomiastica seu laudativa. Deliberativa est poema in suasionem boni et dissuasionem mali concinnatum. Iudicialis est poema in execrationem vel invectionem alicuius vitij vel vitiosae personae compositum" (ms. 26.2, f. 78 v.-79 r.) ("The ode is threefold: demonstrative, deliberative, and adjudicating. The demonstrative ode is a poem sung to praise someone, which with a different name is called panegyric, encomiastic or praising. The deliberative ode is a poem composed to persuade men to accomplish good actions and to dissuade them from performing evil deeds. The adjudicating ode is a poem composed to execrate and attack someone's vice or some vicious person").

⁶² Line 47 is illegible.

⁶³ This line is a quotation, cited wrongly, of Ovid's epistle *Ex Ponto* I, 5, 6. The correct line reads: "ut capiant vitium, ni moveantur, aquae," and it needs to be read with the previous line (*Ex Ponto* I, 5, 5): "Cernis ut ignavum corrumpant otia corpus" ("You see how laziness spoils an idle body, / how water acquires a tang unless it's flowing"). In this epistle, addressed to his friend Cotta Maximus, Ovid explains the reasons for his continuing to write even in exile; the epistle is indeed an apology for cultivating one's passions even in the hardest existential conditions. Lines 4-5 are meant to introduce the poet's excuses for the alleged poor quality of his writings, a sort of *topos modestiae*: thus, as an idle body is corrupted by inactivity and as water becomes polluted unless it runs, so also poetic talent diminishes if not exercised.

⁶⁴ In Moltzer we have "plana".

55 Culmina deflet⁶⁵ pedibus precelsa Cytheron
 vertice qui bino fertur ad astra poli;
 fontibus irriguis vertex manabit uterque
 qui fessis animis dulce levamen erant⁶⁶.
 Primeus⁶⁷ Tulij vertex et Apollinis altar
 60 depromet rivos arte sonantis aquae
 qua saliente tuam mentem putato iuventus;
 ore bibas pleno sumpta redundet aqua:
 hac sola vivit Pallas virtusque decora,
 hac facilis, vati est laudis aperta via,
 65 hac omnes hac forte gradum, qua ducit Apollo.
 Deus dabit hic sacro tingere labra lacu.

It is therefore praiseworthy to have the name of poet
 and to follow the sacred Muses and the Cithaeron, which if you wish
 45 to overcome with an easy step, o poet,
 chase away inactivity and laziness:
 [...] Waters get corrupted unless they move;
 the fame that you long for needs to be sought with constant work,
 50 under whose guidance you will quickly grasp your Cithaeron.
 Muses are accessible, but they dwell on high rocks:
 it is hard to overcome these, the rest of the way is plane.
 You only conquer the rocks and do not spare hard work
 and the goddesses will voluntarily triumph over your fate.
 55 His highest summits bends downward for your feet the Cithaeron,
 which with a double summit is brought up to the stars of the sky;
 both summits will pour watering springs
 which will be⁶⁸ a sweet solace for tired souls.
 The first summit of Tullius and the altar of Apollo
 60 will pour the rivers with the art of the sounding water,
 [And] mounting it may the youth judge your mind;
 Drink your fill and may the drunk water overflow:
 through this only live Pallas and the beautiful virtue,
 through this is open to the poet an easy way to praise,
 65 through this all pass, through this perhaps is the passage through which
 [Apollo leads.
 God will allow [you] to moisten here [your] lips in the sacred lake.

Having illustrated which and how many merits poetry possesses, in ll. 43-66 the author exhorts his young pupils to embark on the way towards the Muses

⁶⁵ Probably “deflectit”.

⁶⁶ Probably wrong instead of “erunt”.

⁶⁷ Instead of “primus”.

⁶⁸ Here it would be more logic “they will be”, that is “erunt” in the original.

and to reach the summit of Cithaeron⁶⁹. It is hard to decipher and understand certain lines, and the fact that only one copy of this manual has survived does not help to dispel the doubts. On the other hand, in the case of line 48, that is quoted from some other source, you can be certain of copying mistakes.

The most important thing to do, the poet exhorts, is to chase away laziness and to apply oneself with zeal to the study of Latin versification. Lines 49 and 51-54 are drawn from the above-mentioned poem by Moltzer, and expound the idea that once the poet-novice reaches the rocks where the Muses dwell, most of the way has been accomplished, since the Muses are accessible to those who commit themselves with constant work to reach them and they will let themselves be relished. Also in this quotation of Moltzer's lines, we observe a divergence: thus, l. 14 of Moltzer's poem, "Atque ultro venient in tua vota Deae" ("And the goddesses will come spontaneously according to your pledges") is rendered by our author in line 54 as "Atque ultro vincent in tua fata Deae" ("And the goddesses will voluntarily triumph over your fate"): and thus the latter attributes to the Muses, that is to poetry, the ability to immortalize in poetry not only those who are celebrated but also those who celebrate skilfully. The usual destiny of mortals in fact is oblivion; only the Muses are able to change it, promising glory after death to those who honour them. This modification seems to hint at a different conception of poetry with respect to the German humanist. While the latter seems to suggest that the efforts of study will be rewarded by the pleasure and delight of composing poetry, the Mohylanian author underlines how poetic art can change the destiny of those who practice it. This statement seems to be in line with the conception of poetry, like rhetoric, as an instrument of persuasion.

The following lines illustrate, with the metaphor of water, the division of the manual. Thus, the first summit with which the novice poets will have to test themselves, is that of the rudiments of rhetoric ("Tulij vertex"⁷⁰), followed by poetry, protected by Apollo, who leads the chorus of the Muses. Water is present both in the form of a refreshing spring on the summits of the mountains and in the form of rivers, or brooks, which will lead the poet-novice to the summit. This image indeed reflects the division of the material of the course, in which the two main parts, rhetoric and poetics, are called "vertex" ("summit"): each of them is then divided into chapters called "fons" ("spring, fountain"), the latter in turn into sections called "stillicidium" ("fall (of a liquid) in successive drops"), which finally consist of paragraphs named "stilla" ("drop"). This terminological division is meant to transmit the idea that each little emission of water, from the smallest drop to the series of drops of the *stillicidium*, up to the spring, constitutes a step of the learning process that will culminate on the summit in the image of the sacred lake, first source of poetic inspiration, sacred to the gods, from which the novice-poets will draw abundantly at the end of the course. The

⁶⁹ Cithaeron is a mountain range in Central Greece, between Boeotia and Attica. Numerous events in Greek mythology took place there, and it was especially sacred to Dionysus.

⁷⁰ That is the summit of Marcus Tullius Cicero.

author may be hinting here at the sacred lake (sacred to Apollo) at Delos, a circular lake where rainwater was collected and where melodious swans honoured the Muses. Also Pallas-Athena, goddess of wisdom, of all intellectual activities, of arts and sciences, was fed with this water. In a similar way, also virtue could be drawn from it, and this fact established a direct connection between the practice of poetry (Apollo leads through it) and the acquisition of virtue. The dispenser of all poetic and moral graces is God, named in the last line: in this way the Christian nature of poetry, and of the virtue that accompanies it, is restored.

3.3. The second poem, like the first, is found at the beginning of another course of poetics, *Praecepta de arte poetica* (ms. 23, f. 2 r.-3 r.), dated 1735, which was composed about thirty years after *Cytheron bivertex*. This manual is shorter than most Mohylanian poetics, the treatment of the different poetic genres in it is quite synthetic, and it has mainly a practical goal: after presenting the fundamental notions of the nature and purpose of poetry and exemplifying the principal metrical systems of Latin poetry, the course revolves around the different types of exercises, that is the practical training of composing Latin poetry, in particular by taking the works of eminent writers as a model. Here is the poem that has the function of a preface to the young pupils of poetics:

PROSPHŌNESIS
AD
POESEOS CULTORES

1 O doctae, quae sis addicta iuventa Minervae
 te Musae ut dicant, dicat Apollo suam,
 non tetrico vultu, incumbas sed fronte serena
 his studiis; si optas nomen habere bonum.
5 Hoc, autem nolim, facias ut mente coacta:
 namque nihil talem⁷¹ posse poeta docet:
 tu nihil invita dices faciesque Minerva.
 Ingenia excelsi nilque coacta dabunt.
 His scitis, tandem tibi sit delectus habendus
10 quo in studiis possis pergere rite tuis.
 Non prius est abiecta rudis spernenda phasellus
 evadat donec scita triremis aquis.
 Neque, vadis quod nare soles, committitur alto
 candide, praebe aurem, non ego, Naso monet:
15 non ideo debet pelago se credere, si quae
 audet in exiguo ludere cymba lacu.
 Hoc quid? Parva prius tandem maiora petenda,
 si vis Parnassi culmen adire biceps.
 Si Phaetonteum fatum gustare perhorres,
20 teque suo terret si Icarum exitio:

⁷¹ It should be “tale”.

high seas on a big ship, the lyric poet was the one who sailed down a river in a small boat⁷³. Our author here instead uses a distich by Ovid (*Tristia* 2, 330-331). In this book Ovid, exiled at Tomi by Augustus because of “*carmen et error*” (“a poem and an error”), according to his own words⁷⁴, tries to justify the accusations to the *carmen*, according to which the latter would induce Romans to commit adultery and to corrupt their morals. In the aforementioned lines, he uses the image of a small boat as a *topos modestiae*, adduced as a reason for his cultivating a smaller field, that is light poetic genres, and of his having refrained from more demanding genres, such as the epic poem, or in any case the celebration of Rome’s glorious history and of Augustus’s deeds. To the same end, and addressing himself to the same addressee, Horace uses this metaphor in the above-mentioned lines (*Carm.* IV, 15, 1-4a), even if certainly in a different situation. In our poem these lines are used in the opposite sense, as an exhortation to the pupils not to despise simpler genres initially in favor of poetic compositions that are beyond their current skills. The mention of Ovid’s authority is meant to give more weight to the author’s words, and the same is true of the examples from Classical mythology adduced a little further. Phaethon and Icarus both represent human ambition to accomplish superhuman exploits without measuring their own forces: Icarus aimed to fly too high and his waxen wings were melted by the sun, causing him to fall to his death in the sea, whereas his father Daedalus, despite flying with similar wings, wisely flew further from the sun and survived. Phaethon, in turn, dared to ask the Sun-god, as proof that the latter was his father, to be allowed to drive his chariot; despite the Sun’s warning of the inherent danger of such an undertaking, the boy insisted. Then, scared by the sight of animals representing the signs of the zodiac, Phaethon loosened the reins and began to deviate from the middle path through the heavens. This caused the Sun’s chariot to come too close to earth, thereby setting the world on fire due to its great heat; in answer to complaints from the earth’s creatures,

⁷³ Cf. also Horace, who in *Carm.* IV, 15, 1-4a, imagines Phoebus who warns him against composing epic poems: “Phoebus volentem proelia me loqui / victas et urbis increpuit lyra, / ne parva Tyrrhenum per aequor / vela darem” (“I wanted to speak of battles and cities / defeated, but Phoebus with scolding lyre / forbade my little boat / to sail the Tyrrhenian Sea”). The metaphor of the boat and of navigation is used quite frequently in the prefaces to Mohylanian poetics: cf., for instance, the course *Fons Castalius* (ms. 9), in the preface of which the poet is likened to a sailor, his mind or his work to a boat. We also find here some *topoi*, traditional for this metaphor: navigation (by sea) is dangerous, in particular when it is undertaken by an inexperienced sailor, and indeed the novice poets’ intellect (*ingenium*) is defined “*ignarum navigii*” (ms. 9, f. 2 r.; “having no experience of navigation”). The boat often has to beware of the dangers, constituted by rocks and cliffs, sea monsters (here represented by Carybdis), unfavourable winds and storms.

⁷⁴ Cf. *Tristia* 2, 207. The *carmen* is most probably *Ars Amatoria*, a didactic poem that gives amatory advice to the men and women of Rome. The error, of which the poet does not say, could either have been a love affair with a female relative of Augustus or the knowledge of such love affair (perhaps of the emperor’s niece, Julia) of which Ovid did not inform the emperor.

Zeus sent a thunderbolt that struck Phaethon and hurled him into the river Eridanus. The stories of Icarus and Phaethon, both ending tragically with a fall, are illustrated in particular in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Icarus's story in book VIII, Phaethon's in book II).

In the hope that his pupils will not follow such examples, their teacher shows them the right way: this involved scrupulously following the precepts given in the manual, formulated both positively, as models to be imitated, and negatively, that is as 'vices' (defects, usually pertaining to literary style) to be avoided. And to stress how assiduously his young pupils are expected to apply themselves to the art of poetry, their professor echoes one line of Horace's (AP, 268b-269), "Vos exemplaria Graeca / nocturna versate manu, versate diurna" ("For yourselves, handle Greek models by night, handle them by day"): with these words the Latin classic exhorts any Roman poet wishing to excel in the dramatic genres to assiduously read Greek models by day and by night, constantly and tirelessly. Even if Horace specifically speaks about poetical meters, his advice, lapidary and incisive, with the anaphora of *versate* and the chiasmus, sounds like a command that has to be obeyed. Similarly our author, who here, as in his poetic preface, insists on diligence and perseverance as the only way to achieve good results.

3.4. The following example is found in the same manual in the section on funeral poetry (ms. 23, f. 31 v.). As we will shortly see, the only reference to Horace is in the last line, which is a quotation of his *Carm.* IV, 7, 16. The poem is modeled on the epitaph to emperor Charles V Habsburg found in J. Pontanus's manual, in the section *Tyrocinium poeticum*⁷⁵. Since Pontanus's *Institutiones* were one of the Mohylanian teachers' sources, they freely borrowed poetical examples as well as rules and prescriptions from it⁷⁶. Here, however, the author creatively approaches the original, and while he borrows the latter's syntactical structure, sentences (at times verbatim, as in the last two lines) and metrical scheme, he fills his poem with local content. Thus, the epitaph is devoted to empress Anna Ioannovna, who had died just recently, and this is made clear in the

⁷⁵ As O. Cyhanok observes, this epitaph is present in five Mohylanian poetics: *Cunae Bethleemicae*, *Via poetarum ad castalidum...*, *Officina*, *Via ingenuos poeseos candidatos*, *Tabulae praeceptorum poeseos* (Cyhanok 2014: 281-282).

⁷⁶ Cf., for instance, the manuals *Cunae Bethleemicae*, *Via poetarum ad fontes castalidum...*, *Officina*, *Via ingenuos poeseos candidatos*, *Arctos in Parnasso*, *Tabulae praeceptorum poeseos* (see also Cyhanok 2014: 281-282). The authors of *Via ingenuos poeseos candidatos* and *Arctos in Parnasso* also borrowed other epitaphs from Pontanus. Other times the author of a manual simply indicated other sources for models of a particular genre: this is the case, for instance, of *Cedrus Apollinis*, whose author invites his pupils to consult the edition *Epitaphia Ioco-seria* to find more examples of this genre (that is the book by Pierre-Francois Sweerts, *Epitaphia Ioco-Seria*, Bernard Gautheri, Cologne 1623).

title. Like its model, the epitaph mainly contains the military/political deeds by which the sovereign distinguished himself/herself. Cf.:

Tumulus Potentissimae Imperatricis Rossiae Annae

1 Anna Dei dono caelis demissa virago,
mater Russiae gratia in orbe data.
Europae pressit tollentem cornua Regem.
Haec Anna: atque Asiae terror et horror erat.

5 Haec Gedanum victrix pedibus calcavit, et eius
invictam Gallus noverit⁷⁷ ipse manum.
Deinde Lecho frenum indidit Augustoque regenda,
imposita cidari, Sarmata regna dedit.
Atque agit a nobis et honores spernere et unum hoc⁷⁸
10 discite mortales; pulvis et umbra sumus⁷⁹.

Epitaph to the most powerful empress of Russia Anna

1 Anna, heroine sent as a God's gift from on high,
mother of Russia for grace given on earth.
She oppressed the king of Europe who was raising his horns.
This is Anna: and moreover she was Asia's terror and horror.

5 This conqueror has trampled Gdańsk under her feet, and her
invincible hand was known also by the French.
And then she curbed the Poles, and having imposed a tiara,
she offered Augustus to govern the Sarmatian kingdoms.
And she said: we should despise honours, and this one thing learn,
10 O mortals: we are dust and shadow.

The first two encomiastic lines, which have no parallel in the original, are probably meant to stress the author's loyalty to Russia's autocrats, as well as introduce the reader to the celebrated personage. The author then goes over the main events of Anna's reign, in particular her intervention in the Polish succes-

⁷⁷ Probably wrong instead of "noverat".

⁷⁸ In the model this line reads: "Atque ait, e nobis et honores temnere, et unum hoc" ("And he said: we should despise honours, and this one thing"), and thus it was slightly modified by the copyist.

