

Nazar Fedorak

<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0976-4862>
Ivan Franko National University of Lviv
Ukrainian Catholic University
nfedorak@ukr.net
DOI: 10.35765/pk.2022.3803.06

The Question of Genre and Historical Contexts of the Lviv *Prosfonema* of 1591

ABSTRACT

The article updates a long-term discussion about the genre of the early baroque *Prosfonema* of 1591 (the first known literary work that came out of the Lviv Dormition Brotherhood) and a number of other texts from the end of the 16th to the first half of the 17th century. The gradual formation of scientific understanding of the genre polysemantics of early Baroque works, along with their belonging to the literary and proto-theatrical spheres is traced. At the same time, the article highlights the direct relationship between the panegyric declamation constructions of the *Prosfonema* to the actual history of the judicial confrontation between the Lviv Dormition Brotherhood and the episcopate in 1590–1591. Such historical contribution may aspire to a separate methodological status in the study of declamatory and panegyric literary forms.

KEYWORDS: declamation, dialog, eulogy, court, synchronous poetics.

STRESZCZENIE

Kwestia gatunkowego i historycznego kontekstu lwowskiej „Prosfonemy” z 1591 roku

Artykuł aktualizuje wieloletnią debatę na temat gatunkowego charakteru wczesnobarokowej *Prosfonemy* z 1591 r. (pierwszego znanego dzieła literackiego, które powstało w Bractwie Lwowskim) oraz szeregu innych tekstów z końca XVI – pierwszej połowy XVII w. Autor pokazuje, jak stopniowo w nauce kształtowało się rozumienie gatunkowej wieloznaczności dzieł wczesnego baroku oraz ich przynależności do literackich form proto-teatralnych. Artykuł dowodzi również zasadności analizy pochwalnej i przeznaczony do wygłoszenia *Prosfonemy* w kontekście sądowego konfliktu między Bractwem Lwowskim a biskupem w latach 1590–1591. Zaproponowana

Suggested citation: Fedorak, N. (2022). The question of the genre and historical contexts of the Lviv *Prosfonema* of 1591. © ⓘ *Perspectives on Culture*, 3(38), pp. 41–57. DOI: 10.35765/pk.2022.3803.06.

Submitted: 18.05.2022

Accepted: 30.08.2022

aktualizacja wymaga nowego metodologicznego podejścia do badania tego rodzaju literackich zabytków.

SŁOWA KLUCZE: deklamacja, dialog, panegiryk, sąd, poetyka synchroniczna.

Prosphonema, a work which originated in the society of the Lviv Dormition Brotherhood and its school and was published as a brochure in 1591. It stands at the roots of the Ukrainian school theater, and at the same time, it organically fits into the genre of baroque poetry of the late 16th and the 17th century. Such a peculiar duality or syncretism of this work, resulting from the time of its appearance in early modern social and early baroque literary circumstances, led to different generic attributions of the *Prosphonema*, depending on adopted research perspectives. Some occasional or even superficial generic definitions of this work became certain *topoi* in the history of Ukrainian literature, sometimes distorting the early baroque genological duality of this and later similar texts that formed both the dramatic and poetic canon of the Ukrainian Baroque.

Works such as the *Prosphonema* have long been categorized (Petrov, 1895, p. 77; Žiteckij, 1900, p. 106; Franko, 1980, pp. 367–368; Franko, 1981, pp. 298, 303; Franko, 1983, pp. 273, 277; Franko, 1984a, pp. 91, 92; Franko, 1984b, p. 113) as dialogs or declamations, specifying these literary concepts for years (in addition to the mentioned scholars, the same categorization was made by Volodymyr Peretts (Peretc, 1909, p. 142) and earlier by Volodymyr Rezanov (Rezanov, 1910, pp. 114–115). Perhaps the first one who tried to distinguish between the dialog and declamation by genre was Serhiy Yefremov. In his *Історія українського письменства* (1911) he provided the following list of works in which, in his opinion, the formal and content structures of poetry and drama had not yet been distinguished: *Ляментъ дому Княжатъ Острозскихъ* (1603); *Възерунокъ цнотъ* (1618) by Oleksandr Mytura; Christmas poems (*На Рождѣство Христа въришь для утѣхи православнимъ христїанамъ*) by Pamvo Berynda (1619); *Въришь на жалосный погребъ Зацного Рыцера Петра Конашевича Сагайдачного* (1622) by Kasiyan Sakovych; Passion poetry (*Розмышлян[н]є о муцъ Христа, спасителя нашего*) by Yoanykiy Volkovych; *Ляментъ із приводу відомої острозької трагедїї 1636 року*; *Ляментъ людей побожныхъ* (1638); a number of eulogies and congratulations to Petro Mohyla; or *Перло многоцѣнное* (1646) by Kyrylo Stavrovets'kyu (Ėfremov, 1995, p. 130). Even though today in literary criticism as established among the names of genres of Ukrainian baroque literature, in particular, lament and eulogy are noted, the observations of S. Yefremov remain relevant as a kind of

a springboard for new genological way of thinking in the history of Ukrainian literature.

