

OD KIJOWA DO RZYMU

Z dziejów stosunków Rzeczypospolitej ze Stolicą Apostolską i Ukrainą

pod redakcją M. R. Drozdowskiego, W. Walczaka, K. Wiszowatej-Walczak

Białystok 2012

Natalia Pylypiuk

EDMONTON

May the victorious cross be a sword in his hand *On a Morality* *Play by Mykhailo Kozachyns'kyi*

The title of this paper cites the concluding verse of «An Image of the Passions of this World, Rectified by the Figure of the Suffering Christ» (*Образ страстей міра сего образом страждущаго Христа исправися*),¹ a play performed in Kyiv in the early 1740s. Some scholars have attributed its authorship to the Mohylanian professor, Mykhailo Kozachyns'kyi. Among them, Nikolai (Mykola) Petrov was the first to describe the original manuscript and to indicate that the work was composed in honor of Rafail Zaborovs'kyi, who then occupied the throne in Kyiv's St. Sophia Cathedral. Petrov's argument was based on perceptive reading of the play's last scene.² Employing visual strategies of the Jesuit school theatre, this scene features thirteen "angels," who—besides holding emblems of the instruments of Christ's passion—recite verses that name elements of the coat of arms of Zaborovs'kyi (i.e., a heart in

¹ Cited, with omission of the hard sign [ѣ], according to: V. Riezanov, *Drama ukrainska. I. Starovynnyi teatr ukrains'kyi. Vypusk tretii: Shkil'ni diistva velykodn'oho tsykliu*, Kyiv 1925, p. 389. All subsequent references to this publication will be provided in the text of the article in the following fashion: (DU3: 389), and observe this minor spelling adjustment.

² N. I. Petrov, *Ocherki iz istorii ukrainskoi literatury XVII i XVIII vekov. Kievskaiia iskusetvennaia literatura XVII–XVIII vv., preimushchestvenno dramaticheskaiia*, Kyiv 1911, p. 285–293. See esp. 292–293.

flames, bearing the imprint of a cross, with a crown above it)³ and other families. Among the latter, the Dunins are specifically named by the Twelfth Angel, as is the reference to their heraldic bird, a swan.

Petrov also argued that in the 5th scene of the Second Act, the gods of war—“Bellona” and “Mars”—symbolize respectively “Russia” and the “warrior” who entered into union with tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich in 1654. In Petrov’s opinion, the gifts Bellona presents to Mars allude to the creation of the New Zaporozhian Sich on 31 March 1734. In the 6th scene, he claimed, Rebellion (*Bunt*) stands for “Mazepa’s betrayal.”

In Petrov’s estimation, the play was performed in 1739 or 1740 to celebrate the completed renovation of the Old Academic Building (*staroakademichnyi korpus*), which originally had been erected under Mazepa as a one-story building. The scholar bases his hypothesis on verses in the Third Act, in which Great Wisdom decides to inhabit forever the abode that has been prepared for her (*Се покой мой, ту вселюся вовіки* [DU3: 380]). Worth noting here is the fact that the upward expansion of the building, which was intended to accommodate Philosophy and Theology classrooms, as well as a Congregational Hall for student disputations, was actually completed in early 1739. However, the hall saw its first solemn gathering on 7 July 1739, when it was formally consecrated.⁴ This suggests that the performance of a Paschal play could not have taken place in the new Congregational Hall before Easter of 1740. Worth noting in this context is the fact that the consecration of the Church of the Annunciation, which was part of the newly expanded structure, took place as late as 19 November 1740.⁵

Scholars of the late nineteenth century established that it was the function of the poetics and rhetoric preceptor to compose plays for the Christmas and Easter celebrations, as well as other special occasions. Inasmuch as Petrov had no evidence that Kozachyns’kyi taught this sequence in the academic year 1739–1740, he set out to investigate the question of authorship, by identifying the similarities between some of the play’s characters and their eponymous counterparts in a 1734 drama, which clearly belongs to Kozachyns’kyi. Titled «A Tragedy, that is Sorrowful Tale,

³ Zaborovs’kyi’s coat of arms is preserved on the gate he built on the territory of St. Sophia Cathedral. This architectural monument has been recently restored; see the photographs on Wikipedia: <http://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Брама_Заборовського>

⁴ In 1739, an elaborate panegyric “Thesis,” engraved by Hryhorii Levyts’kyi was presented to Zaborovs’kyi as part of the celebrations marking the new building’s opening. See the reproduction in H.N. Lohvyn, *Z Hlybyn. Hraviury ukrains’kykh starodrukiv XVI–XVIII*, Kyiv 1990, ill. Nos. 90, 365 and 366.