⁷⁹ This is Pontanus's epitaph: "Tumulus Caroli V, ex Hippolyto Capilupo. Europae domuit tollentes cornua Reges / Carolus, atque Asiae terror et horror erat. / Et pedibus Libyam calcavit victor, et illi / Innumeras victus praebuit Indus opes. / Deinde sibi fraenum iniecit, fratrique regendum / Imperium, et nato cetera regna dedit. / Atque ait, e nobis et honores temnere, et unum hoc / Discite mortales, pulvis et umbra sumus." ("Epitaph to Charles V, from Hyppolitus Capilupo. He subdued the kings of Europe who raised their horns / Charles, and he was the terror and dread of Asia. / And triumphant he trampled upon Libya with his feet, and to him / the river Indus made available nourishment and countless resources. / Then he restrained himself, and gave to his brother / the empire to govern, and to the [new] born the other kingdoms. / And he said: we should despise honours, and this one thing learn, / O mortals: we are dust and shadow.").

sion (years 1733-1735), which ended up with the election of Frederick Augustus of Saxony King of Poland as Augustus III. The “king of Europe” of line 3 is probably Louis XV, king of France, who after the death of Augustus II supported the candidacy of his father-in-law Stanisław Leszczyński⁸⁰; this locution is certainly due to the memory of the original, although there it stands in the plural. The topic of the Polish succession is taken up again in lines 5 to 8: the Pole (*Lechus*) whom Anna restrained is Stanisław; on 30 June, 1735, the Russian forces won a decisive victory over Stanisław, at Gdańsk, where he was entrenched with his supporters. As to line 4, the author quoted the original verbatim since it could apply to the new subject as well, for Anna’s reign saw the beginnings of Russian territorial expansion into Central Asia. The last two lines contain a gnome or *sententia*, which was often prescribed in the conclusion of epitaphs: thus Horace’s words extrapolated from their context become a learned sentence with a Christian and Baroque nuance, as a sort of *memento mori*. In Horace’s ode, instead, they constitute the culminating point of his reflection on the fugacity of human life, which is evoked by a vision of the regeneration of nature in spring. Indeed, in opposition to nature, human life is ineluctably marked by death. Line 16 in Horace is a meditation on the frailty of human destiny to which neither the mythical hero Aeneas, nor the historical heroes Tullus Hostilius and Ancus Marcius could escape. In our epitaph instead it becomes the conclusion of a moral precept on the vanity of the earthly values of honour, good reputation and glory.

3.5. The examples analyzed so far illustrate a use of Horace’s poetry (and not only Horace’s) which can be subsumed under the more general concepts of citation and echoing, whether or not the source is indicated. They usually concern single lines which, for their incisiveness and expressive conciseness, attracted Mohylanian teachers. In the examples given below, however, we are confronted with a different type of imitation, in which a whole poetical composition, or a part of it, is modeled on another one, from the metrical, thematic and lexical/stylistic point of view. This type of imitation, known as “Christian parody” (see Chapter 2), in particular of Horace’s works, was especially cultivated in Baroque poetry. It is a poetical composition in which the linguistic-stylistic and thematic components and the metrical scheme of the original are used in a new poetical composition to express contents that are different and extraneous, or totally opposed to those of the original poem. Consequently, in the new context these elements acquire different meanings, religious-Christian, for instance⁸¹.

⁸⁰ Louis XV this way hoped to renew France’s traditional alliance with Poland and thus balance Russian and Austrian power in Northern and Eastern Europe.

⁸¹ The composition of hymns and of other poems on Christian topics with Horatian meters, which was probably begun by the one who is generally considered the first Christian poet, Prudentius (Aurelius Prudentius Clemens, 348-413 ca.), experienced great fortune along the centuries. For a synthetic review of the ‘Christian’ reception of Horace, see the studies indicated in footnote 27 of Chapter 2.

Therefore, it is very different from Renaissance parody or from our conception of parody, in that it lacks any comic or satiric intent.

Every way of relating to a specific tradition is the expression of a definite attitude towards that tradition, and manifests the resumption of a 'dialogue' with it. In this case, the Christian parody, a pan-European phenomenon, practiced by both Catholic and Protestant poets, together with the revival of the genres of medieval religious literature (for instance, sacred hymns), is the manifestation of a culture informed by a totalizing Christian vision of life: the latter is an expression both of the Reformation and of the Counter-Reformation. Certainly, an important impulse for the Catholic religious-cultural counteroffensive in education, in sciences, arts and literature had come from the Council of Trent (1545-1563). Its principal aspect, and the one that mostly concerns the type of education at the KMA, consists in the assimilation of Renaissance humanism and its legacy, first through the Christianization of antiquity, and especially its mythology, so as to comprehend its heroes and the pagan stories exclusively in an allegorical key and in accordance with Christian religion. As is well known, this new culture was initially elaborated by the Jesuits and disseminated in their school system, the principles of which also inspired Orthodox schools in Eastern Europe. And so pagan authors were admitted into the curriculum only in the so-called "castigatae-purgatae-castratae" editions, a sort of Christian literary anthologies⁸².

The Horatian parody was then 'grafted' into this Christianized vision of the world. Its antecedents, particularly the adaptation of Horace's odes to new ends and themes, are to be found in the German Protestant world, which was looking for literary instruments that could best foster the spread of the reformed Christian vision of the world. Therefore, a good number of talented poets tried this type of composition. It was M. K. Sarbiewski, however, who perfected this parodistic technique, thereby earning himself the accolade of the "Christian Horace"⁸³.

Within the context of this tradition, and inspired both by Sarbiewski's example and the practice of other European writers, the authors of the Mohylian poetics set to work. Especially after Prokopovyč's course, which had paid close attention to the different types of exercises for the pupils, we start to find this type of exercise in the Mohylian poetics, besides the exercises recommended and exemplified by Prokopovyč, especially in the *comparatio*, *laudatio* and in

⁸² Such a selection of pagan authors had been carried out also by Protestant men of culture and expurgated editions of Classical authors were used also in Protestant schools. Cf., for instance, the edition *Selectiores Horatiani operis Odae ad formandos mores tum cognitu utiles, tum perque iucundae...*, published in 1542 by Andrzej Winkler, rector of the reformed school at the church of Saint Elizabeth at Wrocław (Budzyński 1985: 137).

⁸³ For a useful review of the abundant production of Horatian parodies, cf. Budzyński 1985: 134-166; on parody in Sarbiewski and in general on his Horatianism, cf. *ibidem*: 167-196.

the fable. Prokopovyč illustrates it with the elegy on Saint Alexis⁸⁴, in turn a parody of Ovid's elegies *Tristia*, I, 3; I, 4.

The examples that I will provide and comment on are found in the above-mentioned course *Praecepta de arte poetica* (ms. 23).

The first, a fragment, may have been an experiment, also in view of where it is found: it is the remaking of the third stanza of Horace's *Carm.* II, 10, and it is mentioned by the author of the manual to illustrate the Sapphic stanza (composed of three sapphics and an Adonic line). Generally, in the exemplification of Latin meters, the authors use lines from Horace's odes, at times a whole stanza and its parody by Sarbiewski; other times Sarbiewski's lines written with Horatian meters. Here, to exemplify the Sapphic stanza, the author quotes ll. 9-12 of *Carm.* II, 10. The repeated quotation of lines from this ode in the Mohylanian poetics is no coincidence (cf. *Rosa inter spinas* and *Camoena in Parnasso*): dedicated to Lucius Licinius Murena, it contained philosophical motives of Horatian lyric that were dear to Mohylanian teachers. They revolve around the concept of *mesôtēs*, that is of the *aurea mediocritas*, of measure, of avoiding excess. The comparison of the boat that manages to avoid both storm and dead calm with the man who follows the right path is suggested by the initial and final metaphors, taken from the field of navigation. In this stanza Horace draws a comparison with a tall pine and high towers, to mean that who wants to elevate himself too high often ends up falling miserably. Cf. ms. 23, f. 5 r.:

Saepius ventis agitur ingens
pinus et celsae graviore casu
decidunt turres feriuntque summos
fulgura montis.

The giant pine is shaken by winds
more often, lofty towers collapse
with a greater crash, and lightning strikes
the summits of mountains.

The novelty in this case is that after the citation of Horace's lines the author presents his readers with a remake of this stanza in the key of parody and introduces it with the annotation "Ad imitationem Horatiani accipe aliud sapphicum [sic!] carmen pro exemplo" ("May you receive another Sapphic poem as an example of Horatian imitation"). Cf.:

⁸⁴ Thus defines Prokopovyč parody (Prokopovič 1961: 246): "Videlicet cum ad normam poematis ab aliquo auctore editi nostrum opus ita aptamus, ut veluti vestigiis insistentes, et verba verbis, et sententiis sententias similes vel, si libuerit, contrarias et e regione oppositas conferamus" ("When we accommodate our work to the model of some other author's poem, and as following in his steps, we use words and thoughts similar to his or, if it is pleasing, contrary and from an opposite field"). For a short review of the definitions of parody in the Mohylanian poetics, cf. Masljuk 1983: 187.

Saepius plagis agitur insons
 coetus et tristes graviore damno
 imminent casus feriuntque sanctos
 tela malorum.

More frequently the innocent assembly is stirred up
 by the blows and sad accidents overhang
 with more serious damage and the darts of the wicked
 strike the saints.

In this fragment of parody, which faithfully reproduces the syntactic construction of the original, as well as its meter, Horace's allegory is not found. Instead of the tall pine we find an innocent assembly, presumably the Christian community of believers, apparently persecuted, along with the saints, by the wicked and the mighty. Taking into account the seemingly devout content, if the allegorical background of Horace's words had been reproduced, it would have caused a derisory intent, as if to mean that the blows and the misfortunes endured by the Christians are the consequence of their desire for power and supposed presumptuousness. This stanza was probably part of a longer poem, a parody of the whole ode by Horace. Knowledge of the source would certainly help us to comprehend the context and the meaning of the quoted fragment more clearly. The intent of the author, however, seems to lie in pointing out this type of learned exercise, this re-reading and re-writing of a Classic in a Christian key to his pupils.

3.6. Indeed, in this same manual we find two more examples of Horatian parody. The first, incomplete, bears the title *Parodia Hoppii ad Christum* (ms. 23, f. 11 v.), i. e. its author is the German Neo-Latin poet David Hoppius (the parody is the first in the mentioned edition Hoppius 1690). Also in this example, the profane content of the model is 'coherently' sacralized, as expressed by a sort of epigraph "Alij alijs, ego delector rebus sacris", which slightly modifies the original "Alios aliis, auctorem delectari rebus sacris" ("Other people find pleasure in other activities, the author finds pleasure in matters of religious worship"). The parody bears the title *Ad Christum* (To Christ). I will present the Latin texts (first Horace *Carm.* I, 1, and then the parody), followed by the respective English translations:

1	Maecenas atavis edite regibus, o et praesidium et dulce decus meum, sunt quos curriculo pulverem Olympicum collegisse iuvat, metaque fervidis
5	evitata rotis palmaque nobilis terrarum dominos evehit ad deos; hunc, si mobilium turba Quiritium certat tergeminis tollere honoribus; illum, si proprio condidit horreo

10 quidquid de Libycis verritur areis.
 Gaudentem patrios findere sarculo
 agros Attalicis condicionibus
 numquam demoveas, ut trabe Cypria
 15 Myrtoum pavidus nauta secet mare.
 Luctantem Icaris fluctibus Africum
 mercator metuens otium et oppidi
 laudat rura sui; mox reficit ratis
 quassas, indocilis pauperiem pati.
 Est qui nec veteris pocula Massici
 20 nec partem solido demere de die
 spernit, nunc viridi membra sub arbuto
 stratus, nunc ad aquae lene caput sacrae.
 Multos castra iuvant et lituo tubae
 permixtus sonitus bellaque matribus
 25 detestata. Manet sub Iove frigido
 venator tenerae coniugis inmemor,
 seu visa est catulis cervae fidelibus,
 seu rupit teretes Marsus aper plagas.
 Me doctarum hederæ præmia frontium
 30 dis miscent superis, me gelidum nemus
 Nympharumque leves cum Satyris chori
 secernunt populo, si neque tibus
 Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia
 Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton.
 35 Quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres,
 sublimi feriam sidera vertice.

1 Maecenas, issue of ancient kings,
 my fortification and sweet adornment,
 a chariot gathering dust at Olympia
 and narrowly missing the turning post
 5 with burning wheels is pleasure to some;
 and Victory makes them lords of the earth.
 The fickle mob of Romans exalts
 a certain man with triple honors;
 another longs to fill his barns
 10 with all the grain that Africa threshes.
 Not even the wealth of Áttalid kings
 would move a farmer, contentedly hoeing
 his family plot, to ply the dread
 Aegean aboard a Cyprian skiff.
 15 The merchant in fear of African winds
 wrestling the Adriatic commends
 the peaceful fields of home, but quickly
 repairs his vessel, averse to poverty.
 There even exists a man who would spend
 20 part of his day with cups of ancient
 Massic wine beneath a green

arbutus or next to a sacred fountain.
 Many are partial to army camps,
 the blare of trumpets and tubas, and warfare,
 25 detested by mothers. The hunter remains
 outdoors in the cold, forgetting his tender
 wife when his dogs have spotted a deer
 or a Marsic boar is tearing his nets.
 What elevates me to the gods is an ivy
 30 crown for learning. The icy grove
 and bands of nymphs cavorting with satyrs
 distance the crowd, if Polyhymnia
 deigns to lend me her Lesbian lute
 and Euterpe consents to sharing her tibias.
 35 And if you entitle me lyric bard,
 I will hit the stars with the top of my head.

Parodia Hoppii ad Christum

1 Jesu Rex, atavis nate potentibus.
 O et Praesidium, et suave decus meum;
 Sunt, quos assiduè docta volumina
 Pervoluisse juvat: Tempus et optimis
 5 Impensum studiis, ars quoque nobilis
 Musarum sobolem provehit ad Deos.
 Hunc, si nobilium nomina Principum
 Possit perpetuis condere versibus:
 Illum, si propriâ condidit arculâ
 10 Quicquid colligitur mercibus ex malis.
 Gaudentem patrios fundere sacco
 Nummos, egregiis vix rationibus
 Unquam permoveas, ut fugiens gulam
 Frugalis⁸⁵ placitis abstineat cibus.
 15 Fumantem facibus perpetuis domum
 Aegrotus metuens, pectore supplici
 Fundit vota DEO: mox redit ad suos
 Mores, indocilis mente Deum sequi.
 Est qui perpetuae secula gloriae⁸⁶,

⁸⁵ Here the correct form would be “frugalibus”.

⁸⁶ The parody is interrupted after this line at the end of f. 11 v., even if evidently the author intended to continue it, because further down we find the word “et”, with which indeed the following line begins. For completeness sake I will copy here the rest of the parody, as it appears in Hoppius: “Et partem solidi quærere gaudii / Spernit, nunc Veneris delitias sequens / Blandas, nunc vitiis deditus improbis. / Multis metra juvant et hominum lyra / Permistus sonitus silaque matribus / Non ingrata. Volat per mare frigidum / Mercator Pelagi non memor horridi: / Seu visa est oculis terra vagantibus / Seu portum subiit quassa iterum ratis. / Me sacrorum animat pagina fontium / Et miscet superis; me Domini favor / Sanctorumque piæ cum gemitu preces / Confirmant dubium: si neque subtrahit / Flamen

Hoppius's parody to Christ

- 1 O king Jesus, descended from powerful ancestors
 o both my protection and my charming honor,
 there are those who love to constantly read and re-read
 learned books, and the time devoted to good studies
 5 and also the noble art lead
 the offspring of the Muses to the gods.
 One man [feels happy] if he can celebrate with everlasting verses
 the names of the noble princes;
 another one, if he hid in his own casket
 10 what he gathered from evil goods.
 Even with excellent reasoning it would be hard
 to persuade a man who enjoys his father's money
 to shed it from his purse, so that refraining from gluttony,
 being satisfied with frugal foods, abstain from [other] foods.
 15 The sick man, fearing the house burning with
 perpetual flames, with a suppliant heart
 showers God with promises; at once he goes back to his habits
 recalcitrant in his mind to follow God.
 There are those who of everlasting glory in the centuries...

The resemblance between the two poems is manifest. In both of them the meter is the first Asclepiadean. The parody follows the original quite faithfully, also in the syntactic construction, at times almost verbatim, as for instance in the second line. This ode, which opens the first book of Horace's odes, is addressed to Maecenas, Horace's protector and close friend. The ode touches on a theme dear to the Latin classic, that of the choice of career or occupation, and asserts the value of this choice, which in his case is poetry. In order to reach the declaration of his own preference in the conclusion, Horace illustrates different kinds of life, including the discussion on the relationship between active life and contemplative life that informed culture at his time.

It is interesting to see how the activities via which some men aspire to immortal glory and are thus likened to the gods – in Horace's case the Olympic games – in the parody is the diligent study and composition of encomiastic poetry. In other words, human activities are listed according to a different hierarchy, at the top of which Horace places lyric poetry, while the parody places serving God by reading and studying the Holy Scriptures, theology. Indeed, thus we read in ll. 29-30a of the parody, although they are not quoted in the *Praecepta de arte poetica* (ms. 23): "Me sacrorum animat pagina fontium / et miscet superis" ("The pages of sacred sources revive me / And unite me with the gods on high").

The fact that the parody ranks sacred things first among human activities is demonstrated not only by the epigraph, but also by the list of other human behaviours that contravene divine commandments: where in Horace we have the

suppetias, nec stabilis Fides / Promissam refugit prèndere gratiam. / Quod cum me superis coetibus inseres / Sublime usque canam carmine gloriam".

accumulation of riches, i.e. corn from the fields of North Africa, in the parody we find evil goods, which can also be understood as goods acquired dishonestly; where Horace speaks of agriculture and contrasts it with navigation, the parody reprimands those who devote themselves to corporeal pleasures to the detriment of the spirit. And to the merchant who rebels against the penury of peasant life and decides to try his fortune by setting sail again, corresponds the sick man, who is evidently also an inveterate sinner whose repentance is superficial, short-lived and dictated exclusively by the fear of death and of divine punishment, and not by a sincere heart. The terms that indicate the pagan realia of Horace's day are replaced with Christian or neutral vocabulary (cf., for instance, "Attalicis condicionibus" replaced by "egregis rationibus").