Two years later (1913) the idea of S. Yefremov was developed by the already mentioned V. Rezanov, who devoted a separate study to the issue of distinguishing between dialogs and declamations. His conclusions are following:

1. The terms “dialog” and “declamation” should be distinguished;
2. The term “declamation” in poetics does not have the meaning of a literary genre, but implies a purely school ceremony with the participation of students and teachers; in practice, the term is also used in relation to works intended to be performed during the ceremony – hence the confusion of the two meanings of the term;
3. The basis of “declamations” were recitations of prose and poetry (composed by a teacher or students themselves), which were written at a certain time and performed by one participant after another in the form of consecutive monologues. Gradually, stage attributes and dramatic elements were added to this original basis layer by layer, which made it increasingly complex, and in certain cases, with the general taste for theater, they became dominant;
4. Declamations can be divided in two categories: classroom and festive; the content of the former was quite diverse, while that of the latter was limited mainly to clarifying attitudes towards the events that were celebrated (for certain reasons, which will be discussed later, the *Prosphonema* cannot be included either into the purely classroom or purely festive declamations – N.F.);
5. Declamations were usually performed without a stage setting, but in some cases, on solemn occasions, the stage setting was allowed” (Rezanov, 1913, pp. 39–40).

Then, V. Rezanov proposed a kind of gradation, or hierarchy, of declamations. According to his observations,

in their form, declamations involved: a) recitation of prosaic or poetic works of different literary forms (speeches, poems, odes, elegies, etc.), recited successively by performers, one replacing another; b) the same kind of recitation, but in a larger stage setting: performers were dressed in appropriate costumes of real or allegorical persons, and they recited next to paintings or surrounded by decorations, performing certain actions and motions; the recitation was opened by an introduction in a dialogic form, performed by several participants who conducted a dialog, and ended with an epilogue; c) small dramatic performances in simplified forms; and finally d) whole large dramas – tragedies (ceremonial recitation on the Passion of Christ) (Rezanov, 1913, p. 40).

In my opinion, such a “classification” of declamations is too extensive and therefore vague, because, in fact, most poetic and perhaps all dramatic works of Ukrainian literature – that is, far from just declamations – at least in the 17th century, can easily fit into these parameters.

Nevertheless, V. Rezanov’s observations, based on the material of “the Lviv poetics of the late 17th century,” were supported by Oleksandr Bilets’kyu (1923) in his work on the history of theater in Russia, *Старинный театр в России* (Ukrainian title: *Зародження драматичної літератури на Україні*). He also stressed that a “declamation” is “not so much a literary genre as a kind of a school ceremony”. In his opinion,

declamations sometimes take place in front of an icon or a painting; on solemn occasions, with the permission of authorities, purely theatrical attributes are allowed ... Therein is the importance of dialogs and declamations: in Ukraine they were the first attempt of a dramatic genre; and they continued to exist even after drama appeared – without necessarily being connected to it; their topics became extremely diverse, as well as their style: some are restrained and serious, while others – comical (Bilec’kij, 1965, pp. 307–308).

Actually, the rudiments of these “extremely diverse themes,” as well as the ways of their recitation, are already quite prominently presented in the *Prosphonema* – a work whose organic connection with the school drama has been consistently defended by Rostyslav Pylypchuk, providing more and more arguments (Pilipčuk, 1991; 1996; 1998; 1999; 2001).

Yaroslav Isayevych also paid special attention to *Prosphonema* in the context of school recitations and dramatic dialogs. He stressed that in Lviv,

the Stauropegion issued a number of declamations and dramatic dialogs performed by students of the brotherhood’s school: *Prosphoneme* (1591), *Вірши о Різді* by Pamvo Berinda (1616), *Христос Пасхон* by Andriy Skul’s’kyu (1630), *Розмишляє о музи Христа* by Yoanykiy Volkovych... Not without reason, in the early 17th century, Ivan Vyshens’kyu accused the Brotherhood preachers that they did not want to work in the church, just stage comedies and play (Īsaēvič, 1966, pp. 164–165).

Lyudmyla Sofronova reduced the distance between the *Prosphonema* as well as other declamations and the theater, stressing that school theater is primarily a rhetorical theater. And, citing examples of “a whole class of oratorical works that were at the intersection of literature and theater,” in particular, she noted that “school declamations could be close to a panegyric (cf. Ukrainian declamation in honor of Mykhaylo Rohoza)” (Sofronova, 1981, p. 127) – and the “declamation in honor of Mykhaylo

Rohoza” – meets, in fact, in addition to the *Prosphonema*, one of its genre-functional parameters.

That is, one and the same text could belong to the literary genre of eulogy, and at the same time be performed as a declamation, which in combination with possible, albeit minimal, elements of theatrical direction, scenery, audience and performance, can already be interpreted as a theatrical genre (of course, at the level of development and ideas about the theater in the 16th and 17th centuries).