⁵ See the entry: *Zaborovs’kyi, Mykhailo*, [in:] *Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia v imenakh XVII–XVIIIst. Entsyklopedychne vydannia*, ed. Z. I Khyzhniak, Kyiv 2001, p. 213.

about the Death of the Last Serbian Tsar, Uroš V, and about the Fall of the Serbian Tsardom» (*Трагедія, серъч печальная повѣсть о смерти послѣдняго царя сербскаго Уроша Пятаго и о паденіи Сербскаго царства*), this play was written in 1734, when Kozachyns'kyi taught in Sremski Karlovci, while on an educational mission to Serbia.

In this paper I propose that the primary goal of Kozachyns'kyi was to prepare a morality play to be performed during Easter week. I concur with Petrov that he pays tribute to Zaborovs'kyi in the play's last scene. But this does not detract from the fact that the work observes many of the strategies used by earlier Mohylian authors who wrote for the Pascahl season. Given that this is a morality play, I question whether the figures of Bellona, Mars, and Rebellion function unequivocally as symbols of Russia, Khmelnytskyi's union with the czar in 1654, and Mazepa's "betrayal" of 1712. Finally, I posit that the restoration of Kyiv's metropolitan see in 1743 motivated the laudatory conclusion to «An Image of the Passions of this World, Rectified by the Figure of the Suffering Christ» (henceforth, «An Image of the Passions...»). Politically, this event was much more important than the completion of the Old Academic Building.

In Ukrainian scholarship both Kozachyns'kyi and his literary activity have obtained minimal and sporadic attention. «An Image of the Passions...» was published for the first time in the September 1877 issue of *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii* by S. T. Golubev.⁶ Subsequently, Volodymyr Riezanov republished it—among compositions belonging to the Easter cycle—in his 1925 collection, *Drama ukrains'ka*, but without ever speculating about the identity of its author. In this publication, Riezanov also announced that the original manuscript had been lost.

In the last thirty years, the most significant and extensive discussion of Kozachyns'kyi and his oeuvre has been by Vlastimir Erčić, a historian of Serbian culture, who in 1980 published a monumental study, devoted in great part to the Sremski Karlovci play. He summarizes the arguments made at the turn of the last century by such scholars as N. Petrov, S. Maslov and V. Riezanov. Comparing the two works in greater detail, Erčić discusses the similarities between various characters, as well as the educational goal of the plays. Agreeing with Petrov's hypothesis, he concludes that the author of «An Image of the Passions...» was, undoubtedly, Kozachyns'kyi.⁷

In his 2005 study, devoted to early-modern Ukrainian drama, the Ukrainian scholar Mykola Sulyma merely mentions but does not study the play Kozachyns'kyi wrote in Serbia. He also mentions another play from 1744, «The Tender Mercy

⁶ See his *Dve dramatičeskiiia p'esy proshlago stoletiiia*, TKDA, 9 (1877), p. 616–665.

⁷ V. Erčić, *Manuil (Mihail) Kozáčinskij i njegovna Traedokomedija*, Novi Sad–Belgrade 1980, p. 211–218.

of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, Roman Emperor...» (*Благоутробіє Марка Аврелія Антоніна Кесаря Римскаго...*),⁸ and summarizes the plot of «The Image of the Passions...», considering it among works composed for Easter. But, like Riezanov before him, Sulyma does not speculate about its author's identity.⁹ More recently, in her 2008 monograph on Ukrainian drama, Paulina Lewin mentions Kozachyns'kyi only in reference to a panegyric declamation he wrote in 1744 for the Russian empress Elizaveta Petrovna, but does not discuss any of the plays he penned.¹⁰

Before I turn to the main focus of my paper, a few biographical notes about Kozachyns'kyi and the church hierarch he praises in the conclusion of his play are in order.

Baptized as Emmanuel (Manuilo, in the vernacular Ukrainian), Kozachyns'kyi was born in 1699, in the town of Iampil in the Bratslav Regiment, today the regional center of Vinnyts'ka oblast'. The son of Oleksandr, an impoverished nobleman, he studied at the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy from 1720 to 1733. During his studies he travelled to various European countries, and acquired competence in German. In 1731–32, while still studying Theology, he taught rhetoric at his alma mater.

At the end of 1733, Kozachyns'kyi headed a delegation consisting of six scholars, whom Rafaël Zaborovs'kyi—the then “Archbishop of Kyiv, Halych and All Little Rossiia”—sent to Serbia, on an educational mission, which had been envisaged by the Serbian metropolitan, V. Jovanović. In Sremski Karlovci, Kozachyns'kyi reorganized the local school, fashioning it after the Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium. He served as its prefect and rector, while simultaneously teaching Latin, poetics and rhetoric. It is here that in 1734 he composed for a school performance the aforementioned play about Tsar Uroš V.

