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INTRODUCTION

History is the chronological record of significant events. In it one finds a plethora of various occurrences and issues from which literary imagination often creates its own version of such events and issues. Friedrich Schiller, one of the greatest German writers of serious historical drama, has defined the relationship between history and literary imagination as follows: "... Die Geschichte ist überhaupt nur eine Magazin für meine Phantasie, und die Gegenstände müssen sich gefallen lassen, was sie unter meinen Händen werden. ..."¹ By this statement Schiller indicated that a work of art is not a faithful reproduction of historical record, but rather the construction of a relational model, in which the writer is free to present historical persons and re-enact historical events according to his own vision and insights.

A multitude of historical events and characters have captured the fascination and sympathy of literary imagination. Furthermore, literary imagination is naturally attracted to momentous events and to the great personalities involved in them resulting in such works as Shakespeare's Henry IV, Goethe's Egmont, Schiller's Maria Stuart, Dumas' Napoleon, and Pushkin's Boris Godunov, to name only a few.
Another such fascinating historical character is Hetman² Ivan Mazepa³ (1632-1709), Chief Executive of the Ukrainian Kozak⁴ State. His turbulent life affected the history of almost all nations situated between the northern and southern boundaries of Europe⁵ and his personality, ambition, drives, and romance stimulated the interest and curiosity of his contemporaries. His political and military exploits were reported in the English, American, French,⁶ and German press. The Germans gave space to Mazepa in the Theatrum Europäum, Historische Remarques, Neu-eröffneter Historischer Bilder-Saal, Europäische Fama, Wöchentliche Relationen, Leipziger Post-und-Ordinar-Zeitung, Mercurius, and others.⁷

The historical figure of Mazepa not only stimulated the minds of analysts of history but also the imagination of many writers in many countries. In world literature the character of Ivan Mazepa made its debut in the Histoire de Charles XII (1731) in which Voltaire briefly described Mazepa's wild ride into exile. In 1764, Andre Dorville extended the legend in his work, Mémoires d'Azema, contenant diverses anecdotes des regnes de Pierre le Grand, Empereur de Russie, et de l'Imperatrice Catherine son Epouse, traduit du russe.⁸ It was, however, the English Lord Byron's Mazeppa (1819) his last Oriental Tale, which became the source for most of the romantic treatment of the Mazepa theme in Europe. In 1829, Victor Hugo published the lyrical
poem *Mazeppa* in *Les Orientales*. In East European literature the first important work about Mazepa was the poem, *Voynarovsky*, written by Kondratyj Ryleev in 1825. This work inspired Pushkin to write *Poltava* (1829), his well-known epic poem about Mazepa. In 1839, the famous Polish writer Julius Słowacki wrote the drama, *Mazeppa*. In Ukrainian literature the most comprehensive work about Mazepa, Bohdan Lepkyi's trilogy, *Motria, Ne vyvai*, and *Baturin*, appeared in 1926 and 1927. John Howard Payne's drama *Mazeppa or the Wild Horse of Tartary*, introduced the Mazepa theme to American audiences in 1831.

The Mazepa theme also found its way into German literature. The historical work which introduced the details of Mazepa's political career into German consciousness was *Mazepas Leben* written in German by Bantysch-Kamenskyj (Moscow, 1835).

The German literary works which center their attention on the historical figure of Mazepa were written during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Among the works written about Mazepa, four are still extant:

1. *Der König der Steppe* (ein Drama) by Andreas May (1849)
2. *Mazeppa* (ein historischer Roman) by Adolf Müzelburg (1861)
3. *Mazeppa* (ein Trauerspiel) by Rudolf Gottschall (1865)
4. *Der Teufelsjünger* (ein Roman) by Johann Froembgen (1941)
No trace of any other German works of the nineteenth century concerning Mazepa remains. They were either destroyed or lost, but knowledge of their existence can be derived from references in Dmytro Doroshenko's study *Die Ukraine und das Reich. Neun Jahrhunderte deutsch-ukrainischer Beziehungen im Spiegel der deutschen Wissenschaft und Literatur* (1941). These works are:

1. "Mazeppa, ein Gedicht" by G.E.S(täbisch) (Spremberg, 1844)

2. *Die Schlacht bei Poltava* (ein dramatisches Gedicht in fünf Aufzügen) by Karl Julius Stark (1855)

3. *Mazeppa oder Ritt ins Todtenreich* (eine Erzählung) by Wilhelm Anthony (Elberfeld, 1872)

In the works that remain, the authors Andreas May, Rudolf Gottschall, and Johann Froembgen focus on the life of Hetman Ivan Mazepa, and on the political-historical events of his reign as chief executive of the Ukrainian Kozak State from 1682 to 1709. The work of Adolf Müzelburg, on the other hand, deals with events in Mazepa's life from his adolescence to his adulthood. The historical areas which May, Gottschall, Müzelburg and Froembgen deal with in their works are:

1. The Ukrainian-Muscovite Relations
2. The Mazepa and Peter the Great Relationship
3. Mazepa's Youth
4. Mazepa, Hetman of Ukraine
5. Mazepa's Love Affair
6. The Tragic Outcome of Mazepa's Love Affair
7. Mazepa and Vasyl Kochubey
8. Mazepa, Karl XII and the Battle of Poltava

From these general areas the imagination of each author selected historical facts and alternately shaped, reordered, universalized, built and transformed them within the literary work.

It is the purpose of this dissertation through the systematic separation of fact from fiction and an analysis of the changes to trace and examine the process by which the imagination of these authors arrived at the artistic re-creation of historical fact. No similar study has previously been attempted in German scholarship, although Mazepa as portrayed in the fiction of various writers has been studied by literary critics, the most comprehensive study being Hubert Babinski's The Mazeppa Legend in European Romanticism, in which he discusses works of Voltaire, Byron, Pushkin, Julius Słowacki, and others.

The form of the study undertaken in this dissertation shall consist of a five-step procedure: (1) looking at the historical profile of persons and historical events which took place; (2) identifying the author's selective preference for certain figures and events from among the available historical data; (3) describing the type and degree of transformation which the historical material underwent in the author's hands; (4) analyzing the author's
purpose in transforming the historical data and (5) showing how historical data was worked into the general scheme of the literary work. This is, therefore, an analysis of historicity (historical authenticity) versus literary imagination.

The purpose of the first step in this procedure is to establish the relationship of the literary work to its historical source by asking how the details of the literary work square with historical data. Before this question can be approached, however, it is necessary to identify the nature of a work of literature which, of course, strongly affects the relationship between literature and history.

Because all the works under consideration in this dissertation deal with some aspect of the life of Ivan Mazepa, these works are in the broadest sense biographical narratives. Because Ivan Mazepa was an historical figure, they are not only biographical, but also in part historical narratives. This suggests the nature of the relationship of the literary works with their historical sources. As biographical narratives they ought to be a record of some factual truths about the life of an individual, in this case Ivan Mazepa. As historical biographical narratives they should remain in part true to the course of events and portray the peculiar conditions of a particular time. Furthermore, the authors should remain aware of the fact that the historical material belongs to publicly known
matter and its presentation and acceptance depends "on the audience's [reader's] willingness to assimilate the portrayal of a familiar story or personage to the knowledge it already brings to the theater [book]."²⁰

Because May, Gottschall, Müzelburg and Froembgen focus their attention on Ivan Mazepa, an historical figure known to the audience/readers of nineteenth and twentieth century Germany, they must contend to some degree with the historical settings, relationships, and figures of that time. These were, of course, the Polish court of King Jan Kasimierz,²¹ the Ukrainian-Muscovite relations, the Ukrainian Swedish Alliance, the Battle of Poltava, Peter the Great, Karl XII, Vasyl Kochubey, and Motrja Kochubey—all of which played an important role in the life of Ivan Mazepa. As the first step in the analysis of the works, therefore, we consider the degree of authenticity in dealing with the historical persons and events.

On the other hand, since these works are fictional biographies, they allow their authors a degree of freedom in subordinating fidelity to fact to the literary purpose—that of story making. For this purpose the authors engage in a preferential treatment of historical data.

This consideration brings us to the second step in our analysis which is the identification of the author's selective preference for singular figures and events from the plethora of available historical data. Whereas in step
one our aim was the establishment of historical accuracy, in step two we view the historical facts as constituent parts of an aesthetic structure—genre—within which they must operate to create a coherent literary text. The selection of historical facts is, thus, subject to the restriction and limitations of genre, in this case the novel and the drama.22

As we examine the restrictions and limitations which genre imposes on May, Gottschall, Müzelburg, and Froembgen we are well served to look at the historical data available to the authors vis a vis what they chose for presentation in their works, how they presented it and why.

The first area from which the imaginations of May, Gottschall and Froembgen drew their material were the historical facts dealing with the Ukrainian-Muscovite relations and the Mazepa-Peter the Great relationship. The presentation of this historical material in the works of Andreas May and Rudolf Gottschall differs sharply from the presentation of the same material in the work of Johan Froembgen. The principles of genre, specifically, those of the novel and drama are responsible for the difference in presentation.

Whereas Froembgen's novel is a work meant to be read, May's and Gottschall's dramas are literary works and at the same time pieces of representational art, that is, they are dramas meant to be performed. As representational
art, they are subject to the restrictions of time and space. They must be acted in a given time on a stage, and in front of an audience. Although stage size may differ from theater to theater, the acceptable performance time for a modern drama is well defined: "Three hours is a high limit of comfort and convenience in a theater . . . a drama expanded beyond this space is in danger of wearing either by monotony or by variety and multiplicity of incidents." This restriction of time and space forced May and Gottschall to be selective in the type and the amount of the material chosen for the literary dramatic presentation of the historical backdrop. Unable to reproduce all of history, the dramatists chose to present only those elements which bring out the dominant patterns of the Ukrainian-Muscovite relations and the Mazepa-Peter the Great relationship.

The technique of representation of selected historical facts in the dramas of Andreas May and Rudolf Gottschall, as in most historical dramas, are dialogue and action. They are the means by which May and Gottschall invoke the larger perspective of their historical world. Traditionally, the genre affords the dramatists no opportunity for narrative intrusions, comments, or explanations, which may stand between the drama's world and the spectator. The actions and words of the characters, therefore, must offer direct information of the play's reality, and must reveal in bold and singular strokes "the quality of the
world the characters inhabit, the circumstances that cause their interaction with one another and the events that are likely to follow from their interactions . . ." For example, in May's drama the dialogue between Mazepa and Kochubey reveals the political relations between Ukraine and Muscovy (III, v); in Gottschall's drama the terse dialogue between Mazepa and Peter illustrates their personal relationship (I, xviii), and the simple act of Peter's pulling on Mazepa's beard clearly establishes his dominance over Mazepa (I, xiv).

The restrictions of time and space do not apply to Johann Froembgen's work Der Teufelsjünger. His novel is an extended fictional prose narrative in which the literary imagination is free to recreate history virtually in its totality. Froembgen in contrast to May and Gottschall, is comprehensive in range and elaborate in the historical detail he employs in his reconstruction of the Ukrainian-Muscovite relations, and the Mazepa-Peter relationship. In contrast to the selected historical facts highlighted in the works of May and Gottschall, Froembgen depicts the prior historical events, for example, the hetmanate of Doroshenko and Samoilovych and the changes in Muscovy (Chapters 2-4), that shaped Mazepa's era.

The technique of representation in Froembgen's work is not limited to dialogue and action, but is, instead, considerably varied and diversified. It consists of the
narration of action not directly represented, dramatic dialogue, transition from one character, setting or situation to another, and descriptions of settings and events. All this allows for the reproduction of both intricate and simple patterns and designs of the historical canvas which Froembgen used as the backdrop of his novel.

The second area from which the imaginations of these authors draw historical facts is Mazepa's youth. Inasmuch as the process of revealing the past life of a character is subject to the limitations of the genre, Andreas May's and Rudolf Gottschall's dramas are limited in temporal and spatial range, and could only portray specific dramatic events, i.e., Mazepa as Hetman of Ukraine. All the events in this period of Mazepa's life have to be presented directly and in chronological order. Any reference to significant past events of Mazepa's youth has to be presented indirectly via exposition. They have to be reported by means of monologue or dialogue by other characters who serve as commentators on the past. For example, in May's drama, the legend of Mazepa's wild ride is retold by Kochubey to Dimitri; in Gottschall's drama the love affair of Mazepa's youth is retold by Harpyna to Lodiosa.

Because the events of the past are presented as exposition rather than as dramatic action, these reports must be brief and concise. Any such reporting temporarily suspends the action of the play, and long narratives of past
events slow the pace and hamper the drama.

Adolf Müzelburg's and Johann Froembgen's novels, in contrast to May's and Gottschall's dramas, enjoy the luxury of narrative representation. No other genre is able to provide the reader with such a detailed representation of character. It can, at will, begin the presentation of the character from any single point of his life and move gradually from one period of the character's life to another. It can also give a flashback. Unfettered by the considerations of time and space, the novel can build and develop the character, slowly allowing for the discovery of character by the gradual increasing momentum of disclosed information.

Müzelburg and Froembgen begin their novels with narrations of Mazepa's youth. Unlike May and Gottschall, whose presentation is limited by the number of characters feasible for appearance on a stage Müzelburg and Froembgen are free to conceive as many characters as suit the needs of character exposition.

The third area from which the imaginations of these authors draw historical facts is Mazepa as Hetman. The figure of Ivan Mazepa as Hetman of Ukraine dominates the greater part of the work of May, Gottschall, and Froembgen. In Müzelburg's work it is the culmination point of one aspect of character development. The characterization of Mazepa as Hetman in the works of May, Gottschall, Müzelburg
and Froembgen differs, however, according to the restrictions of genre.

In May's and Gottschall's dramas the character of Mazepa as Hetman is developed primarily through dialogue and action. The action is chiefly interpersonal and exposes Mazepa's public side. The spectator must deduce the inner quality of Mazepa's character from the patterns of external behavior. To aid the spectator May and Gottschall create situations, characters, and confrontations which help characterize Mazepa. For example, in May's drama aspects of Mazepa's character are revealed in a dialogue between Kochubey and Dimitri (I, iii); in Gottschall's drama Mazepa's character reveals itself in the confrontation with Bulawin (I, xii). May and Gottschall concentrate upon a single dominant character trait in Mazepa, which they reveal through the patterns of action and dialogue.

In contrast to the dramas of May and Gottschall, the novels of Müzelburg and Froembgen reveal not only the public, but also the private side of Mazepa. Through the use of varied techniques of narration, foreshadowing, retrospection and authorial comment, both authors present character directly and indirectly. The reader is thus offered a combination of intensive and extensive study of both the public and private sides of Mazepa.