L. Sofronova also attempted to add some new points to Rezanov’s list of distinctions between the dialog and declamation. In particular, in her *Поэтика слов’янського театру*, she considered (and later, in her next work on this topic: *Старинный украинский театр*, 1996), she already gave up any distinction, since:

- the dialog was based on verbal conflict, a dispute, while declamation was an extensive description;
- unlike in declamations, in dialogs one could often find fictional characters, historical figures, or allegories;
- dialogs were easily extended with a prologue and epilogue, and turned into more complex works than declamations, even though they were undergoing the same transformations;
- the monologue in declamations did not imitate real expression, but was only “a well thought out, planned speech in which the presentation of a topic, its development and conclusion were distinguished ... This is how the oratorical genre of declamation was created, where the introduction, the treatment of the topic and the epilogue were distinguished” – and at the same time, “dialogs between characters resemble debates that were extremely popular in the Baroque” (Sofronova, 1981, pp. 128, 129, 135, 136).

Finally, R. Pylypchuk emphasized another – seemingly quite simple and obvious, but often neglected thesis – that the distinction between dialog and declamation, which was emphasized by V. Rezanov in 1926 lied in the fact that in declamations, “the pupils-performers stepped out in front of the audience one by one and recited speeches or poems on certain topics, sitting, standing or from the pulpit; this genre of the ‘declamation’ has nothing to do with a ‘dialog’, which necessarily requires at least two interlocutors” (Rezanov, 1926, p. 20). That is, the dialog was fundamentally different from the declamation in that it involved direct address of the interlocutors to each other, and not to the public.

Thus, the declamation is a synthetic genre from the literary point of view, that may contain elements of, for example, lamentation or eulogy, or be written in one of these genres; and from the theatrical point of view, it is a prerequisite of the Ukrainian school theater, covering elements of

such genres as dialog, Christmas play, passion or historical drama, etc. The earliest known example of this synthetic genre is the Lviv *Proshponema*. Based on the works of the early Ukrainian Baroque, it can be observed that later, in the transformation from declamation to dialog, there was inevitably a transition in theatrical parameters from lamentation or panegyric forms of presentation to the mystery, miracle or, for example, tragicomedy. It was only near the end of the 17th and in early 18th century with the development of historical themes in Ukrainian drama, that it became possible to combine stage action and, so to speak, group forms of eulogy, e.g., *Милість Божа, Владимир* by Teofan Prokopovych.

The list of works, generic or oratorical nature of which allows comparing them with *Proshponema* in search of genetic or typological connection, is quite wide even in the 17th century. S. Yefremov's particular "proposals" have already been mentioned above. The tentative list by Ivan Franko, compiled on the basis of a number of his literary and theatrical works, is even longer:

- *Діалог християнський, в котром ся показует, хто ест християнин правдивий* [*Christian dialog, which shows who a true Christian is*];
- *Містерія страстей Христових* [*Mystery of the Passion of Christ*] (*Dialogus de passione Christi*);
- *Київська пасія 1629 р.* [*Kyiv Passion of 1629*] (Franko, 1981, p. 300);
- *Бенкет духовний* [*A spiritual feast*] (conventional title);
- *На Рождество Господа Бога и Спаса нашего Исуса Христа вѣршиѣ* [*On the Nativity of our Lord God and Savior Jesus Christ*] by Pamvo Berynda – these poems were called “a collection of Christmas declamations” (Franko, 1983, p. 274);
- *Възерунок цнот ... Елисея Плетенецького* [*The Paragon of Virtue ... of Yelysey Pletenets'kyu*] by Oleksandr Mytura;
- *Лямент ... на жалосное прѣставленіе ... Леонтія Карповича* [*Lament ... for the pitiful death ... of Leontij Karpovič*] by Meletiy Smotryts'kyu;
- *Вѣршиѣ на жалосный погреб зацного рицера Петра Конашевича Сагайдачного ...* [*Back to the mournful burial of the honorable knight Petro Konashevych Sahaydachnyu*] by Kasiyan Sakovych;
- *Лямент по святобливе зешлом ... – Иоанні Васильевичу ...* [*Lament for the saintly passing of Ioan Vasylyevych*] by Davyd Andriyevych;
- *Епикидіон, або Вѣршиѣ жалобнїя на погребеніе Василіси Яцковни* [*Epikidion or eulogy for the burial of Vasyliisa Yatskovna*] by Stefan Polumerkovych (has not been preserved to this day);
- *Імнологія* [*Imnology*] by Pamvo Berynda and Taras Zemka;
- the anonymous *Евфонія веселобрмячая* [*Euphonia cheerful and bright*];

- eulogy *Еводи* [Evodi] by Hryhoriy Butovych in honor of bishop Arseniy Zhelybors'kyu;
- *Вършиль з трагедіи „Христос Пасхон”* [The best from the *Khristos Paskhon* tragedy] by Andriy Skul's'kyu;
- *Розмишляне о муць Христа, спасителя нашего* [Reflection on the martyrdom of Christ, our Savior] by Yoanykiy Volkovych.

In addition, theater expert Petro Rulin pointed out the fact that “the play about Alexei, the man of God is called a ‘dialog’” (Rulin, 1925, p. 210), while Mykola Petrov regarded *Дръйствіе Митрофана Довгалеvського* [*The Works of Mytrofan Dovhalev's'kyu*] a school declamation (Petrov, 1911, p. 292), although the latter was already written in the 18th century.