This play, consisting of thirteen loosely connected scenes, contains an ardent defense of the establishment Kozachyns'kyi set up with his colleagues. Concluding with a representation of the seven liberal arts, it strongly emphasizes the importance of education for the wellbeing of a polity. Its eleventh scene opens with a discussion between the gods of war, Mars and Bellona, who argue that Serbia does not need schooling. Pallas (i.e., the Greek goddess of wisdom)—whom Mars also calls by her Roman name, Minerva—teaches peace, whereas he and Bellona prefer to attain their goals by waging war. Both characters vow to evict wisdom, the unwanted newcomer. When Pallas enters, she first approaches Mars, arguing that it is difficult to be victorious without wisdom, and to celebrate victory without education:

⁸ M. Sulyma, *Ukraïns'ka dramaturhiia XVII–XVIII st.*, Kyiv 2005, p. 85.

⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 66.

¹⁰ P. Lewin, *Ukrainian Drama and Theatre in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, Edmonton 2008, p. 30.

*Кто когда без мудрости побьдигел бляше,
или без учения кто торжествоваше?
Е ли без учения Мар'сова сила
под Черными Горами Турка побьдила,
Темшваром, Белиградом, и под Варадином?* (Erčić: 531)

Pallas also criticizes Mars for praising his own power, while destroying education:

*[...] Но, почто Марс свою силу восхваляет,
и почто учение здѣ уничтожает?
[...] Соломон премудрости в главѣ третьей читите,
А прочитавше, молю да ся умудрите.* (Erčić: 531)

Her arguments are rejected by both Mars, who sees no need for her (*Но нам кая потреба мудрости?*) and Bellona, who proclaims that they will defend freedom with the sword (*Ми свободу саблюю будем защищати*). When Pallas replies that it is more beneficial to attain freedom without bloodshed (*Лучше без кровопролиття се имя стяжати*), Mars evicts her by force. As she departs, Pallas predicts that without educational institutions churches and justice will suffer, monasteries will fall and normal family relationships will disintegrate (Erčić: 531–532).

During his mission, Kozachyn's'kyi also served as a preacher in Croatia. On 13 February 1737, he was consecrated into the priesthood in Belovar; and in August of the following year, Kozachyn's'kyi returned to Kyiv with two members of the original mission (P. Padunov's'kyi and T. Klymov's'kyi). Upon his return, he first served in the city's Vydubyts'kyi Monastery; then in January 1740 he was tonsured, accepting the monastic name Mykhailo.

Earlier, in the fall of 1739, Kozachyn's'kyi had begun teaching at his alma mater. He became a professor of theology and conducted consecutively—until the end of the academic year 1745—three biennial courses on Aristotelian philosophy. The manuscript manuals he prepared in Latin for each of the courses he taught in Sremski Karlovci (1735) and later in Kyiv (1739, 1741 and 1743) have been preserved, allowing scholars the opportunity to study his strategies as a preceptor, as well as his philosophical tenets. The last of these, whose title begins with the words *Philosophia aristotelica ordine scholae peripatheticae ex consvestis in alma et orthodoxa Academia Kijvoho-Mohilo-Zaborovsciana...*, praises Zaborov's'kyi's successful efforts to revive in 1738 the teaching of Greek, Hebrew and German at the academy. It also acknowledges the restitution on 15 July 1743 of the Kyivan hierarch's title of metropolitan—*mitropolitae Kijoviensis, Haliciensis et Parvae Rossiae*—which, after

the death in 1718 of metropolitan Ioasaf Krokov'skyi, Mazepa's protégé, had been forbidden for twenty-five years.

Between June 1740 and June 1746, Kozachyns'kyi also served as prefect of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. During his tenure, he did much to improve the conditions of the buildings where students studied, lived and prayed, by courting the financial assistance of Zaborovs'kyi. He also supported the latter's efforts to circumvent the Russian Synod's rule forbidding Ukrainian scholars to publish in Ukraine.

In this period, Kozachyns'kyi authored another historical drama, the aforementioned work about Marcus Aurelius, which was performed by students of the academy on 5 September 1744, the birthday of empress Elizaveta Petrovna. Interestingly, Lviv's confraternity press published the play the subsequent year.

In 1744 Elizaveta Petrovna and her husband, Oleksandr Rozumovs'kyi, were in Kyiv on an extended visit. In conjunction with this, Kozachyns'kyi also penned a panegyric declamation for the imperial visitor, titled «To the Angel, holding the Charter, on the Triumphant Gates of the Kyiv-Caves [Monastery],» (*На триумфальных киево-печерних воротах, до ангела держащего хартию*), which—like the play—was most probably performed by students of the Academy.¹¹

Marcus Aurelius, the last of Rome's "Five Good Emperors," was a Stoic philosopher, whose writings in Greek reveal the manner in which he approached Plato's ideal ruler. By honoring the empress with a play devoted to him, the philosopher and school prefect, Kozachyns'kyi, implied that Elizaveta Petrovna is a contemporary analog of the Roman emperor. In this manner he courted her generosity toward the school. The priorities of the empress, however, were different. She donated only 1,000 rubles to the school, while giving 10,000 to the Caves Monastery.