3.7. The next example is found in the chapter *De Hymno* ("On hymns"). The hymn is here defined as a "carmen sive cantus in Deum" ("a poem or a song to God"), in which the Christian poet should test himself joyfully. In addition to this short definition, the author recalls that the Catholic Church also sings hymns to celebrate the saints on their respective saint's day. In the Mohylanian poetics we find various examples of hymns, some of which composed with Horatian meters⁸⁷. Indeed, the short explanation of the genre of the hymn is followed by two hymns by Marc-Antoine Muret, devoted respectively to the Holy Trinity and to Saint Barbara, both written in the second asclepiadean meter. Petrov⁸⁸ states that Mohylanian authors modeled their own hymns for religious holidays and saints on Muret's hymns. While this topic lies beyond the scope of my present research, the Mohylanian poetics tell us that the preferred form of imitation of Horace by Mohylanian teachers is parody; and Horace's presence runs throughout this chapter.

After the above-mentioned hymns we find a poetical composition, whose insertion in the chapter on hymns is due to the fact that is addressed to God, and thus, according to the definition of hymns given by the manuscript's author, could be considered as such. However, this poem also shares the features of the parody genre. Indeed, not only is it written in a Horatian meter (in this case the alcaic), but it also follows, at times verbatim, the chosen model, i.e. Horace's *Carm.* I, 29, although it features religious content not present in the original. The insertion of

⁸⁷ In the Mohylanian poetics the hymn is commonly defined as a sublime chant to praise God. Generally three variants are mentioned: 1. the hymn that derives from Hebraic tradition, the creator and model of which was David, the author of the psalms; 2. the hymn that derives from Greek-Roman antiquity: its authors and models are said to be Orpheus, Linus, Musaeus, Homer. These hymns were composed in honour of pagan gods and goddesses and the peculiarities of this genre were invoking the divinity and the use of the iambic dimeter or of the hexameter; 3. finally, the Church hymns, composed in honour of the Christian God and of other divine persons, such as the Holy Spirit, and the saints. Hymns were generally dealt with in the section (chapter) on lyric poetry.

⁸⁸ Petrov 1867: 87.

this parody in the chapter on hymns is due to the fact that it is addressed to God. The author of the manual does not specify the authorship of the parody which bears the title *Ode ad Christum Satanae et inferni victorem* (Ode to Christ, victorious over Satan and hell). Also this parody belongs to Hoppius (it is the 29th of the first book, just as Horace's ode) and the title is also taken from it⁸⁹.

As I have done above, I will present the Latin texts (Horace's *Carm.* I, 29) and the parody, followed by the respective English translations.

1 Icci, beatis nunc Arabum invides
 gazis, et acrem militiam paras
 non ante devictis Sabaeae
 regibus, horribilique Medo
5 nectis catenas? Quae tibi virginum
 sponso necato barbara serviet?
 Puer quis ex aula capillis
 ad cyathum statuetur unctis,
 doctus sagittas tendere Sericas
10 arcu paterno? Quis neget arduis
 pronos relabi posse rivos
 montibus et Tiberim reverti,
 cum tu coemptos undique nobiles
 libros Panaeti Socraticam et domum
15 mutare loricis Hiberis,
 pollicitus meliora, tendis?

1 Iccius, now do you envy the Arabs'
 magnificent riches? Plan an offensive
 against the unconquered kings
 of Sabaea? Fashion chains
5 for the horrible Mede? Which barbarian
 maid, her fiance slain, will become
 your slave? What royal lad,
 who mastered Seric shafts,
 on his father's bow, will scent his hair
10 and ladle your wine? Will any deny
 that rivers can run uphill
 and the Tiber change direction,
 when they see you trading the books of Panaetius,
 purchased far and wide, and Socrates'
15 school, for Spanish leather?
 You promised better things.

1 Jesu malignis nunc Satanae invides
 Auisis et acrem militiam paras
 Non ante devictis Averni
 Gentibus: et Stygio Tyranno

⁸⁹ Cf. ms. 23, f. 26 r.

- 5 Nectis catenas: Nunc tibi gens pia
 Orco subacto serviet unice:
 Minister in templo sacro unctus
 Ad cathedram statuatur aura,
 Doctus fideles pascere oves tuas
 10 Verbo sacrato: Quis neget impiis
 Pravas remitti posse noxas
 Mentibus et Satanam fugari:
 Quum tu Redemptor Christe in amabiles
 Sedes Draconis, Tartaream et domum
 15 Vastare, credenti cohorti
 Pollicitus meliora, tendis.
- 1 O Jesus, you now look with hostile eye at Satan's
 daring deeds, and prepare a vigorous campaign
 against the people of the Avernus, hitherto unconquered
 and are forming chains for the tyrant
 5 of the Styx; now a pious people, since death has
 been subdued, will serve only you.
 An anointed priest in the sacred shrine
 will be established for the pulpit from on high,
 experienced in grazing your faithful sheep
 10 with the sacred word: who could deny that
 perverse guilts can be remitted to the
 impious minds and Satan can be put to flight,
 when you, Christ Redeemer, who have
 promised better things to the crowd of the
 15 believers, aim at devastating
 the seats loved by the serpent and the Tartarean dwelling.

Horace's *Carm.* I, 29, is addressed to his friend Iccius, who was preparing to leave for Arabia with the expedition led by the prefect of Egypt Aelius Gallus. Here Horace contrasts Iccius's philosophical past with a future that promises him great pleasures and riches. The ode has a bipartite structure: the first part (ll. 1-10a) illustrates his friend's new interests, namely the mirage of potential successes and riches; the second part (lines 10b-16), deals with his past interests, i.e. philosophy. The humorous intent is quite manifest: "the ode consists in the ironic presentation of an intellectual, moreover one who plays the Stoic, who is driven by a sudden yearning for conquest and enrichment"⁹⁰. In Hoppius's parody, the humour is naturally absent: on the contrary, the playful irony is reversed, also by collocating the vocative at the beginning of the first line, which was usually reserved for the divinity. Indeed, the parody is addressed to Jesus Christ himself, and the author turns to him in the hope that he will fulfill his promises to those who have believed in his words. The theme of the defeat of the devil's forces and the establishment of the divine kingdom was popular in European Neo-Latin Baroque

⁹⁰ Horace, 1991-1994, vol. 1, bk. 2: 599.

poetry. Here too the metrical scheme of the original is preserved (alcaic stanza) and the syntactic construction of the model is followed quite faithfully, down to the enjambements and to the construction with inversion in line 14 (“Socraticam et domum” – “Tartarea et domum”). The pagan terminology is replaced by Christian expressions: instead of the Arabic riches that Iccius yearns for, we find Satan’s evil deeds, upon which Jesus Christ looks with disfavour (with a different meaning of the verb *invideo*); instead of the princes of Sabaea (a region of Arabia), we find the people of the underworld and the tyrant of the Styx. In this case, whilst in antiquity *Stygius Tyrannus* indicated Pluto, here this locution indicates Satan, and this reinterpretation in a Christian key allows the author to preserve the pagan terminology. Instead of Horace’s ironic questions about Iccius’s future pleasures, we find a series of assertions, and the expressed hope that people may faithfully serve Christ, who took human form for the salvation of human kind. It is not quite clear to whom the term *minister* refers, probably to the priest figure in general, to the priest as a servant of Christ and ‘alter Christus’, and as such a true pastor of souls. The *adynata*⁹¹ of Horace’s ode are replaced by Christian ones, i.e. Christ’s promises, impossible in the eyes of the world, the forgiveness of sins, the defeat of the devil and of death, the resurrection of the body. Finally, the motif of the destruction of infernal abodes and apparently of their transformation into pleasant abodes corresponds to Horace’s *aprosdoketon*⁹². Even if the verb *mutare* of the Horatian model is replaced by *vastare*, this transformation seems to be implied by the comparison with the original.

3.8. The next example of Horatian imitation is found at the end of the manual *Libri tres de arte poetica* (ms. 15, f. 211 r.), which has the same title as Prokopovyč’s manual. The section of poetic exercises (*Exercitationes operum scholasticorum*), however, does not contain the examples provided by Prokopovyč, but a series of poems which are probably the work of the poetical students, as the title seems to imply. Indeed, the rather modest level of the Latin in some poems also suggests that they are not the work of expert Latinists. Although the poetical exercises mainly feature religious content⁹³, we also find a poem entitled *Alia carmina de hieme* (“Other verses on winter”)⁹⁴. However, although the stated theme here is winter, the poem seems to be a Christianized answer, or rather a confutation of Horace’s *Carm.* I, 4. Horace’s poem is a capti-

⁹¹ Rhetorical figure of a logical type, which consists in stressing an impossible fact.

⁹² Unexpected word or expression, used in an estranging way instead of a usual locution.

⁹³ We find, among others, *Carmina de peccatore clamante ad Deum* (“Verses on a sinner crying out to God”), *Carmina de Trinitate Sacro Sancta* (“Verses on the Holy Trinity”), and a poem on the statement “*Vita mortalis non est anteponeunda immortalis*” (“Mortal life should not be preferred to immortal life”). Re this last poem see Siedina 2011.

⁹⁴ Evidently the word *carmen* is used here with the meaning of *verse*, since there is only one poem.

vating meditation on the temporality of human life, as opposed to the circularity of the time of nature (this same theme will be dealt with again in *Carm.* IV, 7). As in *Carm.* IV, 7, it is the return of spring and the consequent enjoyment of nature's beauty that leads the poet by contrast to think about death, and thus about the fleeting nature of human life and the necessity to live and enjoy the present day. For a better comparison, I will first quote Horace's *Carm.* I, 4:

1 Solvitur acris hiems grata vice veris et Favoni,
 trahuntque siccas machinae carinas,
 ac neque iam stabulis gaudet pecus aut arator igni,
 nec prata canis albicant pruinis.
 5 Iam Cytherea choros ducit Venus imminente Luna,
 iunctaeque Nymphis Gratiae decentes
 alterno terram quatiant pede, dum gravis Cyclopum
 Vulcanus ardens visit officinas.
 Nunc decet aut viridi nitidum caput impedire myrto
 10 aut flore terrae quem ferunt solutae;
 nunc et in umbrosis Fauno decet immolare lucis,
 seu poscat agna sive malit haedo.
 Pallida Mors aequo pulsat pede pauperum tabernas
 regumque turris. O beate Sesti,
 15 vitae summa brevis spem nos vetat inchoare longam.
 Iam te premet nox fabulaeque Manes
 et domus exilis Plutonia; quo simul mearis,
 nec regna vini sortiere talis
 nec tenerum Lycidan mirabere, quo calet iuventus
 20 nunc omnis et mox virgines tepebunt.

1 Winter dissolving graciously yields to Spring and Favonius;
 machines are hauling dusty keels.
 Stables no longer please the ox nor fire the farmer,
 nor meadows blanch with frozen dew.
 5 Venus leads the dance beneath the hovering moon.
 Nymphs and the beautiful Graces uniting
 shake the earth with alternate feet, while fiery Vulcan
 watches the weighty Cyclopes at work.
 Now is the time to burden your glistening head with myrtle
 10 or blossoms the loosening lands produce,
 and burn a victim, gift to Faun, in the shadowy woods,
 a lamb or a goat, as he prefers.
 Pale Mortality kicks at the pauper's door and the king's;
 his foot is impartial. O happy Sestius,
 15 the shortness of life precludes far-reaching hope. Too soon
 you succumb to night, the storied ghosts,
 and Pluto's impoverished palace, where you will go and never
 be chosen to minister wine like this
 or gaze again at Lycidas firing all the boys
 20 and soon to heat the maidens too.

- and at the trophies of the generals.
- 15 Life's short span forbids us to form every remote expectation.
 The dreadful darkness will shortly oppress you,
 Pluto's squalid mansion, to visit which no one
 will bring drinking cups.

Up to line 12, almost every line in this poem seems to be a confutation or reversal of the corresponding line in Horace's ode, although it is not always completely clear what the author has in mind. Thus in lines 1-2 a severe winter prevents spring from coming and freezes Zephyr (the warm westerly wind that melts the snow, harbinger of spring), while in Horace the spring and Favonius (the Latin equivalent of Zephyrus) melt away the harsh winter. In line 3 both the cattle and the cowherd rejoice, the latter probably because in winter he does not have to take the cows to pasture. Flora, goddess of flowers and of spring, turns white, evidently due to the snow. As to line 5, the author seems to have tried to partly imitate the syntactic construction of Horace's line 5, however with little success: indeed it is not clear whom he refers to with "aethera [aetheria] cohors". As to the Hyades, since they are the five stars in Taurus associated with rainy weather, here they are meant to reinforce the chilly, wintry image. Ll. 7-8 are somewhat obscure: it is not clear why Neptune has his feet bound with shackles or which star does this and attends to the Furies. The only thing that comes to mind is a clumsy attempt at reversing the image of graceful dances led by Venus in Horace's ode (where evidently the Furies should be the opposite of the Graces). Since the stated tone of the poem is one of grief and sorrow, the reversal of Horace's invitation to encircle the head with green myrtle (i.e. to enjoy youth¹⁰¹) is consistently carried through. In as much as the underlying theme is that of the 'winter of life', i.e. of approaching death and God's subsequent judgement, there is not much to rejoice at. On the contrary, it is exactly at this moment that it is fitting to repent and to expiate one's sins in a Christian vision of life.

Lines 13-17a reproduce Horace's ll. 13-17a, although with some changes. It is not clear why our author substitutes "regumque turris" with "atque ducum trophea": perhaps to avoid slavishly reproducing Horace's words, although the parallelism is thus lost. Indeed, although *tropheum* can mean a material monument, it is not comparable to a dwelling place. Horace's "fabulae Manes", which symbolically represent the possibility of life after death, which the Latin poet considers an invention, is coherently omitted. The sense of Horace's last lines (18-20) is that the after-life lacks the pleasures of earthly life, which are symbolically represented by the convivial situation of the symposium. Our author may have wished to reiterate this idea, but again his words are not really clear. And of course, he omits any hint at lines 19-20, which contain the motif of erotic love, conventional in Hellenistic poetry: the young Lycidas with whom young men are inflamed and who will soon attract maidens.

¹⁰¹ Myrtle, sacred to Venus, is often associated with youth (cf. Horace's *Carm.* I, 25, 18).

Although the artistic value of this remake of *Carm.* I, 4 is somewhat poor, it is interesting as a poetic statement, however tentative, of how a poem about death should be elaborated in a Christian key. Horace's 'polychromatic' description of the awakening of nature becomes a black and white mournful allegorization of winter through which the readers are reminded of the brevity of life and the inescapability of death and of God's judgement.

3.9. Lastly, imitation of Horace takes the form of school exercises written using the Greek lyric meters that Horace introduced into Latin poetry, in particular the Alcaic stanza¹⁰². Although this type of exercise was already mentioned in the *Rosa inter spinas* manual¹⁰³, it is mainly after Prokopovyč's *De arte poetica* manual, which contains a long chapter on the different types of linguistic-literary exercises, that Mohylanian authors introduce this section into their courses more often, particularly following Prokopovyč's exercises, and at times introducing their own.

As an example of the rewriting of a poetical composition using a different meter, Prokopovyč rewrites lines 4-6 of Catullus's V ode on the temporality of human life using first the Sapphic stanza and then the Horatian (Alcaic) meter, and finally elaborating the same idea and expressing it in twelve lines instead of the three of the original, this time using the same Phalaecean verse as Catullus. As to this type of use of Horace's meters, generally speaking they do not constitute an elaboration or a rewriting of the content of any particular Horatian ode, i.e. they are scholastic exercises that concern only metrics and not synonymity. Their interest lies mainly in their showing us what type of exercise the pupils were engaged in.

The first example is found in ms. 32. The manuscript opens with the title *Carmina lyrica per omnia genera ab Horatio usurpata* ("Lyric poems of all genres usurped from Horace"), which however promises more than it delivers. Indeed, there are only three poems. The *genus* of the title refers to the different metrical systems, which were one of the criteria according to which poetry was classified. And thus the adjective "horatiana" refers to the different meters that Horace used and introduced into Latin poetry. All of the poems are of a religious character and revolve around the birth of Christ, as is indicated by the subtitle *De Natali Christi Domini* ("On the birth of Christ the Lord"). The poems deal with three moments of the birth of Christ, respectively with the song of the angels, the apparition of the star and the parturition of the Virgin. Christian themes in Neo-Latin poetry, first and foremost the Life of Christ, were so popular that it

¹⁰² Since this is the meter in which Horace wrote most of his odes, it is commonly defined as "Horatian".

¹⁰³ Ms 7.1; in the section *De medijs comparandae poeseos* ("On the means to compose poetry"), the author lists different types of imitation, including the remake of a poem using a different meter, and adduces Statius's remaking of ll. 9-14 of Horace's *Carm.* I, 3 as one of the examples of this exercise using the hexameter (ms. 7.1, f. 11 v.-13 v.).

is virtually impossible to find a definite source for these poems¹⁰⁴. The episodes of the first two poems are narrated respectively in the Gospel according to Luke, and in the Gospel according to Matthew.

Here is the first poem, written in the first Asclepiadean meter:

1
De Angelorum cantu
Asclepiadea

1 Ad Cunas Domini dulcisoni melos
 custodes Genii dant modulamina
 pastores veluti pervigiles gregis.
 Grex illis, Deus est Agnus, ovis Parens.

5 Flentem sic Genii vociferi vocant
 his ex tristitiis astra petat retro.
 An quod Pastor adest fistula fors opus
 caelos voce replent fistula ceu Geni.
 Nunc in carne colit tactibus Angelus

10 tactus carnis erit passio post brevi.
 E caelis Dominus strata solo via
 monstrant tactibus id cum Genii canunt.

On the Angels' song

Asclepiadeans

1 At the cradle of the Lord the sweet sounding
 guardian angels offer songs, melodies
 as pastors who keep watch over the flock.
 For them the flock is God, the Lamb is the Father of the sheep.

5 Thus the guardian angels with a loud voice call to him who is crying
 so that from these sad things he may rise again to the stars.
 Maybe because there is the shepherd, a reed is needed
 the guardian angels fill the skies with [their] voice as with a reed.
 Now the angel adores in flesh with touches,

10 the touch of the flesh shortly after will be the passion.
 From heaven the Lord is the way laid out for the earth,
 the guardian angels show this to the touch, when they sing.