As for the seventeenth century, the following should be added to the detailed list mentioned by S. Yefremov: *Лямент дому княжат Острозских над зеишлым с того свѣта ясне освещоным княжатем Александром Константиновичем, княжатем Острозским, воеводою Волянским* [*Lament for the house of the dukes of Ostroh over his excellence Prince Alexander Konstantinovič, Duke of Ostroh, leader of the Volhynian army*] (allegedly by Dem”yan Nalyvayko) and the anonymous *Плач, або Лямент по зестю з свѣта сего вѣчной памяти годного Григорія Желиборского* [*Lamentation for the noble Hryhoriy Zhelybors'kyu departed from this world to eternal memory*]. The *Eucharisterion* by Sofroniy Pochas'kyu can also be a clear echo of the *Prosfonema*, which is not only purely literary, but also historical.

Here we should refer to the events in Lviv at the end of the 16th century, in particular 1590–1591 – that were an immediate stimulus for the writing of the *Prosfonema* and formed the specific historical context of the publication and purpose of this work.

At that time, as it is known, relations between the Lviv Stauropegion Brotherhood and the Lviv Bishop Hedeon Balaban deteriorated extremely. After January 1, 1586, when Patriarch Joachim of Antioch approved a new statute for the Lviv Brotherhood with much broader powers than before, the conflict with the bishop steadily intensified.

Some historians emphasized the inevitability and seriousness of this confrontation, citing not only situational but also mental reasons for it. Firstly, as Oleksandr Barvins'kyu wrote, in Ukraine “up to the mid-16th century, the main pillars of the internal order of the Ruthenian Church were such that the clergy were elected, and the secular people had a vital role in church affairs” (Barvins'kij, 1886, p. 7), however, already at the Council of Vilnius in 1509, “the Fathers ... complained that some, for the sake of worldly glory and profit, buy the offices of bishops for themselves during their lives and accept them without the knowledge and consent of the metropolitan and bishops, without the choice of princes and lords of the Ruthenian faith” (Barvins'kij, 1886, p. 12). And it was in this

way that “during the lifetime of Bishop Tuchaps’kyy Hedeon’s father, or rather, Hryhor’s father in secular life, Marko Balaban, ‘obtained’ – as was the custom then – an expletive to rule the Galicia from the Polish king Sigismund Augustus. When Tuchaps’kyy died (1549), the king instructed the then Polish Archbishop Piotr Starzechowski (1540–1554), who was competing for the right to grant it, to present Marko Balaban (1549–1568) for the position. Taking advantage of this “custom, Marko (Arnesniy as a Bishop) gave the rulership to his son Hryhor, monastic name Hedeon, who ruled the whole diocese during his father’s lifetime and was actually the bishop” (Lužnic’kij, 1961, 59).

Secondly, after the Union of Lublin in 1569, as a result of the unification of legislation and customary law according to the Polish model, according to O. Barvins’kyy, a “new order” arrived, which, in particular, affected the Orthodox clergy: not only the secular population was sharply divided into the gentry and the commoners, but the clergy “was also divided into the ‘gentry of the spiritual state’, which soon became angry with the ‘gentry of the secular state’ and the lower clergy of the ‘common state’” (Barvins’kij, 1886, 15). This made ordinary priests and monastic communities completely dependent (even under the fear of physical violence, brutal reprisals, and imprisonment) on persons in authority and facilitated oppression of the former by the latter. Having been brought up on such models and accustomed to such behavior, Hedeon Balaban sought to get rid of the only opposition force in his “possessions” – the Lviv Brotherhood organized on the basis of ancient bourgeois traditions and its subordinate institutions (monasteries, schools, printing houses). After all, according to the charter of the Lviv Dormition Brotherhood in Lviv in 1586, “the brothers themselves chose their elders and judged in their own brotherly court. The court could condemn the irreparable to be expelled from the Church, and a priest had to announce it publicly in church. The bishop could not pardon an offender of this kind until the he surrendered to the brotherhood” (Barvins’kij, 1886, p. 28).

In addition, thirdly, despite the fact that many of the burghers were literate, and some of them were even highly educated for people for that time, especially in such large cities as Lviv or Vilnius, in the eyes of the bishops, the brotherhood mostly appeared as a rugged collection of “farmers, shoemakers, saddlers and tanners” (Barvins’kij, 1886, p. 34). It is interesting that in this view, the Ruthenian bishops, in fact, fully adhered to the position advocated by the Jesuit Piotr Skarga (by the way, the Jesuits finally established their house in Lviv in 1590): secular people should not interfere in church affairs (Barvins’kij, 1886, p. 34). Anyway, Hedeon Balaban’s disdain for the members and leaders of the Lviv Brotherhood was immense.

The culmination of the confrontation between the Brotherhood and Bishop Hedeon came in the aftermath of the visit of Patriarch Jeremiah of Constantinople to Lviv in 1589, who by his authority – more “legitimate” for the Kyiv Metropolitanate than that of the Patriarch of Antioch – fully confirmed all the privileges of the Dormition Brotherhood and finally approved its stauropegic status. The author of the *Хроніка Ставропізійського братства* [*The Chronicle of the Stauropegion Brotherhood*], Denys Zubryts’kyy, following a complaint of the Brotherhood filed in 1590 to King Sigismund III and the Synod, cited a number of shocking facts of Bishop Gedeon’s and his servants’ behavior (by the way, at that time such behavior was less surprising than today).