On 17 March 1745 Kozachyns'kyi organized a philosophical disputation in Kyiv and had the Lviv confraternity press print it for him, under the title *Aristotelian Philosophy, published on the Basis of Intellections of the Peripatetic* [philosophers] (*Філософія Аристотелева, по умствованію перипатетиков изданная*). The edition was embellished with engravings by Ivan Fylypovych and the renowned Hryhorii Levyts'kyi, and contained a genealogy of the Rozumovs'kyi family, as well as panegyrics honoring both Oleksii and his younger brother, Kyrylo.

According to a recent encyclopedic entry by the Ukrainian scholar S. R. Kahamlyk, the monk Tykhin (bapt. Tymofii) Aleksandrovych expected to teach poetics in place of (zamist') M. Kozachyns'kyi during the academic year 1743–1744.¹²

¹¹ For a biography of Kozachyns'kyi and a list of his works, see the entry by M.D. Rohovych in: *Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia v imenakh XVII–XVIIIst. . .*, p. 262–263.

¹² Kahamlyk notes that Aleksandrovych, in expectation of the task, prepared a manual of poetics, titled *Praecepta de arte poetica ad usum Roxolanae juventutis in alma orthodoxa ac celeberrima*

This new information suggests that Petrov (and subsequent generations of scholars) worked under the incorrect assumption that Kozachyn's'kyi did not teach poetics in Kyiv, after his return from Serbia.¹³ This, however, does not necessarily explain the Mohylian prefect's activity as dramaturg and panegyrist in 1744–1745. Perhaps, other reasons need to be considered. For example, the fact that Zaborov's'kyi selected Kozachyn's'kyi to head the delegation to Serbia and, upon his return, approved his appointment as prefect, might indicate that he held his younger colleague in special esteem and entrusted him with the task of writing for celebratory occasions.

Various internal intrigues and the fact that Kozachyn's'kyi avoided the Synod's censorship, by publishing his works in L'viv, led to his "voluntary retirement" from the post of prefect in June of 1746.¹⁴ First he went to the Vydubys'kyi Monastery; then he was appointed as hegumen of St. Nicholas Monastery of Krasnohirs'k, in Hadiach. Finally, in 1748 he became archimandrite of Holy Trinity Monastery in Slutsk (Belarus'), within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. According to prince H. F. Radziwill, Kozachyn's'kyi died of jaundice on 4 August 1755.¹⁵

Kozachyn's'kyi's senior by 23 years, Rafail Zaborov's'kyi was born in 1676 in the town of Zboriv (presently the regional center of Ternopil' oblast) to a Roman Catholic nobleman and his Orthodox spouse. Opposing her husband's wishes, who sought to educate the boy in a Jesuit college, the mother sent young Mykhailo (his baptismal name) to the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. There he studied under Ioasaf Krokov's'kyi and Stefan Iavors'kyi. The latter took him to complete his studies at Moscow's Slavonic-Greek-Latin Academy and, subsequently, tonsured him. Zaborov's'kyi held various pedagogical and administrative posts in Russia between 1723

Kijovo-Mohylo-Zaborovsciana Academia tradita et explicata anno 1743 ad nobiles poeseos audiores reverendis patre T. Alexandrowicz. See his entry on T. Aleksandrovych in: *Kyjivo-Mohylianska akademiia v imenakh XVII–XVIII st....*, p. 31.

¹³ I have not been able to locate references to other preceptors of poetics during Kozachyn's'kyi's tenure as prefect. The sole exception being Varlaam Liashchev's'kyi, who taught in 1740–41 (see: *Kyjivo-Mohylianska akademiia v imenakh XVII–XVIII st....*, p. 338). Inasmuch as preceptors of rhetoric were often in charge of the full poetics-rhetoric sequence, it may be useful to enumerate those who taught during this period: Syl'vester Liaskoron's'kyi (1739–40), Ioann Kozlovych (1740–41), Arsenii P'iatnytskyi (1742–43), Tykhin Aleksandrovych and Syl'veter Dobryna (1743–44), Tykhin Aleksandrovych (1744–45, 1745–46), Dosefei Haliakhov's'kyi (1746–47). See Ia.M. Stratii, V.D. Lytvynov and V. A. Andrushko, Compilers. *Opisanie kursov filosofii i ritoriki professorov Kievo-Mogilianskoj Akademii*, Kyiv 1982, p. 98–108.