The fourth area from which the imaginations of these authors draw historical facts is Mazepa's love affair, the
tragic outcome of the love affair and Kochubey's role in precipitating its end. May and Gottschall make the love affair and its consequences central to the development of their plot.

The plot of a drama is shaped by dramatic purpose and theatrical conditions. The dramatic purpose of plot is "to affect the audience through sensation first of all and through imagination only secondly." Theatrical conditions require that this dramatic purpose be realized in a short period of time, during which the interest of the spectator must be deeply engaged and continuously sustained.

In order to construct a plot within their purpose and satisfy the theatrical limitations, May and Gottschall develop Mazepa's historical love affair into a dramatic theme and a dramatic conflict. Theme and conflict are translated into action that permits division into proportionate parts and reflects Freytag's traditional structure of tragedy: exposition, rising action, climax, falling action and catastrophe.

To fit the historical material to the literary form, May and Gottschall condense historical action, collapse historical time, create coincidences, and generally select and arrange material for the desired effect. In short, the literary imagination imposes a new order and relationship on historical events and persons.

In contrast to the drama, the plot of the novel is
shaped solely by the power of literary imagination. The plot must be carefully designed, but is not limited by restrictions of time and space. The only requirement of plot in a novel is that the totality of events creates a coherent whole. Thus Mazepa's historical love affair, its tragic outcome, and Kochubey's role in precipitating its end take on different dimensions in the novels than they do in the dramas where the love affair constitutes a major part of the plot.

In Adolf Müzelburg's novel, the plot is composed of a series of interconnected episodes, for example, Mazepa at the Zernicky estate, Mazepa's confrontations with Rotoff, and Mazepa at the Polish court. Each episode contains a unity and purpose of its own, and each character within each episode is functional in illuminating the main character—Mazepa. Each episode can be described according to its nature as either adventurous, motivating, amorous, historic, political or social. The historical love affair of Mazepa supplies Müzelburg with a theme for the love action or amorous episode. The tragic outcome of the love affair and Kochubey's role in precipitating its end are omitted from Müzelburg's work.

Johann Froembgen's plot is a simple series of actions, moving from the beginning through a logically related sequence of actions to a logical and natural end. The historical love affair, its tragic outcome, and
Kochubey's role in precipitating its end were useful to Froembgen in his psychological portrayal of Mazepa. In weaving this historical material into his novel, Froembgen condenses historical time, shapes the events of the affair and its consequences to embellish the portrait of Mazepa.

The last area from which the imaginations of these authors draw historical facts is Mazepa, Karl XII, the Ukrainian-Swedish Alliance and the Battle of Poltava. The action in the works of May, Gottschall, and Froembgen culminates in the political union of Mazepa and Karl XII of Sweden and the Battle of Poltava. These events are the natural outgrowths of the preceding action, and categorize the works as tragedies; that is, works in which the hero and his world begin in a condition of harmony which then disintegrates leaving him, at the end, in a state of isolation. The presentation of these events, which so wholly defines the character of the work, is determined by the capacity of the genre and the emphasis of the plot.

Because drama is never emancipated from the restrictions of time and space, and the magnitude of its action must be limited to a number of situations and characters which can be realistically and practically presented on a stage in a short period of time, Mazepa's union with Karl XII and the Battle of Poltava are presented only indirectly in the dramas of May and Gottschall. The course of these events and the development of the character of Karl XII are
reported by secondary personae, or presented in monologues or character dialogues.

In Froembgen's novel, both Mazepa's union with Karl XII and the Battle of Poltave are recreated in full detail. Froembgen's re-creations not only abound in historical detail, but are also a highly-colored dramatization of incidents and their impact on the character of Mazepa.

Steps three, four, and five of the process of investigation—describing the type and degree of transformation which the historical material underwent, stating the author's purpose in transforming the historical data and showing how the historical data was worked into the general scheme of the literary work—deal exclusively with the author's imaginative creativity.

In steps three, four, and five it will be observed how the literary imagination of the author "having assimilated the known facts about an historical persona and his world, is able to invent a possible plausible version of the experience which we can never come to know" from history itself. We shall see how the transformation of the material is controlled by the author's idea of what is characteristic of the person about whose life he writes. The historical facts, now shaped by the imagination, will be analyzed as details illustrating a whole way of life, and will be interpreted as indications of an inner reality created by the sensitivity and power of poetic vision of the author.
Here fiction takes precedence over historical reality, and as such the fictional biography will no longer be viewed as an expression of conditions, but as the author's personal exposition of what he feels to be the characteristic, essential qualities of a particular individual in a particular historical situation.

In this dissertation the analysis of the process by which literary imagination comes to fruition in the artistic re-creation of historical facts, or historicity versus literary imagination, is based primarily on a comparative study of historical sources (English, German, Ukrainian) and the literary text. The method of literary text analysis itself is inductive, based on internal evidence contained in the works themselves.

Each successive chapter of this dissertation will begin with an account of the historical facts which afford a necessary foundation for the understanding of the process of artistic re-creation of these facts. The historical account will then be followed by listing the historical "inaccuracies" immediately followed by a discussion of the author's apparent purpose in transforming the historical data, and how it is worked into the scheme of the literary work.

Because the authors and the works are not well known to the general public a short biography of the authors for purpose of identification and a summary of their works have been included in the appendix of this dissertation.
Notes to Introduction


2"Het'man" derives from Old German "Hoeftmann" = Commander-in-Chief.

3It is widely accepted in the orthography of the West to spell the name of Mazepa with a double "p." This is historically incorrect, as documented in letters written by Mazepa bearing his own signature, written with only one "p." For details see Theodore Mackiwa's article "Mazepa or Mazeppa?" The Ukrainian Review Vol. X, No. 4 (1963), pp. 42-45. I use a single "p" in spelling Mazepa's name, unless I am quoting from a text in which the author has chosen to spell the name of Mazepa with a double "p."

4The word "kozak" comes from the Turkish word "kazak." In English this word has two spelling variants: "kozak" or "cossack." I use kozak unless I am quoting from a text in which the author has chosen the latter spelling variant.

5Frank Mocha, in his article "Mazeppa in European Romanticism," Polish Review 19(3/4)(1974), pp. 191-200, claims that to the Swedes Mazepa was an ally, to the Turks an avowed enemy, to the Ukrainians a national hero, to the Russians a traitor and to the Poles an uncertain ally.

6For a comprehensive study of Mazepa in the English press see Theodore Mackiwa's English Reports on Mazepa 1687-1709 (New York: Ukrainian Historical Association, Inc., 1983). For both English and American press releases see Theodore Mackiwa's article "Mazepa in the Light of Contemporary English and American Sources," The Ukrainian Quarterly, 15 (1959), 346-62. For French references see Gazette de France: December 6, 1687; December 20, 1687; February 14, 1688; June 19, 1688; November 5, 1689; November 13, 1692; November 23, 1702; April 15, 1702; and February 9, 1708.

8 Translated into German: Die schöne Russin oder wunderbare Geschichte der Azema (Braunschwig, 1766 and 1773).

9 An adaptation of the Cuvelier-Chandenson drama Mazeppa ou le cheval Tartare, mimodrame en trois actes (Paris, 1825).

10 For a discussion of the works by Voltaire, Dorville, Byron, Hugo, Ryleev, Pushkin and Slowacki on Mazeppa see Hubert Babinski's The Mazeppa Legend in European Romanticism. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974).


12 Spelled Mazeppa in the literary works of Andreas May, Rudolf Gottschall, Adolf Müzelburg, and Johann Froembgen.

13 Also extant are two lyrical works about Mazepa: a poem by Bertolt Brecht "Ballade vom Mazepa," and a poem by Rainer Maria Rilke "Sturm" in Das Buch der Bilder. This dissertation, however, concerns itself only with prose works. In the prose works discussed in this dissertation, Mazepa is the protagonist; therefore, the drama by Heinrich Bertuch Alexei Petrovitsch (1812) in which Mazepa is a secondary character is not included in the discussion.

14 Doroschenko, pp. 279-81.

15 Spelled Kotchubei in May's drama, Kotchubei in Froembgen's novel. I use the spelling Kochubey unless I am quoting from May's or Froembgen's work.

16 I use the Swedish spelling of the king's name unless I am quoting from a text in which the name of the King appears as Charles.

17 Spelled Pultawa in May's, Gottschall's and Müzelburg's work; and Pultawa in Froembgen's work. I use the spelling Poltawa unless I am quoting from a text in which the spelling is different.

18 Whereas literary imagination in the works of May, Gottschall, Müzelburg and Froembgen uses historical information to enhance the poetic representation of characters and events, literary imagination of the writers of documentary drama, a drama form of the twentieth century,
uses historical information in the drama to present a picture of the political-social-economic state of affairs, which it then subjects to analysis and criticism.

19 Babinski briefly discusses Heinrich Bertuch's drama Alexei Petrowitsch (1821)


21 Spelled Johann Kasimir in Müzelburg's novel. I use the spelling Jan Kasimierz unless quoting from a text in which the name is spelled differently.

22 The selection of historical facts is also affected by the literary tradition or convention of the time. This dissertation, however, will not study the works as representative of literary schools.


25 Andreas May, Der König der Steppe (München, 1849), p. 50.

26 Rudolf Gottschall, Mazeppa (Leipzig, 1865), pp. 45-47.

27 Gottschall, p. 47.

28 Spelled Doroschenko in Froembgen's novel.

29 Spelled Samoilowitsch in Froembgen's novel and Samoilovich by the historian Clarence Manning. I use the spelling Samoilovych unless quoting Froembgen or Manning.

30 Johann Froembgen, Der Teufelsjünger (Wiesbaden, 1941), pp. 19-108.

31 May, pp. 6-7.

32 Gottschall, pp. 134-147.

33 May, pp. 6-7.

34 Gottschall, pp. 31-35.


CHAPTER I
THE NATURE OF HISTORY AND LITERATURE

A close relationship between history and literature was established in Germany in the early nineteenth century. History and literature, their nineteenth century practitioners agreed, "offered a continuous, integrated, selective narrative of experience that had meaning and relevance to man's condition; both attempted to distill out of experience some understanding of the relationship between action and reaction, cause and effect." Yet, despite the common features history and literature share, they are not the same. Therefore, we ask what is the nature of history and the nature of literature which brings them so closely together, yet forever keeps them apart? We shall begin with the above quotation.

According to this quotation both history and literature, with the exclusion of poetry, are prose narratives. Both the historian and the literary artist are engaged in a process of selection and both the historical and the literary artist are concerned with the relevance of and meaning of human experience. These are the common denominators between history and literature. Let us briefly examine them.

Recorded history and literature are both forms of
narrative. They are in the most general sense stories with a plot. This statement is intended to make two points: one, both history and literature use language as a means of expression; and two, that both history and literature, as stories, must adopt some external structure, or frame, for the employment of their ideas. If we consider language, it is clear that it is the common heritage of the historian and literary artist. Both the historian and the literary artist are aware of the dynamics of language, and consequently they "use the language to express what they explain and conjure, and they use it symbolically, to express more than the words alone mean. The historian, like the poet and novelist, is aware of the metaphoric resources of language, and he draws upon them for both meaning and strength, ..."² 

Thus, both the historian and the literary artist can bring out the deeper and subtler tones of things they are saying through the employment of symbols, metaphors, metonymy, synecdoche, and irony.³

In the broadest terms both history and literature are narratives. They both adhere to certain organizational principles, that is, facts and events of both historical and literary works must be arranged in some preconceived order, i.e. plot. This plot must be arranged so as to have a beginning, a middle and an end. Furthermore, the events of the plot must be logically related. This sequence of events is accomplished by the author's choosing some point or event
as a beginning, another point or event as an end, and other
points or events as transitional.

The second significant common denominator between
history and literature is the historian's and the literary
artist's use of the process of selection. The selection is
necessary insofar as neither can deal with the vast terri-
tory of human experience or all the historical facts in a
single work. Both the historian and the literary artist
must, therefore, confine themselves to certain experiences
and certain historical events which they order into the
context of a work. The ordering of these experiences and
events within the work determines the nature of the product
created. For example, if the facts or experiences are so
ordered as to create a reconciliation of opposing forces,
the nature of the work is that of comedy; if, on the other
hand, there is no reconciliation of opposing forces, the
nature of the work is that of tragedy. 4

The last common denominator between history and
literature is their mutual concern with the relevance and
meaning of human experience. Both are looking for what is
real in life. In their pursuit of the significance of life
both are concerned with the here and now. As the English
historian Geoffrey Barraclough wrote, "I would define his-
tory as the attempt to discover, on the basis of fragmentary
evidence, the significant things about the past and signifi-
cant means significant now. The past, no doubt existed for
itself; but history exists for us. In other words, it should be relevant to our needs, and provide answers for questions which concern us. Literature too exists for us. It is meaningful and relevant when it is concerned with the questions to which each generation needs answers.

Up to this point we have discussed the features common to both history and literature. Nevertheless, the end products created by the historical imagination and the literary imagination are uniquely different.

Although both history and literature are verbal structures in the form of narrative prose, the language of the literary artist is strikingly different from that of the historian. The difference between literary language and the language of the historian lies in the fact that the historian, bound by the authority of historical records, uses language to appeal to the reader's sense of fact, while the literary artist, concerned with aesthetic principle, uses language to appeal to the reader's emotional being, or his inner self. To achieve his goal the historian uses words for their denotation, that is, "giving them verifiable, but general referents to the world of things." The literary artist, on the other hand, uses words "to evoke emotional responses from the reader." This distinction between historical (scientific) and literary language is made by I. A. Richards. Richards' distinction between the language of the literary artist and that of the historian is that
"art uses 'emotive language'—language employed for the effects it produces in emotion and attitude—as contrasted with science [history] which uses 'referential language'—language used for the sake of the reference it produces."\textsuperscript{11}

Both history and literature acknowledge external structure for the employment of their ideas. This structure, or plot, in both works has a beginning, a middle, and an end. Here the similarity between the historical work and the literary work ends, for the development of each plot is dictated by the nature of the content of the historical and the literary work. The plot of the historical work is meant to be true, that is, the historical picture created by the historian must stand in relationship to evidence, such as documents, historical records, etc. The historian can only deal with actual past events. He is tied to a particular plane of reality; the events happened and they cannot be changed. The historian "cannot move beyond the definition of history as past condition."\textsuperscript{12} He is always confined by the past, and always by actuality. Consequently, the historian, although he may choose any historical event as the inaugural point and any one as the terminating point, he must follow the stream of time and order of events as prescribed in historical records. The literary artist, on the other hand, has a single task: to construct a coherent picture, one that makes sense. The events within his work may be true or imaginative and need not be localized in
place or time." Faulkner once said, "I can move people around like God, not only in space but in time."\(^13\) Thus the literary artist can work with what happened, might happen or should have happened. His plot does not need to reflect the same temporal order as does the historian's. The literary artist may, therefore, begin his narration in media res, or he can return to any point in the past through means of flashback. If he chooses, he can move into the future or he can suspend narration with authorian intrusions, or even jumble chronology through the employment of stream of consciousness. The beginning, middle, and end of his narration must only have a logical progression, that is, the series of actions must be planned so that they are interrelated and contribute toward creating a coherent whole.

