



## President and Fellows of Harvard College

---

Love One's Enemies: Ioasaf Krokovs'kyi's Advice to Peter in 1702

Author(s): Gary Marker

Source: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 1/4, UKRAINIAN PHILOLOGY AND LINGUISTICS IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY (2007), pp. 193-223

Published by: [Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41304506>

Accessed: 02-02-2016 17:40 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



*President and Fellows of Harvard College and Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Love One's Enemies: Ioasaf Krokovs'kyi's  
Advice to Peter in 1702

GARY MARKER

ВАШЕМУ ЦАРСКОМУ ПРЕСВЕТОМУ ВЕЛИЧЕСТВУ, ГОСУ-  
ДАРИЮ НАШЕМУ премилостивому, от подающего миръ ЦАРЯ  
Небеснаго, мирнаго в Державе Царской Правления, от заступницы  
Христиановъ непостыдныя, Преподобныя ЦАРИЦЫ, воз-  
бранныя ВОЕВОДЫ, непреодоленныя над врагами победы,  
Преподобных и Богоносных Оцов наших, АНТОНИЯ ФЕОДОСИЯ  
и прочих Святых Печерских...<sup>1</sup>

**T**HUS CONCLUDES AN INVOCATION to Peter I in 1702 introducing the new printing of the Kyiv *Paterik* that was dedicated specifically to the tsar. This particular edition is noteworthy not simply because it was a presentation volume. It includes new verses, illustrations, and, most importantly, an original introduction addressed to the tsar himself, composed by the sitting archimandrite of the Caves Monastery, Ioasaf Krokovs'kyi. Written in a homiletic style, the essay follows a familiar baroque formula expressing unrestrained adulation of the ruler and his achievements, connecting him to God, biblical heroes, and martyred saints. Interspersed among these numerous and unremarkable allusions, along with the obligatory adulation of the double-headed eagle and the intercession of the Theotokos, however, are lengthy and elaborate paeans to love, mercy to one's antagonists, and peace. These themes were not so unusual in the early 1720s when the victory over Sweden was complete and Peter could afford to be magnanimous toward his vanquished foes. But they were quite extraordinary for these times two decades earlier, when war was most decidedly in the air. No other text of its day contains anything quite like it, a departure so striking that it immediately captures the reader's attention, as I imagine it was meant to do. Krokovs'kyi's most persistent message dwells on the biblical prescription to love one's enemies, a laudable sentiment surely, but hardly what one might expect in the early stages of the Northern War.

This introductory essay (much like Krokovs'kyi himself) has successfully eluded scholarly analysis, or even passing mention. None of the studies of *staropechatnye predisloviia i poslesloviia* that proliferated during the 1980s and 1990s refer to it, and neither, so far as I can determine, does anything else, with the single exception of a very brief reference in the companion volume on Petrine panegyrics.<sup>2</sup> I have spent some time endeavoring to find out what I can about Krokovs'kyi's clerical career and his mental world—no easy matter, as will soon be evident. At this point I am still reconstructing Krokovs'kyi's life and work to provide a context for teasing out the text's importance and possible meanings. This paper constitutes results to date rather than a final assessment, a reconstruction of his pastoral activities and writings leading up to the *Paterik*, an exegesis of this particular edition, and then some suggestions about his outlook and what he might have been talking about in his message of peace and love.

#### INTRODUCTION

The Petrine era produced quite a few clerical authors, panegyrists, and homilists, arguably more than at any previous time in the entire history of East Slavic Orthodoxy. Collectively they produced a number of important tracts on a wide range of subjects, some overtly political, others not. They also orated many hundreds, and perhaps as many as a few thousand sermons, most of which either have been lost or have attracted little serious attention. In addition, several hierarchs such as Krokovs'kyi penned sermon-like texts in the form of instructions, meditations, and introductions to other works, and these too have drawn sparse notice. The primary exceptions to this relative inattention have been the handful of preachers in residence at or actively supported by the tsarist court, the Ukrainians Stefan Iavors'kyi, Feofan Prokopovych, Teofilakt Lopatyns'kyi, and Havryil Buzhyns'kyi. Some other well-known Moscow (and, more importantly, *velikorusskie*) clerics, most notably Karion Istomin, also produced sermons (or at least *slova* of some sort, according to the inventories of their works) and yet we know them almost entirely as authors of pedagogical texts—primers, multilanguage lexicons, and the like—and as overseers of the *pechatnyi dvor*. What, when, or to whom they preached, or how they employed scripture and other sacred texts remains almost entirely unknown. When we venture outside of the court the coverage is sparser still. With the exception of Dymytrii Tuptalo in Rostov, Ioann Maksymovych briefly in Tobolsk, and perhaps several others, few Petrine-era clerics who preached outside of Moscow or St. Petersburg have entered into the mainstream of Russian historical narratives.

This is a pity. Preaching at the pulpit in provincial cathedrals remained

highly exceptional until the very end of the eighteenth century, and the opportunity to preach was theoretically limited to those granted the formal title of *propovednik*, a signifier of having mastered specific rhetorical skills at seminary. This fact alone marked these orations and those who intoned them as special, voices that were privileged to speak and at times publish when others could not. Much of this preaching from the pulpit was confined to cathedrals in the capitals, yet a few hierarchs located outside the metropole did occasionally produce engaging and thought-provoking words that deserve inclusion into the intellectual and cultural history of the day. The reasons for including them go beyond enriching and enlarging what is still a very small canon, although those are two desiderata. Sermons, or other homiletic-style texts, provided the primary vehicles through which educated clergy communicated their ideas, made subtle suggestions, praised, and condemned. In spoken form they constituted, or had the capacity to constitute, intimate—if highly formalistic—speech acts before a select, typically well-placed, and always captive audience of listeners. On those occasions when these texts went into print shortly after the orations they achieved a second and more enduring life, a kind of literary permanence, through which the words and the authors who assembled them could reach beyond their immediate listeners to more distant readers, even if the implied second audience (lay and clerical elites) was socially not all that different.

Most intellectual or cultural historians, if they read the sermons at all, tend to look primarily at *pokhval'nye slova* and view them as freestanding texts, or ideological statements in themselves outside of a larger discourse or context. Alternatively, linguistically trained specialists, most notable Viktor Zhivov and Giovanna Brogi, have examined sermons in search of key words and expressions of sacrality, tsarist charisma, and pagan allegory, so as to trace statist and secularizing tendencies. But homilies could be richer, subtler, and more multivalent than that, and as *slova Bozhii* they almost invariably dwelled fundamentally on the biblical, the theological, and the spiritual. Riccardo Picchio's concept of dual codes comes to mind here, but if anything, it understates the multiple meanings that could be read into a particularly well-crafted sermon, a situation that demands that these texts be read closely, and from beginning to end.<sup>3</sup> Set within a rigid narrative, more or less scholastic structure that all the relevant sermonizers had carefully studied or taught in seminary and knew backwards and forwards, these types of printed texts could at times also function as communications across geographic space, directed to those who, equipped with a similar training, would know where and how to look for the voice of the author and the personal or political suggestions contained within what was otherwise a formalistic commentary on scripture or a saint's life. In the hands of a gifted practitioner such as Prokopovych the result could be a sophisticated and multivalent work demanding a trained eye and a careful hermeneutic reading. But even in lesser hands, the medium could be an

effective vehicle for subtly embedding individual arguments within otherwise commonplace structures and tropes. It could, from the perspective of its critics, mask “the false and potentially treasonous opinions of the clerical party in the guise of profound learning.”<sup>4</sup> Thus, studying the sermons of the day in pursuit of authorial presence requires a very specific methodology of reading that attempts to tease out the multiple layers that could be set within the rigid framework.

As it happens, most of the trained preachers of the day had spent their formative years studying at the Mohyla Academy in Kyiv, where they had been drilled in scholastic homiletics for months and even years on end in their rhetoric classes. As their careers developed, the expanding and unprecedented opportunities to serve in the upper echelons of the Petrine church sent many of them far away from their homes in Ukraine. On a relatively personal and informal level some (Tuptalo, Iavors’kyi, Lazar Baranovych, etc.) became active letter writers whose epistolary archives are often voluminous and always illuminating. It was through print, however, that they established what today we would call a discourse, or a set of shared conventions, tropes, and key terms through which to express their ideas so as to embed them in common understanding. It was in print that they communicated to textual communities and cast themselves as clerical intellectuals. I would suggest that geographic diversity was a foundation of this set of communicative practices, and that clerical hierarchs were highly conscious of geography and locality in their writings. Kyiv’s clergy, fanning out to all corners of the realm during Peter’s reign, need to be included as primary subjects if we are to have a better grasp of what might be termed the political discourses of the Russian Orthodox Church at the very dawn of Empire. As a consequence, a fuller understanding of what the Petrine-era Orthodox clergy were writing to and among themselves requires spreading our gaze beyond Moscow and St. Petersburg to the other sites, Kyiv most prominently, where these texts were penned.

Kyivan clerics were acutely sensitive to their heritage and to the still unresolved status of their city within a Moscow-centered church and state. How did they manifest this sensitivity, and how, if at all, did it change once they moved out of the Hetmanate into Muscovite church institutions? What did it mean to deem them Ukrainian in a Moscow-centered (later, St. Petersburg-centered) church, other than to celebrate their knowledge of Latin and love of the baroque? Was there a distinctly Ukrainian (or Ruthenian) clerical cast of mind, mode of expression, or set of concerns that migrated with them once they headed east? These are the larger questions that inform this attempt to reconstruct the life and ideas of a little-known (to put it mildly) but critically situated figure such as Krokovs’kyi.