It is known that the synod heard the complainants and the accused, and on June 22, 1590, it issued a special decree signed by Metropolitan Mykhaylo Rohoza and four bishops. This decree, in particular, once again confirmed that “the brotherhood has never been subject to the authority of the Lviv bishops and in the future need not obey either the authority of Hedeon Balaban or his successors...” (Zubric’kij, 2011, p. 77) Hedeon Balaban himself signed this verdict with his own hand (Zubric’kij, 2011, p. 77). However, he did so in similar situations, of which there were many, both before and after. And then, after the synodal judgment of 1590, the confrontation resumed very quickly.

It is not surprising that the Lviv Brotherhood filed new complaints against Mykhaylo Rohoza, insistently inviting him to come to Lviv, where he would hopefully have a final trial. When these complaints were supported by Prince Konstantyn Ostrohs’kyy, it became known that in early 1591, the Metropolitan of Kyiv would visit Lviv.

The subtitle to the *Prosfonema*, written and printed in the fraternal printing house on the occasion of this visit, indicates the exact date of the planned delivery of this text: “January 17, 1591.” Indeed, January 17 of that year, according to the old calendar (January 28 – according to the new style) fell on a Sunday, for which, probably, a solemn Mass celebrated by the bishop was planned, and on the next day – according to the text of the *Prosfonema* itself (“In the morning, he will come to the school kindly visiting...”, *Prosfonima*, 1988, p. 503) – he visited the Brotherhood’s school. However, for some reason, the Metropolitan was one day late with his arrival (Zubryc’kyj, 2011, p. 78), so it is not known exactly what date the *Prosfonema* was delivered on. According to D. On January 22 (Friday, February 1, new style), Mykhaylo Rohoza consecrated the small church of the Saints Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian and John Chrysostom, which the Brotherhood built near the bell tower, and instructed to lay the foundation for the large church of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, the foundations of which were laid soon the same year. Also,

on January 22 (old style), a metropolitan pastoral letter was dated, which stated that Bishop Hedeon oppressed the Brotherhood and announced the summons of the bishop to court on January 25 (Monday, February 4, old style). On January 23 (Saturday, February 2 new style), Metropolitan Mykhaylo Rohoza, at the request of the brotherhood, celebrated the Holy Liturgy in the Monastery of St. Onuphrius (Zubric'kij, 2011, p. 78). It can be assumed that on Sunday, January 24 (February 3, new style), the Metropolitan was to celebrate the service in the main church of Lviv, St. George's Cathedral, which was the seat of Bishop Hedeon Balaban. This allowed maintaining a certain parity between the parties participating in the trial scheduled for the next day.

Taking into account the outlined historical context, the whole artistic fabric of the work seems to be completely permeated with more or less expressive hints, requests and hopes for a fair decision by a fair judge and as if reproduces in advance the desired course of the trial that was to take place. It is because of these circumstances that it is difficult to place this work on the same level as the above-mentioned eulogies-declamations either clearly intended for school or purely festive. Regarding the first type – because of the mainly “non-academic” direction of the work, and as the second one – because of the lack of completeness of the celebration of the Metropolitan's arrival and due to the distinct notes of anxiety that also permeate the work.

Already in the coat-of-arms verse at the very beginning of the *Proshphonema* there is an appeal to the whole Ruthenian community to strengthen themselves: *Мужайся, многоплеменный росский народе, / да Христос начало крепости в тебе буде* [Courage, Ruthenian people of many tribes, / Christ will be the root of strength in you] (503).

If we recall O. Barvins'kij's remark that in the times before the Union of Brest in 1596, “many brotherhoods accepted not only Orthodox, but also people of other faiths, including Latin, and even consecrated persons” (Barvins'kij, 1886, p. 23), then these lines from the *Proshphonema* can be interpreted as an appeal to the Lviv fraternal community.

In “The introduction of the first kind”, the third boy expresses the hope that: *Не завжды бывает тма на воздух мглистая, / ань тривает уставичне нощ чернооблачная* [“It is not always darkness in the air, / nor does the night last forever black-clouded”] (504) – and it seems like the hint to the “darkness” and “black clouds” is to the atmosphere in which Metropolitan Mykhaylo Rohoza arrived. Immediately, the fourth boy, directly addressing the awaited guest, first complaining: *О наставниче добродетели и покоры всякой, / якосмы перше заживали жалости великой...* [“... O preceptor of virtue and obedience of all kinds, / I am the first to feel great sorrow ...”] (04) – and conveys the joy of hope: *Так*

*нам нынѣ, видячи тя, радость наставаєт, / всякого бо нелестнаго душа
умилно въздыхает* [“So now, when we see you, we rejoice, / for every soul
that is troubled sighs with joy”] (504).