The historian and the literary artist both engage in the process of selection for the construction of their work. Both must focus only on certain ideas or events. Each, however, uses a different set of criteria for the selection of his material. The historian at all times is guided by a sense of authenticity. His material—history—is a record of what has happened, according to evidence, and although a historian may be selective he can never operate with an inventive principle. In simple terms, the historian's selection of facts used for historical reconstruction in his works may in no way be arbitrary or merely fanciful, but necessary and legitimate.\(^14\) The historian cannot create
the pieces of his puzzle, but must put together those he has found. In addition, he cannot order the pieces in a way he desires, for they are already ordered for him chronologically by the documented data. In other words, the historian can only uncover the stories already buried in the chronicles, and through his creative imagination inspire them with a new life or a new meaning.

The literary artist, on the other hand, is guided in his selection of raw material by the principle of poetic essentiality. The author chooses what he feels is the essential quality of an individual or an age. Any fact not pertaining to the author’s vision may be disregarded or changed so as to reflect the author’s poetic vision. Furthermore, the literary artist may mix real with imaginary events, as long as he stays within the boundaries of the probability of human behavior. In a word, “Shakespeare, in creating Casar or Macbeth, may select and combine and invent within elastic limits not granted to the historian. Hamlet needs no birth certificate, but Napoleon does.”

Finally, history and literature are both concerned with the relevance and meaning of human experience. Both strive to make relevant their material to the present condition of human life. Each, however, is an inquiry of different sorts. History deals primarily with facts, data and empirical evidence, that is, with the external facts of human life. Thus the historian’s questions
pertain to past facts, and he penetrates past events in order to disclose a law, principle or idea which is universal to all men at all times. The literary artist, on the other hand, deals with the "internal currents of men's minds, with the emotions and ideas and motives that run beneath the masks that men assume." In this sense, both history and literature contribute to man's immediate self-knowledge and understanding of life. Specifically, history studies laws, principles, and ideas expressed by others in the past. The historian with his eye understands them, criticizes them, develops them and incorporates them into present thought. He enables the individual to use that thought heritage for his own advancement. Literature, on the other hand, makes a different contribution to man's self-knowledge. It "removes the masks that men assume and penetrates into the well of individual consciousness" and thus enriches man's understanding of himself.

The body of this dissertation will look at the literary artist who borrows from history to construct his own work. However, each of the authors considered does more than use history. He absorbs it. He assimilates the literal, factual and temporal worlds into the imaginary. The reality of the past era, the political condition and the tragedy of the protagonist is for each author only the base from which to speculate about the deeper concerns and the significance of the human condition.
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CHAPTER II
THE UKRAINIAN-MUSCOVITE RELATIONS

In the works of Andreas May, Rudolf Gottschall, and Johann Froembgen, the Ukrainian-Muscovite relations, as they existed in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, provide the backdrop against which the depicted events take place. This historical backdrop, which lends the works the aura of fidelity to historical truth, provides the key to the understanding of the characters, particularly Mazepa, whose actions have significant meaning only in the context of the Ukrainian-Muscovite relations and the political and social conditions they created.

Historically, the Ukrainian-Muscovite relationship was defined by the Pereyaslav Treaty which was signed by the Ukrainian Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky and the Muscovite Tsar Aleksey Mikhaylovich in Moscow in 1654. By virtue of this treaty, recognized at least theoretically until the abolishment of the Zaporozhian kosaks by Catherine II in 1775, Ukraine entered into a protectorate with the Muscovite State under which Ukraine recognized the authority of the tsar, but reserved for itself the right to administer its own laws, elect its own hetman, and maintain diplomatic relations with foreign countries (with the exception of Poland
and Turkey). In its original conception the treaty was a military alliance in which "the Tsar was taking under his protection the Hetman and all the Cossacks with their towns and lands." In return Ukraine agreed to pay revenue into the Tsar's Imperial Treasury, host Muscovite garrisons in Kiev, Pereyaslav, Uman and Bratslav, and provide the Tsar with kozak troops in the event of war. According to the treaty, Ukraine was therefore allowed to maintain a sovereign existence under a Muscovite protectorate. This treaty was, however, violated by Muscovite aggression and encroachment on various Ukrainian liberties. "Use of certain phrases had allowed the Muscovites to claim a predominant position in the country and to interfere in the affairs of the Host." Muscovy began taking advantage of her weaker ally, Ukraine, by demanding unabated loyalty from the Hetman, exorbitant taxes from the people, and a continuous supply of kozak troops for Muscovite military expeditions.

The political demise of Hetman Ivan Samoilovych, which was effected by Muscovy, best exemplifies the reality of the Ukrainian-Muscovite relationship and the supremacy of Muscovy over Ukraine only eighteen years after the signing of the Pereyaslav Treaty. Under the compulsion of the treaty, Samoilovych, with 50,000 kozaks, was ordered to join the Muscovite commander Prince Vasili Golitzyn on an ill-conceived campaign against the Crimean Khan. The campaign took place in the summer of 1687, but Samoilovych objected
to a summer campaign and advised the Muscovite authorities to begin the march early in the spring in order to cross the dry steppe before the intensity of the summer heat. However, his advice was given no consideration, and Samoilovych was forced to abide by Muscovite rule despite his better judgment. As Samoilovych had feared, the dry steppe was sizzling with fires resulting from the summer heat and Golitzyn was forced to retreat. Samoilovych was chosen as the scapegoat for the Muscovite commander’s failure. His hesitation to accompany Golitzyn was used as proof of his guilt, and Golitzyn forwarded an accusation against Samoilovych to Muscovy which resulted in the arrest of the Hetman in 1687. Samoilovych, charged with "having an understanding with the Tartars, especially in the matter of steppe fires" was deposed and banished to Siberia without trial or sentence.

With the sanction of Muscovy, a new hetman by the name of Ivan Mazepa was elected. By this time Muscovite rule in Ukraine was well established and the rights of the hetman were limited. Muscovite encroachment and aggression in Ukraine continued unabated, as documented in Mazepa’s letter to Skoropadsky, the Colonel of Starodub, a kozak military bastion. In this letter Mazepa complained of the stationing of Muscovite garrisons in Ukrainian cities not specified in the treaty:
In 1698, Mazepa forwarded a letter of grievance to the Tsar protesting the increasing engagement of kozak troops in Muscovite wars and the devastation of land and wealth in Ukraine:

```
На протязі дванадцяти років від самого початку мого гетьманування я зробив 11. літніх і 12. зимових походів і не трудаю розсудити всьому, які труднощі, страти і руйну від тих безпосередніх походів терять Запоріжьке Військо і всю Україну.
```

The Tsar remained unmoved by Mazepa's appeals for change. Andreas May depicts the historical reality of the Ukrainian-Muscovite relationship in a dialogue between Mazepa and his trusted friend, Kochubey. In that dialogue, Mazepa recounts the points of the Pereyaslav Treaty which guaranteed Ukraine its sovereign existence:

```
Русland nannte die Ukraine damals noch sein Schwesterland, ihm gleich in der Unabhängigkeit. Des Kosaken Lanze für des Czaren Thron, des Czaren Schwert für des Kosaken Freiheit!
```

He bemoans the fact that the treaty had been violated by numerous Muscovite aggressions and charges Moscow with the unlawful levying of taxes:

```
```
He also laments the subjugation of Ukraine to Muscovite laws:

Da kam der neue Ukaz, die Ukraine sollte fortan Kleinrußland heißen; von gebornen Russen sollten wir nach Russen-Recht gerichtet werden.¹¹

In Gottschall's work we also see an accurate rendering of the Ukrainian Muscovite relations. He uses the arrival of Peter in Baturin, Mazepa's estate, to create a revealing dialogue which demonstrates the Tzar's supremacy and his unabated demands on the Hetman and his kozaks. In that dialogue Peter demands higher taxes and more kozak recruits for his wars: "... der Krieg verlangt, / Das Ungemeine—Steurn und Rekruten!"¹² When Mazepa protests, Peter dismisses his objection with a jarring reminder of the balance of power: "So ist mein Wille, Hetman!"¹³ Peter reminds Mazepa that insubordination is punished severely: "Blut! Blut, bis der Verrath erstickt!"¹⁴

Froembgen reconstructs the details of the Ukrainian-Muscovite relationship by focusing on Samoilovych's political plight, that of a vassal bound to master. In his narration of Samoilovych's engagement in the Muscovite summer campaign, his political subordination to the will of Muscovy and his consequent demise, Froembgen makes it clear that while there is a succession of characters, the dismal political circumstances for Ukrainians of that period remain the same, or grow worse. Mazepa, who came to office after Samoilovych, can be seen in the very same historical context in which Samoilovych is depicted.
All three authors, May, Gottschall, and Froembgen, rely strictly on historical facts in order to create a realistic backdrop for their works. By not manipulating historical data, they legitimize their works as historical tragedies. They allow the forces of history to shape, define and direct the depiction of characters, particularly that of Mazepa. In allowing history to give substance and credibility to their works, these authors emulate Schiller, who in reference to his own historical drama *Wallenstein* wrote, "... ich mußte die Handlung wie die Charactere aus ihrer Zeit, ihrem Lokal und dem ganzen Zusammenhang der Begebenheiten schöpfen ... Ich suchte absichtlich in den Geschichtsquellen eine Begrenzung, um meine Ideen durch die Umgebung der Umstände streng zu bestimmen und zu verwirklichen; davor bin ich sicher, daß mich das Historische nicht herabziehen oder lähmen wird..."\(^{15}\)

On the other hand Adolf Müzelburg bypasses the question of the Ukrainian-Muscovite relationship. It has no place in a novel in which the apprenticeship of Mazepa determines the action of the novel. Müzelburg fabricates historical situations and conditions and uses them to stimulate the hero, Mazepa, and to lead him through a variety of experiences which give him maturity, wisdom and insight into his life.
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CHAPTER III

MAZEP A AND PETER THE GREAT

The relationship which existed between Mazepa and Peter, as viewed historically and as presented in the literary works of May, Gottschall, and Froembgen, affected Mazepa's actions and determined the course of events which culminated in the Battle of Poltava. By carefully avoiding literary flights of imagination, May, Gottschall, and Froembgen give the reader a true representation of the Mazepa–Peter relationship and thereby inspire within the reader a conviction of historical accuracy and of the inevitability of the events which followed as a result of that relationship.

Historically, the relationship between Peter and Mazepa was that of lord and vassal, although the Pereyaslav Treaty had initially guaranteed the hetman his sovereign rights. Muscovy, however, had perverted the conditions of that treaty to gain control of Ukraine. By July 1687, when Mazepa was elected into office, the power of the hetman was further curtailed by the renewal of the Pereyaslav Treaty with Muscovite-imposed modifications, as stated in the Kolomatsky Statutes. These statutes bound Mazepa to the will of the Tsar by placing the control of the hetmanate in
the hands of the Tsar:

Mazepa's duty was to ensure that all Cossack and Ukrainian stations were defended. He knew that the Cossacks were the backbone of the empire's military and that their loyalty was crucial for the Tsar's stability. Mazepa understood that any move against the Cossacks would be met with resistance, and he was committed to maintaining peace and order in the region. His efforts were aimed at preventing any threat to the Tsar's authority and ensuring the loyalty of his subjects.

Despite the uneven distribution of power between Mazepa and Peter, their relationship appeared harmonious:

"There is no doubt that the young Tsar had a sincere affection for Mazepa. He liked his shrewd intelligence and domineering character, his leaning toward reading and his 'European ways'." Furthermore, Peter's triumphant march into Moscow and the honor he paid Mazepa during that march demonstrated the fact that he held Mazepa in the highest esteem:

27. листопада 1703 відбув Його Царська Величність урочистий вступ пішки в Москву, який продовжився з ранку аж до вечора. Були збудовані чотири постійні арки; на них красувалися друковані надписи: перша арка біля палацу князя Бориса Алексеевича Голіцина, царського тайного совітника та віце-короля Казані і Астрахані, друга— збудована однім чужеземним архієпископом, третя— архімандрию грецьких монахів; четверта— церковним фаворитом, паном Александром Даниловичем Меньшиковим, недалеко від палацу, де зарез презирив козацький генерал Мазепа.

Коли Його Царська Величність проходив поез цей останній палац, то зупинившись, мав довгу розмову з паном Мазепою, який презентував йому осипаний бриліантами кіплона, а цілюму царському окруженню пам'яслів чимало наполів. З

Although Peter respected Mazepa, he made no provisions to guarantee the future existence of Ukraine. On the contrary, Peter's political goal was to occupy the shores of
the Baltic Sea to the north and the shores of the Black Sea to the south. Peter's hope was to establish Muscovite dominance throughout Eastern Europe.

Peter was unscrupulous in advancing Muscovite dominance and was totally unbridled by any political standards. His own words attest to his political perfidy: "We need Europe for several decades, and later we must turn our backs on it."^4

Peter was equally merciless in crushing any and all opposition to his rule as the massacre of the Streltsy so vividly illustrates. In 1698 the Streltsy, the regular troops of the Empire, rebelled unsuccessfully against Peter. On October 27, 1698, he ordered the mass execution of the defeated Streltsy. In his *Datium Intineris in Moscoviam* (Vienna 1700), Johann Georg Korb gave a portrait of Peter as he watched the execution:

Дня 27. жовтня 1698 року цар наказав своїм вельможам і полковникам, що кожний з них мусить власноручно відрубити кілька голов стрільцям. Сам цар, сидячи у кріслі, дивився сухими очима на всю цю жахливу трагедію і забиття стільки людей, обуруючись лише тим, що багато з бояр приступало до цих незвичайних обов'язків з дріжджими руками.°

Mazepa was well aware of the dangers of Peter's rule both to his own position and to the future of Ukraine, and he presented a warning to the Ukrainians:
Despite his awareness of Peter's political ambitions, Mazepa seemed to remain his most devout servant. Peter never doubted Mazepa's loyalty because Mazepa never gave him occasion to suspect foul play in his policy toward Muscovy. For all outward appearances, Mazepa played the role of a faithful servant of the Tsar, and Peter disregarded any talk to the contrary as intrigues against Mazepa:

It was a case every day of some fresh intrigue, set on foot by obscure emissaries, who went to Moscow with imaginary letters or speeches made by the Hetman, and who importuned the ever-opened ears of the secret service with their revelations.