¹⁴ The opinions concerning this matter differ. Compare the view of Erčić, *Manuil (Mihail) Kozachinskij...*, 164–168 and the entry by M. D. Rohovych in: *Kyjivo-Mohylianska akademiia v imenakh XVII–XVIII st....*, p. 262.

¹⁵ For a discussion of his creativity during this period, see Erčić, *Manuil (Mihail) Kozachinskij...*, p. 244–246.

and 1731, when he returned to Kyiv to be enthroned as archbishop. The ceremony took place in the presence of hetman Danylo Apostol (1654–1734).

Zaborovs'kyi devoted much effort to the eparchy and especially to the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, initiating and completing numerous architectural projects on its campus and throughout Kyiv. The iconostasis in St. Sophia's Cathedral, which is in place today, was finished during his tenure. Zaborovs'kyi also blessed the ground for the erection of St. Andrew's church in the Podil area of Kyiv. He was, moreover, an active fundraiser, who sought to improve the living conditions of the academy's preceptors and students. In 1734, he formulated new rules for the academy, *Leges academicae docentibus et studentibus observandae*, in which he detailed the rights of students, as well as the duties of the rector, prefect and preceptors. Among his achievements were the introduction in 1738 of Hebrew and German courses, and the reinstatement of Greek, for which—as already mentioned—he received praise in one of Kozachyns'kyi's philosophy manuals. To teach these courses Zaborovs'kyi supported scholars of stature, such as S. Todors'kyi, V. Liashchevs'kyi and D. Nashchyns'kyi. The culminating moment of his career as a church leader was the restoration on 15 July 1743 of the Kyivan metropolitan see. On that day archbishop Zaborovs'kyi assumed the title of metropolitan, a title he held until his death on 29 November 1747.¹⁶

In my opinion, the importance of this victory for the Kyivan church hierarchy should not be underestimated. I suggest that this was the event, which prompted Kozachyns'kyi to compose a morality play for Easter 1744, concluding it with a special tribute to Zaborovs'kyi.

The prologue of «An Image of the Passions...» lauds the healing and eternal power of wisdom, contrasting it with the fleeting nature of the world and the destructive power of vanity:

*Тако непостоянна, тако неключима
В мір' суетою вся суть уничижима.
Єдину токмо мудрост от сих разд'ляю:
Сю бо єдину аз в'чнну быти знаю. (DU3: 349)*

Thus, although the play is ostensibly dedicated to a consideration of the passions of the world and the suffering of Christ, it foregrounds from the very outset the theme of wisdom. This theme is not unusual for plays of the Easter cycle, which address two important events in sacred history: (1) Pre-Eternal Wisdom's creation of Mankind along with the latter's self-willed fall from grace, and (2) the

¹⁶ For a biography of Zaborovs'kyi and a list of his works, see: *Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia v imenakh XVII–XVIII st....*, p. 213–214.

redemption of Mankind through the death and resurrection of Christ, who incarnates Pre-Eternal Wisdom on earth. In Kyivan paschal dramas, Wisdom as a rule is one of many characters. However, the play «Pre-eternal Wisdom...» of 1704 is one notable exception. Here, its eponymous hero takes center stage from the very beginning. Worthy of note here is the fact that the composition of this play complemented the cultural and political aspirations of metropolitan Varlam Iasyn's'kyi, hetman Ivan Mazepa's right hand in matters of the church.¹⁷

An Image of the Passions... consists of three acts. The first begins with opposing views of the world, expressed by a laughing Heracles and a lamenting (sic!) Democritus. Then the virtues and vices are personified in dialogues, conducted by characters drawn from scripture and classical mythology. The first to appear are Abel and Cain. The actions of the latter illustrate the sin of Fratricide. Then the Pharisee and the Tax Collector¹⁸ are presented with their respective counselors—Pride and Humility. In the second scene the World, the Flesh, the Devil and Polytheism extol themselves. Apostasy advises the World to turn away from God and to calmly enjoy itself. In the third scene Atlas complains about his burden and is consoled by Valour and Hope. In the fourth scene, Job expresses his gratitude to God, whereas three angels sing their praise unto heaven. The Devil promises to visit calamities upon him, but Job remains steadfast and is then consoled by three Messengers. In the fifth scene we encounter the Rich Man and Lazarus,¹⁹ who vehemently rejects the ill advise of his Neighbours. In the sixth scene the rich Merchant travelling to Jericho is attacked by Thieves and left in a sad state by the wayside. He is ignored by both Disdain and Uncharity. Then he is rescued by Charity and Love of Humanity (i.e., the Good Samaritan). As we can see, what unifies these seemingly disparate scenes is the manner in which they symbolically demonstrate the differences between good and evil, between good and poor judgment, between delusion and reality.