## IOASAF KROKOV'S KYI: LIFE AND WORK

Although less prolific than some of the other hierarchs and not known as a great rhetorician, Krokov's kyi is a more or less familiar name within Ukrainian and Ukraine-focused scholarship. In Russian, or Moscow-centered works, by contrast, or in surveys of East Slavic Orthodoxy, he appears very infrequently.<sup>5</sup> Nikolai Novikov and Evgenii Bolkhovitinov, both of whom scoured the available archives and went to great lengths to familiarize their readers with Orthodox literati of previous eras, do not list him in their respective compendia of Russian writers.<sup>6</sup> Neither does Jacob Stählin, Andrei Nartov, Mikhail Semevskii, or Ivan Golikov, the engaging, vaunted fabulists and gossip mongers of Petrine historiography.<sup>7</sup> A. V. Kartashev, whose two-volume *Ocherki po istorii russkoi tserkvi* includes a fifteen-page discussion of Kyivan influence in the Petrine church entitled "Nachalo gospodstva malorossiiskogo episkopata," does not include Krokov's kyi.<sup>8</sup> Igor Smolitsch's *Geschichte der Russischen Kirche* lists just about everybody who ever held an important clerical title, but Smolitsch gives Krokov's kyi only a brief retrospective glance when discussing the 1808 reform of seminary education.<sup>9</sup> James Cracraft identifies Krokov's kyi simply as a client of Iavors'kyi whose investiture as metropolitan caught Peter's attention briefly in 1708.<sup>10</sup> Paul Bushkovitch notes in passing that Krokov's kyi received a letter in 1708 from Tsarevich Aleksei asking for some theological texts, and later that Aleksei confirmed that he knew Krokov's kyi.<sup>11</sup> K. V. Kharlampovich, whose massive *Malorossiiskoe vliianie na velikorusskuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn'* remains the standard bearer for information on this subject, barely acknowledges him.<sup>12</sup> And in the cruelest blow of all, Sergei Mikhailovich Solov'ev's encyclopedic *Istoriia Rossii s drevneishikh vremen* never mentions him at all! In sum, even in those infrequent works of scholarship where he does appear, Krokov's kyi is little more than a name, virtually without character.

So who was he, and why does he deserve our attention? Ioasaf Krokov's kyi's life and career followed a trajectory similar to that of the many other educated Kyivan clerics of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In its association with the three leading institutions of Orthodoxy in the Hetmanate—the Caves Monastery, the Mohyla Academy, and the Kyiv Metropolia—his career retraced that of other Ukrainian hierarchs who came immediately before him, such as Baranovych, Innokentii Gizel', and Varlaam Iasyn's kyi. Born around 1648, Krokov's kyi studied at the Mohyla Academy in Kyiv and then, like several other Ukrainian clerics of his day, at the St. Athanasius Academy in Rome. He returned to the cloister of the Caves Monastery and for a time functioned as an overseer of its press.<sup>13</sup> After serving as an instructor of rhetoric and philosophy at the Mohyla Academy he became its rector in 1693. He then ascended to the position of archimandrite of the Caves Monastery in 1697. While still at the academy he was selected to lead a large delegation to Moscow in 1693–1694

bearing letters from Hetman Ivan Mazepa and Metropolitan Iasyns'kyi, his two most important patrons, on behalf of the Mohyla Academy's request for material support and tsarist recognition.<sup>14</sup> Then in 1699, again in Moscow, he argued for the Academy's right to self-government, comparable to what academies elsewhere in Europe had achieved.<sup>15</sup> Entrusted with such weighty responsibilities, Krokovs'kyi became the obvious choice for metropolitan of Kyiv after Iasyns'kyi's death in 1707.

In spite of the fact that he came to preside over the golden troika (Academy, Caves Monastery, and Metropolia) of Kyivan Orthodoxy, most of the scholarship sees Krokovs'kyi as little more than a client, first of Iasyns'kyi and then of Iavors'kyi, whose influence with Peter is deemed the prime factor in Krokovs'kyi's elevation to metropolitan. And, in truth, Krokovs'kyi did not offer much of a public face, no correspondence, so far as we know, from which to glimpse him relatively unobstructed, unlike some of the other Ukrainian-trained hierarchs who became almost larger than life and who engaged in extensive correspondence.<sup>16</sup> We have a momentary and dramatic glimpse of him in the autumn of 1708, just before and after Mazepa's defection to the Swedes became public. We know that he met with the hetman's personal staff in October to discuss Mazepa's physical state. He was in Hlukhiv in early November and apparently was confronted by Mazepa while gathering his hierarchs in a town cathedral (probably the St. Nicholas Church) to pronounce Mazepa's anathema.<sup>17</sup> But if any portentous words were exchanged at this fraught moment they have left no trace. Whatever private misgivings he may have had at the time, Krokovs'kyi remained steadfastly committed to Peter, as acknowledged in a tsarist charter of 11 March 1710. In December 1708, the charter recounts, Krokovs'kyi "demonstrated his loyalty as an avid defender of Orthodoxy," for which Peter found him to be an acceptable candidate for the then-vacant seat of metropolitan, and in recognition of which he reaffirmed the monastery's stauropelial status.<sup>18</sup>

There exists a brief correspondence in *Pis'ma i bumagi Petra Velikogo* about the investiture and the gathering of gifts to be presented to Krokovs'kyi on his arrival in Moscow.<sup>19</sup> Whatever notoriety he has generated in Russian historiography derives from his implication in the affairs of Tsarevich Aleksei in 1718. At Peter's insistence, Krokovs'kyi, then seventy years old and in ill health, was summoned under guard to be interrogated in St. Petersburg about his own role and that of other Kyivan hierarchs in supporting the tsarevich. The metropolitan died on 1 July before reaching the capital, but his fall from grace seemed imminent, much like that of Archbishop Dosifei of Rostov, another of Stefan's clients, who was broken on the wheel at Peter's command because of his complicity in the affair. In anticipation of Krokovs'kyi's interrogation, a large file of miscellaneous documents, most of which have nothing to do with Aleksei Petrovich, was collected by the Metropolia and sent ahead to Moscow

for inspection.<sup>20</sup> This archival miscellany, one suspects, constitutes all that remained of the Metropolia's records for this time period after the terrible devastations in the wake of the post-Mazepa conflagration. In any case, there is almost nothing left in Kyiv.

If Krokovskiy's career as archimandrite and metropolitan has drawn at best passing scholarly attention, his connection to the written word and print seems to be a veritable black hole. Even the glare of the tsarevich affair focuses upon his connections and alleged conversations rather than his theological or political outlook. If he imparted any ideas or theological inclinations to Aleksei, the literature hasn't reproduced them. The primary exception to this inattention is Georges Florovsky's *Puti russkogo bogosloviia*, which associates the pedagogical philosophy behind the "Kyivan system" of seminary education specifically with Krokovskiy's influence. Florovsky attempts a brief reconstruction of Krokovskiy's thoughts on the Immaculate Conception and on the larger controversy over the Marian cult in Kyiv. But, lest we imagine that we are on the verge of adding a new name to the literary pantheon, he denies them any particular originality:

Probably the most representative figure of this final chapter in the Mogila era in Kievan intellectual history was Ioasaf Krokovskii (d. 1718), reformer, or even second founder, of the Kievan school...More than any other figure he seems to exhibit in religious activity and intellectual outlook all the ambiguities and contradictions of Kiev's cultural "pseudomorphosis." Educated at the Greek College of St. Athanasius in Rome, Krokovskii for the rest of his life was to retain the theological set of mind, religious convictions, and devotional habits he acquired there. At Kiev, he taught theology according to Aquinas and centered his devotional life—as was characteristic of the Baroque era—on the praise of the Blessed Virgin of the Immaculate Conception. It was under his rectorship that the student "congregations" of the Kiev Academy known as Marian Sodalities arose, in which members had to dedicate their lives "to the Virgin Mary, conceived without original sin" ("Virgini Mariae sine labe originali conceptae") and take an oath to preach and defend against heretics that "Mary was not only without actual sin, venial or mortal, but also free from original sin," although adding that "those who regard her as conceived in original sin are not to be classed as heretics." Krokovskii's acceptance of the Immaculate Conception and his propagation of the doctrine at Kiev was no more than the consolidation of a tradition that for some time in the seventeenth century had been forming among various representatives of Kievan theology, including St. Dimitrii of Rostov. And in this realm, too, it was but an imitation or borrowing from Roman thought and practice.<sup>21</sup>



Not exactly high praise. The devotion to Marianism among the Kyivan clergy of that time and their embrace of the cult of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin (for example, their insistence on adding the words “Virgin Mary” to “Blessed Mother of God”) lies beyond question. Nevertheless, the matter of how, and from what sources, Florovsky constructed this picture of Krokovs’kyi’s *individual* theological outlook is unclear. Florovsky habitually wrote aggregate footnotes to whole sections of text, from which it is often impossible to discern specific sources for specific claims.<sup>22</sup> A more admiring portrait emerges in a mid-nineteenth century history of the Kyiv Academy in which Krokovs’kyi is endowed with profundity, a great mind, and bold genius (“genial’naia smelost’”), with which he tackled the most abstract questions that would have made him a leading teacher in the most eminent schools of Europe.<sup>23</sup> Precisely what he said or wrote to merit such gaudy praise is never explained, however, because, “there is no need to say much about the mind and talents of this remarkable individual.” Thus, even when showered with praise, the man remains obscure.