Peter usually so chary of his confidence gave it wholly to Mazepa: nothing could disabuse him to the man, who . . . inspired him with a sense of absolute security.

Mazepa on his side loyally forwarded to his sezerian the tempting letters that the King of Poland and other enemies of Russia sent him.

The learned theologian Teofan Prokopovych, who knew Mazepa intimately, left this revealing portrait of him:

... Mazepa was full of hatred for the Russians, but nobody would have guessed it, for on all occasions he affected an absolute submission and a passionate devotion to Russia.

Mazepa patiently waited for the appropriate moment to strike against Peter, and saw his chance in an alliance.
with the Swedish king, Karl XII.

Peter was so enraged over Mazepa's union with the Swedes, that he immediately ordered the burning of Mazepa's headquarters Baturin. "The whole population of Baturyn, including women and children, was slaughtered to a man, while the town was burned and destroyed." It is estimated that over 15,000 lives were lost because of Peter's rage. After the burning of Baturin, Peter ordered all the kozak officers to appear in Hlukiv for the election of a new hetman—Colonel Ivan Skoropadsky of the Starodub Regiment. Skoropadsky "seemed that type of harmless figurehead that suited the Tsar's policy and would not go beyond his orders." Peter followed the election of the new hetman with a manifesto to the Ukrainian people "declaring Mazepa a traitor, and accusing him of intending to compel the Ukrainians to become Roman Catholic and return Ukraine to Polish domination." As the ultimate expression of his rage, Peter had Mazepa hanged in effigy.

A scaffold was erected in front of the Cathedral in Hlukiv, a manikin was brought in under heavy guard and then Menshikov and Chancellor Golovkin mounted the scaffold and tore off the decoration of St. Andrew from the neck of the figure. The executioner read aloud the Tsar's list of charges and the manikin was hung and dragged with jeers through the streets of Hlukiv.

Peter also called on the Church, to turn against Mazepa; on November 23, the Novgorod Protopope A. Zarutsky pronounced a formal excommunication and anathema against Mazepa.

After the Battle of Poltava, Peter offered great
sums of money to the Turkish authorities for the extradition of Mazepa. The Turks, who had given Mazepa and Karl political asylum, refused to give Mazepa up. They remained true to the commandment of the Koran, and would not surrender fugitives who sought asylum with them. Mazepa died in Bender on August 22, 1709.

In their works, both Gottschall and Froembgen stress the lord-vassal relationship in a scene at Baturin, the hetman's estate. As Peter arrives at Baturin, Mazepa falls to his knees in homage to the Tsar: "Ich beuge/Das Knie vor meinem Czaren!"¹⁴ Froembgen defines the relationship by having Mazepa lament his position in a discussion with his good friend Kochubey, in which Mazepa refers to himself as: "Otaman der Ukrainischen Kosaken! Vasall des Zaren!".¹⁵

Peter's imperialistic design, and the consequences of that design for the future of Ukraine are prefigured in May's drama. May even emphasizes that Russian appropriation of power in Europe and the methodical attempts to stamp out the Ukrainian identity were in accordance with Peter's plan for the future of Russia:

"Mazeppa," rief Peter, "bist auch du so blind, meine großen Pläne nicht zu durchschauen? Die Russen sollen einst Europa beherrschen; ich lege den Grundstein zu dem Weltreich. Um einen solchen Bau für die Dauer aufzuführen, reicht es nicht hin, die Völker unterworfen zu haben: du mußt ihnen auch die Wurzeln ihres Volkstums aus der Seele reissen."¹⁶

Froembgen, too, exposes Peter's dream of Muscovite domi-
nation and the preclusion of the existence of a sovereign
Ukraine:

Alles in Rußland muß endlich einmal zusammengefaßt
werden. Vom Eismeer bis zum Schwarzmee, von der Ost-
see bis Sibirien wird nur ein Wille gelten, der meine. 17

May alone makes reference to Peter's stark brutality
and to the fact that the implementation of Peter's plan and
the realization of his imperialistic dreams were founded on
the massacre and destruction of human life, which Peter
extinguished without pity or remorse:

... [Mazepa] saß ... mit Peter bei einem seiner rohen
Gelage. Es war am Abend des Tages, an welchem er hundert
Strelitzen mit eigener Hand die Köpfe abgeschlagen hatte.
Der Czar scherzte, heiterer als je. 18

Unnerved by Peter's imperialistic design, Mazepa,
both historically and in the works of May, Gottschall and
Froembgen, sought the opportunity to sever ties with Peter.
This led Mazepa into secret negotiations with the Swedish
king, Karl XII. May and Gottschall focus attention on the
Ukrainian-Swedish alliance and on Mazepa's severance of his
relationship with the Tsar. Although secret negotiations
with the Swedes were ongoing, historically, the schism
between Mazepa and Peter did not become apparent until
Mazepa's forces joined with those of Karl XII. During the
delicate negotiations only a few trusted Kozak officials
were privy to Mazepa's political design. No one else sus-
pected Mazepa, nor did Mazepa make any public statement of
intent. On the contrary, he remained outwardly fervently
committed to Muscovy. Gottschall and May, however, create
fictitious incidents which disclose Mazepa's intent to sever relations with Peter.

Gottschall, following a legend, creates an incident in which Peter, annoyed by Mazepa's report of unrest in Ukraine, pulls Mazepa's beard. Mazepa, outraged, draws his sword, but thinking better of it, immediately falls to his knees and begs forgiveness. The Tsar is appeased: "Ich hab' ein felsenfest Vertrau'n zu dir; / Du meinst es gut, wenn du mich warnen willst." Mazepa, however, swears revenge: "Am Bart gezupft--mishandelt wie ein Knecht, / Der Hetman der Kosacken--Rache, Rache!" The bond is broken.

The introduction of this incident is dramatically justified, that is, to mark a clear turning point in Mazepa's political attitude. This incident makes clear to the audience that, as of that moment, all of Mazepa's efforts and energy will be geared toward mobilizing himself and the kozak host in favor of the Swedish alliance. Tension mounts in the audience's anticipation of Mazepa's future actions. The audience is made to realize that Mazepa is merely a patient, watchful, prisoner who bides his time by flattering his master, the better to take advantage of him at the propitious moment.

May creates a different scene in his drama. Mazepa is confronted by a Tsarist messenger to whom he openly disclosed his alliance with the Swedes. Mazepa commands
the messenger to report to the Tsar: "Eilt jetzt zum Czaren und meldet ihm, was ihr gehört habt." May's fictitious incident, like Gottschall's, signals a dramatic turning point in the relationship and creates the same dramatic tension in the audience's anticipation of Mazepa's future actions, as does Gottschall's incident.

Froembgen alone pursues the events following the break between Peter and Mazepa, the fate of the Ukrainian-Swedish union, and Mazepa's defeat at the Battle of Poltava. Historically, Mazepa's sudden switch of allegiance was an unexpected blow to the Tsar, who viewed Mazepa as an obedient and faithful servant. Peter reacted with fury and vengeance. In his novel, Froembgen accurately traces the Tsar's acts of vengeance: the burning of Baturin, the forced election of the new hetman, the manifesto to the Ukrainian people, the hanging of Mazepa in effigy, and the excommunication and proclamation of anathema. Froembgen depicts all of these facts in accordance with historical truth. His attention to detail makes his novel a literary-historical record of the Mazepa-Peter relationship and the events which followed in the aftermath of the breach.

By allowing the historical Mazepa-Peter the Great relationship to determine the character of Mazepa and his actions within the literary works, May, Gottschall, and Froembgen approach Shakespeare and his innovation in the treatment of the hero which "could be described as an
attempt to balance the hero against his historical context, indeed, to disperse our interest so that we are unable to experience the hero or his context independently of one another."\(^{22}\) This approach is evident in Shakespeare's historical drama *Henry IV* in which Shakespeare "recognized that wherever the personal destiny of an heroic man might lie, he also could be understood, and desperately needed to be understood, as a more restrictively 'historical' phenomenon."\(^{23}\)

Adolf Müzelburg makes no mention of Peter the Great. In his work Mazepa is shown in his relationship with the Polish king Jan Kasimierz, not the Muscovite Tsar.
Notes to Chapter III


5 V. Sichynskyi, Chuzhynsi pro Ukrainu (Augsburg, 1946), p. 52.


8 Vogüe, p. 212.

9 A spelling variant of Baturin.


12 Doroshenko, p. 376.

13 Manning, p. 186.

14 Rudolf Gottschall, Mazeppa (Leipzig, 1865), p. 41.

15 Johann Froembgen, Der Teufelsjünger, (Leipzig, 1941), pp. 110–11.

17 Froembgen, pp. 167-68.

18 May, p. 50.

19 Gottschall, p. 49.

20 Gottschall, p. 49.

21 May, p. 54.


CHAPTER IV
MAZEPAS YOUTH

Ivan Mazepa was born on March 10, 1632.1 His family was of a prominent Ukrainian nobility and they resided near Bila Tserkva in the province of Kiev. Mazepas father, Stepan Adam Mazepa-Koledynsky, was a kozak official and his mother, Maryna Mokiyevska, was the daughter of an Ukrainian gentry family which also lived in the area of Bila Tserkva.

At an early age Mazepa was trained in the kozak arts. In fact, "As soon as the boy was old enough to sit in the saddle, he was taught to ride, to shoot and hunt."2 Mazepa received his formal education in Kievs famed Kiev-Mohylanska College, one of the finest educational institutions in Eastern Europe of the time. Mazepa also studied at the Jesuit College in Warsaw.

At the request of his father, Mazepa entered the service of the Polish King, Jan Kasimierz, at an early age. He served as the Kings page and was sent by him to Western Europe to continue his education. Mazepa then visited France, Germany, Italy and Holland, where he studied artillery. Upon his return to Poland the King sent him on several diplomatic missions to the Ukrainian hetmans: Ivan Vyhoverky in 1659; Yurij Khmelnytsky in 1660; and Paul
Teteria in 1663. In 1663, Mazepa decided to leave the service of the Polish King and return to his home estate and his ailing father.

While still in the service of Jan Kasimierz as a page, Mazepa had an encounter with a Polish nobleman by the name of Jan Pasek, who also served at the Polish court. According to historical records, "In 1616, Pasek was involved in an army plot against the King and Mazepa revealed this to the King. Pasek was tried, sentenced, and his estates were confiscated. Though he was later pardoned and reinstated, Pasek could not forget what Mazepa had done to him...."^4

Pasek took revenge on Mazepa in 1688 when he completed the writing of his Memoires in which he created a legend in order to defame Mazepa. Pasek wrote "a circumstantial story that Mazepa was having an affair with the wife of a certain Polish nobleman, Falbowski or Falibowski. Pasek was not sure of the man's name, his estate or even the year of the episode."^5 The content of Pasek's story is as follows:

Mazeppa's suit of Falbowski's wife was so ardent that the husband became suspicious. He very ostentatiously announced that he was going on a journey and then with his servants lay in wait along the road that Mazeppa would have to take to reach his house. The wife at once sent for her lover and Mazeppa soon appeared. It was easy for the husband and his retainers to overpower the solitary horseman. A retainer identified him. The magnate ordered Mazeppa stripped naked, bound hand and foot and tied to his own horse, a spirited animal. The horse was started back at a gallop through the woods, and the nobleman expected that his rival would be killed. He
himself went home and used his spurs to good effect on his guilty wife. In the meanwhile Mazeppa was carried back torn and bleeding to his estates and in such a condition that even his servants did not recognize him.6

Pasek's story found great response in the West where it was popularized in Lord Byron's long poem Mazeppa (1819), which became the source for romantic treatment of the Mazepa theme in Europe. The tale of fantastic adventure and superhuman passion suited the requirements of Romantic literature and excited the imagination.7

Theodore Mackiw, a Mazepa scholar, questions the truth of the story of Mazepa's wild ride. He argues, "... if Mazepa had really been punished by Falbowski, as Pasek described, how could the Polish King have promoted Mazepa to a higher rank in 1665 after such a scandal."8 Mackiw also quotes two other scholars in support of his opinion: Kostomarov, an historian and author of the well-known Mazepa monograph, and Alexander Brückner, a prominent historian of Polish literature.9

Of the four authors whose works are considered in this treatise—Andreas May, Rudolf Gottschall, Johann Froembgen, and Adolf Müzelburg—Müzelburg alone begins his portrayal of Mazepa with Mazepa's boyhood. In depicting the life of young Mazepa, however, Müzelburg does not adhere either to historical timeframe or to historical truth. He narrows the historical timeframe of about fifty years to a literary timeframe of about twenty years and uses the parental estate and the Polish court as settings for his
contrived plot, the purpose of which, according to Müzelburg is: "... ihm [Mazepa] das Leben und die Welt zu zeigen wie sie waren, und seinen Geist, seinen Charakter zu bilden." Consequently, the fashioned events, the created characters, and the circumstances of his work do not necessarily reflect historical truth, but allow Mazepa to develop his character, and realize his inclinations and inspirations in a series of fantastic adventures more fully than he ever could in the real world. This liberty to alter or discard historical facts which do not pertain to Müzelburg's vision of Mazepa's life and to create circumstances designed to bring out the emotional nature of the character is a privilege Müzelburg enjoys over the historian. This same privilege was preempted by Friedrich Schiller in his historical drama Die Verschwörung des Fiesco zu Genau in which the literary character Fiesco is but a shadowy image of the historical Fiesco. In Schiller's own words: "... Der Genueser Fiesco sollte zu meinem Fiesco nichts als den Namen und die Maske hergeben."

Müzelburg begins his work by identifying Mazepa as a Polish nobleman. In this Müzelburg is historically incorrect; Ivan Mazepa was not a Polish, but a Ukrainian nobleman. Müzelburg's confusion on the issue of Mazepa's nationality may have stemmed from the fact that at the time of Mazepa's birth, Ukraine was incorporated into the Kingdom of Poland (1569-1648).
Of Mazepa's life on the parental estate, Müzelburg writes that it was a world governed by harmony and happiness: "Glück und Jugend hatten ihm gelacht-- sorgenfrei, nur seinem Hange folgend, von treuen und erfahrenen Dienern berathen, hatte er ein freudiges Leben geführt."\(^{12}\) The harmony of Mazepa's existence is destroyed when his cousin Johan makes an attempt on Mazepa's life: "...--er [Mazepa] hatte das Paradies seines unschuldigen Glaubens verloren, die wirkliche, die wahre Welt mit ihrem Kampfe, ihren Leiden war ihm entgegengetreten--.."\(^{13}\) Mazepa, Müzelburg writes, was then forced to flee from his parental estate.