The episode of the apparition of an angel (followed by a heavenly army) announcing the birth of the Messiah to the pastors who were keeping watch over their flock is narrated in the Gospel according to Luke (ch. 2). The poetical elaboration of the theme in this poem is a school exercise constructed according to definite rhetorical strategies, the goal of which is to challenge the reader's intel-

¹⁰⁴ The religious poetry on Christ's birth in the Mohylanian poetics frequently included Jacopo Sannazaro's epic poem *De partu virginis*. Other authors, whose religious poetry was certainly known, were J. Balde and of course Sarbiewski. The birth of Christ was the topic of many examples of orations.

lect. This is done mainly with the construction of *acumen* (conceits) and the use of figures of speech and of thought, which according to Sarbiewski, we should call *argutiae*¹⁰⁵. While the *acumen* was generally recommended in the conclusion (*clausula*) of the epigram, some authors call it the soul of poetry and attribute it the function of *delectare*¹⁰⁶. This opinion was evidently shared by our author too.

The main simile is between angels and pastors: while pastors keep watch over an earthly flock, for the angels the flock is constituted by the son of God, who is the lamb. Thus, line 4 contains an *acumen*, which plays with the polysemy of the metaphors of the lamb and the shepherd in the Bible. Since it is the shepherds who found Jesus, he is a lamb¹⁰⁷; however, being God, he is also the ‘father’ of the sheep, the shepherd of the people (cf. Psalm 23). The poem is also built around a few words, repeated with the figure of polyptoton: besides the flock, they are touch (*tactus*) and flesh (*caro*); their materiality contrasts with the immateriality of the dominating motif that runs throughout the poem, that of sound. The latter is both vocal, sung and the sound of musical instruments. Thus “custodes genii [...] dant modulamina dulcisoni melos”; they “flentem [...] vociferi vocant” (the loud voice is stressed here by the alliteration), where “flentem” also evokes an acoustic impression. Further on, sound evoked in the image of the “fistula” (reed or shepherd’s pipe) that matched the angels’ voice, fills the

¹⁰⁵ In his tract *De acuto et arguto* Sarbiewski lists the traditional classifications of the forms of *acumen* and *argutia* and proposes his own definition, which aims at originally reinterpreting the precepts of rhetorical manuals. For Sarbiewski *acumen* is a faculty of the mind that is able to create, through a *discors concordia* or a *concors discordia*, a conceptual contradiction that delights subtle intellects. On its part, in Sarbiewski’s conception *argutia* is a simple verbal ornament of the *acumen*, cf.: “Atque ita non ipsum omnino argutia acumen erit, sed ornamentum et quaedam quasi vestis acuminis” (“And thus *argutia* will not be entirely the same thing as *acumen*, but [it is] a decoration and almost a sort of garment of the *acumen*”) (Sarbiewski 1958: 30). Most Mohylanian authors do not make a distinction between *acumen* and *argutia*, although Sarbiewski’s distinction is probably reflected in their differentiation between *acumen in verbis* (when two similar words have an opposed meaning) and *acumen in sensu* (a play of concepts, when from the previous exposition a *ratio ingeniosa* is derived unexpectedly or against the reader’s (listener’s) expectation). However, the notion of *argutia* in Sarbiewski is much more than a simple *acumen in verbis*, in that he lists, explains, and provides examples for thirteen “modi inveniendi argutias, quae in lusu verborum consistunt” (“ways to find *argutias*, which consist in a play of words”; *ibidem*: 32).

¹⁰⁶ Thus, for instance, the author of *Parnassus* speaks about *acumen* (ms. 16.1, f. 9 v.), “Delectat poeta tunc cum adhibet suis versibus acumen vel conceptum ingeniosum qui est anima poeticae” (“The poet delights then when he adds to his verses *acumen* or an ingenious conceit, which is the soul of poetry”). The same definition with slight variations is found in *Officina* and in *Hortus poeticus* by Mytrofan Dovhalev’skyj.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. also the prefiguration of Jesus as the sacrificial lamb in Isaiah 53:7: “He was treated harshly and afflicted, / but he did not even open his mouth. / Like a lamb led to the slaughtering block, / like a sheep silent before her shearers, / he did not even open his mouth”: see <<https://www.biblegateway.com/passages/?search=Isaiah%2053:6-8&version=NET>> (accessed 30 November 2017).

skies. The metaphor of the lamb implicitly reappears in line 10, which alludes to Jesus Christ's passion. Finally, the metaphor of the way prepared from heaven for the (inhabitants of the) earth unites the divine and the human nature of Jesus.

3.9.1. The following poem is centered around the miraculous event of the apparition of the star (narrated in Matthew, ch. 2), that leads the wise men to the place where Jesus was born so that they may worship him. In this poem the author uses a different Horatian meter, the minor sapphic.

2

De Apparitione Stellae.

Saphica [sic!].

1 Dum velut calcar stimulans, polorum
cernimus stellas radiis micantes;
calcar ad Christum stimulans dicatum
regibus astrum.

5 Natus in terrâ Deus en supremus
astra cui servi radiis corusca
en velut servus sequitur per oras
stella supremum.

10 Nemo supremum venerans polorum
lampadem succendit agendo grates;
ergo de caelis datur ut lucerna
stella corusca.

On the apparition of the star

Sapphics

1 While, as an inciting spur, we examine
the stars of the skies that twinkle with [their] rays,
a spur inciting toward Christ, is a star
dedicated to the kings.

5 Behold is born on earth the greatest God,
whom the lightening stars with [their] rays serve,
behold as if a servant the star follows through
the regions the greatest God.

10 No one who venerates the greatest of heaven
sets a lamp on fire giving thanks;
therefore from the skies it is given as a lamp
a lightening star.

In this poem the dominating image is that of light, and it is expressed by the words “stella” (“astrum”), “lampas”, “lucerna”. The metaphor of the light applied to Jesus Christ is the central trope in the gospels, cf., for instance John, 8:12, where Jesus declares: “I am the light of the world. The one who follows

me will never walk in darkness, but will have the light of life”¹⁰⁸. The star is then metaphorized in its own turn, and materialized: in the first quatrain it is a “calcar stimulans ad Christum”, particularly dedicated to the wise men (*regibus*); in the second a servant of God, who faithfully follows Him. Finally it is a lamp, called from on high to illuminate the greatest of heaven, and the source of life; indeed, the centrality of the image of the star is also highlighted by the fact that the final line of each stanza contains the word “stella” or “astrum”. In this poem, as in the previous one, different figures of repetition are used to stress the key concepts: cf. “calcar stimulans”, “calcar ad Christum stimulans” (with *amplificatio*), “servus”, “servi”, “supremus”, “supremum”. At the same time the contrast and the movement earth/sky and vice versa (and by implication human/divine) runs throughout the poem: in the first stanza the action of the humans (“cernimus”) is directed first from the earth to the sky, and then from the skies to the earth (“astrum [...] regibus dicatum”). In the second stanza Jesus Christ unites in himself both earth and sky (heaven), in that he is God in human flesh. And thus the One who belongs to the heavens is on earth, while his servant (the star) is in the sky. Finally, because those who venerate Christ on earth do not ignite a lamp to give thanks, light is given from on high.

3.9.2. Finally, the third poem is written in the fourth Asclepiadean meter. Although it is entitled *De partu virgineo* (“On the Virgin’s delivery”) it is mostly a collection of tropes that play with the divine and human nature of Jesus Christ and of his mother the Virgin Mary. Here it is:

3
De Partu Virgineo

Gliconica mixta cum Asclepiadeis

1 Caelum Virgo Deîpara
IESVS est Phaeton Justitiae Sacrae
 in Caelo velut ortus hic
in Sacra Mariâ Criminis inscia.

5 Virgo, Soles, Parens Sacra
verum Sole Deo tecta reviseris;
 qui tunc vestis erat tibi
cunis carne simul vestis eum modo.

3
On the parturition of the Virgin

Gliconics mixed with Asclepiadeans

1 You are the heaven, Virgin God-Bearer
Jesus is the Phaethon of divine justice

¹⁰⁸ <<https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=John%208:11-13&version=NET>> (accessed 30 November 2017).

as if born in the sky is this one,
 in the holy Mary who did not know sin.
 5 Virgin, days of sunlight, holy parent
 in truth you will be seen again covered by God, who is the sun;
 he who was then your cloth
 now you clothe him in flesh in the cradle.

The poem is skilfully constructed with a series of traditional Christian metaphors identifying the Virgin Mary with the sky (heaven) and Jesus with the sun. Here too, the motif of light runs throughout the poem. The identification of Jesus as the Sun of righteousness was mainly derived from the prophecy in Malachi 4: 2: “But for you who respect my name, the sun of vindication will rise with healing wings”¹⁰⁹. The theme of Jesus as the Sun of God, the Light of the World, is elaborated in the first chapter of the Gospel according to John: “In the beginning was the Word [...] What has come into being in him was life, life that was the light of men; and light shines in darkness [...] The Word was the real light...”¹¹⁰. Jesus as the Light of the World is further spoken of in John 8:12, 9:5, and 12:46. From the earliest Christian times, Jesus was identified as the Sun of God, the Christianized Sun god, Phoebus/Apollo¹¹¹. Here, however, Jesus is called with an antonomasia “Phaethon of holy righteousness”, i.e. with the name of the son of the sun, probably to stress his being the son of God and at the same time the son of Mary in the flesh. Indeed, if Mary is identified with heaven, Jesus, her son, comes from heaven as well and thus has a truly divine nature.

The motifs of light and the union of divine and human nature in Mary and Jesus, i.e. of material and immaterial, are elaborated in the second part of the poem. Line six alludes to the motif of the woman clothed with the sun in Revelation 18, traditionally identified with the Virgin Mary¹¹². It is followed in the last two lines by a conceit, constructed with a polyptoton (*vestis...vestis*): while Jesus, God the sun, was Mary’s garment, now in the flesh is clothed by her.

4. The examples which I have illustrated are quite representative of the modes of poetic reception of Horace’s poetic legacy by teachers of poetics and

¹⁰⁹ <<https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Malachi%204:1-3&version=NET>> (accessed 30 November 2017).

¹¹⁰ *The New Jerusalem Bible*, Henry Wansbrough, ed., New York, London 1985, see: <https://web.archive.org/web/20140707121555/http://www.veritasbible.com/new-jerusalem1989/read/John_1> (accessed 30 November 2017).

¹¹¹ Cf. also the mosaic of the Vatican grottoes under St. Peter’s Basilica (3rd century AD), on the ceiling of the tomb of the Julii (Pope Julius I), where Jesus Christ is represented as the sun-god Helios or Sol Invictus riding his chariot.

¹¹² The author probably knew Stefan Javors’kyj’s poem *Ty oblečenna v solnce, Devo Bogomati*, constructed on the contraposition of the author’s human sinful nature, and the overwhelming holiness and splendour of the Virgin Mary, where, among other appellations, she is called “raj”. It is also possible that the name *Virgo Deipara* (literally *Devo Bogomati*) for Mary has been suggested to our author by Javors’kyj’s poem.

their disciples at the KMA. In the opening poems addressed to the pupils, Mohylian teachers use Horace in two ways: on the one hand they stress the high value of poetry as the only art able to keep alive the memory of great men and their feats for generations to come (thus elaborating on this idea as it is expressed in Horace's *Carm.* IV, 8). On the other, they underline that although talent is necessary when composing poetry, if it is not accompanied by diligent application and exercise, is not enough to make one a poet worthy of this high name.

Indeed, in their poetic 'practice' Mohylian teachers themselves apply Horace's conception of poetry as the depository of glorious memories of important historical figures: quite a few poetic works in the Mohylian poetics are panegyrics, i.e. belong to the epideictic genre, which once more demonstrates the practical application of poetry by Mohylian teachers and students of poetry. It is mainly to refute the Platonic contention that poets are liars and that poetry arouses negative passions, that human actions are often made to be the principal subject matter of poetry, and Mohylian novice-poets chose their material from history. The narration of famous men's deeds in hymns and praises was required to promote models of virtue which the readers would both admire and wish to emulate. The main criterion for such a depiction was verisimilitude, i.e. the different modes of idealization (poets were instructed to represent what ought to have happened, more than what actually happened) were admitted as long as they made the narration credible.

As to Horace's teaching of the 'amicable' union of *natura* and *ars*, with their insistence on constant exercise, all the poetics courses are a practical demonstration of this necessity.

The main modes of Horatian imitation in the Mohylian poetics entail his Christianization. In particular, the latter takes three forms: parody, poems partly inspired by Horace's lyric, in which the transformation into a Christian key is carried out only fragmentarily, and the use of Horatian meters for the composition of poems on Christian topics. These three modes are in line with the Christian interpretation/imitation of Horace that began in Western Europe in the first centuries after Christ and continued in different guises well into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Indeed, for Jesuit pedagogy, which inspired education at the KMA, poetry was a veritable 'spiritual exercise', a sort of poetic theology¹¹³. With its metrical virtuosity and brilliant verbal craftsmanship, Horace's poetry provided an excellent model for the introduction of Christian contents (in the parodies and in quantitative Latin poetry that adopts Horatian meters).

On the other hand, many motifs of Horace's poetry could be easily made to coincide with the ethical and religious tenets of education at the KMA: for instance, reflection on the brevity of human life, the impossibility of achieving complete happiness, the avoidance of excesses, contentment with little, love of virtue and the like.

¹¹³ Cf. Li Vigni 2005: 28 ff.

Through the elaboration of pagan authors in a Christian key and the foundation of their own Parnassus on the hills of Kyiv¹¹⁴, Mohylian teachers aimed at including their institution in European *Latinitas*. Indeed, the examples that I have illustrated show that the education and the assimilation of the Classics that was part of it at the KMA, shared the same absorption of ancient learning in Christian thinking that took place in the schools (of different confessions) of contemporary Western Europe¹¹⁵.

¹¹⁴ Cf. the recurring images in the Mohylian poetics of the Pindaric *locus amoenus*, which now finds itself on the hills of Kyiv with the attributes pertaining to it: the clear pegasean spring, the thick foliage of laurel, the steep and inaccessible mountain path reserved to a few, the summit of the acquired poetic art.

¹¹⁵ Cf., for instance what the Protestant Georg Fabricius writes in the introductory poem (addressed to the poetics students) of his *De re poetica libri VII*, Lipsiae 1589: “Carminum divinum celebratur nomen, et usus / ille vetus nostro tempore durat adhuc. [...] Disce bona imparibus iungere verba modis. / His Domino grates ut possis dicere Christo, / et sanctas dulci voce referre preces” (“With poems the divine name is celebrated, and that / ancient custom still continues in our time. [...] Learn how to join good words with uneven rhythms. / So that with them you may say thanks to Christ the Lord, / and offer holy prayers with a sweet voice”).

Conclusions

The reception of Horace in the Mohylian poetics, especially as regards the areas of poetic theory, metrics and lyric poetry, as my analysis has shown, was strongly influenced by the didactic purposes of the manuals themselves. Having first-hand knowledge of Horace, the authors generally drew whatever best suited their didactic approach from his works: in doing so, they apparently limited themselves to a functional and therefore partial understanding of the Latin classic, leaving aside a more comprehensive understanding of his poetic oeuvre. The poetics manuals do not, of course, reflect the entire didactic process, but represent the most reliable source available to us for reconstructing the teaching practice of literary theory and praxis at the KMA.

The general poetics described in detail the nature, ends, scope, subject matter and other important features of poetry such as *imitatio*, *inventio*, *dispositio*, and *elocutio*: in this section authors made ample use of Horace's legacy of literary theory, and drew Horatian ideas from their original context and at times modified them to serve a moralistic and functional conception of poetry. According to such a conception, poetry was an excellent tool in the hands of learned men to accomplish specific tasks, such as civilizing human mores, handing down the brave deeds of ancestors and their praises to posterity, extolling outstanding examples of virtues and dissuading people from vice. Moreover, according to such a conception, poetry was required first of all to form and educate devout Christian believers, and to imbue them with moral values, such as scorn for material goods and riches, the cultivation of virtue, love and care for their neighbours, for their homeland and so on.

And thus, on the one hand, Horace was made a champion of a didactic stance and a moralistic conception of poetry. On the other, his teachings were adopted for questions of style, diction and metrics, as well as other aspects of literary expression. For instance, Horace's words on *decorum*, i.e. on appropriacy, particularly in the related fields of *dispositio* and *elocutio*, but also as regards *inventio*, were widely used by Mohylian authors to formulate specific prescriptions for their pupils, devised to suit their own need to emphasize one aspect or another. The need for *decorum* in the elaboration of a style appropriate to a specific genre was reiterated in the particular poetics, and in that section the authors again turned to Horace for help. Indeed, the consideration by Mohyl-

anian poetics teachers (following Renaissance literary theorists and critics) of poetry within rhetorical categories and as a didactic tool to pursue the ends of moral philosophy made Horace's *Ars Poetica* extremely congenial to them. In particular, this vision manifested itself in the need for the artist to conform to the expectations of the audience in all aspects of the poem: the guiding principle in this respect was *decorum*. As to Horace's other 'literary' epistles, Mohylian authors mainly turned to them for statements on the origin and the usefulness of poetry, on the role of the poet, and for advice for those who set about composing poetry, and aimed at writing good poetry.

Another aspect of the composition of poetry on which Mohylian poetics teachers particularly insisted was the need for methodical and assiduous exercise, which could make up for any lack of natural talent: here too they validated their statements and their advice to their students with Horace's words.