What, then, did Krokovs’kyi actually write other than the 1702 introduction? His name does not often appear in most of the standard descriptive bibliographies (e.g., Bykova and Gurevich, Zapasko and Isaievych, and others).<sup>24</sup> The most helpful guide here is the second volume of Petr Pekarskii’s *Nauka i literatura v Rossii pri Petre Velikom*, whose index shows that, while archimandrite and metropolitan, Krokovs’kyi had his name affixed to several Kyivan imprints. In many instances he is listed in the title of a volume not as author but because the volume came out under his aegis. Thus, a 1699 *Oktoikh*<sup>25</sup> identifies itself in the colophon as containing “a new form of illustration executed in the Caves Monastery under the aegis of Metropolitan Varlaam Iasyns’kyi and the archimandrite of the monastery Ioasaf Krokovs’kyi.”<sup>26</sup> A 1704 *Oktoikh* lists Krokovs’kyi alone.<sup>27</sup> Similar inscriptions were included in title pages of psalters (1705 and 1708), a collection of akathists (1706), a liturgy (1708), as well as several other imprints.<sup>28</sup> A vita and service of St. Nicholas of Myra (December 6) from 1700 lists Krokovs’kyi on the title page after Peter I and Patriarch Adrian, as does a 1705 edition of Ioann Maksymovych’s *Alfavit*.<sup>29</sup> Other works, including the 1702/1705 edition of volumes 3 and 4 of Tuptalo’s *Zhitiia sviatykh*, mention him, both on the title page and in the colophon.<sup>30</sup> Once Krokovs’kyi became metropolitan in 1708, several additional Kyivan imprints included dedications specifically to him.<sup>31</sup>

The fact that Krokovs’kyi chose to be named in much of the published output of the Caves typography is mildly noteworthy in that it suggests an awareness of print and a desire to inscribe himself onto the output of his monastery’s press, to tie his own name to the creative endeavors of his fellow Ukrainians rewriting the canon of religious texts. F. I. Titov’s massive history of the Kyivan press confirms that Krokovs’kyi paid close attention to it and

occasionally intervened directly to make certain that liturgical books were properly edited and that ornamentation, a defining feature of baroque-era imprints, was designed with care.<sup>32</sup> But this tradition of hierarchic intervention and inscription began well before him, at least in Kyiv and Chernihiv. Listing clerical and secular authorities on the title page had become common practice during Petro Mohyla's time as metropolitan in the 1630s, and his successors followed suit. While including the archimandrite on this list was uncommon for other East Slavic presses (including *pechatnyi dvor*, which usually stopped with the tsar and patriarch), it had become well established in Kyiv. One assumes that inscribing the name of the archimandrite on the title page was a way of articulating the Caves Monastery's special prominence as an autocephalous institution and the archimandrite as an authority unto himself, subject to the hierarchies of church and secular authorities but autonomous all the same. Yet this does not bring us closer to Krokov's'kyi himself.

Krokov's'kyi's pen was not entirely dormant, however. He wrote brief introductions to some of the above texts, including an explanation of the timing of the holy mysteries of the Eucharist, a subject of considerable controversy. Of greater interest is an akathist to St. Barbara published in 1698, which, specialists agree, was almost certainly Krokov's'kyi's original work, even though his name does not appear on it.<sup>33</sup> Typically associated throughout Eastern Christianity with services to the Theotokos, akathists were composed to extol many other saints, and their verses were chanted as part of their name-day services. Still, it was unusual in the East Slavic world to publish individual akathists at this time (rare in Kyiv and Chernihiv and virtually unknown in Moscow). Most remained as manuscripts, to be chanted in situ, at or in the vicinity of the monastery where they had been composed, or in local cathedrals. In those instances when they were published, they appeared mostly as collections of several akathists, or as part of a larger work, almost always dedicated to the Theotokos, but sometimes to St. Nicholas the Wonderworker.

This particular akathist also was published as part of a larger *sbornik*, all of whose texts were devoted to St. Barbara. In addition to the akathist, the volume includes Tuptalo's recently rewritten vita of St. Barbara, some devotional verses devoted to her, and a very carefully crafted discussion of her local relics and their miracle-working history ("Povest' o chestnykh moshchakh Sviatyiya Velikomuchenitsy Varvary").<sup>34</sup> More than a single set of hymns, it is a collection meant to honor and celebrate the saint in full splendor, a guide to her veneration in major cathedrals of the Hetmanate. As a printed artifact, it was intended to make that celebration in some sense more visible and public. According to some scholars (Pekarskii, Isaievych) the text of Krokov's'kyi's 1698 akathist to St. Barbara is substantially different from that of previous ones. Even if Krokov's'kyi had not authored that piece of the volume, the *sbornik* came into existence under his aegis and almost certainly at his personal direction.

The title clearly reflects the identification of St. Barbara with this time and place.

Акафист святой славной и всехвалной Великомученице Варваре В Богоспасаемом граде Киеве, при церкви бодраго нетленных ея мощей стража, святого архистратига Михайла, монастыра золотOVERHOГО, многая исцеления с верою притекающим подавающей, сочиненный, Егоже подобает молитвенно пети благочестивым иже Святыми ея молитвами, правоверным исповеданием и мученическим страданием...: ея же помощью, и поспешеством избобразися в святой великой чудотворной печерской киевской лавре.<sup>35</sup>

Some of this language, specifically the reference to the “Miracle-Working Caves Lavra” had become conventional, a title-page formula that appeared on numerous Kyivan imprints and that conveyed the foundation story of the monastery as told in the *Paterik*. This formulation’s sense of special affinity between divine intervention and local identity, simultaneously Kyivan and monastic, is transparent. But the rest of this phraseology is new, most notably the reference to St. Barbara’s relics in the St. Michael Cathedral, and it highlights the specifically local claims that Krokovs’kyi and his contemporaries were making for the cult of St. Barbara as celebrated throughout the Orthodox world. Before one turns the page, before reading a single line of the actual akathist, vita, or miracle tales, one experiences an intermingling of St. Barbara and the consecrated places of Kyiv such that one would have difficulty imagining one without the other. This, I believe, was the whole point. All of this material—the akathist, Tuptalo’s vita, relics, miracle tales—emphasizes the local and temporal, Kyiv and the here and now, and in so doing lays a privileged claim over St. Barbara, one not found in earlier akathists to her.

During the course of the seventeenth century St. Barbara had become a highly visible patron saint of Kyiv, and she had been openly embraced as such by several clerics. Tuptalo refers to her repeatedly as his patron in both his *Diariusz* and in his correspondence, as do several other clerics and even lay figures in the Hetmanate.<sup>36</sup> This cult nominally derived from her local relics, which, they maintained, had arrived in Kyiv at the beginning of the twelfth century to honor the imminent wedding of Barbara Comnena, the daughter of the Byzantine emperor Alexius, to Sviatopolk Iziaslavich, prince of Kyiv. This was a problematic claim, however. Chronicles from Rus’ and Byzantium make no mention of such a marriage, and, so far as is known, Alexius did not have a daughter named Barbara.<sup>37</sup> In the eyes of modern scholarship, therefore, the tale constitutes an apocrypha, which according to current thinking came into being only in the mid-seventeenth century, perhaps while Mohyla was metropolitan, or during Bohdan Khmel’nyts’kyi’s revolt against Poland.

The miracle tale, though, anticipates our skepticism and provides an alternative explanation for the silence of the chronicles. After taking us through the account of the marriage (which, in this rendering, was to Mikhail Iziaslavich) and gift of the relics, the author proclaims that Mikhail constructed a stone church, in honor of his name-day saint (the Archangel Michael), in which to house the relics. Shortly thereafter, Batu Khan and his horde arrived out of the east and put Kyiv to the torch. In order to protect the relics, the clergy of St. Michael's placed them in a secret location where they remained for centuries until they were uncovered and verified by Mohyla in 1644. Over the next several years unassailable dignitaries, including the chancellor of the Polish king, Metropolitan and Prince Gedeon Chetvertyns'kyi, and the patriarch of Antioch came and worshipped at the relics, and Lazar Baranovych, rector of the Mohyla Academy (and later archbishop of Chernihiv) preached about her and confirmed their authenticity. The tale offers several more accounts of the verification of the relics and the miraculous striking down of two thieves who thought to steal them from their resting place. Why, then, do the chronicles remain silent? The tale explains that the clergy maintained public secrecy about their very existence, lest they be uncovered and desecrated in the wake of Batu's assault. Instead, they kept the memory alive verbally, telling the truth down through the generations until finally in the time of Mohyla it was deemed safe to reveal the truth and inscribe it in texts. One cannot fail to marvel at the scholarly sensibilities of the author, the need for logic and evidence to disarm potential skeptics.

The volume does not indicate when during the seventeenth century this miracle tale was composed, or whether Krokovs'kyi had a hand in its compilation. But the references in the past tense to Baranovych and Chetvertyns'kyi (who died in 1693 and 1690, respectively) suggest that it was newly penned, and, if so, it is highly probable that Krokovs'kyi was directly involved. Here we need note only that Krokovs'kyi showed every indication of actively participating in this cult, and by extension in advocating for Kyiv's claim of sacral heritage and privilege within an East Slavic Orthodox cosmology that had grown increasingly mindful of what might be termed the greater or all-inclusive and increasingly indeterminate Rus' vaguely and uneasily extending from the Carpathians to Moscow and beyond.

The language of this akathist reinforces that link, if somewhat more subtly than the miracle tale. It dwells on the bride-of-Christ theme, which was a prominent feature of Tuptalo's vita, and on St. Barbara's unshakable faith in the face of her unbending father. But then, in the fifth *kontakion*<sup>38</sup> (*kondak*) the akathist expands on an important but fleeting episode of the vita, in which God parted the mountains so that Barbara could hide from her father in a cave.<sup>39</sup> The *kontakion* grants this miraculous intervention a poetic visibility that goes well beyond its place in the vita, as line after line repeats the refrain of "stone"

and “cave.” (“Радуися, сквозе камение прошедшая,” “Радуися, среде камня камень Христова,” “Радуися, в пещеру каменную вшедшая, видети,” etc.)<sup>40</sup> This poetic language continues into the succeeding *ikos*, linking St. Barbara’s sanctuary in the stone cave and her flight from her stone-hearted father with the rock on which Christ built his church, imagery that in 1690s Kyiv would resonate with deep local associations tying both the crypt at Saint Michael’s and the Caves Monastery to the actual life of the saint. The final verse makes the link explicit: God’s cave of antiquity and the blessed city of Kyiv are merged, tending and preserving the sacred body.