There is no historical evidence to support Müzelburg's narration of Mazepa's life on his parental estate and the unexpected life-threatening confrontation with his cousin Johan which forces him to flee from his home. The character of Johan and the interplay between Mazepa and Johan are merely products of Müzelburg's literary imagination. Johan is a necessary literary invention, his role being to propel Mazepa out of his naive, sheltered, private existence into the world at large. Mazepa's estate, an asylum from the stresses of wider social and political life, has to be destroyed so that Mazepa can participate in life's broader spectrum and ultimately grow through a direct encounter and involvement with the here-and-now. Johan's secondary function in the novel is to serve as a contrast to
Mazepa. Johan's sordidness starkly contrasts with Mazepa's righteousness.

Müzelburg also creates two other fictitious characters which play an important role in his novel—Zernicky and Krinecky. It is Zernicky who first recognizes Mazepa's need to experience the world. He directs Mazepa to the court of the Polish king, Jan Kasimierz: "... erprobe Deine Kraft in dem Leben des Hofes, lerne Ritterlichkeit von den elden Herren, Sitten und Aufstand von den feinen Damen, unterrichte Dich im Waffenhandwerk und erwirb Dir die Sporen. Das ist ein würdiges Leben." 14

Through Zernicky, Mazepa meets Krinecky, the King's advisor in Warsaw. Krinecky befriends Mazepa and warns Mazepa of all the dangers of courtly life. He teaches Mazepa the code of behavior befitting a page and oversees Mazepa's education under the guidance of a trusted pedagogue. Through learning and study, Mazepa's impulsiveness is eventually tempered, and his character is developed as his intellect matures:

Aber nicht allein der Geist, auch das Herz und der Charakter Iwans 15 veredelten sich in der Gesellschaft seines vertrefflichen Lehrers und Freundes ... Aus seinem Munde erhielt Iwan beruhigende Augenschlüsse und Erklärungen über Vieles, was den denkenden und feurigen Jüngling sonst vielleicht lange gequält und irre geleitet haben würde. Hier erschloß sich ihm eine ernste und doch milde Auffassung des Lebens, eine gerechte Abschätzung des Guten und des Bösen in der Welt, hier lernte er sein Dasein auf bestimmte und edle Zwecke richten und die Unbeständigkeit irdischer Güter verachten. Seine Gedanken und Handlungen gewannen hier eine feste Grundlage, sein Herz wurde geläutert. Er
Zernicky and Krinecky are indispensable characters in Müzelburg's novel. They serve as Mazepa's mentors, and guide Mazepa toward spiritual, social, and political maturation. They monitor his development and advise him in moments of crucial decision-making. Their erudition and life experience protect Mazepa from error and failure. Their purpose in Müzelburg's novel is to serve as a positive force in Mazepa's life, in sharp contrast to the negative-force characters, Johan and Rotoff. Where the former are agents of social and political corruption, Zernicky and Krinecky are agents of social and political righteousness.

Although Zernicky and Krinecky are fictitious characters, there is historical evidence of a person in Mazepa's life who was his friend and mentor, and whom he trusted implicitly. This was Maryna Mokiyevska, Mazepa's mother. Mokiyevska was a person in a position to help her son. After the death of her husband, she took her vows at the Flora-Ascension convent in Kiev and soon became the abbess, Sister Mary Magdalen. As abbess of the most important convent in Kiev, Mary Magdalen had contact with the leading kozaks and Muscovites in the city. She also had contact with the Patriarch in Moscow, an influential
figure in social and political developments. Mazepa relied heavily on his mother's advice, and her death in November 1707 greatly saddened him. He had just lost a wise and trusted counselor:

Her death left an unfillable gap in his life. It would be an exaggeration to say that she had dominated him, but he admitted frankly to Peter, and Menshikov, to Orlyk and to all his friends that he had always followed her advice. It was her influence that had kept him from making mistakes in his early years. More than once her influence in powerful quarters in Moscow had extricated him from difficulties which he had created or into which he had fallen. She had been his one confidante, his political guide...

Celesta, a playful and sensuous woman of great beauty, is another wholly fictitious character in the work of Adolf Müzelburg. In the novel Mazepa comes into contact with Celesta while serving as a page at the Polish court. Although his meeting with her results in his dismissal from the King's service, Mazepa's interaction with Celesta proves positive. She teaches Mazepa that a person who strives for moral refinement should not neglect the simultaneous refinement of his sensuality. She explains to Mazepa that the experiencing of one without the other leads to emotional poverty, that it is a response to life made only by part of his being. In order for Celesta to effect a sensual response in Mazepa she contrives the following scene: Celesta lures Mazepa into her quarters, charms him and then commands her servants to perform a dance for Mazepa. Their provocative and seductive movements stimulate Mazepa's senses and release a flood of intense emotions hitherto
unknown to him:

Iwan schaute diesem Spiel zu mit Empfindungen, die er nie gekannt hatte . . . Er war jung, auch in ihm schlummerte jene geheime Sehnsucht der Liebe, . . . die . . . nur eines unbewachten Augenblicks bedurfte, um in den Flammen der Sinnlichkeit aufzulodern. Seine Brust athmete schwer, sein Auge verdüsterte sich, um dann um so heller aufzuflammen, und hing unverwandt an den Bewegungen der schönen Tänzerin, die jetzt mit den zärtlichsten Blicken ihre Sprödigkeit aufgab und in die Arme des Tänzers sank.18

Müzelburg uses Celesta not only to educate Mazepa in the art of love, but also to entangle the plot of his novel, for Celesta is also responsible for Mazepa's dismissal from the King's court, which sets Mazepa on a new road to adventure. This invented episode is, however, at variance with the historical truth. In fact Mazepa left the King's service in 1663 of his own free will, and the relationship between the King and Mazepa remained friendly and cordial thereafter.

Müzelburg creates another character, Rotoff, who, in his work, plays an important role in the life of young Mazepa. Müzelburg uses history as a springboard for his literary imagination in the patterned recurrences of the political confrontation between Mazepa and Rotoff. All of these confrontations have their roots in a single historical event which involved Jan Pasek's conspiracy against the King and Mazepa's uncovering of that conspiracy. Each literary variant of the historical confrontation (Mazepa, Rotoff, Krinecky; Mazepa, Rotoff, Sapieha, Bernskiold; Mazepa,
Rotoff) serves to lead Mazepa from a desire to plunge impulsively into the world of action toward a pattern of action controlled by reason. Mazepa learns slowly to assess the intricacies of situations, to put reason above impulsive action, and to place moderation above a violent manifestation of self will. Mazepa learns to see life as an intricate texture of opposing forces and realizes that mastery of life consists in determining circumstances rather than being determined by them.

The legend of Mazepa's wild ride appears in the work of all four authors—May, Gottschall, Müzelburg and Froembgen. Each of them, however, uses the legend for a different purpose. Müzelburg employs the story of the ride to construct an episode of political revenge. In an effort to rid himself of his political opponent once and for all, Rotoff ties Mazepa to the back of a wild horse and sends the horse galloping into the wilderness. There is no mention in Müzelburg's work of an illicit love affair.

Political revenge is not, however, the sole reason for introducing the legend into the novel. The ride tests the level of Mazepa's physical and mental endurance:

\[O,\ \text{wer vermag es, diesen Ritt zu beschreiben, den wildesten, den je ein Mensch unternommen? Wer vermag es, diese Qualen zu schildern, die härtesten, die je ein Sterblicher erduldet?}\]

and, more importantly, it delivers Mazepa into the hands of the kozaks which reset the stage for new adventure.

Andreas May links the legend of the ride to the
supposed illicit love affair with Pani Falbowska. In his version the ride is also used to deliver Mazepa into the hands of the kozaks:

Es war ein ukrainisch Pferd und nahm den Weg in die Steppe zurück. Dort fanden es einige Bauern, banden den Halbentseelten los und gaben ihn [Mazepa] dem Leben wieder. ... Bescharmt, nach Polen züruckzukehren, reichte er sich unter die Kosaken. Seine Tapferkeit, seine ritterlichen Künste, die Bildung und Gewandtheit seines Geistes erwarben ihm bald die Bewunderung dieser wilden Schaaren. Er wurde Hauptmann, Oberst und zuletzt ihr Hetmann.20

Both Müzelburg and May deviate from historical fact in using the legend as the source of Mazepa's contact with the kozaks and his rise to power. Historically, Mazepa was not brought to the kozaks as Müzelburg claims, in the aftermath of a political confrontation, or as May claims, as the result of an unsuccessful amorous adventure. On the contrary, Mazepa was reared in the kozak community and eventually rose through its ranks until elected to the position of hetman after Samoilovych was deposed.

Gottschi in his drama uses the legend of the ride for two literary purposes: one, to introduce the literary character Harpyna, and two, to create a subplot—the Lodoiska-Kasimir romance. Harpyna's primary role in the drama is to link together the dramatic characters—Mazepa, Matrena, Lodoiska, and Kasimir—and thus unify the drama's main plot and subplot into a cohesive whole. Her kinship with all the characters stems from her past relationship with Mazepa. She was Mazepa's lover, Maria, now living in
disguise as Harpyna, the soothsayer.

Ich bin Maria, die du [Mazepa] einst geliebt
In sünd'ger Liebel In die Steppe floh ich,
Als man aufs Roß dich band; doch treu im Herzen
Hab' ich ein langes Leben dich getragen.21

Harpyna not only links all the characters together,
she is also the embodiment of the missing ingredient in the
lives of those characters—love, untainted by personal
ambition and false pride. As such, she brings to light
through contrast the emotional impurity in the other
characters. Throughout the drama, Harpyna's actions are
dictated by her conscience. She has no ulterior motive for
supporting Mazepa, Matrena, Lodoiska, and Kasimir in their
distress. Her abode in the forest becomes a sanctuary for
them. Lodoiska, burdened by Mazepa's illness and depressed
by the unfortunate twist of events in her own love affair,
is sustained by Harpyna's promise: "Dem Vater bring' ich
Heil und auch dem Kinde—."22 Kasimir, suicidal after his
confrontation with Mazepa, finds solace and strength in
Harpyna:

Kasimir: Da steh' ich—Schutt und Asche rings—und leer
Die Welt--wie seltsam lockt des Dolches
Spitze!
(zieht einen Dolch hervor)
Ein Stoß—und all der bunte Traum zerstiebt,
Da rings um mich ein wertlos Leben lügt—
(greift nach seiner Depesche)

Harpyna: (hervortretend).
Versage nicht—und folge mir!

Kasimir: Wer ruft?
Harpyna: Vergebung, Hoffnung, Leben—nicht die Gruft. 
(Kasimir folgt zögernd der Harpyna, die ihm 
voranschreitet.)

Even Matrena, who flees Baturin, finds security with 

Harpyna:

Harpyna: Wer bist du?

Matrena: Nichts
Als ein unglücklich Weib! Ein Blatt, vom Sturm 
Getrieben bald zum Staub und bald zum Himmel.
Matrena ist mein Name!

Harpyna: Sei willkommen!

The absence of this Harpyna-type of purity in the 
other characters is, in part, responsible for their misfortunes. Had Iskra not been steered by false pride and 
ambition, Matrena would not have been emotionally destroyed. 
Had Mazepa not been egocentric in his desire to restore his 
honor, Lodoiska and Kasimir could have been spared their 
agony. Had Matrena truly loved Mazepa, betrayal and murder 
would never have found a place in her heart. Had Harpyna's 
example been followed by the other characters, all of the 
various conflicts and confrontations could have been avoided.

Gottschall's second purpose in utilizing the legend 
of Mazepa's equestrian adventure is to create a subplot— 
The Lodoiska-Kasimir love affair. Gottschall employs the 
legend by making it the source of the problem in the 
Lodoiska-Kasimir love affair, and the reason for Mazepa's 
intervention in its development. In the subplot, Lodoiska 
is Mazepa's daughter and Kasimir is Sapieha's son. Sapieha
is the Polish nobleman who banished Mazepa from the King's court and tied him to the back of a horse. Here Gottschall not only distorts the original legend by introducing a fictitious son on the side of the Polish nobleman, but also by introducing a fictitious daughter on Mazepa's side. According to historical records, Mazepa's marriage ended with the death of his wife in 1702 and produced no offspring.

Gottschall creates Lodoiska and Kasimir and their love affair as a subplot which clearly parallels in its structure and development the Mazepa-Matrena affair, in order to throw Mazepa's character into relief. Mazepa's contribution to the complications and struggle of the affair exposes a side of Mazepa's character which expresses itself only in the interplay between Lodoiska/Kasimir and Mazepa. The conflict is set in a domestic arena, rather than a political one. Mazepa is cast in the role of an ordinary father rather than a politician. His personal viewpoint is muddled in sharp contrast to his lucid political vision. His thinking is clouded by hurt ambition, false pride, and narrow personal goals which in turn hinder the positive development of his daughter Lodoiska's romance.
(Parallel : Iskra)

Initially Mazepa is a caring, loving father. He has no intention of standing in the way of his child's happiness:
Komm an mein Herz, mein Kind! Dich glücklich wissen—
Es wär' mir Balsam für so manche Wunde!25

However, his intellect is overpowered by his emotions when
he discovers the identity of Lodoiska's lover, Kasimir:

Wenn du den Vater liebst—so weich' zurück!
Nicht von den Sapiehas kommt uns Heil!
Noch ist die alte Schande nicht gesühnt.26

As Mazepa's cognitive faculty becomes emotionally clouded
his actions become misdirected attempts at interpreting
Lodioska's life in terms of his own experience:

Mein Kind—in meinem Mantel berg' ich dich,
Damit du nimmer die Gespenster siehst,
Die mich entsetzen—Auch das Schlimmste nicht,
Den Hollengeist, der dir von Liebe spricht!27

In a wild, misconceived attempt to protect Lodoiska from the
hurt which he sustained in circumstances totally unrelated
to Lodoiska's situation, Mazepa forbids the marriage to
Kasimir. Unable to focus on the reality of the situation,
Mazepa becomes an instigator (Parallel: Iskra) and agent of
distress for Lodoiska, who is forced to choose between the
honor of her father and her lover Kasimir (Parallel:
Matrena):

. . . ein heller Stern
Glänzt durch Gezweig und winkt mir wehmuthvoll,
Und in der Liebe Arme möcht ich sinken.
So ruft mir eine inn're Stimme zu
Denn eine tiefe, ew'ge Liebe hält
Der Tochter Herz gefesselt an den Vater.28

Gottschall's purpose in interjecting into the drama
the Lodoiska-Kasimir conflict, rooted in the events of the
legend of the ride, is to expose a duality in Mazepa's
character. As a political leader, Mazepa acknowledges no
obstacles to his success. No price is too high for the attainment of his goal. No pain, personal or other, is too great to overcome in the quest of his political ideal. However, as a father and ordinary human being, Mazepa is egocentric and obeys no higher principle than his own feelings. Gottschall's purpose in exposing this duality in Mazepa is to create a dramatic character of flesh and blood, not a mere political profile in the annals of history.