When they turned to Horace for 'help', Mohylian poetics teachers at times felt free to change the original text, modifying some lines, excluding others, or else re-wording Horace's assertions, whether to illustrate the divine inspiration of poetry, to add *movere* to the ends of poetry¹, or to make Horace a 'supporter' of Christian virtues. This process was in line with the tendency in ecclesiastical institutions of the time, whether Catholic, Protestant or Orthodox, especially after the Reformation and subsequent Counter-Reformation, to make poetry a rhetorical instrument of Christian morality. It is no surprise that this tendency also appeared in the quotation of Horace's poetry (single lines or stanzas) in order to illustrate single metrical lines and metrical systems (among which I have illustrated the Sapphic and Alcaic stanzas, which were the most widely exemplified and used, together with the dactylic hexameter, both in the Mohylian poetics and in contemporary Ukrainian Neo-Latin poetry).

In order to better understand the poetics teachers' selective approach to Horace's and other authors' poetry (Latin and Neo-Latin), we should recall that in the conception of poetry propounded by the Mohylian poetics the ethical aim came first; as for the aesthetic end of poetry, it was mainly comprised in precepts concerning *decorum* and a style suitable for each specific genre. Such poetry was not called upon to express the poet's inner emotions and feelings: the latter were mostly conceived as the expression of moral virtues or, as in the case of panegyric poetry, as the expression of admiration for characters who fully embodied those virtues and were therefore presented to the budding poets as models to follow and emulate.

The poet's goal was to embody the most eminent virtues in the characters represented, by using appealing poetical language. In order to do this, he could and should creatively imitate one or more chosen models. Indeed, *imitatio operis* or *auctorum* was a necessary step and one of the four indispensable elements for composing 'good' poetry, and it constituted one way for the aspiring poets to practise *exercitatio*, which was another of the four fundamentals for a good

¹ Which, once again, manifests the penchant for considering any art of speech in rhetorical categories.

poet, a central one indeed. The choice of Horace and of his Christian ‘interpreters’ or ‘emulators’ was a natural one. In fact, there were many reasons for choosing Horace’s poetry, besides its constituting a model of Lyric meters. Indeed, Mohylanian authors mainly turned to Horace not for those odes or verse lines that could be considered ‘lyrical’ in the common sense of this word, but rather to those verse lines that were the expression of a poetry of thought, which sprang from reflections rather than from direct emotions. Horace’s diction, as has been observed, has a rhetorical orientation, often being addressed to a certain ‘you’ and taking the tone of an admonition-exhortation, and this is exactly what Mohylanian poetics teachers were looking for. Another feature that certainly attracted them was the fact that statements in Horace’s poetry are often not expressed with elaborate metaphors, but rather with images simply taken from life.

What also appealed to Mohylanian teachers in the Horatian lyric was the way the Latin classic gave natural phenomena a symbolic meaning with reference to human life (cf. for instance *Carm.* I, 4; I, 9; II, 3; II, 10; IV, 7, and others). Indeed, if we pay attention to the fragments quoted by Mohylanian authors to exemplify the different metrical systems, we can see that nearly all of them display the aforementioned features. Moreover, at times the poet’s thoughts on human relationships are only hinted at with a few words, and are expressed through the metaphoric representation of nature².

Furthermore, Mohylanian authors were also attuned to what Wilkinson defines as the oratorical features of Horace’s language, its artistry, which expressed itself in a particular sensitivity “to sounds and rhythms and to the architectural construction of sentences”³.

Being clerics of an Orthodox institution, Mohylanian poetics teachers in their didactic practice avoided motifs connected with erotic love. For this reason they were particularly attuned to the Christian interpretation and elaboration of Horace. Christian Horatianism dated back a long time, since the first Christian poet to be called the “Christian Horace”, had been Prudentius (348-ca. 405). He made ample use of Horace’s lyric meters in his poetry and in his hymns, and for the first time Horace’s lyric settings and his lexical resources were deftly transferred to new Christian contexts.

As we have seen in the third chapter, the centuries-long Christian interpretation of Horace, in authors such as George Buchanan and especially Horace’s brilliant seventeenth-century Polish ‘interpreter’, Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski, occupied a prominent place in the Mohylanian poetics reception of Horace through the composition of poetry, which was a mandatory exercise for pupils attending this course.

As regards the Christianization of Horace’s poetic legacy, which followed a trend already established in other European schools, it took three forms: parody, the resumption of Horace’s single lines and/or lexical units as well as met-

² On the relationship between Horace and nature, see the chapter *Il sentimento della natura* in Pasquali 1920: 521-553.

³ Wilkinson 1980: 134.

rical schemes to express Christian concepts, and the use of Horatian meters for the composition of poems on Christian topics. These three modes were in line with the Christian interpretation/imitation of Horace which had begun in Western Europe in the first centuries after Christ and continued in different forms well into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Indeed, for Jesuit pedagogy, which inspired education at the KMA, poetry was a veritable ‘spiritual exercise’, a sort of poetic theology⁴. With its metrical virtuosity and bright verbal craftsmanship Horace’s poetry revealed itself to be an exceptional source for the introduction of Christian content (in the parodies and in quantitative Latin poetry that adopts Horatian meters). On the other hand, many motifs of Horace’s poetry could easily be made to coincide with the ethical and religious principles of education at the KMA: for instance, the reflection on the brevity of human life, the impossibility of achieving complete happiness, the avoidance of excesses, contentment with little, self-sufficiency, love of virtue, fortitude in the face of adversity and death.

And thus, in the opening poems which were found at the beginning of a few manuals, and were addressed to the pupils, Mohylian professors used Horace in a twofold way: on the one hand, they reminded their pupils that although talent is necessary when composing poetry, unless accompanied by diligent application and exercise, it is not enough to turn anyone into a poet worthy of that lofty name⁵, able to accomplish the primary goal of poetry, which they stressed, on the other hand, is that of keeping the memory of great men and their feats alive for future generations (thus elaborating on the same idea expressed in Horace’s *Carm.* IV, 8).

In their literary practice, the Mohylian teachers themselves set about disproving the Platonic contention that poets are liars and that poetry arouses negative passions, by often choosing their material from history, and by taking human actions as the principal subject matter of poetry. In doing this, both teachers and novice poets applied Horace’s conception of poetry as the depository of glorious memories of important historical figures: quite a few poetic works in the Mohylian poetics were panegyrics, i.e. belonging to the epideictic genre, or other poems belonging to the epic genre.

Moreover, as I mentioned earlier, the narration of praiseworthy men’s deeds in hymns and praises constituted an excellent means to promote models of virtue that the readers would both admire and wish to emulate. The main criterion for such a depiction was verisimilitude, i.e. the different modes of idealization (following Aristotle, poets were instructed to represent what could have or ought to have happened, more than what actually happened) were acceptable as long as they made the narration credible.

At the basis of a successful poetic depiction was Horace’s teaching on the ‘amicable’ union of *natura* and *ars*: all authors of poetics, with their insistence on constant exercise, provided a practical demonstration of this necessity.

⁴ Cf. Li Vigni 2005: 28 ff.

⁵ See Siedina 2012a.

By elaborating selected pagan and Christian authors and the foundation of their own Parnassus on the hills of Kyiv in a Christian key⁶, Mohylian teachers aimed at including their institution in European *Latinitas*. Indeed, the examples that I have illustrated show that education, and the assimilation of the Classics that took place at the KMA, were part and parcel of the way in which ancient learning was integrated in Christian thinking in the various confessional schools of contemporary Western Europe. Further research into the Mohylian poetics, especially as regards specific literary genres, will most probably confirm that Kyivan authors did not stand aside from West European cultural and literary trends but actively partook in them.

⁶ Cf. footnote 114 of Chapter 3.

Bibliography

I. MANUSCRIPT SOURCES

1. *Poeticarum institutionum breve compendium* (1671), NBU, IR, call number ДС / П 233, f. 14-30.
2. *Fons Castalius in duplices rivulos solutam scilicet et ligatam orationem Kijovo-Mohilaeanis musis consecratus felici auspicio emanavit Anno Domini 1685*, NBU, IR, call number 656 / 446 C, f. 1-81.
3. *Cunae Bethleemicae* (1686-1687), NBU, IR, call number 499 П / 1729, f. 1-298.
4. *Camoena in Parnasso Kijovo-Mihilaneo [sic] ad suavissimum caelestis musae Mariae modulamen duplici oratoris poeticoque sono inter amoena litterariorum ludorum spectacula suum devote exhibens tenorem anno coelitus orbi astra ex quo sevii gaudia Musa* (1686/1688), NBU, IR, two manuscripts, 1. call number 657 / 448 C; 2. call number 658 / 449 C, f. 1-121.
5. *Cytheron bivertex irriguis poetico-oratorii eloquii fontibus rorans in collegio Mohilaeano polonis neovatibus errectus atque clarissimae cytheroniadi castissimae Virgini Mariae sacratus anno quo Filius aeterni Patris hanc dimissus in oram* (1694-1695), NBU, IR, call number ДС / П 235, f. 1-189.
6. *Lyra variis praeceptorum chordis ad edendam civilem et palestricam vocem conformem voci in deserto clamantis sancti Ioannis Baptistae Apollinaeo pollice instructa anno quo Deus e superis verbum pax bona locutus* (1696), two manuscripts, 1. NBU, IR, call number 501 П / 1719, f. 1-64; 2. L'vivs'ka Naukova Biblioteka Akademii Nauk Ukraïny im. V. Stefanyka (Lviv Scientific Library of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine), Viddil Rukopysiv, Arkhiv L'vivs'koï arkhi-dijeceziï (Manuscript Section, Archive of Lviv Archdiocese), call number N. 22.
7. *Rosa inter spinas seu Ars poeseos suos continens difficultatum aculeos concluso horto Mariae in debitum venerationis cultum dedita atque neopoetis ad carpendum ex ea tam ligati quam soluti eloqui fructum in Helicone Mohilaeano explicata anno quo Deus quaeque potens laurum construxit ab Ozov* (1696-1697), NBU, IR, two manuscripts, 1. call number 665 / 456 C, f. 1-230; 2. call number ДС / П 237, f. 1-103.
8. *Hymettus extra Atticam duplici tramite neovatibus scandendus seu Poesis bipartita tum ligatae tum solutae orationis praeceptionibus instructa Roxolanaeque iuventuti in Collegio Kijovo-Mohilaeano proposita Anno quo Turca ab deleto*

- pax nota gubernat in orbe hlc DoMnans terrIs Cara teraXque VIret* (1699), NBU, IR, call number 315 П / 122, f. 1-186.
9. *Fons Castalius ad hauriendum sitiēti eruditae iuventuti intra montana Kijoviae in Collegio Kiovo-Mohileano excussus et caet ... anno Domini quo deliberaturis honores fluxerat ad cunas postquam aqua vivax* (1700), NBU, IR, call number ДС / П 239, f. 1-189.
 10. *Cedrus Apollinis pharetrati Rossiaco Orpheo ob bicornem exstruendam cytharam bino poeseos et rhetorices stylo instructam ad concessum pennis gloriae mentibus ac montibus instans in bicolli Kijovo-Mohyleano Parnasso erecta et ad fluvium Borysthenem pegaseis fontibus irrigata anno 1702*, NBU, IR, call number ДС / П 241, f. 1-209.
 11. *De arte poetica libri III ad usum et institutionem studiosae iuventuti Roxolanae dictati in orthodoxa Academia Mohyleana anno Domini 1705*, NBU, IR, call number ДС / П 248, f. 1-116 (Teofan Prokopovyč's treatise of poetics)
 12. *Arctos in Parnasso Mohilo Mazepiano exorta Neo equites humanioris litteraturae Orthodoxos Pegasum gerentes bino idearum cursu ad altiora tam ligati quam soluti eloquii culmina evehens anno quo bella parat Rossus spreto de Caesare mota*, 1705, NBU, IR, call number ДС / П 245, f. 89-175.
 13. *Idea artis poeseos ad usum et institutionem studiosae iuventuti Roxolanae tradita in orthodoxa Kijoviensi Academia a reverendissimo patre Laurentio Gorka professore poeseos anno quo praesule Barlaamo Kijoff detracta parentat scilicet 1707 Iacobi Rudinski*, NBU, IR, two manuscripts, 1. call number 505 П / 1721, f. 175-415, 2. call number ДА / П 420, f. 1-361.
 14. *Lyra Heliconis intra regiam aviti tentorii supremi domini maecenatis patris pastoris illustrissimi sanctissimo digito citata atque geminum solutae nempe et ligatae orationis melos in alma Mohilomazepiana Academia Roxolanis neovatis eiusdem benedictionis auspiciis concinnans ... sub reverendo patre Paisio Klepic*, 1709, NBU, IR, call number 674 / 463 C, f. 1-183.
 15. *Libri tres de arte poetica ad eruditionem et scientiam nobili ac generosae iuventuti Roxolanae traditi in Kievomohileano Collegio anno incarnatae Sapientiae 1714 mense Octobri 8*, NBU, IR, call number 509 П / 1718, tom 1, f. 123-208.
 16. *Parnassus alias Apollinis cythara nobis exercitium poeticum in Collegio Kievo mohileano traditum et explicatum anno verbi Incarnati 1719 in annum 1720*, NBU, IR, two manuscripts: 1. call number ДС / П 252, f. 1-254; 2. call number 509 П / 1718, tom II, f. 1-275.
 17. *Fons Poeseos*, 1721, NBU, IR, call number 316 П / 119, f. 1-152.
 18. *Apollo musaeo Rossiacae Palladis Praesidens seu Praecepta Poeseos explanans anno quo Cara Salus visit Rossos in pace togata 1722*, NBU, IR, call number 317 П / 120, f. 1-164.
 19. *Via poetarum ad fontes castalidum vario genere tam ligatae quam solutae orationis redundantes annuo cursu trita atque in tres metas divisa, quarum prima in se includit constructiones artis poeseos, secunda praecepta periodorum et chriae, tertia epistolarum anno facti Viatoris de caelo in terram Dei vigesimo*

- septingesimo 24, 1724*, NBU, IR, four manuscripts: 1. call number ДС / П 254, f. 1-308; 2. call number 682 / 481 C, f. 1-141; 3. call number ДС / П 255, f. 1-122; 4. call number ДА/877JI, f. 36-167.
20. *Officina praestantissimae artis Poeticae diligentibus Rossiacae Minervae operariis edita atque omnium idoneo praeceptorum cultu adornata per reverendum patrem Isaatium Chmarny anno Domini 1726-1727*, NBU, IR, call number 686 / 482 C, f. 1-352.
 21. *Via ingenuos poeseos candidatos in bicollem Parnassum et ad prima Palatii eloquentiae atria ducens et iisdem in Kijovo-Mohileano orthodoxo Collegio ostensa et resecta anno Domini 1729 sub reverendissimo patre Theophano Trochymowicz tradente Poesim anno Domini 1729 laborante Petro Stafanowicz*, NBU, IR, two manuscripts: 1. call number 687 / 477 C, f. 1-131; 2. call number 320 П / 118, f. 2-106.
 22. *Tabulae praeceptorum Poeseos in Parnasso Kijovomohileano traditae atque ad usum Roxolanae iuventuti per capita et puncta explicatae ex anno reparationis nostrae 1729 in annum 1730 neovatibus repraesentante*, NBU, IR, call number 321 П / 109, f. 1-168.
 23. *Praecepta de arte poetica in usum Roxolanae iuventuti in alma ac orthodoxa Kijovo- Mohylo-Zaborowsciana Academia tradita et explicata 1735*, NBU, IR, call number ДА П / 424, f. 1-38.
 24. *Epitome meditationis poeticae circa amplificationis rudimenta, cultum orationis utriusque et ligaturam versificam in Academia Russorum Orthodoxa Kijovomohilaeana iuventuti patriae explicata ex anno salutis 1734 in annum 1735*, NBU, IR, call number 690 / 485 C, f. 1-84.
 25. *Via lactea in praeclaro coelo almae orthodoxae Academiae Kiovo-Mohylo-Zaborowscianae proposita duplici tramite ligata scilicet et soluta oratione scandenda ingenuis neovatibus Roxolanae iuventutis ad bicollem Parnassum notitiam nimirum artis Poeseos et principiorum Tullianae eloquentiae anhelantibus declarata eXitIt Ut MUnDIs CeLsa saLUtIs In astra haC oVIUM praesul DUX Raphael fUerat (1735-1736)*, NBU, IR, two manuscripts: 1. call number 322 П / 101, f. 163-308; 2. call number 690 / 485 C, f. 141-277.
 26. *Hortus poeticus legendi gratia flores et fructus ligatae et solutae orationis in alma Kijoviensi Academia Mohylozaborowsciana in maius alimentum Roxolano abdolonimo eiusque orthodoxae patriae penes Iordanicum et marianum pontum pastinatus Anno quo eXIMle LeCta Urbs gLaDIIs ozoV IUssIt Anno Calendis 8bris 1 1736 Anno*, NBU, IR, two manuscripts: 1. call number ДС / П 261, f. 1-207; 2. call number 521 П / 1710, f. 1-184.
 27. *Regia regis animorum Apollinis, id est structura Poeseos in supremis Parnassi collibus erecta generosae iuventuti Roxolanae in almo Athenaeo Kijovo-Mohylo-Zaborowsciano anno Supremi Regis regum 1739 in annum 1740 ad inhabitandum tradita*, NBU, IR, call number 326 П / 103, f. 3-47.
 28. *Liber de arte poetica in duas classes ligatam scilicet et solutam orationem divisus et in almakijov[isic]-Mohylo-Zaborowsciana Academia publice tractatus ex anno Domini 1742 in annum Domini 1743 mense Septembris 24 die sub reverendissimo professore Sylvestro Dobryna*, NBU, IR, call number 691 / 682 C, f. 9-164.