Блажен град Киев, хранящ святое твое тело,  
еже больных врачует и хранить в нём цело.  
Хранима телом в храме вожда сил небесных,  
с ним мя от бед душевных храни и телесных.<sup>41</sup>

Whatever the larger significance of the Kyivan cult of St. Barbara—an intriguing subject that requires further study—the narrative and organizational strategy of this specific volume—the totality of the title page, akathist, vita, and tale in combination—clearly situates Kyiv and the Caves Monastery within a heavenly pantheon and divinely-touched space, linking its place within Orthodoxy to the fulfillment of God’s will. Once again, in the 1690s, when Kyiv was juridically under the domain of Moscow, a capital to which it was developing multiple links while simultaneously being centrifugally pulled and pushed by other forces, this articulation of a special role in the divine plan strives to define Kyiv’s distinctive identity and the central role of the clergy as protectors of its sacred heritage. Competing voices from the Hetmanate’s lay elites, Samiilo Velychko’s chronicle, the so-called *Litopys Samovydsia*, and others, see matters rather differently and place hetman and *starshyna* at the center of the region’s narration. Thus, the images embedded by Krokovs’kyi in texts such as the St. Barbara akathist constitute not just expressions of local heritage vis-a-vis, say, the Moscow Patriarchate, but also claims for specifically clerical preeminence in defining and protecting that heritage. This larger agenda was not new to him (both Gizel’ and Baranovych had made similar arguments previously), but it helps to situate Krokovs’kyi and the politics of specific saintly cults within Orthodoxy that he embraced at the time when he penned his introduction to the *Paterik*.

#### THE KYIV *PATERIK* AND THE EDITIONS OF 1702

Krokovs’kyi wrote the introduction to the 1702 edition of the Kyivan *Paterik* in his capacity as archimandrite.<sup>42</sup> The *Paterik*, of course, is the monastery’s

foundational text and among the most widely discussed early compilations of Rusian Orthodoxy. It tells the tale of the monastery's beginnings, the hagiographies of many of its earliest monks, including the founder, St. Feodosii, as well accounts of early miracles. It identifies the monastery as a geographic starting point of East Slavic holiness, and as such it served myriad ideological agendas over the centuries. Often recopied, it had already gone through two printed editions in East Slavic presses (1661, 1678) before this one, both of which entailed extensive compilations and comparisons of extant manuscript copies within the Caves Monastery, closely overseen by its archimandrite.<sup>43</sup>

By the end of the seventeenth century the *Paterik* functioned simultaneously as a beacon of a specifically Kyivan spiritual heritage (like the St. Barbara cult) and as a signifier of East Slavic (or Rusian) Orthodox unity, two very different but not necessarily antagonistic agendas. In 1702 the Caves Monastery produced two imprints of the *Paterik* (press runs unknown), one made public in June, the other in September. The descriptive bibliographies, such as Pekarskii and Bykova and Gurevich, list these as two separate editions, but a comparison of the two makes it clear that the text of the *Paterik* was set in type only once in that year, and that it remained the same for both imprints. Each measures the same size (folios 240 x 145 cm); the formatted text of the *Paterik* is identical in both printings, running to 271 leaves, organized identically from one printing to the other and with the same number of engravings (47).

There are important differences between the two volumes, however. The first printing reproduces almost exactly what had been included in the imprints of 1661 and 1678: the *Paterik* itself, a relatively simple title page, and a lengthy and highly argumentative introduction to the reader. The title page includes an appropriate dedication on behalf of the monastery to the tsar, the (unnamed) patriarch, and the archimandrite (Krokovskiy), who was identified by name. This older introduction had been the work of Gizel', initially penned under very different political circumstances for the 1661 printing. It offers nothing less than a point-by-point defense of the authenticity of the tales and of the relics of the saintly church fathers buried in the monastery's crypts against unnamed Roman Catholic (in other words, Jesuit) skeptics; hence the title "Предисловие к читателю Православному содержащее ответы противу хулений на Святых Печерских." In so doing it provides a template for reading the narratives that follow. This version, presumably, is produced with a clerical audience (the "Orthodox reader" of the title) in mind, almost certainly those in the Hetmanate who might still be harboring Uniate sympathies at the dawn of the eighteenth century. In short, this is a working text.

The second variant appeared a few months later and, as a presentation volume for the tsar, is more ornate and visually striking. It includes all of the texts of the first printing, but with some additions, all of which are placed at the front of the volume. The new frontispiece is particularly elaborate, and it

is accompanied by a new invocation to the tsar and verses dedicated to Peter and the house of Romanov (“Мир дому цареву...”). The obverse page contains a separate dedication that is not in the earlier imprint. The volume overall is adorned with approximately two dozen lavish and mostly new illustrations by the most celebrated Kyivan engraver of the day, Leontii Tarasevych. Tarasevych is best known for his engraved portrait of Prince V. V. Golitsyn from 1687, and the vivid and ornate imagery of his work reflects his training in the Polish baroque. It would have been Krokovs’kyi’s decision to commission Tarasevych to design the new engravings, an indication that he wanted this imprint to reflect the monastery at its best.

As in the earlier printings, the subsequent engravings in the second 1702 edition, that is, those that are interleaved with the basic text, depict scenes from the *Paterik* itself, images from the lives of Kyivan saints, miracles, shrines, and the like, most of which occupy an entire half sheet. Clearly expensive to produce, it was carefully bound and intended more for display than for private reading.<sup>44</sup> It is this printing—and not the earlier one—into which Ioasaf inserted his introduction to the tsar, placed just before the older introduction to the reader. The archimandrite knew that the reader of record was the tsar, and one must assume that he assembled the ornamentation, introduction, and verses—that taken together formed a discrete unit separate from the *Paterik* itself—so as to capture the sovereign’s eyes, to direct what he saw first and what he read. The press run is not known, but we do know from the inventories of libraries old and new that multiple copies were produced, presumably for elite recipients. Still, the audience of record was the sovereign, and one must assume that Krokovs’kyi assembled the ornamentation, verses, and introduction with Peter in mind.

A word of caution is in order here. This was Kyiv after all, where imprints containing detailed and over-the-top ornamentations had been the norm for decades, and not Moscow, where the more muted baroque of the late seventeenth-century tsarist court was just beginning to produce this type of imagery in *konkliuzii* and some books. The Caves Monastery was justifiably proud of its stable of skilled engravers, and it luxuriated in the baroque as a way of celebrating its participation in a broader European culture beyond the specific parameters of East Slavic Orthodoxy. It often employed elaborate engravings in its publications as a mantel of learning and high culture. Kyiv was not just another provincial town or remote *pustyn’* of the Muscovite steppes, this style proclaimed. It was special, different but no less exalted than the capital. Local bookmen wanted everyone—Moscow, Warsaw, Rome, and most of all Kyiv itself—to take note: baroque equaled Europe, and Kyiv’s clergy were members of the club. Even relatively modest works sometimes were adorned with visual images that filled the page with saints, the Theotokos, Christ, angels, doves, eagles, serpents, banners, history, coats of arms, orbs, scepters, and

anything else deemed susceptible to pictorial representation. Title pages and frontispieces were often adorned with the most intricate headpieces (*zastavky*, border engravings, and the like. Typefaces were often varied over the page so as to emphasize their aesthetics rather than the words themselves. And as the seventeenth century proceeded, these engravings became ever more elaborate, technically more sophisticated, and visually more like Western European art. Against that background, the ornamentations of the second 1702 *Paterik* in themselves constituted nothing new. They bear mention because of their contents, their specific link to Krovovskiy's text, and because they reproduce visually the local self-consciousness of Kyivan bookmen.

#### KROKOVSKYI'S INTRODUCTION, FRONTISPIECE, AND VERSES

Krovovskiy composed his introduction in a narrative style that to some extent anticipated that of the panegyric sermons or *pokhval'nye slova* that would become relatively commonplace in Russian clerical discourse just a few years later. From that perspective it amounts to an unabashed and sustained work of flattery. This prefiguring is interesting because it is one of the earliest East Slavic texts of this genre written on behalf of Peter I as an emerging statesman. Less literary and far less elegant than, for example, Feofan Prokopovych's speech welcoming Peter to Kyiv in 1706, it nevertheless anticipates its tone and format. Moreover, although not orated so far as we know, the introduction was written as if it were meant to be—that is, as a speech act—clearly evincing Krovovskiy's training as a homilist and his relative inexperience in writing other types of didactic prose. Indeed, the extensive recourse to biblical epigrams, references, and parables that litter both the text and marginalia leads one to imagine that Krovovskiy was writing as if it were a sermon. And it is here, encased in scripture and praise for the tsar, that Krovovskiy articulates his message.