In the Second Act, “Rossia”²⁰ approaches an Astronomer, and inquires whether the season is propitious to begin the education of her sons. After consulting the

¹⁷ For a discussion of this topic, see my article, *The Face of Wisdom in the Age of Mazepa*, [in:] *Mazepa and his Time: History, Culture, Literature, Political Thought*, ed. G. Siedina, Alessandria 2004, p. 367–400. Also see my forthcoming article: *Mudrist' predvichmaia (1703) — drama-moralite dlja aristokrativ*. Special issue of *Kyivs'ka akademiia*, ed. N. M. Yakovenko and M. V. Jaremenko, expected: January 2012.

¹⁸ The Pharisee and the Tax Collector also appear in Kozachyn's'kyi's 1734 play. See: Erčić, 519–521.

¹⁹ The Rich Man and Lazarus also appear in Kozachyn's'kyi's 1734 play. See: Erčić, 539–549.

²⁰ For 18th c. Ukrainians this term signified their country, not Russia. Similarly, “rosskii” referred to Ukrainians. To avoid any anachronisms, I do not translate or modernize these terms, but present them in quotation marks.

heavens, he responds affirmatively and advises her to search for a teacher. Their conversation echoes that of Serbia and the Astronomer in Kozachyns'ky's play of 1734.²¹ The second scene introduces Pallas, who explains that no monarch or commander, no powerful man, famous or wealthy, can do without her. Those who do not recognize her are blind. Whosoever employs Pallas in their struggle attains victory. Through her, people are honest and wonderful, whereas without her their lives are not safe:

*Аз госпожа премудрости всѣми есм славила,
 Всяк, иже мене не вѣст, слѣп имжа очима.
 Кто убо таков может когда обрѣстися,
 Бы без моего могл дара вознестися?
 Нѣст цар, нѣст вожд, нѣст крѣпкій, славен и богатій,
 Дабы без мене сія улучил пріяти...
 Кто мудрости моя аще и во брани
 Возыскует, любезнь побіждает страни.
 [...]
 Мною суть челоуѣци честни и прекрасни,
 И вовсяком дѣль суть и будуть опасни.
 Без мене челоуѣка мертва чаю быти
 И весма во всем мирѣ аки бы нежити.
 Аз рачитилей своих мудрост достигнути
 Хотящ, наставляю на правыя пути.* (DU3: 366–367)

“Rossia” approaches Pallas with her three sons, calling her the *most loved mother of the young*. The goddess offers her assistance, which she gratefully accepts. Subsequently, Pallas invites the best teachers in the world: Apollo (an allegory of the Arts); Tullius (i.e., Cicero, a metonymy for Rhetoric), and Aristotle (a metonymy for Philosophy). Two of “Rossia’s” sons are well disposed to study with their new teachers, whereas the Third Son exits full of grief. He is followed by Disobedience and Transgression. In a rather humorous scene, the boy encounters Bacchus, whom he greets with joy and whose counsel he accepts. Rejecting a life in the *dark vale of wisdom* (*в темной ... мудрости долинь* (DU3: 371)), the boy proclaims that he and Bacchus will enjoy much merriment together. In the fourth scene king Solomon praises Wisdom, announcing that even those who wear royal purple and gold acknowledge Pre-Eternal Wisdom for she is the only one capable of bringing forth the fruit of life eternal. In turn, the king is praised by his Counselors and the

²¹ Erčić, 523–527.

Queen of Sheba, who brings him gifts. Solomon welcomes her quest for wisdom and exclaims that those who seek wisdom can subdue their enemies. Then Nero approaches Solomon, but covers his ears, so as not to hear his advice. Wisdom, according to Nero, is not eternal and does nothing but restrain the soul. He is supported by Audacity, Godlessness and Murder, whose counsel he heeds. Worthy of note here is the fact that all the scenes in the Second Act move quickly and contain many humorous and ironic moments. Performing as they do symbolical roles, these characters inhabit a theatrical space where historical time frames are completely irrelevant.

In the fifth scene, Bellona lavishes praise on herself and invites all those who are at war to join her:

*Кръпость моя и сила толь многа повсюду,
Коль от начатка міра не бьяше отнюду.
Сильна и славна в свѣті предзрюся одина,
Всякаго взира нища и лицарска сина.
[...]
Мною царіе свою разшириша славу,
Их же вѣнцем приодѣх и украсих главу:
Моим щитом таковий славен будет всюду;
Ему же аз повсегда помощница буду:
Хто храбрый во войнѣх или славен в бою,
Прійдет и поклонится, да живет зо мною.
Да прійдете от востока, запада, юга,
Аще мене кто хоче пріяти за друга:
Сего вознесу, вѣнцы увѣнчаю глави.*

Mars, mesmerized by Bellona's pride, authority, power and strength, offers himself to her and promises to serve the goddess wholeheartedly. At this point Bellona presents to him and his retinue unnamed gifts, commanding that they be safeguarded.