29. *Praecepta de arte poetica ad usum Roxolanae iuventuti in alma orthodoxa et celeberrima Kijovo Mihilo-Zaborowsciana [sic] Academia tradita et explicata per Tych. Alexadrowicz 1743*, NBU, IR, call number 326 П / 103, f. 53-156.
30. *Praecepta de arte poetica ex authoribus, qui genuinam poeseos rationem attigerunt summatim cum pernecessariis observationibus collecta atque ad usum studiosae iuventuti in alma et orthodoxa Academia Mohilo-Zaborowsciana tradita nec non explicata sub reverendissimo patre professore poeseos Georgio Konysky 1746*, NBU, IR, call number ДА / П 426, f. 1-166.
31. *Theophani Procopowicz de arte poetica libri III in compendium redacti*, NBU, IR, call number 698 / 491 C, f. 1-33.
32. *Carmina Lyrica per omnia genera ab Horatio usurpata*, NBU, IR, call number 509 П / 1718, tom III, f. 1-92.
33. *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, Rukopysy, n. 407 I, f. 1-84.

II. PUBLISHED SOURCES

- | | |
|------------------------|--|
| Acron 1902-1904: | H. Acron, <i>Pseudacronis scholia in Horatium vetustiora</i> . Recensuit Otto Keller, I-II, Lipsiae 1902-1904. |
| Ahrens 1984: | R. Ahrens, <i>The Poetics of the Renaissance and the System of Literary Genres</i> , in: E. Wolff, U. Broich, Th. Stemmler, G. Strattman (eds.), <i>Functions of Literature. Essays presented to Erwin Wolff on his sixtieth birthday</i> , Tübingen 1984, pp. 101-117. |
| Askočenskij 1856: | V. Askočenskij, <i>Kiev s drevnejšim ego učiliščem akademieju</i> , II, Kyiv 1856. |
| Badius Ascensius 1500: | J. Badius Ascensius (Bade, Joss), <i>Ars poetica [...] Horatii [...] cum explanatione Iodocii Badii Ascensii</i> , Paris 1500. |
| Baldassarri 1986: | G. Baldassarri, <i>Generi letterari e tradizione epica nei Poetices Libri</i> , in: Cubelier de Beynac, J. and Magnien, M. (éd. par), <i>Acta Scaligeriana: actes du colloque international organisé pour le cinquième centenaire de la naissance de Jules-César Scaliger (Agen 14-16 sept. 1984)</i> , Agen 1986, pp. 87-105. |
| Baldwin 1959: | Ch.S. Baldwin, <i>Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice. Classicism in the Rhetoric and Poetic of Italy, France, and England 1400-1600</i> , Gloucester (MA) 1959 ² . |

- Bentley 1825: R. Bentley, *Notae atque emendationes in Q. Horatium Flaccum integrae, nunc separatim usui critico diligentissime typis exscriptas, cum ipsis indicibus Bentleianis*, Bassi, Quedlinburgi et Lipsiae 1825.
- Berkov 1968: P. N. Berkov, *Russkie novolatinskie i grečeskie poety XVII-XX vekov*, "Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves", XVIII, 1968, pp. 14-54.
- Bienkowski 1976: T. Bienkowski, *Antyk w literaturze i kulturze staropolskiej (1450-1750). Główne problemy i kierunki recepcji*, Wrocław 1976.
- Boldrini 1999: S. Boldrini, *Prolegomeni ad una nuova edizione del De generibus metrorum quibus Horatius Flaccus et Severinus Boetius usi sunt di Niccolò Perotti*, "Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica", LXI (N.S.), 1999, 1, pp. 105-125.
- Boldrini 2011: S. Boldrini, *La prosodia e la metrica dei Romani*, Roma 2011.
- Bolgar 1963: R. R. Bolgar, *The Classical Heritage and Its Beneficiaries*, Cambridge 1963³.
- Brink 1963: C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry. Prolegomena to the Literary Epistles*, Cambridge 1963.
- Brink 1971: C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry. The Ars Poetica*, Cambridge 1971.
- Brink 1982: C. O. Brink, *Horace on Poetry. Epistles Book II: The Letters to Augustus and Florus*, Cambridge 1982.
- Brogi 2004: G. Brogi, *The Hetman and The Metropolitan. Cooperation Between State and Church in The Time Of Varlaam Jasyns'kyj*, in: G. Siedina (ed.), *Mazepa e il suo tempo: storia, società, cultura – Mazepa and His Time: History, Society, Culture*, Alessandria 2004, pp. 417-444.
- Brogi Bercoff 1999: G. Brogi Bercoff, *O jazykovej situácii v Velikom Kniazestve Litovskom i v Rossii (konec XVI-načalo XVIII veka)*, "Studia Russica", XVII, 1999, pp. 11-21.
- Budzyński 1975: J. Budzyński, 'Parodia' i 'palinodia' horacjanska w liryce M. K. Sarbiewskiego. Studium z techniki poezji barokowej, "Meander", XXX, 1975, pp. 88-108.
- Budzyński 1985: J. Budzyński, *Horacjanizm w liryce polsko-lacińskiej Renesansu i Baroku*, Wrocław 1985.
- Bulgakov 1843: M. Bulgakov, *Istorija Kievskoj Akademii*, Sankt-Peterburg 1843.
- Busch 1964: W. Busch, *Horaz in Russland*, München 1964.

- Buszewicz 2006: E. Buszewicz, *Sarmacki Horacy i jego liryka. Imitacja – gatunek – styl. Rzecz o poezji Macieja Kazimierza Sarbiewskiego*, Kraków 2006.
- Cairns 1986: F. Cairns, *The 'Poetices Libri Septem' of J. C. Scaliger: An Unexplored Source*, "Res Publica Litterarum", IX, 1986, pp. 49-58.
- Charipova 2006: V. L. Charipova (Šaripova), *Latin books and the Eastern Orthodox clerical elite in Kiev, 1632-1780*, Manchester-New York 2006.
- Chyžnjak 2001: Z. I. Chyžnjak (upor.), *Kyjevo-Mohyljans'ka Akademia v imenach XVII-XVIII st.*, Kyiv 2001.
- Chyžnjak 2002: Z. I. Chyžnjak, *Rektory Kyjevo-Mohyljans'koji Akademiji. 1615-1817 rr.*, Kyiv 2002.
- Curtius 1953: E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, New York 1953.
- Cyhanok 1999: O. Cyhanok, *Z istoriji latyns'kych literaturnych vplyviv v ukrajins'komu pys'menstvi XVI-XVIII st.*, Kyiv 1999.
- Cyhanok 2000: O. Cyhanok, *Horacij v kyjivs'kych poetykach*, "Medijevistyka" (Odesa), 2000, 2, pp. 94-101.
- Cyhanok 2014: O. Cyhanok, *Funeral'ne pys'menstvo v ukrajins'kych poetykach ta rytorykach XVII-XVIII st.: teorija ta vzirci*, Vinnycja 2014.
- Cytowska 1983: M. Cytowska, *Studia Neolatina. Pięć odczytów*, Wrocław 1983.
- Čyževs'kyj 2003: D. Čyževs'kyj, *Literaturnyj ukrajins'kyj barok: narysy*, Charkiv 2003².
- Davis 2010: G. Davis (ed.), *A Companion to Horace*, Chichester (West Sussex)-Malden (MA) 2010.
- Donati 1631: A. Donati, *Ars poetica Alexandri Donati senensis e Societate Iesu libri tres*, Romae 1631.
- Doroškevyč 1979: V. I. Doroškevyč, *Novolatinskaja poezija Belorussii i Litvy: pervaja polovina XVI v.*, Minsk 1979.
- Dovhalevs'kyj 1973: M. Dovhalevs'kyj, *Poetyka (Sad poetyčnyj)*, transl. by V. P. Masljud, Kyiv 1973.
- Duckworth 1966: G. E. Duckworth, *Studies in Latin Hexameter Poetry*, "Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association", XCVII, 1966, pp. 67-113.
- Eleonskaja 1974: A. S. Eleonskaja, *Posmertnyj panegirik Petru I v stenach Slavjano-Greko-Latinskoj Akademii*, "XVIII vek", IX, 1974, pp. 259-269.

- Fabricius 1589: G. Fabricius, *De re poetica*, Lipsiae 1589.
- Farrell 1970: A. P. Farrell, SJ, (ed.), *The Jesuit Ratio Studiorum of 1599*, Washington D.C. 1970.
- Ferri 2007: R. Ferri, *The Epistles*, in: S. Harrison (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 121-131.
- Fiske 1929: G. C. Fiske, *Cicero's De Oratore and Horace's Ars Poetica*, Madison (WI) 1929.
- Fitzpatrick, Ball, Mayer 1933: E. A. Fitzpatrick, A. R. Ball, M. H. Mayer (eds.), *St. Ignatius and the Ratio Studiorum: Translations, the Constitutions, part IV, by Mary Helen Mayer; the Ratio studiorum, by A.R. Ball*, New York 1933.
- Ford 1982: Ph. J. Ford, *George Buchanan Prince of Poets*, with an Edition (Text, Translation, Commentary) of the *Miscellaneorum Liber* by Ph. J. Ford, W. S. Watt, Aberdeen 1982.
- Fraenkel 1966: E. Fraenkel, *Horace*, Oxford 1966.
- Fraenkel 1993: E. Fraenkel, *Orazio*, Italian edition ed. by Salvatore Lilla, Roma 1993.
- Friis-Jensen 1995a: K. Friis-Jensen, *Commentaries on Horace's Art of Poetry in the incunable period*, "Renaissance Studies", IX, 1995, 2, pp. 228-239.
- Friis-Jensen 1995b: K. Friis-Jensen, *Horace and the Early Writers of Arts of Poetry*, in: S. Ebbesen (hrsg.), *Geschichte der Sprachtheorie 3. Sprachtheorien in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, Tübingen 1995, pp. 360-401.
- Friis-Jensen 2007: K. Friis-Jensen, *The Reception of Horace in the Middle Ages*, in: S. Harrison (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 291-304.
- Gasparov 1970: M. L. Gasparov, *Poezija Goracija*, in: M. L. Gasparov, *Kvint Goracij Flakk. Ody. Epody. Satiry. Poslanija*, Moskva 1970, pp. 5-38.
- Gasparov 1986: M. L. Gasparov, *Srednevekove latinskie poetiki v sisteme srednevekovej grammatiki i ritoriki*, in: M. L. Gasparov, *Problemy literaturnoj teorii v Vizantii i latinskom srednevekov'e*, Moskva 1986, pp. 91-169.
- Gasparov, Ruzina 1978: M. L. Gasparov, E. G. Ruzina, *Vergilii i vergilianskie centony (poetika formul i poetika reminiscencij)*, in: P. A. Grincer, E. M. Meletinskij (red.), *Pamjatniki knižnogo eposa*, Moskva 1978, pp. 190-211.
- Giangrande 1966: G. Giangrande, *Emendation d'une crux Horatienne*, "Eranos", LXIV, 1966, pp. 82-84.

- Głębicka 1993: E. J. Głębicka (ed.), *Horacy i polski horacjanizm. Materiały z sesji naukowej zorganizowanej w Warszawie w dniach 26-27 września 1992 roku przez Polskie Towarzystwo Filologiczne i Wydział I Nauk Społecznych Polskiej Akademii Nauk w dwutysięczną rocznicę śmierci Horacego* (Series: *Acta Societatis Philologiae Polonorum*, vol. 1), Polskie Towarzystwo Filologiczne, Warszawa 1993.
- Glei, Seidel 2006: R. F. Glei, R. Seidel (hrsg.), *'Parodia' und Parodie. Aspekte intertextuellen Schreibens in der lateinischen Literatur der Frühen Neuzeit*, Tübingen 2006.
- Głombiowska 1978: Z. Głombiowska, *Inspiracje elegijne w i księdze "Piesni" Jana Kochanowskiego*, "Meander", XXXIII, pp. 147-158 and 211-223.
- Głombiowska 1981: Z. Głombiowska, *Przekład czy imitacja renesansowa?*, "Meander", XXXVI, pp. 251-259.
- Golden 2010: L. Golden, *Reception of Horace's Ars Poetica*, in: G. Davis (ed.), *A Companion to Horace*, Chichester (West Sussex)-Malden (MA) 2010, pp. 391-413.
- Golubev 1901: S. Golubev, *Kievskaja Akademija v konce XVII i načale XVIII stoletii*, Kyiv 1901.
- Grabowicz 2009-2010: G. Grabowicz (Hrabovyč), *"Mylost' Bozhii, Ukraynu... svobodyvshaia..." and Ukrainian Literature after (and before) Poltava: The Missing Link*, "Harvard Ukrainian Studies", XXXI, 2009-2010, 1-4, pp. 535-552.
- Grimal 1968: P. Grimal, *Essai sur l'Art poétique d'Horace*, Paris 1968.
- Hack 1916: R. K. Hack, *The Doctrine of Literary Forms*, "Harvard Studies in Classical Philology", XXVII, 1916, pp. 1-65.
- Hardison 1962: O. B. Hardison Jr., *The Enduring Monument. A Study of the Idea of Praise in Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice*, Chapel Hill (NC) 1962.
- Hardison, Golden 1995: O. B. Hardison, L. Golden, *Horace for Students of Literature. The "Ars poetica" and its Tradition*, Gainesville (FL) 1995.
- Herrick 1946: M. T. Herrick, *The Fusion of Horatian and Aristotelian Literary Criticism, 1531-1555*, Urbana (IL) 1946.
- Hight 1949: G. Hight, *The Classical Tradition: Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature*, New York 1949.
- Hnatjuk 1993: O. Hnatjuk, *Do pereocinky literaturnoho procesu XV-XVIII st. (Ohljad publikacij davn'oji ukrajins'koji literatury)*, in: O. Myšanyč (upor.), *Jevropejs'ke vi-drodžennja ta ukrajins'ka literatura XIV-XVIII st.*, Kyiv 1993, pp. 237-266.

- Hnatjuk 1994: O. Hnatjuk, *Ukrajins'ka duchovna barokkova pisnja*, Warszawa 1994.
- Hoppius 1690: D. Hoppius (Hopf), *Parodiae in Libros Odarum et Epodon Quinti Horatii Flacci rebus sacris maximam partem accommodatae a M. Davide Hoppio [...]*, Brunsvigae 1690.
- Horace 1482: *Horatius Flaccus Quintus Opera*, Com. C. Landinus, Florentiae 1482.
- Horace 1970: Horace, *Horace. Satires, Epistles, Ars Poetica*, with an English Translation by H. Rushton Fairclough, London-Cambridge (MA) 1970¹¹.
- Horace 1989: Horace, *Epistles Book II and Epistle to the Pisones ('Ars poetica')*, edited by Niall Rudd, Cambridge 1989.
- Horace 1991-1994: Horace (Q. Orazio Flacco), *Le opere*, Introduzione di Francesco Della Corte, testo critico di Paola Venini, Traduzioni di Luca Canali, I (bks. 1-2) - II (bks. 1-4) Roma 1991-1994.
- Horace 1994: Horace, *Horace's Odes and Epodes*, translated with an Introduction and Commentary: David Mulroy, Ann Arbor 1994.
- Horbenko 1995: Je. Horbenko, *Kyjevo-Mohyljans'ka Akademijska Architekturnyj narys*, Kyiv 1995.
- Hrabovyč 1992: H. Hrabovyč, *Pytannja kryzy i perelomu v samousvidomlenni ukrajins'koji literatury*, "Slovo i čas", 1992, 1, pp. 38-44.
- Hughes 1892: Th. Hughes, *Loyola and the Educational System of the Jesuits*, New York 1892.
- Ijsewijn 1986: J. Ijsewijn, *Julius Caesar Scaliger hypercriticus: Les Poetes latins postclassiques juges par J.-C. Scaliger*, in: J. Cubelier de Beynac, M. Magnien (éd. par), *Acta Scaligeriana: actes du colloque international organisé pour le cinquième centenaire de la naissance de Jules-César Scaliger (Agen 14-16 sept. 1984)*, Agen, 1986, pp. 119-127.
- Ijsewijn, Sacré 1990: J. Ijsewijn, D. Sacré, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies. Part I. History and Diffusion of Neo-Latin Literature*. Leuven 1990².
- Ijsewijn, Sacré 1998: J. Ijsewijn, D. Sacré, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies. Part II. Literary, Linguistic, Philological and Editorial Questions*, Leuven 1998².
- Iurilli 1998: A. Iurilli, *L'opera di Orazio fra editoria e scuole umanistiche*, in: *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Bariensis. Pro-*

- ceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Neo Latin Studies, Bari 29 August to 3 September 1994*, (Series: *Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies*, vol. 184), Tempe (AZ) 1998, pp. 329-336.
- Ivan'o 1981: I. Ivan'o, *Očerok razvitija estetičeskoj mysli Ukrainy*, Moskva 1981.
- Kadlubovskij 1899: A. Kadlubovskij, 'Pravila piitičeskie' Apollosa Bajbakova, "Žurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosvješčenija", 1899, 7, pp. 189-240.
- Kolinec' 1988: V. V. Kolinec', *Pro stan ta problemy doslidžennja latynomovnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji spadščyny*, in: V. Rusanivs'kyj (upor.), *Rol' Kyjevo-Mohyljans'koji akademiji v kul'turnomu jednanni slov'ians'kych narodiv*, Kyiv 1988, pp. 169-178.
- Korž 1970: N. H. Korž, *Pereklady tvoriv Horacija na Ukrajinu (XVIII-XIX st.)*, "Inozemna filolohija", 1970, 20, pp. 68-73.
- Krekoten' 1963: V. I. Krekoten', *Bajky v ukrajins'kij literaturi XVII-XVIII st.*, Kyiv 1963.
- Krekoten' 1981: V. I. Krekoten', *Kyjivs'ka poetyka 1637 roku*, in: O. V. Myšanyč (upor.), *Literaturna spadščyna Kyjivs'koji Rusi i ukrajins'ka literatura XVI-XVIII st.*, Kyiv 1981, pp. 118-154.
- Krekoten' 1992: V. I. Krekoten', *Osvitnja reforma Petra Mohyly i utveržennja baroko v ukrajins'kij poeziji*, *Zapysky NTS* (Series: *Praci filolohičnoji sekciji*), CCXXIV, 1992, pp. 7-24.
- La Penna 1993: A. La Penna, *Saggi e studi su Orazio*, Firenze 1993.
- Leonhardt 1989: J. Leonhardt, *Dimensio syllabarum. Studies zur lateinischen Prosodie-und Verslehre von der Spätantike bis zur frühen Renaissance. Mit einem ausführlichen Quellenverzeichnis bis zum Jahr 1600*, Göttingen 1989 (= *Hypomnemata*, 92).
- Lewin 1968: P. Lewin, *Wykłady poetyki w szkolach rosyjskich od konca wieku XVII do roku 1774*, "Slavia Orientalis", 1968, 2, pp. 153-157.
- Lewin 1972: P. Lewin, *Wykłady poetyki w uczelniach rosyjskich XVIII w. (1722-1774) a tradycje polskie*, Wrocław 1972.
- Lewin 1974: P. Lewin, *Nieznana poetyka kijowska z XVII wieku*, in: S. Kozak (ed.), *Z dziejów stotunków literackich polsko-ukraińskich*, Wrocław 1974, pp. 71-90.