He begins with a parable of King Solomon—an absolutely standard piece of Ukrainian panegyric writing throughout the seventeenth century—both to endow Peter with Solomonic wisdom and to explain that the monastery's gift of prayer for Peter to “the intercessor herself, the Queen of Heaven the Most Pure Virgin Mary, Mother of God” is more fitting than the gold and precious stones that the Queen of Sheba gave to Solomon. Similarly, the gift of the newly printed *Paterik* reflects the same God-granted sweetness of the spirit. It continues in this vein for several more lines:

Царица оная, пришедши к Царю Соломону, прославляше его от богатства великого и от предстоящих ему, рече бо: блажени отроцы твои сии, иже тебе предстоятъ. Но наша, паче Ваша Царская Святопечерская Обитель, приходящи ныне с даром сим



прославляти Ваше Царское Величество, яко достоить, недоумеет и не дерзает. Явно бо есть богатство славы Монаршаго Престола, Вашего Царскаго Пресветлаго Величества, всем концем Земли.<sup>45</sup>

This use of counterpoint (for example, “Царица оная...но наша Обитель”) between Peter and Solomon, the Caves cloister and Queen of Sheba, the Queen of Sheba and the Queen of Heaven, although not especially deft, enables Krokovs’kyi to represent the monastery in unusually exalted terms. Their gift, he seems to say, offers a pathway of prayer to the Queen of Heaven, something far more valuable than what the earthly queen could offer Solomon. The passage imagines the Kyivan monks as the sovereign’s prayer givers of choice for heavenly intercession, and in the process offers considerable support to Florovsky’s observation about Krokovs’kyi’s espousal of the cult of the Virgin Mary. But these remarks serve merely to situate the archimandrite’s voice, to enable him to move on to the here and now, the main thrust of his introduction, which focuses on political virtue. He interweaves additional dualisms around the image of the double-headed eagle, a common trope in these texts: Heavenly and earthly kings, faith and piety, divine wisdom and reason, courage and zealotry, fortitude and strength, mercy and truth, law and justice. But highest of all, proclaims Krokovs’kyi, stand love and peace.

Любовь Вашего Царскаго Пресветлаго Величества, не токмо к ближним, но и ко врагам истинно являемая, исполняющая Заповедь Государю сию: любите враги ваша, добро творите ненавидящам вас: началствовати над иными добродетельми зрится. Понеже любовь вся добродетели превосходит, по главу Павла Святаго: ныне пребывают вера, надежда, любвы, три сия, болши же сих любвы. Любовь бо превосходить премудрость, превосходит и веру: аще имам Пророчество, и всем тайны вся, и весь разум, и аще имам всю веру, яко и горы преставляти, любве же не имам, ничтоже есть, рече Апостоль.<sup>46</sup>

Your tsarist Majesty’s love, not only for those close to him, but even for his enemies truly demonstrates that he carries out the commandment of Our Lord to love your enemies, do good for those who hate you: to raise this over all other acts of goodness. Love eclipses all [other] goodness, according to the Chapter of Saint Paul. There is faith and hope, but the greatest of these is love. Love eclipses divine wisdom, it supersedes even faith, and verily prophesy itself, and all the mysteries, everything, all reason, all faith, and eclipses even the mountains. For if there is no love there is nothing, says the Apostle.

This paraphrase takes two familiar passages from scripture, both dealing with love, and combines them didactically. First, it speaks of loving one's enemies, a message associated with Christ's preaching on the mountainside to his disciples, as told in the Gospels of Matthew 5:44 and Luke 6:27–28, 35.<sup>47</sup> Krokovskiy then splices onto it the equally familiar passage from Corinthians 1:13 (“And now these three remain: faith, hope and love. But the greatest of these is love”), a curious strategy because this scriptural text does not go exactly where Krokovskiy chose to take it. True love, says Paul, “does not envy...it is not rude...it is not self-seeking, it is not easily angered, it keeps no record of wrongs...It always protects, always trusts, always hopes, always perseveres.”<sup>48</sup> But nowhere does chapter 13 of Corinthians mention enemies. This fusion is Krokovskiy's own narrative license, and while merging separate passages in the New Testament does not violate the accepted scholastic conventions of homiletic writing, one has to assume that he does so here with specific purposes in mind.

He expostulates further that the two-headed eagle of the tsar unites all of these virtues around peace and love (“мир с любовью в двоглавленном Вашего Царского Пресветлаго Величества орле прославляющемся”); that love forms the union and symmetry of these two virtuous heads (“И тако согласию и союзу добродетельных тех двоих глав”). He lingers over this theme over the next several paragraphs, citing Psalms, Christ's sermons to his disciples, the Holy Spirit as the dove of peace, Mary (“миропачательница Дева Богородица”), and almost any other scriptural imagery that seemed apposite for declaiming peace. We are commanded, he proclaims, to live in peace among our enemies. The two-headed eagle of the tsar is our agent of peace, our Noah's Ark (“Ибо яко Ковчег Ноев покровением”), which will protect us against “a deluge of blood.”

Lest one imagine that Krokovskiy's evocation of peace and love makes him some sort of early flower child two hundred and fifty years *avant la lettre*, the introduction quickly brings the reader back to Orthodox faith and politics. Every Orthodox believer seeks peace, or communion, with God, but one is also commanded to seek peace with the living, with the sacred and with all people, and even to seek peace with one's sinful self: “Lord, bring peace unto my bones.” The extended passage from which this is taken employs the words *love* and *peace* at least once in every phrase, making their centrality unmistakable to the reader. The two-headed eagle of the sovereign is the agent of peace, its protector and guarantor, the protector of the Caves Monastery.

What, one wonders, does Krokovskiy mean by peace in this setting; why is he dwelling on loving one's enemies? Is he worried about war? Perhaps, but he certainly is not suggesting that Peter simply lay down his arms. Nowhere does he direct the reader to the subsequent line in Luke 6:29 in which Christ advises his disciples to turn the other cheek. On the contrary, Peter is constructing “a

new and mighty fortress against the foes who oppose him.” He had won brave and glorious victories at Azov and Kazikermen, campaigns which involved extensive Zaporozhian Cossack participation and which drew considerable positive attention from the relevant Cossack chronicles, especially the *Litopys Samovydtsia* and the *Kratkoe opisanie Malorossii*.<sup>49</sup> Further victories over enemies both visible and invisible await him; the true unseen enemy is the devil himself, but the devil has no chance against the honor of the Theotokos and the saints, through whom God has granted Peter the power to smite the snake and the lion (the latter being the symbol of the devil, and eventually Charles the XII of Sweden as well). The relics of the Kyivan fathers, Saints Antonii, Feodosii, and the others bear witness throughout Christendom and unto the ends of the earth to the tsar’s bravery and to his pious protection of those relics against enemies. Peter is Moses leading us through the water that swallowed up our enemies.

Peter, Krokovs’kyi predicts, will live long, perform ever more great feats, restore and renew the realm through the power of God’s word. Peter will protect them to the ends of the earth against the assaults from the enemies of Orthodoxy. These are familiar panegyric expressions for the era, and Krokovs’kyi is seemingly determined to employ every possible biblical figure of bravery and righteousness in the course of praising the tsar (the above examples do not come close to exhausting his enormous panegyric arsenal). But they are hardly consistent with the language of pacifism or loving one’s enemies, all of which makes the entire text a bit of a puzzle.

The final pages of the introduction return to the images and figures with which it began: Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, the power of mercy and faith, youth and renewal, the precious gift of the *Paterik*. Structural symmetry of this sort was a standard feature of Kyivan homiletic texts, and we see the same pattern, for example, in sermons by Prokopovych, Iavors’kyi, Buzhyns’kyi, and quite a few others. Fealty to a common model reflects the training they received at the Mohyla Academy, and it echoes textually the hermeneutic precept of alpha and omega with which they had been imbued. Toward the end, Krokovs’kyi does introduce a brief but harsh warning against the Swedes, the only time he alludes to the Northern enemy, identified here by their confession, as “Liuti,” or “Lutherans,” rather than by their nation. They dare not try to harm the faithful, who are the *ptentsy* [his term] of the tsar and eagle, under whose protection they dwell. But otherwise the text ends more or less as it began: the wisdom of Solomon, love and mercy toward one’s foes, and the enduring power of love.

Here, then, is a very curious introduction. Its words and biblical references bear only an episodic relationship to the *Paterik* or the Kyivan church fathers with which they are nominally bound. It offers no guidelines to the reader, no meditations for understanding the ensuing text, functions fulfilled by the older

introduction. With only a few small adjustments it could have been affixed to almost any publication. Clearly, Krokovskiy wanted Peter to take notice of his words as something distinct, in essence to become aware of the archimandrite and the particular words of effusive praise that he used repeatedly throughout the text. He employed some of the form's most commonplace tropes, such as the double-headed eagle and scriptural antecedents, almost to the point of overkill. But what continues to stand out against the backdrop of these conventions is the far from commonplace drumbeat of peace, love, and mercy toward one's enemies. What, then, was Krokovskiy trying to say to his sovereign? The accompanying frontispiece and verses offer assistance here (figure 1, below). They were intended as complements to the introduction, both to render visually and to further clarify Krokovskiy's message.

First the images. As we see, there is a great deal going on here, several stories and images layered on top of one another, all of which reproduce various themes of the introduction. At the top is God the Father and the Holy Spirit (the dove), with cherubim and the Apostle Peter on the left and St. Aleksei the man of God on the right. Prototypically, the sun's rays emanate from God's presence. At the center of the entire image, completely dominating the space between God and Earth, is the commanding figure of the thrice-crowned Mary and Christ child surrounded by open wings and the two-headed eagle. The lower talons of the eagle hold the orb and scepter. The Queen of Heaven is thus seamlessly—and familiarly—joined with the symbols of the tsar's power on earth. On each side of Mary are saintly Kyivan church fathers (Antonii is identified on the left, Feodosii on the right), whose incorruptible relics constitute the focus of Gizel's introduction, gazing downward approvingly at the terrestrial space below.