Froembgen's rendition of the legend of the ride is the most faithful. He uses the legend in his novel to depict the passionate, uncontrollable side of Mazepa's character when intoxicated with the beauty of a woman. The power of Mazepa's infatuation obliterates all distinctions in values and makes Mazepa weak and vulnerable. This process repeats itself in Froembgen's novel with each ensuing love affair. Froembgen thus creates a literary character who is wholly human, motivated not only by political and patriotic sentiment, but sentiment common to all men.

Froembgen also uses the legend as the catalyst for Mazepa's departure from Poland and his immediate entry into Ukrainian politics. Although historically Mazepa left Poland in 1663 and did not join the forces of Doroshenko until 1668, Froembgen compresses historical time, using the ride to launch Mazepa into the beginning of his political career.
Both Gottschall and Froembgen use their creative powers as writers, not historians, to allow the audience/reader to see Mazepa through the artist's perspective; that is, Mazepa is seen in the round not only in reference to an outer world of biographical fact, but also in reference to an inner private world which is created by the writer.
Notes to Chapter IV


3 Spelled by some authors Pasek, by other authors Pasek. I use Pasek unless quoting from a text in which the author uses the other spelling.

4 Mackiw, p. 18.

5 Manning, p. 42.

6 Manning, p. 42.


8 Mackiw, p. 19.

9 Mackiw, p. 18.


15 Ivan is spelled Iwan in Müzelburg's and Froembgen's works.


17 Manning, p. 161.

20 Andreas May, Der König der Steppe (München, 1849), pp. 6-7.
22 Gottschall, p. 92.
23 Gottschall, pp. 67-68.
24 Gottschall, p. 137.
25 Gottschall, p. 59.
26 Gottschall, p. 61.
27 Gottschall, p. 67.
28 Gottschall, p. 61.
CHAPTER V

MAZEPÄ, HETMAN OF UKRAINE

Mazepa became hetman of Ukraine in 1682 at the time when Ukraine was under the Muscovite protectorate. Bound by the conditions of the Pereyaslav Treaty to provide kozak troops for Muscovite military expeditions, Mazepa was drawn into a confrontation with the Turks and Tartars by Tsar Peter the Great, who campaigned against them for control of the approaches to the Black and Azov Seas. This campaign resulted in a long and strenuous war in which the Ukrainian kozaks, under the leadership of Mazepa, played an active and important role in securing Muscovite victory:

Tsar Peter’s first attempt at the siege of Azov in 1695 was a failure; but at the same time, the Ukrainian and Muscovite armies, led respectively by Mazepa and Sheremetiev, were quite successful in the region of the lower Dnipro. The Turkish fortress of Kizikermen and Tavansk and a number of smaller holds were taken. Most of them were destroyed, but Kizirkermen and Tavansk were occupied by garrisons composed of the hetman’s Cossacks and the Zaporozhians. Although early in 1669 the Tartars, with Petryk, penetrated into Ukrainian territory as far as Hadiach, Mazepa soon expelled them.

In 1669 Tsar Peter opened his second campaign with the siege of Azov. Having built a special fleet on the Don near Voronezh he sailed down the river. After a siege and hard fighting, supported by the Ukrainian forces, he took the fortress Azov. The Ukrainian army ... played a decisive role in this campaign according to the testimony of Tsar Peter himself.¹

In recompense for Mazepa’s military excellence and
the victories he secured for Muscovy, the Tsar distinguished Mazepa with the Order of St. Andrew:

... Peter commanded his faithful Hetman to meet him in Voronezh, the highest honours were showered upon him. Mazepa was made the second knight in the roll of the Order of St. Andrew, which had just been founded and the Tsar himself ranked only as sixth in precedence. Such was the recompense for many military labours, constant zeal and loyalty during thirteen years of gallant service to the Tsar marked by incessant victories.2

There was, therefore, no doubt in Peter's mind that Mazepa was his loyal servant; he trusted Mazepa unquestioningly. In fact, "In 1697, when Peter went off on his foreign travels, Mazepa, reposing in the boundless confidence of his young Master, was left absolute lord of Ukraine."3

There is, however, some historical evidence of the fact that, although Mazepa remained outwardly faithful to the Tsar, he "was totally dedicated to the ideal of Ukrainian statehood, and to the ideal of a united Ukrainian independent state."4 One such indication, which points clearly to a political program geared toward effecting sovereignty, was Mazepa's concentrated effort in the area of Ukrainian internal affairs. He sought to protect the territory of Ukraine by fortifying the boundaries which separated it from Russia:

Як організатор оборони й збройної сили Мазепа зробив дуже багато. Він побудував дві лінії твердинь: по річці Самарі й по річці Орелі. Тим він припинив набіг татар на Гетьманщину. Деякі з твердинь були побудовані так, що мали б значення в боротьбі проти Москви, але не проти татар. Так само двозначно будувалися великі твердині: Кніїв і Батурин і менші - Стародус, Новгород-Сіверський та Біла Церква. 5
He also prepared the nation for statehood and sovereignty by fostering education and national awareness through politics and the arts:

Гетьман Іван Мазепа, розбудував усі елементи державного життя, підрогтувавши Україну до незалежності. Крім створення правдивої верхови та підвищення кваліфікації війська, він не менш дбав про розвиток науки, шкільництва, культури і мистецтва. Відомі йому численні архітектурні будівлі, церкви і замки, разом з літературою і мистецтвом дали своєрідний стиль мазепинської доби.6

Mazepa's drive toward the creation of a free Ukraine led him to search for an appropriate ally with whom he could challenge the Tsar and his growing Muscovite empire. Weighing his options carefully with an eye toward the welfare of Ukraine, Mazepa cautiously selected Karl XII of Sweden, and patiently waited for the most opportune moment in which to make his proposal:

Мазепа був свідомий того, що політична атмосфера в інших державах не сприяє будь-якій революції в Україні проти московського царя. Треба було здати нагоди-московсько-шведської війни, в якій Україна була при-мушенна брати участь на боці московського царя. Щойно тоді, коли Карл XII виявив зацікавлення Україною, як один з найважливіших чинників його воєнного успіху, Мазепа міг виступити проти московського царя Петра. Йшло про те, щоб оминитися в колі тогочасних смертних держав як одна суверенна держава нації, щоб не трактувати Мазепу як "бунтівника," який підписав існуючий суспільний лад і дає приклад невдоволеним царем суспільности інших народів. Беручи до уваги, що війна з Моською може бути довготривалою, Мазепі була потрібна прихильність інших держав, зокрема допомога зброєю, воєнними найманцями, добрим політичним й торговельним зв’язками тощо. Гетьман ждав моменту, коли у війні двох монархів зможе стати союзником шведського короля Карла XII і на основі договору з ним виступити як захищник прав української нації на власне суверенне державне життя.7
Mazepa's political design and his union with Karl of Sweden were generated by a deep sense of patriotism. In 1707, Orlyk, his Secretary General, attested to the purity of Mazepa's ambition in his letters which recounted Mazepa's pledge to the Ukrainian people. The pledge as delivered by Mazepa was as follows:

... я призиваю Всемогучого Бога на свідка, що не для приватної користі, не ради якихнебудь інших забаганок, але заради всіх вас, що є під моєю владою і під моїм регіментом, ради дружин і дітей ваших, ради спільного добра нашої бідної матері України, для користі всього війська запорізького і народу українського, для поширення військових прав і вольностей, хочу при Божій помічі так зробити, щоб ви з жінками і дітьми ваших і оточення з військом запорізьким не погубили як з російської так з шведської сторони, якщо б я ради якихнебудь моїх приватних забаганок, осмілився так поступити, то хай мене поб'є на душі і на тілі Бог у Трійці Святій Единій і невинні Страсти Христові.

Mazepa's actions were guided by an astute political insight. He clearly perceived the dangers which threatened Ukraine, not only from Muscovy, but also from Poland, both of which had designs for occupation. Muscovy, "an avowed and acknowledged champion of imperial supremacy of strong states over their weaker neighbor" centered her efforts on the liquidation of the hetmanate and the kozak host. Poland also entertained hopes of controlling Ukraine, and the Swedish-forced election of Stanislaw Leszcynski as King of Poland provided the Poles with the opportunity they were looking for. The Poles turned to Mazepa and the kozak host for support. It was, however, "with traditional desire to control the whole Ukraine," that they opened negotiations.
While Mazepa's predecessors in the hetmanate, Doroshenko and Samoilovych, lost themselves in the whirlpool of internal and external political intrigues, Mazepa managed to survive by virtue of his ingenuity, his charm, his skill to manage and control, his flexibility to adapt, and his strength to persevere. He craftily manipulated situations to meet his ends:

A brutal luxury reigned over banquets and feasts at which he [Mazepa] assembled his companions, and the coarseness of Cossack habits betrayed itself in the number of guests who were carried away drunk. Mazeppa, more master of himself, and full of craft, concluded many delicate negotiations at the table with adversaries rendered helpless by drink. 11

Whenever possible Mazepa manipulated the Tsar. During the winter of 1707 and the spring of 1708, Mazepa was taken ill with gout. Although historian Clarence Manning is unsure "how far this was a feigned illness," 12 a letter written by Mazepa to Peter the Great, exaggerating the symptoms, was successful in holding off Peter's demands that Mazepa join the tsarist troops in the battle against the Swedes. With this letter Mazepa bought himself crucial time for political maneuvering.

The authors May, Gottschall and Froembgen focus on Mazepa, Hetman of Ukraine. The literary character of Ivan Mazepa which emerges from Andreas May's drama is a hero of mythical proportions whose capacities are multiplied and enlarged to make him loom over the common man, despite his tragic flaw—a self-consuming drive:
Der ungezähmte Geist, die wilde Kraft
In [Mazepa's] Brust tobt dennoch ratlos fort
Nach Nahrung und wird in dem ew'gen Hunger
Zuletzt sich selbst verzehren.  

Kochubey is the first character in May's drama to
glorify Mazepa's name:

Ich bin eben im Begriffe, einen Jugendfreund und

Eudoria further expounds on the legendary name and Mazepa's great power. She refers to him as "ein Halbgott" and "der Tartarfresser", who single-handedly conquered and subjugated the Tartars and the Turks, Europe's Asiatic foes. Kochubey adds, "Die Tartaren warf er in die Krim; den Türken schleifte er ihre Festungen; ...." Mazepa is perceived as superhuman. The sheer utterance of his name arouses reverence among commoners, as when Eudoria remarks, "Mich schüttelt's durch alle Glieder." His military might commands restraint and respect from other leaders. Karl XII, the Swedish King, halts his troops at the border of Ukraine, afraid to enter Mazepa's territory.

König Karl steht eingeschüchtert in Volhynien und wagt es nicht, seine Schweden über die Gränze zu führen.

Another great hero in May's drama, Peter the Great, Tsar of Muscovy, honors Mazepa and proclaims him Prince of Ukraine.

... [Mazepa's] Brust war die erste, an welche Peter die blaue Schleife des neuen Andreasordens heftete; der letzte Ukas hat ihn zum Fürsten von Kleinrußland erhoben.
Although May's portrait of Mazepa is rooted in historical facts, he exaggerates some of these facts. For instance, May is correct in his presentation of Mazepa's might, but he is incorrect in his statement that Karl of Sweden feared Mazepa and halted his troops at the border of Ukraine, as Kochubey reports in the drama. On the contrary, Karl XII entered Ukraine in 1708.

To have Karl fear Mazepa is May's tool for manipulating and controlling audience reaction to the defeat at the Battle of Poltava. Karl's fear of Mazepa reinforces Mazepa's image as a mighty warrior and leads the audience into an association of Mazepa with victory and invincibility. The defeat at Poltava, therefore, has a great dramatic impact on the audience because it destroys the illusion of Mazepa as the great victor. It produces first a feeling of disbelief, and then one of sympathy for a fallen hero.

May is also historically incorrect in his statement that Peter the Great crowned Mazepa as Prince of Ukraine. In fact, there was no crowning. The hetmanate was a traditionally Ukrainian military-civilian elective office and no crown was ever attached to it. The distortion of this fact, however, contributes to May's literary scheme of portraying Mazepa as above the common level, and as having greater power and dignity than the ordinary leader. It also serves to reinforce in the audience's mind the respect and
trust given to Mazepa by the Tsar, which later makes Mazepa's betrayal of the Tsar even more poignant and dramatic.

The Mazepa portrayed by Müzelburg is of a far lesser dimension than the one portrayed by May. Nevertheless, he is a hero who applies the lessons he learned in the years of his apprenticeship. He ultimately rises above the common lot of the kozak host and its officers. To demonstrate this Müzelburg contrives an incident in which Mazepa displays his superiority over the other kozaks in a show of unusual courage. Single-handedly, Mazepa kills a wild bull which had burst into the kozak community and threatened the lives of its inhabitants. As Mazepa confronts the wild animal, his actions are guided by a balance between his senses and his mind.


Although there are no historical facts which even remotely suggest such an incident, the incident serves as a culmination point in the learning process and pictures Mazepa in a state of complete control over himself and his environment.