In the sixth scene, a jealous Rebellion (*Bunt*) bemoans the decision of Mars who—in his opinion—was ensnared by his own inclinations. Rebellion does not see any benefit from the union, and confesses that, for the sake of Mars, he had been ready to expand all his powers, powers which Bellona never possessed. Rebellion does not wish to participate in the arbitrary vanity that will now enter “Rossia,” and vows to diligently organize uprisings. Pledge threatens Rebellion with death, if he does not desist. Revenge, on the other hand addresses Rebellion as a *Rossian enemy* (*росскій супостате* [DU3, 377]), and admonishes that opposition to authority is

tantamount to opposition to God. Despite his calls for mercy, Rebellion is tied and led to his punishment. He begs to have his head decapitated.

Read from the perspective of the preceding scene, Bellona and Mars are respectively negative images of King Solomon and Queen Sheba. As gods of war, they rely on sheer force, rather than the wisdom promoted by Pallas. Unlike Petrov, I do not see their union as necessarily an allusion to the Treaty of Pereiaslav. Nor do I perceive Rebellion as an allegory of Mazepa. Let us recall that his munificent legacy, upon which Zaborovs'kyi continued to build, was long felt within the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy.

Would the dramaturg be making allusions to more recent political events, such as the relationship between Elizaveta Petrovna and Oleksii Rozumovs'kyi, which led to theirmorganatic union in 1742?²² I do not know. Given Kozachyns'kyi's friendly relationship with the Rozumovs'kyi brothers, it is unlikely—at first glance—that he would risk making such a suggestion.

In the play, however, Revenge, for whom political authority is obtained by divine right, overtly calls Rebellion a Ukrainian enemy (*rosskii supostata*). Is the author alluding to the social unrest brewing in the New Sich, which—to the consternation of the cossacks—had to endure the close surveillance and restrictions imposed by the Russian authorities? These questions deserve further study. For this reason it would be important to establish the exact date of the play's writing and performance. For now, suffice it to say that—although Bellona, Mars, Rebellion, Pledge and Revenge are powerful—they are not positive characters in the play. They do not conform with the ideal defined first by Pallas and subsequently by Great Wisdom (*Premudrist'*).

In the Third Act, Philosophy (Liubomudrie) wishes to see Great Wisdom. She exclaims that corporeal eyes always seek the light, whereas the eyes of the heart wish to see wisdom. She reveals the desire to taste its fruit. An Angel advises that a pure conscience is required to perceive wisdom, and proclaims that soon Philosophy's wish will be fulfilled.

In the second scene, Great Wisdom enters, supported by Faith, Love and Hope. In her initial soliloquy, she makes allusions to the theory of the Incarnation, thereby identifying herself with the second person of the Trinity. It is in this scene that Great Wisdom announces her satisfaction with the abode (*жильце* [DU3: 380]), which has been prepared for her, and invites her three daughters—Faith, Love and

²² Oleksii Rozumovs'kyi (1709–1771) was drafted into the court choir in 1731. In 1741 he participated in the palace revolt that placed Elizaveta Petrovna on the Russian throne. Two years after their marriage in 1742, he organized her visit to Ukraine, during which the Cossack elite persuaded the empress to restore the hetmancy. In 1750, probably on the directive of the empress, his younger brother, Kyrylo, was elected hetman by the council of the Cossack *starshyna* in Hlukhiv.

Hope—to live with her forever in this place. Great Wisdom announces that to all those who love her, she can open the heavenly door leading unto the chamber of glory. Philosophy rejoices and promises to faithfully serve her heavenly queen. In this fashion, Philosophy and Theology, the most advanced disciplines, in the curriculum of Mohyla-Zaborovs'kyi Academy (as it was called in the school manuals of the period) meet face to face harmoniously. Then Humility and Purity pronounce their greetings and praise.

In this scene, the references made to the abode that was prepared for Great Wisdom lends support to Petrov's thesis about the play celebrating the conclusion of renovations to the Old Academic Building. If this is the case, the play could have been indeed performed during Easter of 1740.