These earthly scenes show a warrior figure on the left, in the pose of Saint George but lacking a nimbus, riding on horseback and in military garb, slaying the serpent or dragon. His spear, touching the hem of the robes of the monastic fathers, is visually tied to celestial space in an unbroken link, as if they (and by extension, the Caves Monastery) were the ones guiding his hand. In the middle is a beast, apparently a lion (the devil), being struck down by a lightning bolt emanating from the celestial royal orb. On the right are Peter I, Aleksei Petrovich (the two men with crowns, named respectively after the apostle and saint shown above), and his cavalymen and aides de camp. Peter is organically connected to the orb by the banner between the two, and through the wings of the eagle to God the Father. Significantly, he is holding no weapons, and he rides with open arms, as if in prayer, exposed and vulnerable, with an expression of joy, triumph, and deliverance, reproducing the expressions and gestures of both Theotokos and Christ. He is their earthly agent, a direct beneficiary of divine intervention through the blessing of Mary. Even Peter's cavalymen, although still armed with spears and axes, are not poised for battle.

The Christ child gazes down upon their leader, and directs him, but Peter does not return the gaze. At the very base of the image are the fortresses of Azov (left) and Kazikermen (right), sites of Peter's recent victories as mentioned in Krokovs'kyi's introduction. The battle is over; Peter has won, and the Heavens rejoice. The hoofs of Peter's steed intrude into the bottom scene so as to link the otherwise peaceful Peter and his soldiers with the triumphal entry into Azov.

There can be no doubt that the engraved frontispiece was crafted specifically for this imprint, and in all likelihood at the archimandrite's instruction, because it tells in visual terms the very story that Krokovs'kyi is about to relate in words: the victorious Peter demonstrating his beatific love for his vanquished enemies, transposing the divine love of the Theotokos and Christ child from Heaven to Earth. It is Peter who stands parallel with the terrestrial St. George, not the sacred heroes of Kyivan antiquity, and it is he who leads the mighty charge of Heaven. The frontispiece, then, was directing the reader's attention to Krokovs'kyi's words and only secondarily to the *Paterik* and saintly church fathers, whose celestial participation is symbolically crucial, but is not the central focus of the visual narrative. Rather, they are visually tied to both the eagle's wings and to the divine holy family by an inscription. Their gaze, if one looks closely, is toward Christ and Mary, even those whose heads are seemingly lowered toward Peter. Mary becomes *their* intercessor (*zastupnytsia*) on behalf of Peter and faith, and one may imagine that the prayers of the Kyivan saints are answered in the affirmative, based on the triumphal scene below. It is as if Krokovs'kyi was endowing ancient and sacred Kyiv, specifically the monastery over which he presided, a primary role in facilitating Peter's campaigns. Victory, the image says, is the victory of Christ, of faith; it cannot be understood otherwise, and thus the tsar need be mindful, grateful, and protective of his Kyivan intercessors. It is they who gaze and supplicate toward the divine on Peter's behalf, rather than Peter himself. It is they, consequently, who pray that Mary and Christ will guide him to reign in faith. Without them the triangle of Mary/Christ-Peter-saints (and they are arranged triangularly)—the link between Heaven and Rus'—is broken.

When read in this way the frontispiece stands as a message to Peter to recognize the importance of Kyiv, the Caves Monastery, and to see his own authority as linked to them through the lineage of the original baptism of Rus' and Kyiv as the starting point of its Christian rulership. Kyiv thus becomes integral to the Muscovite state (not a new theme among Kyivan hierarchs) but on its own terms as the celestial guardian of Christian kingship. That role must be recognized and nurtured, a conclusion that also grants Krokovs'kyi himself a leading, if unvisualized, role in this constitutional arrangement.

The images of the fortresses at Azov and Kazikermen very likely constitute an additional layer of local meaning, one with a decidedly secular content.



Figure 1. Frontispiece from the 1702 *Paterik*.

These had been brutal and costly battles, and both had involved the intensive participation of the hetman and the Zaporozhian forces, whose existence is otherwise nowhere to be found in the frontispiece. Ukrainian chronicles, and presumably the lore that preceded them, treat these battles heroically and the Cossack participation as decisive. From that perspective the panegyric image offers praise to tsar and Cossacks simultaneously, a narrative strategy that had begun somewhat earlier, shortly after the Azov siege itself. Adding the fortress at Azov to the image pushed the iconographic envelope one step further because of its sensitive status in very recent memory. The siege of the fortress had led to extensive casualties. Peter's insistence upon rebuilding the fortress with regimental and conscripted labor, rather than allowing the victorious fighters to return home or to barracks after a two-year-long campaign, generated considerable acrimony, especially among *strel'tsy*, and this

decision precipitated the explosive *strel'tsy* rebellion that engulfed Moscow and its environs.<sup>50</sup> However disgruntled they may have been, Cossack regiments did not rebel, even though elements of the *starshyna* were none too pleased, especially with Mazepa. Thus, the presence of the rebuilt fortress reminded Peter not only that Cossacks shared in his triumph, but that they remained loyal while others, Muscovite forces at that, did not.

When one compares this cluttered and increasingly complicated image to the relatively straightforward one used for the 1661 Kyiv edition of the *Paterik* (figure 2, right), the distinction becomes much clearer, as do the improved technical facility and the strategic positioning of the tsar.

Once again the winged and crowned Theotokos spatially dominates the image, in fact, more so than in the 1702 variant. The theme of the entire image is Mary, Mother of God as protector and intercessor to Christ and the Holy Spirit for the Caves Monastery and its monks, both of which are represented as terrestrial and living beings rather than saintly or celestial ones. The monks, in other words, represent the *current* monastic brotherhood and not the heavenly church fathers; they occupy the entire iconic space on earth that Peter, the warriors, Kazikermen, and Azov collectively usurp in the 1702 representation. All of the banners extending from their mouths to the Heavens, on both sides of both Christ and Theotokos speak of protection (*pokrov*). This is a conventional representation of the protecting presence of Mary, especially for the Caves Monastery, which, as the *Paterik* reminds us, was known formally as the Monastery of the Dormition of the Mother of God in Kyiv.

Secular authority is represented here as well, in the form of the small crest and *bulava* of the hetman, Iurii Khmel'nyts'kyi, on horseback, just beneath Mary, and enveloped in the two-headed eagle, which by this time would have represented—albeit faintly—the overarching authority of the tsar as well as that of the Queen of Heaven. But the connection between image and *Paterik* is organic, and the former leads the viewer to the monastery, quite unlike the 1702 image, which leads the viewer directly to Krokovs'kyi's words. The unity of his introduction and its iconic representation is made manifest by the words embedded in the image and accompanying verses. “The Lord blesses His people with peace,” read the words above God the Father. The banner below God reads “знамение множества мира” (the banner of the multitude of peace). Cherubim incant, “на земле мир” (peace on earth). The Kyivan patriarchs express thanksgiving to Mary for God's granting them peace, and so forth. On earth Peter expresses thanksgiving to God for being granted victory (“Благодарение Богу давшему нам победу”); the warrior declares, “the lion and serpent are struck down.” Above Azov are the words from Revelations 14:8 “Паде, Паде, Великий Вавилон!” (Fallen! Fallen is Babylon the Great). Finally, the words just above Kazikermen read “И ты Капернаум до Небес вознесеися низвержен еси” (“And ye of Capernaum eat what has fallen and ye shall ascend to Heaven”), a



Figure 2. Frontispiece from the 1661 *Paterik*.

reference to John 6:59 when Jesus is preaching at the synagogue in Capernaum, speaking of eating the bread from Heaven, the blood and flesh of Christ (“he who feeds on the bread will live forever”), and even more directly to Matthew 11:23 (“And Thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hell”). The Tatars and Ottomans, like the Jews of Capernaum, stand on the precipice of damnation and are advised to accept Christ’s teaching and join the community of Orthodox faithful. By contrast, the banners on the 1661 image speak only about Heavenly protection and the intercession of Mary.



The wings of the eagle protecting its nest (“яко орел покрывал гнездо свое,” “покров крылу...,” “покри нас кровом крылах,” etc.).

The verses shown on the recto page facing the 1702 frontispiece maintain the focus on the tsar and the by now familiar themes. They begin, “Peace unto the House of the Tsar” and then continue (more accurately, drone) on this theme of peace over the next several lines:

На его царского пресветлаго величества  
 Мирное знамение  
 Царь Неба Царя земна Миром ограждает,  
 Со Знамением Мира, емуся являет.  
 Знамение не ино, токмо ветвь Маслича,  
 [ра]Дуга Небесна МИРА, знамение вечна.

This refrain then extends over the next several lines to SS. Peter and Aleksei, the Trinity, the angels, and the two-headed eagle: Heavenly peace shall be passed on from heaven to earth. The second half of the verse clarifies the message further by making Peter, the image of St. Peter, the earthly agent of peace, of renewal, the conqueror of the enemies of peace, the lion, and the serpent.<sup>51</sup>

Даны суть ЖЕНЕ КРЫЛЬ две, ОРЛА Велика,  
 а жена ОРЛУ в союз, МИР то, zde до века.  
 ОРЕЛ яко, и когда, юность обновляет?  
 О том ответ. Премудрость иных да гадает.  
 ОРЛА ЦАРСКА, zde видим яве обновленна,  
 ДВОЮ бо, со сыном Ея украшенна,  
 Миротворци предстоятъ, от ПЕЩЕРЪ младше,  
 МАТЕРЬ, со СЫНОМЪ, за МИРЪ благодаряще.  
 А видяще над сміем Победу, гошъ просящъ,  
 И над лвомъ зловерія: обеть не относящъ.  
 Яко сотрень змій, аще и левъ пораженный.  
 Будет, БЛАГОРОДИЧЕН враг той заглаженный.  
 Поправши змія, и лва врага ПОБЕДИТЕЛЬ  
 Будет ЦАРЬ Благоверный: Вещает СПАСИТЕЛЬ.

Here then we see the fusion of Peter’s victories on earth with the highest virtues of sacral kingship: Christian renewal and pursuit of salvation, peace on earth and for eternity. Enemies there were, and enemies there remain, but the eagle (Peter) in union with the bride (the Church) will forever be victorious and bring forth peace unto the ages.