Unlike May and Müzelburg, Johann Froembgen does not exaggerate the facts of Mazepa's life. Instead, he draws an analogy between the political failure of Mazepa's predecessor Peter Doroshenko and Mazepa's own political
plight. To create the analogy Froembgen gives attention to the details of Doroshenko's political career. He begins by accurately portraying him as a patriot opposed to both Polish domination in the west and Russian domination in the east of Ukraine. Froembgen sums up Doroshenko's political philosophy in a single sentence: "Wir erkennen keinen Herren an, nicht Moskowis, nicht Polen!" This statement manifests Doroshenko's political program to create an independent and united Ukraine. His first task is to liberate Right-Bank Ukraine from the Poles. This proves fatal for it only precipitates a Polish-Russian treaty by which the Right-Bank Ukraine falls to Poland and the Left-Bank Ukraine to Muscovy. Despite the treaty Doroshenko remains an irreconcilable opponent of the Polish and Muscovite regimes in Ukraine. He wages war with both regimes. During one of his campaigns into the Left-Bank Ukraine he defeats the pro-Muscovite hetman Bruchovetsky (historically Samoilovych). In the midst of his victory, however, he has to return to the Right-Bank Ukraine. Doroshenko appointes Demian Mnchorishny as the colonel to take over command in his absence. The consequences of this prove fatal, for Demian betrays Doroshenko and enters into negotiations with the Muscovites: "... Demian hat das Heer der Kosaken nach Putiwl geführt und sich dort mit den Moskowitern verbrüdert."

In a desperate effort to save his political career
Doroshenko takes action which leads to his demise. He feigns sudden loyalty and submission to Moscovy; at the same time he begins negotiations with Poland, while seeking a secret alliance with the Sultan of Constantinople. Doroshenko's plan is: "Türken, Russen, Polen in den Krieg zu hetzen, um sein Glück am großen Feuerbrand zu schmeiden, ...". Instead, Doroshenko digs his own grave. His plan backfires. Muscovy is able to steer away from war. The Sultan wages war on Poland and is successful in defeating the Poles. Temporarily Ukraine is free of Polish occupation, but a worse fate is at hand. Doroshenko did not foresee the price of the Sultan's alliance: a plundering of Ukrainian lands by the Turks. This ignites terror and distrust among the people and the kozaks turn against Doroshenko:

Die Kosaken fluchten ihm, der die Muselmänner in das Land geholt hatte, die Schänder ihrer Kirchen und Verwüster ihrer Acker.

In panic the kozaks: "richten die Blicke hilfesuchend nach Moskau."

Doroshenko's political career is ruined:

Was nutzen Doroschenko seine Siege! Was half ihm die Vertreibung der Polen aus der westlichen Ukraine und die Bedrohung der Moskowiter auf dem Ostufer des Dnjeper? Er was ein erledigter Mann.

Froembgen's deviations from the accurate representation of historical facts concerning Doroshenko's political career are so few and insignificant that they do not substantially change the historical picture. Froembgen
relies on historical truth to create drama. He allows history to speak for itself and does not need to modify characters of actual historical persons to fit them into his story, or do violence to the chronological table in order to draw together the threads of his plot.

In closely following the conditions which led to Doroshenko's political demise Froembgen is foreshadowing Mazepa's failure as Hetman of Ukraine. As the details of Doroshenko's political career remain fresh in the reader's mind, Froembgen unfolds the details of Mazepa's political career. The reader becomes painfully aware of the parallel in the external conditions faced by both men. Led by the same political idea (an independent and united Ukraine), Mazepa and Doroshenko must confront the Polish ambitions for the occupation of Ukraine and the Russian encroachment on the rights of Ukraine. Like Doroshenko, Mazepa feigns loyalty to both Russia and Poland while secretly seeking a strong ally to combat foreign oppression in Ukraine. As with Doroshenko, Froembgen has Mazepa betrayed by a close friend and abandoned by his kozak officers. Following the same fateful patterns as Doroshenko, Mazepa plunges into the final struggle even though there is little hope for victory. As Mazepa strives to overcome his political obstacles, the reader is haunted by the reality of Doroshenko's failure.

Both historically and in the works of May, Gottschall, and Froembgen, Mazepa is guided by a dream of a
free and independent Ukraine. In May's drama Mazepa, in a vision, sees a union with the Swedes followed by the destruction of Muscovy:

Er [Karl XII]
Vereinigt sich mit mir, hilft mir den Thron
Aufrichten und--dann ziehn zwei Könige
Zum Sturz des Czarenreiches gen Moskau.29

He also sees the emergence of the free Ukrainian State as the bulwark of Western Europe against Russian aggression:

Ein freier Staat soll die Ukraine werden,
Ein freies Reich soll hier entsteh'n, selbständig
Und unabhängig! Wie ein Riese soll es
Sich zwischen Osten und dem Westen lagern,
Ein Bollwerk gegen Rußland für Europa!30

In Gottschall's drama Mazepa's ambitions also center on the realization of a plan which would lead to the establishment of a free Ukraine. Mazepa's thoughts are intensely emotional as his vision unfolds and becomes more articulate:

... ein großes Ziel, nach dem ich ringe,
Umsturz des Alten, neues Maß der Dinge,
Ein freies Reich bis fern nach Asiens Zone,
Und für den Würdigsten die Herrscherkrone!31

Froembgen, in his work, also infuses and inflames Mazepa's mind with the vision of a free Ukraine. Froembgen uses the past of Ukraine to produce striking and effective images which etch themselves into the very depth of Mazepa's mind. In the moments of inspiration, which he drew from Ukrainian history, Mazepa saw his own goals and ambitions defined by the glorious events of the past. The chronicles, legends and tales—repositories of the historical past—furnish Mazepa with inspiration for a future in which he
envisions the resurrection of Ukraine:

In Glanz und Glorie erfüllte die Idee des alten Reiches Rus die Seele, das der Neugeburt entgegendring, das Reich Kiew, das Land der Heeren und der Ritter, wie es lebte in den Lettern der Povesti. Und sein Fürst--Mazeppa! Der die Reihe märchenhafter Fürsten weiterführte--32

By focusing on Mazeppa's vision of an independent Ukraine and on his personal ambition—the attainment of a crown (historically untrue)—May, Gottschall and Froembgen accomplish two things. One, they do what the writers of fictional biographies can do best, that is, not only recover the facts of the life of the man who lived long ago, and trace the thread of events, but also recover the visions and personal ambitions of that individual, and thereby humanize the historical figure. Consequently, May, Gottschall, and Froembgen also increase the aesthetic enjoyment of their works which depends to a great extent "on the author's ability to arouse his reader's empathy and imaginative identification with the character and action unfolded in the narrative."33 Two, they allow the reader to view the ultimate tragedy of Mazeppa on two levels: national and personal. On the national level, the defeat of Mazeppa and his vision seals the fate of a nation destined to political abuse by foreign powers. On a personal level, it marks the end of a great human struggle in pursuit of a dream.

However, May and Gottschall go beyond the presentation of Mazeppa's vision and his personal ambition. They focus their attention on the force behind the vision--
an obsession which permeates Mazepa's whole being and makes him a slave to the vision. The authors' elaboration of this obsessive drive furnishes a key to understanding Mazepa in the context of their works.

In May's drama Mazepa's passion consumes all of his vital energies. This state of emotional frenzy blinds him and leads him to disregard Kochubey's warning:

Du mußt auch Alles setzen auf den Wurf,
Macht, Ehre, Reichtum, Leben. Eines fällt dir:
Thron oder Galgen! 34

This drive for the attainment of his goal at all cost is the key for understanding Mazepa's political actions as well as his motives and interactions with other characters, particularly Natalie.

In Gottschall's work Mazepa is also a man driven by a consuming force:

Wir sind und bleiben uns' rer Träume Sklaven,
Und dieses wilde Blut, das uns beherrscht,
Das Nachts so seltsame Gestalten schafft,
Ist auch die Mutter dessen, was der Tag
Im Licht erzeugt, was die Geschichte nennt!
Denn in der Tiefe uns' rer Seele wohnt
Ein dunkles Müssen, und das Gaukelbild
Des Träumes ist der lust' ge Abgesandte
Der düster waltenden Nothwendigkeit. 35

By focusing on the strength of Mazepa's drive Gottschall, like May, emphasizes Mazepa's creed: the quest for freedom. In pursuit of his goal Mazepa becomes a man for whom no price, no sacrifice is too great: "Ihm gilt ein Menschenleben nichts." 36 This is the key essential for understanding of Mazepa and his interplay with other
characters, especially Matrena and Iskra.

Historically Mazepa was indeed driven by the force of his vision, although May and Gottschall somewhat overdramatize that fact. According to a portrait of Mazepa rendered by the historian Clarence Manning, Mazepa was always "calm, dignified, and unruffled." According to the French academician, Vogüe, Mazepa was always "a master of himself." In their exaggeration of Mazepa's unsatiated drive for freedom May and Gottschall create a character somewhat reminiscent of Goethe's *Egmont*. In creating the Egmont character Goethe "sought to arouse [the reader's] fascination for his hero's personality, which he characterizes with the term 'Dämonisch.' Once [the reader] recognize[s] the 'demonic' quality of Egmont, it becomes evident that every element in the play is designed to develop and sustain [the reader's] interest in him." Gottschall and Froembgen are concerned with portraying Mazepa's personality in vivid colors, and therefore focus not only on Mazepa's unsatiated ambition, but also on the artful diplomacy Mazepa employs to achieve his political goal. In Gottschall's work Mazepa manipulates people and facts, and compromises his character to achieve his goal. He incites the kozak host and gains their support through trickery:

. . . Heute will
Ich die Kosackenobersten berauschen
Mit Wein, min Schönheit, mit Begeisterung,
Auf daß sie blind zu meinen Verste Fahnen schwören. 40

When the Tsar calls on Mazepa to join him on a military campaign against the Swedes, Mazepa feigns illness, dupes the Tsar and thus buys time for his own calculated undertakings:

Es bleibt kein and'ers Mittel, sei es drum!
Die Maske der Verstellung vor--ich muß
Den Kranken spielen (Laut.) Was ist das? Mir schwindelt! 41

Mazepa even turns against his brother kozak, Bulawin, whose premature call for a break with the Tsar threatens Mazepa's secret military negotiations with the Swedes:

Fort mit ihm [Bulawin]--ins Gefängnis! . . .
. . . Zuerst das Feuer--und nacher den Lärm!
Voreil'ge Jugend stürzt mich ins Verderben. 42

Throughout Gottschall's drama Mazepa justifies his shrewd behavior--trickery, false arrest, feigned illness--by the fairness of his intent.

In having Mazepa feign illness, Gottschall bases this fictional scene on an historical record. However, there is no historical record to indicate that Mazepa resorted to inebriating his kozaks in order to gain their support. On the contrary, Mazepa's decision to break with Muscovy and ally himself with the Swedes was:

...dictated by the deliberate policy of the whole group of high Cossak officers led by the Hetman Mazepa, as head of the Ukrainian state, who acted in the real interest of their country, whose position was endangered by the reckless policy of Tsar Peter, indifferent to the well-being of Ukraine. 43
Gottschall's Bulawin-Mazepa confrontation is also contrary to historical fact. Historically, Bulawin, an otaman of the Don Kosaks, rose in revolt against Peter and his reforms. Peter ordered Mazepa to send forces against him and Mazepa sent a volunteer force which joined the Muscovite forces in suppressing the Bulawin uprising. When it was suppressed, Bulawin was executed.

Gottschall's transformation of historical facts serves to portray Mazepa as a self-ordained leader. It makes clear to the audience that all of Mazepa's actions—moral, deviant or corrupt—are dictated by circumstances and are aimed at the achievement of a higher purpose which gives him the strength of character to express himself shrewdly, cleverly, cunningly, or forcibly. All actions within the play must be understood in this light if one is to appreciate fully all the dimensions of Mazepa's personality.

In Froembgen's novel, Mazepa is the master of deceit. He uses artful schemes in order to sustain himself in the political arena. He has the ability to plan and work in secret while thwarting clandestine opposition without arousing suspicion. His charm dispels Muscovite doubts. He publicly hails Peter as the Emperor and his master, and solemnly declares "diamante Treue" to the crown. He celebrates all of Peter's victories and faithfully advises Peter of all political intrigues against Muscovy. The Tsar
is thoroughly duped:

Hier schreibt er mir, enthüllt mir alles, er, Mazeppa selber... Er läßt mich einen Blick in die Gedanken und Projekte meiner Feinde tun. Und dann zum Schluss bekennt er es aufs neue, was er ist und bleibt: der Man der diamantenen Treue.45

While beguiling Peter, Mazepa begins dealings with the Poles in hopes of making contact with Karl XII. Suspicious, however, of the honesty of Polish intentions, Mazepa cleverly avoids any commitment. Froembgen has Mazepa write a letter to Princess Dolska, his Polish contact with the Swedish King, wherein he secures her confidence while playing for time to calculate his own political maneuvers:

Wochen hatte sie [Dolska] gewartet. Nichts geschah. Jetzt dieser Brief. Er war der schönsten Worte voll, die eine Ahnungslosere betören könnten, Worte glühender Verehrung, Bitten und Beschworungen, um Christi Wunden willen nicht an ihm zu zweifeln, ihn nicht zu verdammn, weil er Fesseln trug, die ihm ein rasches Handeln nicht gestatten.46

Froembgen is not exaggerating the historical situation in presenting such a picture of Mazepa. Mazepa was powerless as far as independent military power was concerned. He had no choice but to resort to diplomacy, which he always used to his advantage. Mazepa "trained in the devious ways of diplomacy both in the West and East"47 was able to hold his own against political intrigue and foreign aggression.

Although Froembgen underscores Mazepa's artful use of diplomacy he does not change the historical facts or present them out of context. Froembgen offers the reader an
explication of Mazepa's character based on the conditions and circumstances which dictated his actions: Mazepa's falsehoods and diplomatic schemings were necessitated by the nature of the limited alternatives he faced; he was trapped by the affairs of the time and the system of things of the particular moment in history.
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CHAPTER VI
MAZEPÁ'S LOVE AFFAIR

In 1668, Mazepa married Anna Frydrykevych. The marriage was not harmonious:

Whether there was a lack of sympathy between the two or whether she was an invalid cannot be decided but from the time that Mazepa entered the service of Samoylovich, she dropped completely out of sight. She did not appear at his entertainments, he apparently did not confide in her and she played no positive role in his life. She even did not appear in Moscow where Peter was trying to promote social life with his own crude tastes.¹

It has been suggested that the marriage was political, for it opened to Mazepa the door to Hetman Doroshenko, a close friend of Anna's first husband:

...шлюб Mazепи з Фридриховичкою відкрив йому безпосередній шлях до Дорошенківського Чигірина.²

In 1704, two years after the death of his wife, Anna, Mazepa decided to remarry. His attention centered on the sixteen year old Motrja Kochubey, and he suddenly approached Colonel Vasyl Kochubey to ask for his daughter's hand in marriage. Mazepa's marriage proposal was met with a strong opposition from Motrja's parents, who "had no desire to see their daughter in the arms of a Hetman who had such a variety of amatory experience."³ Mazepa's age, then over seventy,⁴ and his relationship to Motrja as her godfather⁵, further impeded parental consent.
As a little girl, Motrja looked upon Mazepa as a second father, but by the age of sixteen she responded to Mazepa's amorous overtures. Despite parental opposition, the romance flourished. Madame Kochubey tried to dissuade Motrja from the affair, but when her pleas fell on deaf ears, the mother locked Motrja in the house and forbade her to leave.