In the “Second kind” part, the fifth boy praises Metropolitan Mykhaylo as a warrior of Christ armed with a sword, pointing it out against whom the eulogistic hero steadily directs the double-edged blade of his “theological weapon”:

Припоясан по бедрѣ твоєм меч, богословієм кованный,
добрый воине, меч от всюду наостренный.
Славный и непорочный, с тым ся ти рушаєш смѣле,
и громиш ним богопротивных снадне и умѣле¹

The line of the seventh boy from the same “Second kind” of enemies directly points to Hedeon Balaban and his relatives and servants, while advising the judge (“O sacred head”) how they should be punished:

Нехай же ганьбу отнесуть, нехай ся запалають,
о священная главо, котрыи упадку церкви шукають.
Нехай ся вспачать их рады, нехай ся встыдають явне,
котрыи знищеня наше ради видять марне²

The third boy from the “Third kind” part also speaks about the misadventures of the brothers, continuing to praise the Metropolitan:

Будемо тя пред вѣми велбити, истинный наш пастыру,
не толко на сем едином мѣсти, но и по всем миру.
Абысь нас в пригодах наших нынѣ и всегда раговал,
и от противности людѣй зловѣрных церков заступал³

1 [The sword is belted around your hip, a sword forged by theology,

Good warrior, a sword sharpened all along.

Glorious and blameless, it you are swinging mightily,
and thou slayest the wicked, artfully and wisely] (505).

2 [May they be shamed, may they feel the burn,

O sacred head, those who seek the decline of the church.

May nobody hear their counsel, let them be ashamed of themselves,
those that would be glad to see our destruction] (505).

3 [O our true shepherd, we shall praise thee before all,

Not only in this one place, but throughout the whole world.

May you now and always defend us in our misfortunes,
and protect us from the evil-doers in our churches] (505–506).

The next part of the work is “the Prayer”, which also expresses the hope that Бог Авраамов с нами везде, / и тот валчити за нас буде [“the God of Abraham is with us everywhere, / and he will fight for us”] (506), as well as a call to the praying community: ... *нехай же нам боязнь не панує* [“... Let us not be afraid”] (506). It is also emphasized that

Мѣсто, котрое бог милуєт,
и прибытком своим именуєт,
Тому квалт и грозная зброя,
не может нѣгда зопсовати покоя⁴

Thus, a parallel is drawn between Lviv (although this name is never used, but the context undeniably points to Lviv) and Jerusalem, because: *Мѣсто Іерусалим свѣдоцтво дати може, / иж ты нам оборона певная, весилный боже...* [The city of Jerusalem can give you a proof, / because you are our defense, almighty God...”] (507).

The next section of *Proshonema*, “From the elders,” which is also the final one in the first part of the declamation, that is, in the part that was recited or planned to be recited to the Metropolitan Mykhaylo Rohoza “in the church before the people” (503), becomes the least obscure of the speeches, reaching a thematic culmination. First, according to the rhetoric laws, there are two forces that oppose each other. These are the “infidel winter” which is “keeping the bishops in Jerusalem,” and its Old Testament personification: Sodom and King Nebuchadnezzar on the one hand, and on the other hand – Christ the Spring, “the destroyer of winters” and His “warriors”: Abraham, Lot, *триє отроци во огни суще, ангела...* *Узрѣша”ѣша* [Three young men are in the fire, angel... see”] (507). Further a typical renaissance image of the arrival of spring and awakening of all the forces of nature from the “sinful sleep” of winter is invoked (508). Then, the idea of the inevitable triumph of spring is combined with the expression of hope for the inevitable triumph of justice:

Нынѣ суд, милость и вѣра вящшія суще, поноваяйся,
Стропотная бо исправляет, всяко колѣно не срамяйся...
Трех бо реченных ради, ангелы к человеку ся посылают,
чловеци же суда дѣля нелицемѣрна, бози бывають.
Єгда бо на земли беззаконіє от церкви судом отсѣчется,
тогда лучшему небо и ангели и бог сам совокупится.

4 [The city which God favors
and names as his own estate,
that has power and formidable armor,
Can never rest in peace] (506).

Тобою убо вся сія, о правосуде, чаєм получитьи,
яко не даси церкви христоненависными попраңѣи быти⁵

If the speech of the elders in the church played on the theme of righteousness and unrighteousness, crime and punishment, through the images of winter and spring, the first chapter of the second part of the *Prospho-nema*, that is, a text intended for recitation in the fraternal school, embodies the same theme in the images of darkness and light. At the very beginning of the chapter, the archbishop’s visit to the school is compared to that of a welcome guest and liberator of prisoners: *Радостно же убо в темницах суцим постыщеніе, / радостнѣе же от самыя темница свобожденіе* [“But joyful is the visitation of the prisoners, and more joyful than the prison itself is liberty”] (508).