## CONCLUSION: PEACE AND LOVE IN THE SUMMER OF '02

If this reading of the three interwoven texts is plausible, then it is safe to conclude that Krokov's'kyi had a lot on his mind in 1702. Clearly he is representing the outlook of the Kyivan clergy, particularly the monastic clergy, and even more explicitly the Caves Monastery. It is worth noting that the hetman and his realm are only implied in these texts and never mentioned explicitly. Mazepa had become the primary patron of the monastery, to which he had given several munificent grants and with which he was on the closest of terms. Indeed, Mazepa had been a benefactor of several important church institutions, and he cultivated the clergy much more aggressively and generously than had previous hetmans. Krokov's'kyi is not slighting the hetman and his allegiances are unquestionably local—give Kyiv its rightful place. But this was a dialogue between archimandrite and tsar, exclusive of although not in opposition to the hetman, and the privileged interests are those of his clerical brethren. Support us, he is saying; we are the ones who will pray for you. But bring us peace.

To understand what he meant by peace, we need to place his words against the backdrop of the Northern War, which stood at a critical and potentially perilous juncture in 1701, in particular for the Hetmanate. Hostilities against the Ottoman Empire had come to an inconclusive pause in 1700, with Peter making sweeping demands of the Porte after his recent victories. Some of these demands had been met, leading to a formal truce, which had been tortuously negotiated with the Ottomans over many months by Peter's envoy Emelian Ukrainsev and signed in Constantinople in July 1700. Immediately thereafter Peter declared war on Sweden, a decision that led to the disastrous loss at Narva in November. Charles XII had quickly moved troops into much of the Baltic, especially Poland, and was soon to invade Courland. For the moment, diplomatic historians tell us, Peter was unsure of whether to continue the war, and he sought mediation from France in particular. It was during this time span, during the wave of indecision following the Ottoman truce, that Krokov's'kyi penned his paean to peace and loving one's enemies. The available evidence makes it impossible to know how well informed he was about the course of the war and about the meaning of Peter's momentary pause.<sup>52</sup> But the Cossack regiments, Mazepa most of all, surely did have some idea of what was going on since they had been active participants in the battles in the south and were already being summoned for fighting in Poland. Mazepa, who appears to have been fluent in all the relevant languages, had been an important intermediary between Moscow and the Crimean Khanate. He consulted regularly with the tsar's officials, and received several detailed communiqués from them.<sup>53</sup> So it is likely that he had an inkling that matters were up in the air. One thing Krokov's'kyi did know was that troops were arriving from the east in increased numbers, some of whom were billeted in the Caves Monastery.<sup>54</sup>

From the perspective of Kyiv, Charles's invasion of Poland, rather than taking a turn east toward Moscow as many expected he would, boded ill. Were Poland to be neutralized—as it soon was—the next most likely battleground would be the Hetmanate. Irrespective of whatever rivalries existed between clerical and Cossack hierarchies, all of them desperately hoped to avoid turning the Dnieper into a bloody landscape and the monasteries into military quarters. Everyone acutely remembered the invasions and internecine violence of the so-called Period of Ruin (*Ruina*), and no one wanted a return to that. This imperative, I suspect, had a major influence on Krokovs'kyi's thinking and drove him to press the message of love and peace so urgently. In the vain hope that the sovereign might listen to him, therefore, Krokovs'kyi proposed to tell Peter that the war was over, the treaty had been signed and he was victorious, able to enter his newly won fortresses unarmed and in thanksgiving to God. "Peace be unto the House of Romanov" constituted his argument against opening up a new war with Sweden. If they attack us, we will defeat them, he averred at the end of the introduction. But until and unless that happens, he preached, the tsar should love his enemies, be content with his victories, and rejoice in his southern fortresses and in his marvelous rock, the Monastery of the Caves, whose saints stand beside the Theotokos in protecting him.

As we all know, Peter, flush with his first victories against Sweden, paid no heed. Peace and love were not in the cards for the next two decades, and one should not imagine that this episode constituted a liminal moment or that Krokovs'kyi's stature either grew or diminished after it. This is not a tale of undiscovered genius. From an interpretive standpoint, however, Krokovs'kyi's text demonstrates with unusual clarity the intellectual plasticity of the nominally rigid scholastic homiletic format, even in the hands of a less than elegant writer. Its availability for putting into print ideas and arguments directly to the sovereign made it a venue for relatively free expression that would have been all but inadmissible in any other type of publication of the time. In this particular venue, where independent thought could be imbedded in ways that made it unseen to untrained eyes, the rules of insubordination and *slovo i delo* proved to be decidedly more lax than elsewhere. This comparative openness gave clerical writing a decided advantage over other modes of original expression in the Petrine era, a privileged discursive space to which Peter's clerical intellectuals, virtually alone, had entrée. Practically speaking, this state of affairs greatly favored the Kyivans, who came to consider themselves sanctioned to emulate Krokovs'kyi's example, and on occasion express political opinions with considerable boldness and independence. If one went too far, of course, retribution could be quite harsh, leading to torture and execution. More commonly, as in the case of Iavors'kyi, it led to a loss of authority. But in most instances Peter's *propovedniki* could range surprisingly far before running the risk of tsarist displeasure, so long as they continued to demonstrate ultimate loyalty to the sovereign.

## NOTES

1. This and all subsequent quotes from the 1702 *Paterik* were taken either from the original printing or from a nearly identical reprinting of 1837, *Pateryk yly Otechnyk pecherskii* (Kyiv: Caves Monastery, 1702; 1837).
2. See, for example, A. S. Demin et al., *Russkaia staropechatnaia literatura XVI–pervaia chetvert' XVIII v.: Tematika i stilistika predislovii i posleslovii* (Moscow: Nauka, 1981), which lists (pp. 294–301) introductions to well over one hundred printed works in its index, including an earlier Kyivan *Paterik* from the 1660s, but does not mention Krokovskyi's. The volume on panegyrics simply mentions that Krokovskyi wrote an introduction; see V. P. Grebeniuk, ed., *Panegiricheskaia literatura petrovskogo vremeni* (Moscow: Nauka, 1979), 48.
3. Riccardo Picchio, "The Function of Biblical Thematic Clues in the Literary Code of 'Slavia Orthodoxa,'" *Slavica Hierosolymitana* 1 (1977): 6.
4. Victor Zhivov, *Language and Culture in Eighteenth-Century Russia*, trans. Marcus Levitt (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2009), 102. Here Zhivov is describing Prokopovych's hostility to the so-called bookish language of his traditionalist opponents, a form of writing that Prokopovych himself employed repeatedly in his own sermons.
5. See, for example, D. Vishnevskii, "Kievskaiia Akademiia v pervoi polovine XVIII stoletiiia," *Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii* 43 (March 1902): 326–30; Maksym Iaremenko, *Kyiv's'ke chernetstvo XVIII st.* (Kyiv: Kyievo-Mohylians'ka Akademiia, 2007), 178–84; F. I. Titov, comp., *Russkii tsarstvuiushchii dom Romanovykh v otnosheniakh ego k Kievo-Pecherskoi lavre, 1613–1913* (Kyiv: Tip. Kievopecherskoi lavry, 1913), 63; Serhii Pavlenko, *Otochennia het'mana Mazepy: Soratnyky ta pry-bichnyky* (Kyiv: Kyievo-Mohylians'ka Akademiia, 2004), 260–61; V. Askochenskii, *Kiev s drevneishim ego uchilishchem Akademiei* (Kyiv: Universitetskaia tipografia, 1856), 2:5–24; S. Golubev, *Kievskaiia Akademiia v kontse XVII i nachale XVIII stoletiiia* (Kyiv: Tipografia I. I. Gorbunova, 1901), 6–8, 98; Titov, *Tipografiia Kievo-Pecherskoi lavry: Istoricheskii ocherk (1606–1616–1916 gg.)*, vol. 1 (Kyiv: Kievo-Pecherskaia Uspenskaia Lavra, 1916), 402–13; Titov, *Russkaia pravoslavnaia tserkov' v pol'sko-litovskom gosudarstve v XVII–XVIII vv.*, vol. 2, 1686–1797 gg. (Kyiv: Imperatorskii universitet Sv. Vladimira, 1905), 456–70.
6. Nikolai Novikov, *Opyt istoricheskogo slovaria o rossiiskikh pisateliakh, iz raznykh pechatnykh i rukopisnykh knig, soobshchennykh izvestii, i slovesnykh predanii* (St. Petersburg, 1772); Mitropolit Evgenii [Bolkhovitinov], *Slovar' istoricheskii o byvshikh v Rossii pisateliakh dukhovnogo china greko-rossiiskoi tserkvi* (1827; repr. Moscow: Russkii dvor, 1995).
7. Happily, these four purveyors of lore, popular though they may still be, have been increasingly consigned to the bottom drawer, if not quite the dustbin, of dependable sources on the early eighteenth century. Among their various collections, see A. A. Nartov, *Rasskazy o Petre Velikom* (St. Petersburg: Istoricheskaiia illiustratsiia, 2001); I. I. Golikov, *Deianiia Petra Velikogo, mudrogo preobrazitelia Rossii, 12*