- Liburkin 2000: D. L. Liburkin, *Russkaja novolatinskaja poezija: materialy k istorii. XVII-pervaja polovina XVIII veka*, Moskva 2000.
- Li Vigni 2005: A. Li Vigni, *Poeta quasi creator. Estetica e poesia in Mathias Casimir Sarbiewski*, Palermo 2005.
- Luckaja, Sidorova 1979: F. I. Luckaja, I. M. Sidorova, *Istoki i osnovnye linii razvittija latynojazyčnoj literatury XVI-XVIII vv. na Ukraine i v Rossii*, "Visnyk Charkivs'koho Universytetu. Filolohija", CLXXXIII, 1979, 12, pp. 59-63.
- Ludwig 1993: W. Ludwig (ed.), *Horace. L'oeuvre et les imitations. Un siècle d'interprétation*, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1993 (= Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique, 39).
- Łużny 1966a: R. Łużny, *Pisarze kręgu Akademii Kijowsko-Mohylańskiej a literatura Polska. Z dziejów związków kulturalnych polsko-wschodniosłowiańskich w XVII-XVIII w.* Kraków 1966 (= Zeszyty naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, CXLII, Prace historycznoliterackie, 11).
- Łużny 1966b: R. Łużny, *Poetika Feofana Prokopoviča i teorija poezii v Kievo-Mogiljanskoj Akademii (pervaia polovina XVIII v.)*, in: D. S. Lichačev, G. P. Makogonenko, I. Z. Serman (red.): *XVIII vek; Sbornik statei i materialov. Rol' i značenie literatury XVIII veka v istorii russkoj kul'tury: K semidesiatiletiju so dnja roždenija člen-kor. AN SSSR P. N. Berkova*, VII, Moskva 1966, pp. 47-53.
- Łużny 1974: R. Łużny, *Dawne piśmiennictwo ukraińskie a polskie tradycje literackie*, in: S. Kozak (red.), *Z dziejów stosunków literackich polsko-ukraińskich*, Wrocław 1974, pp. 7-36.
- Magnien 1986: M. Magnien, *Le statut d'Horace dans les Poetices libri VII*, in: C. Balavoine, P. Kaurens (éd.), *La statue et l'empreinte. La poétique de Scaliger*, Paris 1986, pp. 19-33.
- Martindale, Hopkins 1993: Ch. Martindale, D. Hopkins (eds.), *Horace Made New. Horatian Influences on British Writing from the Renaissance to the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge 1993.
- Masenius 1654: J. Masenius (Masen), SJ, *Palaestra eloquentiae ligatae*, Herman Demen, Coloniae Agrippinae 1654.
- Masljuk 1977: V. P. Masljuk, *Teorija končetto u vitčyznjanych latynomovnych poetykach XVII-peršoji polovyny XVIII st.*, "Inozemna filolohija", 1977, 45, pp. 103-110.
- Masljuk 1983: V. P. Masljuk, *Latynomovni poetyky i rytoryky XVII-peršoji polovyny XVIII st. ta jich rol' u rozvytku teoriji literatury na Ukrajinu*, Kyiv 1983.

- Masljuk 2002: V. P. Masljuk, *Davnja ryms'ka poezija v ukrajins'kych perekladach i perespivach. Chrestomatija*, L'viv 2002.
- Michałowska 1974: T. Michałowska, *Staropolska teoria genologiczna*, Wrocław 1974 (= *Studia Staroploskie*, 41).
- Michel 1986: A. Michel, *Scaliger entre Aristote et Virgile*, in: J. Cubelier de Beynac, M. Magnien (éd. par), *Acta Scaligeriana: actes du colloque international organisé pour le cinquième centenaire de la naissance de Jules-César Scaliger (Agen 14-16 sept. 1984)*, Agen 1986, pp. 63-73.
- Mikołajczak 1994: A. W. Mikołajczak, 1994, *Antyk w poezji Macieja Kazimierza Sarbiewskiego*, Poznań 1994 (= *Prace Instytutu Filologii Klasycznej – Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza*).
- Moss 2008a: A. Moss, *Horace in the Sixteenth Century: Commentators into Critics*, in: G. P. Norton (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism. Volume III. The Renaissance*, Cambridge 2008, pp. 66-76.
- Moss 2008b: A. Moss, *Literary Imitation in the Sixteenth Century: Writers and Readers, Latin and French*, in: G. P. Norton (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism. Volume III. The Renaissance*, Cambridge 2008, pp. 107-118.
- Muret 1564: M. A. Muret, *Horatius, M. Antonii Mureti in eundem annotationes. Aldi Manutii de metris Horatianis; eiusdem annotationes in Horatium*, Lugduni 1564.
- Muščak 1960: Ju. F. Muščak, *Ovidii u "Poetyci" Feofana Prokopovyča*, in: M. J. Bilyk (upor.), *Publii Ovidii Nazon. Do 2000-riččja z dnja narodžennja*, L'viv 1960, pp. 53-68.
- Nalyvajko 1972a: D. S. Nalyvajko, *Ukrajins'ke barokko v konteksti jevropis'koho literaturnoho procesu XVII st., "Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo"*, 1972, 1, pp. 30-47.
- Nalyvajko 1972b: D. S. Nalyvajko, *Ukrajina i jevropis'ke vidrodžennja, "Vitčyzna"*, 1972, 5, pp. 183-199.
- Nalyvajko 1972c: D. S. Nalyvajko, *Kyjevo-Mohyljans'ka Akademija i Jevropa, "Vsesvit"*, 1972, 7, pp. 185-199.
- Nalyvajko 1976: D. S. Nalyvajko, *Svit Barokko, "Vsesvit"*, 1976, 3, pp. 185-206.
- Nalyvajko 1981: D. S. Nalyvajko, *Kyjivs'ki poetyky XVII-počatku XVIII st. v konteksti jevropis'koho literaturnoho procesu*, in: O. V. Myšanyč (upor.), *Literaturna spadščyna Kyjivs'koji Rusi i ukrajins'ka literatura XVI-XVIII st.*, Kyiv 1981, pp. 155-195.

- Niedźwiedz 2003: J. Niedźwiedz J., *Nieśmiertelne teatra sławy*, Kraków 2003.
- Niedźwiedz 2005: J. Niedźwiedz, *Značennja škil'noji rytoryky v Ukrajiniv peršij polovyni XVIII st.*, "Schid / Zachid", VII, 2005, pp. 13-22.
- Niehl 2006: R. Niehl, *Parodia Horatiana. Parodiebegriff und Parodiedichtung im Deutschland des 17. Jahrhunderts*, in: R. F. Gleis, R. Seidel (hrsg.), *'Parodia' und Parodie. Aspekte intertextuellen Schreibens in der lateinischen Literatur der Frühen Neuzeit*, Tübingen 2006, pp. 11-45.
- Nisbet 2007: R. G. M. Nisbet, *Horace: life and chronology*, in: S. Harrison (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 7-21.
- Nisbet, Hubbard 1970: R. G. M. Nisbet, M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I*, Oxford 1970.
- Nisbet, Hubbard 1978: R. G. M. Nisbet, M. Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II*, Oxford 1978.
- Nisbet, Rudd 2004: R. G. M. Nisbet, N. Rudd, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III*, Oxford 2004.
- Norden 1905: E. Norden, *Die Composition und Litteraturgattung der horazischen Epistula ad Pisones*, "Hermes", XL, 1905, pp. 481-528.
- Obbink 2014: D. Obbink, *New Poems by Sappho*, "Times Literary Supplement", 5 February 2014, available at: <<https://www.the-tls.co.uk/articles/public/new-poems-by-sappho/>> (accessed 30 November 2017).
- Okenfuss 1995: M. J. Okenfuss, *The Rise and Fall of Latin Humanism in Early-Modern Russia. Pagan Authors, Ukrainians, and the Resiliency of Muscovy*, Leiden 1995.
- Pasquali 1920: G. Pasquali, *Orazio lirico*, Firenze 1920.
- Peretc 1900: V. Peretc, *Istoriko-literaturnye issledovanija i materialy, I. Iz istorii russkoj pesni*, n.p., Sankt-Peterburg 1900.
- Petrov 1866: N. I. Petrov, *O slovesnych naukach i literaturnych zanjatjach v Kievskoj Akademii ot načala eja do preobrazovanija v 1819 g.*, "Trudy Kievskoj Duchovnoj Akademii", 1866, II (7), pp. 305-331; III (11), pp. 343-388; III (12), pp. 552-569, n.p.
- Petrov 1867: N. I. Petrov, *O slovesnych naukach i literaturnych zanjatiach v Kievskoj Akademii ot načala eja do preobrazovanija v 1819 g.*, "Trudy Kievskoj Duchovnoj Akademii", 1867, I (1), pp. 82-123, n.p.

- Petrov 1868: N. I. Petrov, 1868, *O slovesnych naukach i literaturnych zanjatiach v Kievskoj Akademii ot načala eja do pre-obrazovanija v 1819 g.*, "Trudy Kievskoj Duchovnoj Akademii", 1868, I (3), pp. 465-525, n.p.
- Petrov 1875: N. I. Petrov, *Opisanie rukopisej Cerkovno-Archeologičeskogo muzeja pri Kievskoj Duchovnoj Akademii*, I, n.p., Kiev 1875.
- Petrov 1877: N. I. Petrov, *Opisanie rukopisej Cerkovno-Archeologičeskogo muzeja pri Kievskoj Duchovnoj Akademii*, II, n.p., Kiev 1877.
- Petrov 1879: N. I. Petrov, *Opisanie rukopisej Cerkovno-Archeologičeskogo muzeja pri Kievskoj Duchovnoj Akademii*, III, n.p., Kiev 1879.
- Petrov 1891: N. I. Petrov, *Opisanie rukopisnych sobranij nachodjaščichsja v gorode Kieve*, I, n.p., Moskva 1891.
- Petrov 1895: N. I. Petrov, *Kievskaja Akademija vo vtoroj polovine XVII veka*, "Trudy Kievskoj Duchovnoj Akademii", 1895, II (8), pp. 586-622; III (9), pp. 36-56; III (10), pp. 201-256; III (12), pp. 574-632, n.p.
- Petrov 1897: N. I. Petrov, *Opisanie rukopisnych sobranij nachodjaščichsja v gorode Kieve*, II, n.p., Moskva 1897.
- Petrov 1904: N. I. Petrov, *Opisanie rukopisnych sobranij nachodjaščichsja v gorode Kieve*, III, n.p., Moskva 1904.
- Plett 1983: H. F. Plett, *The Place and Function of Style in Renaissance Poetics*, in: J. J. Murphy (ed.), *Renaissance Eloquence. Studies in the Theory and Practice of Renaissance Rhetoric*, Berkeley 1983, pp. 356-375.
- Pontanus 1594: J. Pontanus J., *Poeticarum institutionum libri III*, Ingolstadii 1594.
- Popov 1959: P. M. Popov, *Z istoriji poetyky na Ukrajinі (XVII-XVIII st.)*, in: O. I. Bilec'kyj, F. Ja. Šlom (red.), *Materialy do vyvčennja istoriji ukrajins'koji literatury*, I, Kyiv 1959, pp. 393-403.
- Prokopovič 1961: F. Prokopovič, *Sočinenija*, pod red. I. P. Eremina, Moskva-Leningrad 1961.
- Pylypjuk 1989: N. Pylypjuk, *The humanistic school and Ukrainian literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries*, unpublished PhD thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge (MA) 1989.
- Pylypjuk 1993: N. Pylypjuk, *Kyjivs'ki poetyky i renesansni teoriji mystectva*, in: O. Myšanyč (upor.), *Jevropejs'ke vi-*

- drožennja ta ukrajins'ka literatura XIV-XVIII st.*, Kyiv 1993, pp. 75-109.
- Quintilian 1920-1922: Quintilian, *The institutio oratoria of Quintilian*, Cambridge (MA)-London 1920-1922.
- Rjezanov 1925-1929: V. Rjezanov, *Drama ukrajins'ka: Starovynnyj teatr ukrajins'kyj*, I-V, Kyiv 1925-1929 (= Zbirnyk Istoryčno-filolohičnoho Viddilu Vseukrajins'koji Akademiji nauk, 7).
- Rjezanov 1931: V. Rjezanov, *Do istoriji borot'by literaturnych styliv. Poetyka Renesansu na terytoriji Ukrainy ta Rosiji*, "Zapysky Nižyns'koho instytutu social'noho vcho-vannja", XI, 1931, pp. 30-86.
- Robert 2006: J. Robert, *Nachschrift und Gegengesang. Parodie und parodia in der Poetik der Frühen Neuzeit*, in: R. F. Gleis, R. Seidel (hrsg.), *'Parodia' und Parodie. Aspekte intertextuellen Schreibens in der lateinischen Literatur der Frühen Neuzeit*, Tübingen 2006, pp. 47-66.
- Rose 1993: M. A. Rose, *Parody: Ancient, Modern and Post-modern*, Cambridge 1993.
- Rostagni 1988: A. Rostagni, *Orazio*, introd. by I. Lana, Venosa 1988.
- Russell 2006: D. A. Russell, 'Ars poetica', in: A. Laird (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism* Oxford 2006 (= Oxford Readings in Classical Studies), pp. 325-345.
- Sarbiewski 1647: M. K. Sarbiewski, SJ, *Mathiae Casimiri Sarvievii Lyricorum libri IV, Epodon liber unus alterque epigrammatum ...*, Parisiis 1647.
- Sarbiewski 1958: M. K. Sarbiewski, SJ, *Praecepta poetica (Wykłady poetyki)*, przeł. i oprac. S. Skimina, Wrocław 1958.
- Sarnowska-Temierusz 1969: E. Sarnowska-Temierusz, *Świat mitów i świat znaczeń. Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski i problemy wiedzy o starożytności* Wrocław 1969 (= Studia staropolskie, 24).
- Sarnowska-Temierusz 1974: E. Sarnowska-Temierusz, *Droga na Parnas. Problemy staropolskiej wiedzy o poezji* Wrocław 1974 (= Studia staropolskie, 43).
- Sarnowska-Temierusz 1985: E. Sarnowska-Temierusz, *Zarys dziejów poetyki (Od starożytności do końca XVII w.)*, Warszawa 1985.
- Sazonova 1996: L. I. Sazonova, *K ponjatiju elogiarnogo stilja v rusckoj poezii XVII veka*, "Slavjanovedenie", 1996, 1, pp. 102-113.
- Sazonova 2002: L. I. Sazonova, *Imia v ritorike i poezii XVII veka u vo-stočnych slavjan*, "Slavjanovedenie", 2002, 1, pp. 4-22.

- Scaliger 1651: J. C. Scaliger, *Poetices libri septem*, Lugduni 1651.
- Sellin 1986: P. R. Sellin, *Sources of Julius Caesar Scaliger's Poetices Libri Septem as a Guide to Renaissance Poetics*, in: J. Cubelier de Beynac, M. Magnien (éd. par), *Acta Scaligeriana: actes du colloque international organisé pour le cinquième centenaire de la naissance de Jules-César Scaliger (Agen 14-16 sept. 1984)*, Agen 1986, pp. 75-86.
- Shackleton Bailey 2008: D. R. Shackleton Bailey (ed.), *Horatius Opera*, Stuttgart 2008.
- Šaripova 2000: L. V. Šaripova, *Vnutrišnij ustrij ta funkcionuvannja biblioteki Kyievo-Mohyljans'koi Akademiji do požeži 1780 r.: sprobna rekonstrukciji*, in: *Rukopysna ta knyžkova spadščyna Ukrajinjy*, VI, Kyiv 2000, pp. 75-90.
- Siedina 2005: G. Siedina, *Neo-Latin Poetry in the Kyivan Poetics: Ukraine in the European Latinitas*, in: G. Brogi Bercoff, G. Lami (eds.), *Ukraine's Re-Integration into Europe: A Historical, Historiographical and Politically Urgent Issue*, Alessandria 2005, pp. 197-226.
- Siedina 2006-2007: G. Siedina, *Horacij v kyjiv'skych poetykach: joho učennja pro poetyčnyj tvir-poesis-poeta*, in: M. Krykun, O. Sereda (upor.), *Confraternitas. Juvilejnyj zbirnyk na pošanu Jaroslava Isajevyča*, L'viv 2006-2007, pp. 363-383.
- Siedina 2007a: G. Siedina, *Il retaggio di Orazio nella poesia neolatina delle poetiche kieviane: alcuni modi della sua ricezione*, in: M. G. Bartolini, G. Brogi Bercoff (a cura di), *Kiev e Leopoli: il "testo" culturale*, Firenze 2007, pp. 11-36.
- Siedina 2007b: G. Siedina, *Un poema epico neolatino su Ivan Mazepa*, "Studi Slavistici", IV, 2007, pp. 85-115, available at: <<http://www.fupress.net/index.php/ss/article/view/2123/2044>> (accessed 30 November 2017).
- Siedina 2008: G. Siedina, *Bellica virtus: la celebrazione di Ivan Mazepa nelle poetiche kieviane. Spunti di riflessione*, in: M. Di Salvo, G. Moracci, G. Siedina (a cura di), *Nel mondo degli Slavi. Incontri e dialoghi tra culture. Studi in onore di Giovanna Brogi Bercoff*, II, Firenze 2008, pp. 571-581.
- Siedina 2011: G. Siedina, *The Poetic Laboratory of the Kyiv-Mohylan Poetics. Some Practical Illustrations*, "Studi Slavistici", VIII, 2011, pp. 41-60, available at: <<http://www.fupress.net/index.php/ss/article/view/10518/9905>> (accessed 30 November 2017).