As if reminding the metropolitan of his duty to “deliver the offended from the offending” (509), the students describe coming to the school and the arrival of Mykhaylo Rohoza to Lviv together: *Се бо предсѣдит Христов истинный дѣлатель, / судія же праведный и беззаконію отмститель* [“Behold, the true follower of Christ, / the righteous judge and avenger of iniquity”] (509). They complain movingly: *Лютю бо тогда, отче, бѣ, лютю воистину, / сего ради тако мню, яко никто же воспомяну* [That time, Father, was fierce, fierce indeed, / for this reason I think so, as no one remembers such.] (509). And they place all their hope in the Metropolitan:

Еже тебѣ (многим не бывшим) zde быти,
и по нас праведным судом отмстити.
Но пройдохом, яко же сквоз огонь и воду,
чающе тобою известися на свободу...
И всю жизнь нашу изведи на строеніе,
да тобою получим от бѣд спасеніе⁶

-
- 5 This is the day of **judgment**, grace, and supreme faith, renew yourself
For the stubborn mend their ways, do not be ashamed...
For the sake of the three things mentioned above, the angels send out to the people,
And the heads of the **judges** of the court of law are merciful, they are godly.
When lawlessness on earth is removed from the church by **judgment**,
Then heaven and the angels and God Himself will unite with Him.
We ask you to obtain all these things, for **justice**,
So that you do not allow the Church of Christendom to be violated (508).
- 6 [Still shall ye be there (where many were not),
and avenge us with a righteous judgement.
But we shall pass through it like through fire and water,
seeking by you to be set free...
And spend all our lives building,
should we by you we may be saved from harm] (509).

Thus, the *Prosphonema* uses words with the root “court” six times (directly the lexeme for “court”, as well as the words for a “judge”, or “justice”), which is certainly not accidental, but at the same time quite atypical for Ukrainian panegyric-declamatory works of the late 16th to early 17th centuries. In fact, only in one declamatory work (one without a panegyric aspect) an anonymous – *Скарга нищих до Бога* [*Complaint of the poor to God*] from the late 1580s – early 1590s, where there is a condemnation of the Latins – judgment is mentioned twice more (that the Latins “condemned themselves with their own mouths”, and that “the judgment of His [i.e., God’s N. F.] threatens to crush their heads” (*Skarga*, 1988). The theme of judgment (in particular, not God’s, but earthly, secular) does not appear in early baroque works of partially or fully recitative nature.

Of course, there are other thematic, figurative-symbolic and rhetorical layers in the artistic fabric of the *Prosphonema*, but the clear emphasis on the theme of the confrontation between the Lviv Dormition Brotherhood and Bishop Hedeon Balaban and the arrival of Metropolitan Mykhaylo Rohoza in Lviv in early 1591 is especially important for the brothers, which encourages modern researchers to study the historical context of certain renaissance and baroque works with special attention, for the fullest possible disclosure of the meanings embedded in various rhetorical figures and – more broadly – in the universal phenomenon of synchronous poetics, which, as we can see, was used to reflect the events of not only the past, but also the actual present.

LITERATURE

Sources

- Prosphonema – Просфонима (1988). In: *Українська література XIV–XVI ст. Апокрифи. Агіографія. Паломн[ицькі] твори. Історіограф[ічні] твори. Полем[ічні] твори. Переклад[ні] повісті. Поет[ичні] твори*. Київ: Наукова думка.
- Skarga – Скарга нищих до Бога (1988). In: *Українська література XIV–XVI ст. Апокрифи. Агіографія. Паломн[ицькі] твори. Історіограф[ічні] твори. Полем[ічні] твори. Переклад[ні] повісті. Поет[ичні] твори*. Київ: Наукова думка.

Editions

- Barvîns'kij, O. – Барвінський, О. (1886). *Ставропигійське братство Успенське у Львові, его заснованє, діяльність і значенє церковно-народне*. Львів.

- Bilec'kij, O. – Білецький, О. (1965). Зародження драматичної літератури на Україні. In: О. Білецький. *Зібрання праць*: у 5 т. т. 1. Київ: Наукова думка.
- Êfremov, S. – Єфремов, С. (1995). *Історія українського письменства*. Київ: Феміна.
- Fedorak, N. – Федорак, Н. (2013). Художня тканина «Просфонемі» та її історично-правовий контекст. In: *Львівська медієвістика*. т. 4. ПРОСФΩΝИΜΑ: текст і контекст. Львів: Свічадо.
- Franko, I. – Франко, І. (1980). Бенкет духовний. In: І. Франко. *Твори*: у 50 т. т. 28. Київ: Наукова думка.
- Franko, I. – Франко, І. (1981). Русько-український театр (Історичні обриси). In: І. Франко. *Твори*: у 50 т. т. 29. Київ: Наукова думка.
- Franko, I. – Франко, І. (1983). Історія української літератури. Часть перша. Від початків українського письменства до Івана Котляревського. In: І. Франко. *Твори*: у 50 т. т. 40. Київ: Наукова думка.
- Franko, I. – Франко, І. (1984a). Українсько-руська (малоруська) література. In: І. Франко. *Твори*: у 50 т. т. 41. Київ: Наукова думка.
- Franko, I. – Франко, І. (1984b). Южнорусская литература. In: І. Франко. *Твори*: у 50 т. т. 41. Київ: Наукова думка.
- Īsaēvič, Â. – Ісаєвич, Я. (1966). *Братства та їх роль в розвитку української культури XVI–XVIII ст.* Київ: Наукова думка.
- Krisa, B. – Криса, Б. (2013). «Просфонема» як первообраз української барокової композиції. In: *Львівська медієвістика*. т. 4. ПРОСФΩΝИΜΑ: текст і контекст. Львів: Свічадо.
- Litvin L. – Литвин Л. (2013). Структурно-семантичні домінанти «Просфонемі». In: *Львівська медієвістика*. т. 4. ПРОСФΩΝИΜΑ: текст і контекст. Львів: Свічадо.
- Lužnič'kij, G. – Лужницький, Г. (1961). Вступ [до статті: Ящун, В. Судова розправа Гедеона Балабана архимандрита Жидичинського монастиря на основі оригінальних документів]. In: *Записки НТШ*. т. CLXXI. Збірник Філологічної Секції (т. 30). Нью-Йорк–Париж.
- Perets, V. – Перетц, В. (1909). К історії польського и русского народного театра. In: *Известія Отделенія русскаго языка и словесности Академіи наук*. т. 14, кс. 1. Санкт-Петербург.
- Petrov, N. – Петров, Н. (1895). *Кіевская академія во второй половине XVII и XVIII в.* Київ: Тип. Г.Т. Корчак-Новицького.
- Petrov, N. – Петров, Н. (1911). *Очерки из истории украинской литературы XVII и XVIII веков*. Київ: Акц. О-во «Петр Барскій в Кіеве».
- Pilipčuk, R. – Пилипчук, Р. (1991). Українському театрові – 400 років! In: *Український театр*, 6. Київ.
- Pilipčuk, R. – Пилипчук, Р. (1996). Театр у контексті першого українського національного відродження (кін. XV – поч. XVII ст.). In: *Філософія*.