- vols. (Moscow: Moscow University Press, 1788–1789); M. I. Semevskii, *Slovo i delo! 1700–1725* (St. Petersburg: Tipografia V. S. Balasheva, 1884); Ia. Ia. Shtelin, *Podlinnye anekdoty o Petre Velikom, slyshannye iz ust znamenitykh osob v Moskve i Sanktpeterburge* (Moscow: Ponomarev, 1786).
8. A. V. Kartashev, *Ocherki po istorii russkoi tserkvi*, vol. 2 (Paris: YMCA Press, 1959), 330–45.
  9. Igor Smolitsch, *Geschichte der Russischen Kirche, 1700–1917* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964), 576–78.
  10. James Cracraft, *The Church Reform of Peter the Great* (London: Macmillan, 1971), 139.
  11. Paul Bushkovitch, “Power and the Historian: The Case of Tsarevich Aleksei 1716–1718 and N. G. Ustrialov 1845–1859,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 141, no. 2 (June 1997): 194; Bushkovitch, *Peter the Great: The Struggle for Power, 1671–1725* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 409–11.
  12. K. V. Kharlampovich, *Malorossiiskoe vliianie na velikorusskuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn’* (The Hague: Mouton, 1968), 244, 364, 468, 512–13.
  13. Titov, *Russkaia pravoslavnaia tserkov’ v pol’sko-litovskom gosudarstve*, 458–59.
  14. On Iasyn’skyi’s patronage, see Askochenskii, *Kiev s drevneishim ego uchilishchem*, 2:5–6.
  15. Golubev, *Kievskaiia Akademiia*, 7–8.
  16. Baranovych, Iavors’kyi, Prokopovych, and Tuptalo, among others, wrote private letters throughout their careers, both as a means of maintaining contact with each other across vast distances, and as a method for establishing an epistolary persona, a record of their reflections. Much like Renaissance scholars and bookmen (the republic of letters), they used correspondence to establish collegial affinities, networks within which they could think more expansively than would have been possible in print.
  17. Boris Kurakin mentions accompanying Krokov’skyi to Hlukhiv as Peter’s representative. See Boris Kurakin, “Semeinaia khronika i vospominaniia kniazia Borisa Ivanovicha Kurakina (okonchanie),” ed. F. A. Ternovskii, *Kievskaiia starina* 10 (December 1884): 624–26. My thanks to Ernest Zitser, who is preparing a forthcoming English translation of Kurakin’s autobiographical writing, for bringing this to my attention.
  18. *Opisanie dokumentov i del khраниashchikhsia v arkhive sviateishogo pravitel’stvuiushchego Sinoda*, vol. 1, 1542–1721 (St. Petersburg: Sinodskaiia tipografia, 1868), cccclii–xlvi.
  19. See the summary of this correspondence in Cracraft, *Church Reform of Peter the Great*, 139. The letters themselves can be found in *Pis’mo i bumagi Imperatora Petra Velikogo*, vol. 2 (St. Petersburg: Gosudarstvennaia tipografia, 1890), no. 732.
  20. Some of these materials have been published. See, for example, G. V. Esipov, ed., *Sobranie dokumentov po delu tsarevicha Alekseia Petrovicha* (Moscow: Univer-

- sitetskaia tipografiia, 1861), 190–202; the archival file is in RGADA, f. 6, no. 75, pt. 1, “Delo o Kievskom mitropolite Ioasafe i kievopecherskom arhimandrite Ionike Seniutoviche zameshchennykh v dele o tsareviche Alekseia, tak zhe perepiska, otobrannaia u nikh, 1718 g.,” esp. pp. 316–59.
21. Georges Florovsky, *Ways of Russian Theology: Part One* (Belmont, Mass.: Nordland Publishing Company, 1979), 83–84.
  22. In fact, the English translation provides even briefer notes. One must turn to the Russian original for whatever citations Florovsky provided, but these are frustratingly opaque.
  23. Askochenskii, *Kiev s drevneishim ego uchilishchem*, 291.
  24. See T. A. Bykova and M. M. Gurevich, comps., *Opisanie izdaniia napechatannykh kirillitse, 1689–ianvar’ 1725* (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1958); Iakym Zapasko and Iaroslav Isaievych, *Pam’iatky knyzhkovoho mystetstva: Katalog starodrukiv vydanykh na Ukraïni*, 2 vols. (Lviv: Vyshcha shkola, 1984).
  25. An *oktoikh* (from the Greek ‘Octoechos’), or *osmoglasnik*, is a volume of liturgical chants to be sung at the beginning of a service over the course of an eight-week cycle.
  26. P. Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura v Rossii pri Petre Velikom*, vol. 2 (St. Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia pol’za, 1862), no. 19, p. 20.
  27. *Ibid.*, no. 82, pp. 98–99.
  28. *Ibid.*, no. 94, pp. 110–11; no. 108, pp. 137–38; no. 128, pp. 171–74; no. 129, pp. 174–75.
  29. *Ibid.*, no. 37, pp. 42–45; Zapasko and Isaievych, *Pam’iatky knyzhkovoho mystetstva*, vol. 1, no. 755, p. 116; T. Iu. Glukhikh, comp., *Otechestvennye izdaniia napechatannye pri Petre I: katalog*, Rukopisi, staropechatnye i redkie knigi v sobraniakh Sibiri i dal’nego vostoka (Novosibirsk: GPNTB SO RAN, 1992), 112.
  30. “Kniga zakonchena pri tsare Petre Alekseeviche, pri naslednike Aleksee Petroviche, pri mitropolite Varlaame Iasinskom, archimandrite lavry Ioasafe Krokovskom i pri getmane voisk zaporozhskikh Ioanne Stefanoviche Mazepe.” Glukhikh, *Otechestvennye izdaniia*, 71, 111.
  31. *Ibid.*, 136.
  32. Titov, *Tipografiia Kievo-Pecherskoi lavry*, 1:411–13.
  33. *Akafist sviatoi Velikomuchenitse Varvare* (Kyiv: Caves Monastery, 1698).
  34. Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura v Rossii*, 2:7–8; Zapasko and Isaievych, *Pam’iatky knyzhkovoho mystetstva*, vol. 1, no. 729, p. 113.
  35. Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura v Rossii*, vol. 2, no. 5, p. 7.
  36. M. A. Fedotova, “Kul’t Sviatoi Varvary v tvorchestve Dimitriia Rostovskogo,” *Russkaia literatura*, no. 4 (1999): 99.
  37. Alexander Kazhdan, “Rus’-Byzantine Princely Marriages in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 12–13 (1988–1989): 419.
  38. An akathist consists of several verses, juxtaposed to praise the saint, to recount the saint’s life, and then to connect the saint to the lives of the worshippers. These

verses are called *kontakion*, lengthy hymns of homily that typically begin and end the akathist, and *ikos*, complementary and briefer strophes.

39. "The Lord did not tarry in sending His handmaiden assistance: He commanded the cliff to part...The face of the cliff opened, and the holy virgin Barbara entered the cleft, after which the rock closed behind her, permitting her to ascend to the top of the mountain. There the saint found a cave in which she hid." Saint Demetrius of Rostov, *The Great Collection of the Lives of Saints*, vol. 4, *December*, trans. Father Thomas Marretta (House Springs, Missouri: Chrysostom Press, 2000), 62.
40. *Akafist sviatoi Velikomuchenitse Varvare*, 30.
41. *Ibid.*, 34v.
42. The *Paterik* exists in an able English translation: *The Paterik of the Kievan Caves Monastery*, trans. Muriel Heppell (Cambridge, Mass.: Ukrainian Research Institute, 1989).
43. See the commentary in Bykova and Gurevich, *Opisanie izdaniia napechatannykh kirillitsei*, no. 18, p. 77. See also Zapasko and Isaievych, *Pam'iatky knyzhkovoho mystetstva*, vol. 2, pt. 1, nos. 779, 780; Titov, *Tipografia Kievo-Pecherskoi lavry*, 1:331.
44. A facsimile edition of Tarasevych's engravings for the *Paterik* came out in 1992. *Graviury Leontiiia Tarasevicha k Pateriku Pecherskomu, izdannomu v tipografii Kievo-Pecherskoi lavry v dekabre 1702 g.* (Moscow: Rossiiskii raritet, 1992).
45. "Predislovie," in *Pateryk yly Otechnyk pecherskii* (Kyiv: Caves Monastery, 1702), 4v.
46. *Ibid.*, 3–4.
47. Matt. 5:44: "You have heard that it was said, 'Love your neighbor and hate your enemy.' But I tell you: Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you." Luke 6:27–28: "But I tell you who hear me: Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, bless those who curse you, pray for those who ill treat you." Luke 6:35: "But love your enemies, do good to them, and lend to them without expecting to get anything back."
48. All of the above Biblical quotes come from *Holy Bible, New International Version* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1986).
49. *The Eyewitness Chronicle*, Harvard Series in Ukrainian Studies, vol. 7, pt. 1 (Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1972), 178–202 (from pt. 1, "Letopis' Samovidtsa"); 292–97 (from pt. 2, "Kratkoe opisanie Malorossii").
50. See the description in S. M. Solov'ev, *Istoriia Rossii s drevneishikh vremen*, vol. 14 (St. Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia Pol'za, 1913), 1179–83.
51. My deepest thanks here to Viktor Zhivov for doing me the immense favor of going to the Lenin Library and laboriously copying down these verses for me, as well as the words on the banners of the frontispiece.
52. The military history of the Northern War has been written about exhaustively. For a convenient summary of this early stage in the hostilities, see Lindsey Hughes, *Russia in the Age of Peter the Great* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998),

- 26–31. Solov'ev provides a more detailed narrative and gives extensive attention to Mazepa's role; see his *Istoriia Rossii s drevneishikh vremen*, 14:1252–66.
53. See, for example, the correspondence among Mazepa, Ukrainsev, Petr Tolstoi, and F. A. Golovin, as well as the secret communiqués sent to Mazepa by Peter through a *diak*, Boris Mikhailov. *Getman Ivan Mazepa: Dokumenty iz arkhivnykh sobranii Sankt-Peterburga*, vol. 1, 1697–1705, ed. and comp. T. G. Tairova-Iakovleva. (St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta, 2007), 15–30.
54. *Ibid.*, 22.