- Siedina 2012a: G. Siedina, *Novolatyns'kij viršovani prysvjaty ta peredmovy do Kyjevo-Mohyljans'kych poetyk*, in: A. Danylenko, S. Vakulenko (hrsg.), *Studien zu Sprache, Literatur und Kultur bei den Slaven. Gedenkschrift für George Y. Shevelov aus Anlass seines 100. Geburtstages und 10. Todestages*, München-Berlin 2012, pp. 341-370.
- Siedina 2012b: G. Siedina, *Joasaf Krokovs'kyj nella poesia neolatina dei suoi contemporanei*, Bologna 2012.
- Siedina 2012c: G. Siedina, *Il concetto di virtù nella celebrazione epico-panegirica nella letteratura neolatina ucraina (fine del XVII-inizio del XVIII secolo)*, "Studi Slavistici", IX, 2012, pp. 243-271, available at: <<http://www.fupress.net/index.php/ss/article/view/12241/11605>> (accessed 30 November 2017).
- Sinko 1918: T. Sinko, *Poetyka Sarbiewskiego*, Kraków 1918.
- Sivokon' 1974: G. M. Sivokon' (Syvokin'), *Sad poetičeskij*, "Voprosy literatury", 1974, 5, pp. 254-260.
- Smirnov 1971: A. A. Smirnov, *K probleme sootnošenij russkogo predklassicizma i gumanističeskoj teorii poezii. F. Prokopovič i Ju. C. Skaliger*, in: V. I. Kulešov, A. N. Sokolov (pod red.), *Problemy teorii i istorii literatury: Sbornik statej, posvjaščennyh pamjati professora A. N. Sokolova*, Moskva 1971, pp. 67-73.
- Smith 1935: W. K. Smith, *Horace's Debt to Greek Literature*, "The Classical Review", XLIX, 1935, 3, pp. 109-116.
- Soroka 1997: M. Soroka, *Zorova poezija v ukrajins'kij literaturi kinca XVI-XVIII st.*, Kyiv 1997.
- Spies 1994: M. Spies, *Between Epic and Lyric: The Genres in J. C. Scaliger's Poetices Libri Septem*, in: H. F. Plett (ed.), *Renaissance-Poetik/Renaissance Poetics*, Berlin-New York 1994, pp. 260-270.
- Spingarn 1924: J. E. Spingarn, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*, New York 1924.
- Stawecka 1989: K. Stawecka, *Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski. Prozaik i poeta*, Lublin 1989.
- Sydorenko 1977: A. Sydorenko, *The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century*, Ottawa 1977.
- Syvokin' 2001: H. M. Syvokin', *Davni ukrajins'ki poetyky*, Charkiv 2001².
- Tarrant 2007a: R. Tarrant, *Horace and Roman Literary History*, in: S. Harrison (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 63-76.

- Tarrant 2007b: R. Tarrant, *Ancient receptions of Horace*, in: S. Harrison (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*, Cambridge 2007, pp. 277-290.
- Thomas 2011: R. F. Thomas, *Horace. Odes Book IV and Carmen Saeculare*, Cambridge 2011.
- Trofymuk 1989a: M. S. Trofymuk, *Antičnaja literatura v kursach slovesnosti Kievo-Mogiljanskoj akademii (XVII-XVIII vv.)*, Diss. [...] kand. filol. nauk: AN SSSR. Instytut literatury im. T. G. Ševčenko, Kyiv 1989.
- Trofymuk 1989b: M. S. Trofymuk, *Antyčna teorija slovesnosti v poetykach Kyjevo-Mohyljans'koji akademiji XVII-XVIII st.*, "Radjans'ke literaturoznavstvo", 1989, 4, pp. 61-70.
- Trofymuk 2009: M. S. Trofymuk, *Poetyka epochy Mazepy*, L'viv 2009.
- Ulčinaité 1995a: E. Ulčinaité, *Sarbiewski w retorykach XVII-XVII w. na Litwie. Sprawa imitacji*, Gdańsk 1995 (= Prace historyczno-literackie, 17. *Oświecenie, kultura, myśl*).
- Ulčinaité 1995b: E. Ulčinaité, *Tradycja i nowatorstwo w wykładach retoryki w kolegiach jezuickich w XVII-XVII w.*, in: *Jezuicka ars educandi. Prace ofiarowane Księdzu Profesorowi Ludwikowi Piechnikowi SJ.*, Kraków 1995.
- Urbański 2014: P. Urbański, *Cultural and National Identity in Jesuit Neo-Latin Poetry in Poland in the Seventeenth Century: The Case of Sarbiewski*, in: G. Siedina (ed.), *The impact of Latin Heritage on the Development of Identities in the Lands of the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania*, Firenze 2014, pp. 81-97.
- Uškalov 2002: L. Uškalov (ed.), *Barokova poezija Slobožanščyny: antologija*, Charkiv 2002.
- Vida 1527: M. G. Vida, *De arte poetica libri tres*, Romae 1527.
- von Albrecht 1995: M. von Albrecht, *Horaz und die europäische Literatur*, "Gymnasium", 1995, 102, pp. 289-304.
- Vossius 1647: G. J. Vossius (Voss), *Poeticarum institutionum libri tres*, Amstelodami 1647.
- Waquet 2004: F. Waquet, *Latino. L'impero di un segno (XVI-XX secolo)*, Milano 2004 (or. ed. *Le latin ou l'empire d'un signe. XVIe-XXe siècle*, Paris 1998).
- Weinberg 1961: B. Weinberg, *A History of Literary Criticism in the Italian Renaissance*, I, Chicago 1961.
- Weinberg 1970: B. Weinberg, *Trattati di poetica e retorica del Cinquecento*, I, Bari 1970.

- Wilkinson 1959: L. P. Wilkinson, *The Language of Virgil and Horace*, "The Classical Quarterly", IX (N.S.), 1959, 2, pp. 181-192.
- Wilkinson 1980: L. P. Wilkinson, *Horace and his Lyric Poetry*, Ann Arbor (MI)-London 1980.
- Zapasko, Isajevyč 1981-1985: Ja. P. Zapasko, Ja. D. Isajevyč, *Pam'iatky knyžkovoho mysteyctva: kataloh starodrukiv, vydanych na Ukrajinі, I. 1574–1700, II/1. 1700-1764*, L'viv 1981-1985.

Abstract

This monograph examines, for the first time, the reception of the poetic legacy of the Latin poet Horace (65 B.C.-8 B.C.) in the poetics courses taught at the Kyiv Mohyla Academy (seventeenth-first half of the eighteenth century). The author particularly devoted her attention to the reception of Horace in the areas of poetic theory, metrics, lyric poetry.

Quotations from Horace and references to his oeuvre have been divided according to the function they perform in the poetics manuals, the aim of which was to teach pupils how to compose Latin poetry. Three main aspects have been identified: the first consists of theoretical recommendations on such issues as the purpose of poetry and the role of the poet as well as the fundamental domains of *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*: such recommendations were indispensable for the would-be poets, and were taken mainly from Horace's *Ars poetica* (and to a lesser degree from Horace's other 'literary' epistles and satires). The second aspect is how Horace's poetry influenced the teaching of metrics and the exemplification of metrical schemes (among which the author has illustrated the Sapphic and Alcaic stanzas, which were widely exemplified and used, together with the dactylic hexameter, both in the Mohylanian poetics and in contemporary Ukrainian Neo-Latin poetry). The third important aspect concerns how Horace's works were imitated and his words or dicta borrowed in the composition of poetry, which was a mandatory exercise of the poetics course.

The analysis of these three aspects (each of which is treated in a separate chapter) shows that the reception of Horace at the Kyiv Mohyla Academy was strongly influenced by a vision of poetry as an instrumental science that served the ends of moral philosophy. Indeed, poetry was required first of all to form and educate devout Christian believers, to imbue them with moral values, such as scorn for material goods and riches, the cultivation of virtue, love and care for one's neighbours and so on.

This process was in line with the tendency in ecclesiastical institutions of the time, whether Catholic, Protestant or Orthodox, especially after the Reformation and subsequent Counter-Reformation, to make poetry a rhetorical instrument of Christian morality. In such poetry, therefore, what we could call the aesthetic purpose was totally subordinate to its moral purpose. In poetry so conceived there could be no room for our contemporary conception of the poet's inner emotions or feelings, and the categories of 'originality' or 'sincerity' in our understanding of

them are inapplicable. The poet's feelings were 'acceptable', so to say, inasmuch as they were the expression of those virtues or, as in the case of panegyric poetry, the expression of admiration for characters who fully embodied those virtues and were therefore proposed to the budding poets as models to be imitated.

Also, in the composition of poetry, teachers and budding poets were particularly attuned to the Christian interpretation and elaboration of Horace. Christian Horatianism dated far back, since the first Christian poet to be called the "Christian Horace" had been Prudentius (348-ca. 405). He made ample use of Horace's lyric meters in his poetry and in his hymns, and for the first time Horace's lyric settings and his lexical resources were deftly transferred to new Christian contexts.

The author shows how the centuries-long Christian interpretation of Horace, in authors such as George Buchanan and especially Horace's brilliant seventeenth-century Polish 'interpreter', Maciej Kazimierz Sarbiewski, occupied a prominent place in the Mohylian poetics' reception of Horace through the composition of poetry.

As regards the Christianization of Horace's poetic legacy, which followed a trend already established in other European schools, it took three forms: parody, the resumption of Horace's single lines and/or lexical units as well as metrical schemes to express Christian concepts, and the use of Horatian meters for the composition of poems on Christian topics. These three modes were in line with the Christian interpretation/imitation of Horace which had begun in Western Europe in the first centuries after Christ and continued in different forms well into the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Indeed, for Jesuit pedagogy, which inspired education at the KMA, poetry was a veritable 'spiritual exercise', a sort of poetic theology.

The research draws the conclusion that Horace's legacy was of paramount importance in the manuals analyzed: on the one hand the Mohylian poetics teachers' tendency (after Renaissance literary theorists and critics) to consider poetry within rhetorical categories rendered Horace's *Ars Poetica* extremely congenial to them. In particular, this vision manifested itself in the need for the artist to conform to the expectations of the audience in all aspects of the poem: the guiding principle in this respect was *decorum*. On the other, Horace's ideas were extrapolated from their original context and at times modified to serve a moralistic and 'utilitarian' conception of poetry. With its metrical virtuosity and brilliant verbal craftsmanship, Horace's poetry provided an excellent model for the introduction of Christian content.

The analysis of the way pagan authors (Horace first and foremost) were elaborated in a Christian key in the poetry composed by Mohylian teachers and pupils indicates that education (and with it the assimilation of the Classics) at the KMA was not extraneous to the integration of ancient learning in Christian thinking, as occurred in the different confessional schools of contemporary Western Europe.

Further research into the Mohylian poetics, especially as regards specific literary genres, will most probably confirm that Kyivan authors did not stand aside from West European cultural and literary trends but actively partook in them.

BIBLIOTECA DI STUDI SLAVISTICI

1. Nicoletta Marcialis, *Introduzione alla lingua paleoslava*, 2005
2. Ettore Gherbezza, *Dei delitti e delle pene nella traduzione di Michail M. Ščerbatov*, 2007
3. Gabriele Mazzitelli, *Slavica biblioteconomica*, 2007
4. Maria Grazia Bartolini, Giovanna Brogi Bercoff (a cura di), *Kiev e Leopoli: il "testo" culturale*, 2007
5. Maria Bidovec, *Raccontare la Slovenia. Narratività ed echi della cultura popolare in Die Ehre Dess Hertzogthums Crain di J.W. Valvasor*, 2008
6. Maria Cristina Bragone, *Alfavitari radi učenija malych detej. Un abbecedario nella Russia del Seicento*, 2008
7. Alberto Alberti, Stefano Garzonio, Nicoletta Marcialis, Bianca Sulpasso (a cura di), *Contributi italiani al XIV Congresso Internazionale degli Slavisti (Ohrid, 10-16 settembre 2008)*, 2008
8. Maria Di Salvo, Giovanna Moracci, Giovanna Siedina (a cura di), *Nel mondo degli Slavi. Incontri e dialoghi tra culture. Studi in onore di Giovanna Brogi Bercoff*, 2008
9. Francesca Romoli, *Predicatori nelle terre slavo-orientali (XI-XIII sec.). Retorica e strategie comunicative*, 2009
10. Maria Zalambani, *Censura, istituzioni e politica letteraria in URSS (1964-1985)*, 2009
11. Maria Chiara Ferro, *Santità e agiografia al femminile. Forme letterarie, tipologie e modelli nel mondo slavo orientale (X-XVII sec.)*, 2010
12. Evel Gasparini, *Il matriarcato slavo. Antropologia culturale dei Protoslavi*, 2010
13. Maria Grazia Bartolini, *"Introspece mare pectoris tui". Ascendenze neoplatoniche nella produzione dialogica di H.S. Skovoroda (1722-1794)*, 2010
14. Alberto Alberti, *Ivan Aleksandăr (1331-1371). Splendore e tramonto del secondo impero bulgaro*, 2010
15. Paola Pinelli (a cura di), *Firenze e Dubrovnik all'epoca di Marino Darsa (1508-1567). Atti della giornata di studi – Firenze, 31 gennaio 2009*, 2010
16. Francesco Caccamo, Pavel Helan, Massimo Tria (a cura di), *Primavera di Praga, risveglio europeo*, 2011
17. Maria Di Salvo, *Italia, Russia e mondo slavo. Studi filologici e letterari*, 2011
18. Massimo Tria, *Karel Teige fra Cecoslovacchia, URSS ed Europa. Avanguardia, utopia e lotta politica*, 2012
19. Marcello Garzaniti, Alberto Alberti, Monica Perotto, Bianca Sulpasso (a cura di), *Contributi italiani al XV Congresso Internazionale degli Slavisti (Minsk, 20-27 agosto 2013)*, 2013
20. Persida Lazarević Di Giacomo, Sanja Roić (a cura di), *Cronotopi slavi. Studi in onore di Marija Mitrović*, 2013
21. Danilo Facca, Valentina Lepri (edited by), *Polish Culture in the Renaissance*, 2013

22. Giovanna Moracci, Alberto Alberti (a cura di), *Linee di confine. Separazioni e processi di integrazione nello spazio culturale slavo*, 2013
23. Marina Ciccarini, Nicoletta Marcialis, Giorgio Ziffer (a cura di), *Kesarevo Kesarju. Scritti in onore di Cesare G. De Michelis*, 2014
24. Anna Bonola, Paola Cotta Ramusino, Liana Goletiani (a cura di), *Studi italiani di linguistica slava. Strutture, uso e acquisizione*, 2014
25. Giovanna Siedina (edited by), *Latinitas in the Polish Crown and the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Its Impact on the Development of Identities*, 2014
26. Alberto Alberti, Marcello Garzaniti, Stefano Garzonio (a cura di), *Contributi italiani al XIII Congresso Internazionale degli Slavisti (Ljubljana, 15-21 agosto 2003)*, 2014
27. Maria Zalambani, *L'istituzione del matrimonio in Tolstoj. Felicità familiare, Anna Karenina, La sonata a Kreutzer*, 2015
28. Sara Dickinson, Laura Salmon (edited by), *Melancholic Identities, Toska and Reflective Nostalgia. Case Studies from Russian and Russian-Jewish Culture*, 2015
29. Luigi Magarotto, *La conquista del Caucaso nella letteratura russa dell'Ottocento. Puškin, Lermontov, Tolstoj*, 2015
30. Claudia Pieralli, *Il pensiero estetico di Nikolaj Evreinov tra teatralità e 'poetica della rivelazione'*, 2015
31. Valentina Benigni, Lucyna Gebert, Julija Nikolaeva (a cura di), *Le lingue slave tra struttura e uso*, 2016
32. Gabriele Mazzitelli, *Le pubblicazioni dell'Istituto per l'Europa orientale. Catalogo storico (1921-1944)*, 2016
33. Luisa Ruvoletto, *I prefissi verbali nella Povest' vremennyh let. Per un'analisi del processo di formazione dell'aspetto verbale in russo*, 2016
34. Alberto Alberti, Maria Chiara Ferro, Francesca Romoli (a cura di), *Mosty mostite. Studi in onore di Marcello Garzaniti*, 2016
35. Pina Napolitano, *Osip Mandel'stam: i quaderni di Mosca*, 2017
36. Claudia Pieralli, Claire Delaunay, Eugène Priadko, *Russia, Oriente slavo e Occidente europeo. Fratture e integrazioni nella storia e nella civiltà letteraria*, 2017
37. Alessandro Farsetti, *Una voce parigina nel Futurismo russo: la poesia di Ivan Aksenov*, 2017