- Історія культури. Освіта: Матеріали III Конгресу Міжнародної асоціації українців.* Харків: Око.
- Pilipčuk, R. – Пилипчук, Р. (1998). Початки українського шкільного театру: Ярослав Ісаєвич про «Просфониму». In: *Україна: культурна спадщина, національна свідомість, державність*. т. 5. Львів: Інститут українознавства ім. І. Крип'якевича НАН України.
- Pilipčuk, R. – Пилипчук, Р. (1999). До історії українського шкільного театру кінця XVI – початку XVII століть. In: *Записки НТШ*. т. ССXXXVII. Праці Театрознавчої комісії. Львів.
- Pilipčuk, R. – Пилипчук, Р. (2001). Театр: текст і дійство. In: *Історія української культури: у 5 т. т. 2.* Українська культура XIII – першої половини XVII століть. Київ: Наукова думка.
- Pilip'uk, N. – Пилип'юк, Н. (2013). «Просфонема» у світли гуманістичної думки Європи в XVI ст. In: *Львівська медієвістика*. Т. 4. ПРОСФΩΝИМА: текст і контекст. Львів: Свічадо.
- Rezanov, V. – Резанов, В. (1910). К истории русской драмы: Экскурс в область театра иезуитов. В: *Известия Историко-филологического института кн. Безбородко в Нежине*. Т. 25. Ніжин.
- Rezanov, V. – Резанов, В. (1913). К вопросу о старинной драме: Теория школьных «декламаций» по рукописным поэтикам. В: *Известия Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук*. т. 18, кс. 1. Санкт-Петербург.
- Rezanov, V. – Резанов, В. (1926). *Драма українська. I. Старовинний театр український*. Cz. I. Київ: З друкарні Української академії наук.
- Rulin, P. – Рулін, П. (1925). Студії з історії українського театру (1917–1924). In: *Записки Историко-філологічного відділу УАН*. кс. 5. Київ.
- Sirotnins'ka, N. – Сиротинська, Н. (2013). «Просфонема» Львівського братства та її прочитання в контексті сакральної гимнографії. In: *Львівська медієвістика*, т. 4. ПРОСФΩΝИМА: текст і контекст. Львів: Свічадо.
- Soifronova, L. – Софронова, Л. (1981). *Поэтика славянского театра XVII – первой половины XVIII в.: Польша, Украина, Россия*. Москва: Наука.
- Soifronova, L. – Софронова, Л. (2004). *Старовинний український театр*. Львів: ЛНУ ім. Івана Франка.
- Voznâk, M. – Возняк, М. (1992). *Історія української літератури: у 2 кн.* Кс. 1. Львів: Світ.
- Zubric'kij, D. – Зубрицький, Д. (2011). *Хроніка Ставронігійського братства*. Львів: Апріорі.
- Žiteckij, P. – Житецький, П. (1899, 1900). Энеида И.П. Котляревскаго и древнейший список ея. In: *Кіевская старина*. Кс. X–XII (1899); Кс. I–III (1900).

Nazar Fedorak – philologist, doctor of humanities (PhD), Associate Professor at the M. Voznâk Department of Ukrainian Literature at Ivan Franko National University in Lviv and in the Department of Ukrainian Philology of the Catholic University (Lviv); Chairman of the Literary Commission of the T. Shevchenko Scientific Society; participant and co-editor of the *Mediaevistica Leopoliensis* (“Львівська медієвістика”) research project. His main research interests are medieval and early modern literature. Author of the monographs *Поетика Галицько-Волинського літопису* (Lviv 2006) and *Вінець і вирій українського бароко. Сім наближень до Григорія Сковороди* (Kharkiv 2020).