The third scene of the last act introduces the Church Triumphant, who proclaims her joy for having found divine grace, and requests that God preserve her in one faith, as well as in calm and peace:

*Превелія радости наполяхся нинь,
Когда в неперемьнной хожду благостинь.
Всегда вьм веселяся отнынь пребуду,
Тя Боже, призываяй на помощ повсюду,
Яко радостных сынов днесь вижду со мною,
Обрѣла во благодать суше пред тобою.
Дал ми еси матери премудрость и силу
И поставил благому начальницю дѣлу,
Соблюди мя досель цѣлу непорочну,
Избранную от родов вьх Церков восточну,
Ти сохрани и нынь всецѣлу во вьки,
Да тебѣ со своими честь принесу лики.
Сохрани мя до конца во единой вѣри,
Да буду пребывати в тишини и мирѣ.*

(DU3: 382–383)

On one level, these arguments could refer to the triumph of the “true faith” over Delusion (Prelest'), a character appearing next, who unsuccessfully tempts the Church Triumphant, and in whom Petrov sees an allegory of the Roman Church. (Let us recall here the choice that Zaborovs'kyi—or his mother—made in favour of the Eastern Church.) Delusion is evicted by an Angel. Then, in the fourth scene appears Unity of Mind, who is challenged by Enmity. The latter promises to harrow heaven and earth and to sow hostility everywhere. Welfare enters, promising to obtain divine help so as to preserve calm, peace, and one faith. Enmity proclaims that it is impossible to achieve this anywhere. Her words bring to mind the theme

of Bellona's soliloquy when she proclaims that war was, is, and will be everywhere. Welfare and Unity of Mind assert their ideas once again.

On another level the appearance of the Church Triumphant might be a reference to the restoration of the metropolitan see in July 1743, with all that this implies for St. Sophia as a cathedral church.²³ This would explain the play's insistent foregrounding of the idea of wisdom, be it in education (Pallas), philosophy, theology, or political life (Solomon). If this hypothesis is correct than Kozachyns'kyi's play was performed on Easter of 1744.

In the final scene of the play, an Angel announces that Christ's death has redeemed all. Vanquishing death by dying, he has transformed death into life eternal. The angel calls upon the audience to rejoice. At this point appear the aforementioned angels carrying thirteen representations of the instruments of Christ's passion: flagellum, spear, rope, nails, pincers, hammer, reed, sponge, ladder, crown of thorns, pillar of flagellation, rope, and Cross of Christ. The brief speeches of the angels mention Zaborov'skyi's heraldic emblems. The parallels established by the visual representation of the instruments of torture with the verbal representation of his coat of arms intimates that the archbishop (now metropolitan?) has undergone his own passion. For example, as the Eighth Angel carries an image of the Holy Sponge (a reference to Matthew 27:48, Mark 15:36 and John 19:29), he addresses the suffering Christ as spouse of the church, and calls upon him to collect for himself (Zaborov'skyi's heraldic) heart, which is wounded by arrows and embellished with a cross and a crown above:

*Бієня претерп'є к столу привязаний,
Ти женише церковній, ангелов избранній.
Избери сердце себѣ, стрѣлами раненно,
Крестом и коронною горь украшенно.*

(DU3: 388. Emphasis mine and refer to coat of arms—NP)

* * *

We might never find out the exact date or the exact circumstances that prompted the writing of Kozachyns'kyi's play. Was it the renovation of the academic building originally erected by Mazepa, or was it the diplomatic victory that led to the restoration of the metropolitan's title? Did Kozachyns'kyi make allusions to the Treaty of 1654 or to more current political alliances between those in power and those seeking power? Did he have Mazepa in mind when he created the character

²³ For a discussion of this topic, see my article: *The Face of Wisdom in the Age of Mazepa*, [in:] *Mazepa and his Time...*, p. 367–400.

Rebellion, or was he alluding to growing social strife in Ukraine, which threatened the stability of his church and educational establishment? Perhaps, some of these questions can be answered after a more detailed and sustained study of Kozachyn's'kyi's writings is pursued. His legacy deserves to be studied as an integral whole, within the context of the epoch and taking into account the political and intellectual aspirations of his milieu. Of particular importance is the task of identifying the families or individuals whose coat of arms are intimated in the last scene of the play.

Let us bear in mind, however, that Kozachyn's'kyi was a professor of philosophy and theology, and his «Image of the Passions of this World, Rectified by the Figure of the Suffering Christ» is a morality play. It is not a panegyric. Its primary goal is to warn about the delusions of the temporal world. Whatever the secondary stimuli prompting the writing of the play— and especially its conclusion—its Paschal message promotes, within an academic context, intellectual exercises over bellicose engagements, ethical choices over callous behaviour, peace and welfare in society over fratricidal conflict. As the Thirteenth Angel suggests in the concluding soliloquy, a victorious cross can serve as an effective sword:

*Страсть претерпѣвій,
В гробѣ пребывій,
Воста яко сна жених от чертога,
Порази враги; воспять одесную Бога
Съде; вѣлчествія даждь мир вожделений,
Да будет меч в руцѣ крест непреодолений. (DU3: 389)*