The affair came to a climax one evening when Motrja managed to escape, and fled to the palace of the Hetman. The Kochubeys immediately discovered her absence and sounded the alarm bell to rouse the city. The alarm also aroused Mazepa, who, upon discovering the girl, had the representatives of the Tsar immediately return her to her parents. This nocturnal adventure was perhaps the greatest proof of Motrja's love for the Hetman, for she showed that she was willing to discard all discretion in her passionate pursuit of him. Mazepa's response, however, apparently disillusioned her and even though Mazepa did not give up suit, Motrja seemed to have lost interest in the relationship. Mazepa's letters to her following this event point to the drastic change in her feelings:

Love of my heart,
I see that your Grace has completely changed her old love for me. You know it; let your will be done. Act as you wish. You will be sorry later. Remember only your word that you gave me under oath, when you took from me a diamond ring, my most beautiful and costly jewel. You said then: 'Whether it happens one way or another, our love will never die.'
All four authors include the Mazepa/Motrja affair in their works. However, whereas Andreas May and Rudolf Gottschall make the Mazepa/Motrja affair central to their works, Johann Froebgen uses the affair peripherally to develop the Mazepa/Vasyl Kochubey conflict which eventually leads to Kochubey's betrayal of Mazepa, and Adolf Müzelburg uses the affair only as a theme.

Andreas May merges fact with fiction. He introduces his audience to Natalie, the historical Motrja, at her father's estate. She lost her mother in early childhood, and had become her father's sole reason for existence. All his energies are directed toward the establishment of a perfect future for her:

Als ich mich hier angesiedelt,
War meine Gattin todt. Sie hatte mir
Nur eine Tochter hintergelassen. Ihr,
Dem theuren Kinde nur hab' ich gelebt.
Die sich're Aussicht einer schönen Zukunft
Für sie—das ist mein einziger Wunsch; nur das
Ersehn' ich noch also letzten Sonnenblick
In diesem Leben. Mit der Sorgfalt, deren
Ein Mann nur fähig, hab' ich sie erzogen.
Gleich sorgsam wählt' ich ihr dem künftigen
Gemahl. Und ihr die Möglichkeit zu geben,
Die Welt nur für ein Paradies zu nehmen, . . . ?

The bond between father and daughter is strong and it plays an important role in the later development of the drama, when Natalie must choose between her father and Mazepa.

The historical Vasyl Kochubey, contrary to May's version, was survived by his wife and several children, one of whom was Motrja. Kochubey held a high political office, that of Chief Judge of the kozak host, in Mazepa's
administration, and devoted his time and energy to his work. At home he was an unimpressive father who was completely dominated by his wife, who was known to be a strict and austere woman.

May's distortion of the historical father-daughter relationship is, however, crucial to the development of his drama. It forms a basis for Kochubey's actions in the drama and sheds light on the development of the psychological processes which Natalie undergoes once removed from the parental home.

May goes on to develop Natalie as a child of material well-being, reared at her father's estate and courted by Prince Dimitri, who lavishes her with gifts and affection. Eudoria quotes Dimitri's words which clearly cater to Natalie's whims:

"Furstin, ihr habt euch bei eurer letzten Sticherei über die Seide beklagt, die man in Kiew verkauft. Versucht es einmal mit diesen Spulen. Sie kommen von den ersten Meistern in Lyon."8

Natalie's physical world is one of luxuries.

May is not historically incorrect in his presentation of Mortja's world. Her family belonged to the upper-class landed-gentry and was not wanting financially. The reason, however, that May emphasizes Natalie's wealth is not to demonstrate her affluence but to show a void in her life. Amid the abundance of riches which surround her, she is lacking purpose and love.
Although there is no historical record of a suitor in Motrja's life before Mazepa, May creates the character of Dimitri to portray a suitor who is unable to win her love:

Wie oft hab' ich ihr von meiner Liebe... gesprochen! Dimitri, entgegnet sie stet, ihr kommt fast täglich, uns zu besuchen. Wir sehen uns, wir sprechen uns. Wir leben nebeneinander, wir freuen uns zusammen. Was bedürfen wir mehr zu unserem Glücke?9

Natalie's relationship with Dimitri is placid in that there is no intimacy, no well-spring of emotions. She consents to her engagement to Dimitri only in deference to her father's wish: "Du willst es, Vater."10 By so presenting the relationship between Natalie and Dimitri, May underscores Kochubey's hold on his daughter and the emotional void in Natalie's life as well. This prepares the ground for Natalie's responses to Mazepa. In sharp contrast to Dimitri, who wooes Natalie with material goods, Mazepa attracts her with his energy. Dimitri lacks the force to move Natalie's imagination and to win her heart, while Mazepa's personality and fame electrify her. She is fascinated by Mazepa and is held captive by the narration of his exploits:

Ich will euch hier geloben, mit mehr Freude An eurem Mund zu hängen, wenn ihr mit Dem Vater das Geschick der Völker, die Verwirrungen der Politik, den Lauf Des Krieges, eure hohen Plane Und alle Mittel glücklichen Gedeih'ns Besprecht, als wenn ihr mit bekannter Kunst Uns eure zärtlichsten Romanzen fängt. Nur eines sei mein Lohn: Ihr müßt auch von Den Thaten der Vergangenheit erzählen. Begleiten möcht ich euch, wenn ihr im Donner Der Schlacht die Kühnsten um euch sammelt, in
Die Feinde fliegt und aus der Mitte des Zersprengten Knäu'ls Geschütz und Fahne holt. Ich will--

Natalie's captivation with Mazepa is a historical mirror of Motrja's fascination with Mazepa. Motrja grew up in Baturin, the Hetman's capital. She constantly visited the Hetman's court with her parents. It was said that during banquets she only listened to the Hetman and sang only those songs which he composed. Her childhood esteem of Mazepa, therefore, naturally evolved into love for the Hetman.

The portrait of Natalie's feelings for Mazepa is of paramount importance in his drama. It is the key to Natalie's tragedy, which develops later in the drama. Natalie stands in awe of Mazepa's splendor, and also his power and fame. New elements of meaning enter her emotionally impoverished life and her ego is fulfilled. Unfortunately for her, she does not share Mazepa's sense of purpose to which all else must be subordinated. She is simply filled with romantic illusions, which dissipate when put to the test, plunging her into psychological turmoil.

In his flight of imagination May presents the Mazepa/Natalie affair contrary to historical facts. He has Mazepa abduct Natalie to Baturin, his estate. Once in his power, Natalie is approached by Mazepa who is tempting her by a glamorous proposition: "... ich biet' euch einen Thron der Zukunft!" He shares his confidence with
Natalie and thus seeks to involve her in his future political plans:

Wohlan, ich kenn' nur einen Frauengeist,
Mit dem ich mich entschließen könnt', . . .
. . . Dieser Geist seid ihr, Natalie.
Ihr sollt den mein Geheimniss hören, . . . 14

Natalie is inebriated with the vision:

Das, Fürst, war eine Offenbarung, die
Mir euch aus dem gemeinen Kreis der Menschen
Entrückt hat. Ha, schon steht ihr vor mir da--
Ein Auserwählter, um das Haupt den Schimmer
Der Majestät, ein Gott der Erde! -- So
Empfangen denn auch hier gleich, König, unter
Dem blauen Thronzelt deines Steppenreiches
Die erste Huldigung von deiner ersten,
Von deiner treu'sten Unterthanin! 15

She abandons Dimitri for Mazepa, and in doing so she compromises the honor of her father's word. She believes that the end will justify her action and that all will eventually be reconciled around the crown. Natalie becomes hopelessly enamored with Mazepa and her passion diminishes her capacity to assess reality. She readily makes commitments which are in breach of her duty to her father and her promise to Dimitri. In her mind, she has created an idealized union with Mazepa, a paradise in which all must have a happy ending. While Natalie is living under the spell of a romantic illusion, Mazepa is slowly moving toward his goal, including Natalie, his future queen, into his plans. In creating a love bond between Natalie and Mazepa, May brings out the basic difference in their emotional make-up: Natalie is driven by a blind passion, Mazepa by a sense of purpose. It is this difference which leads their love
affair to a tragedy.

As May develops this portion of the Mazepa/Natalie affair, he capitalizes on two historical facts of the romance: the strength of Motrja's love and Motrja's defiance of her parents. May needs only these factors to set the stage for later complications.

Rudolf Gottschall, like May, merges fact with fiction in his portrait of Matrena, the literary counterpart of the historical Motrja Kochubey. Although Gottschall's Matrena is similar in character to May's Natalie, and the affair develops along the same lines, there are some differences in details. Like May's Natalie, Matrena is a sheltered naive child. However, whereas Natalie lives at her father's estate, Matrena, orphaned in childhood, grows up in a girls boarding school at a monastery, placed there by her father:

Mein einz'ges höchstes Gut, ein Kind, wie dies,  
So reich an allen Gaben der Natur!  
Die Zeit ist wild, von Leidenschaft bewegt.  
Drum als die Mutter starb, verbarg ich rasch  
Die Unbeschützte hinter Klostermauern.16

The literary purpose for Gottschall's deviating from the historical facts of Motrja's childhood is to create a character with a tragic flaw. Brought up in a monastery, Matrena is neither exposed to nor confronted by the external world and the sacrifices it could exact. Her innocence and naivete are essential contributing factors to her ineptitude to handle the burdens of life. This handicap precipitates
the flow of tragic events which follow the death of Iskra, Matrena's father.

Unlike May's Natalie, who is abducted, Gottschall's Matrena flees from the monastery to join Mazepa:

O lang' hab' ich gekämpft--mit bitt'rer Qual
Die Nächte durchgerungen vor dem Kreuze,
Die Heil'ge angefleht, daß sie mich selbst
Von dem Gelübde löse--ach vergebens!
Zu bleiben mit den sündigen Gedanken
Im Heiligthum, schein grös'rer Frevel mir,
Als zu entfliehn, wohin mein Herz mich trieb...  

Whether or not Gottschall modelled this scene on Motrja Kochubey's nocturnal flight from her imprisonment at the paternal home to join Mazepa is not essential. What is interesting is how this act serves to reveal her character. Matrena flees from the monastery to indulge her own emotions and desires. This is an important trait in Matrena. It shows that she is governed by narrow, reserved, and selfish goals, in contrast to Mazepa who is driven by an ideal. This variance in motivational forces, similar to that which existed between May's Natalie and Mazepa, accounts for the later tragedy in the Mazepa/Matrena love affair.

Captivated by Mazepa, Matrena, like Natalie, pledges herself to him. She severs her ties with the past and commits herself to abide by Mazepa's will:

Ich aber liebe dich, wie meinen Stern,
Verbrenn' die Brücken alle hinter mir,
Zerreiß' die Bande jeder andern Liebe,
Und folge deiner Leitung ohne Zagen.  

Matrena's pledge of love to Mazepa, like Natalie's, is that
of a naive girl, untested by life. She is captured by a
will greater than hers and she succumbs to it, unmindful of
the price of her commitment.

Matrena's and Natalie's commitments to Mazepa and
his vision are a prelude to the conflict in duties which
arises when their pledges to Mazepa are put to the test.
The resolution of this conflict in both dramas determines
the action of the rest of the play.

Images of the crown capture not only Natalie's, but
also Matrena's, imagination. Matrena eagerly embraces the
new sensation:

Da stand ich hoheitsvoll
Und alles beugte sich vor mir, und alle
Die bösen Zungen wurden plötzlich stumm--
Und--Königin--so flüstert's in der Runde!19

The real Motrja Kochubey of course never envisioned
herself as the crowned queen of Ukraine; Gottschall's
Matrena did. This is of importance in so far as her vision
of the crown is not dictated by a real voice from within,
but by the anticipation of grandeur. Her vanity plays an
important role in Gottschall's drama. It again underscores
that important discrepancy in attitude and degree of
commitment between the lovers which leads to the tragedy in
their relationship.

Although historically there was no union between
Mazepa and Motrja, Gottschall creates a union of Matrena and
Mazepa at Baturin. Initially the union is successful.
Mazepa is pleased to have his queen at his side and draws
strength from her presence:

... so komm in meine Arme,  
Umranke mich mit deinem ganzen Leben!  
So werd' ich stark und stärker;  

Matrena is also pleased to be in Baturin. She is excited to have a first-hand view of and personal involvement in an important and adventurous political enterprise. Unlike May's Natalie, who is only an observer, Gottschall's Matrena participates in paving the road for the realization of Mazepa's political goal. Single-handedly Matrena charms Gordienko, otaman of the kozaks, into a pledge of support for Mazepa's plan:

Matrena: Versprecht Ihr mir's, Ihr stützt Mazeppa's Plane?

Gordienko: ... ruft Ihr mich ... ich komme!  

She also helps Mazepa in his attempt to rally the kozaks into rebellion against the Tsar:

Auf jener kleinen Bühne werd' ich selbst  
Also Göttin dieses Landes heut' erscheinen,  
Durch den Prolog zu einem Stück, da noch  
Zur Zeit der Polenherrschaft spielt, anregen  
Die schwankenden Gemüther, ...  

Gottschall purposely builds an illusion of matrimonial harmony to make more poignant the tragic events—betrayal, execution, murder, and suicide—which are eventually precipitated by this very union.

The historical love affair between Mazepa and Motrja Kochubey, as portrayed in the works of Andreas May and
Rudolf Gottschall, is a fine example of the blending of history and fiction and a show of the authority of the literary imagination over its historical material. Whereas the historical events which surround Mazepa's life were well known and documented in contemporary publications, the love affair between Mazepa and Motrja remained less known. This lack of public knowledge of the details of the romance leaves May and Gottschall a great deal of room to display their creative powers by means of contrived episodes upon which they build and develop their plots. Their skillful and subtle use of known facts of the romance works to enhance the seeming veracity of their story, despite the flights of literary imagination.

Johann Froembgen introduces the Motrja affair into his novel as one of three affairs in which Mazepa is involved. It is preceded by the affair with Pani Falboska and Princess Dolska. The purpose of each of these love affairs is to change the course of events within the plot.

On presenting Mazepa's affair with Matrena, the literary counterpart for the historical Motrja Kochubey, Froembgen does not significantly alter historical fact. He focuses attention on the two historical obstacles which stand in the way of the Mazepa-Motrja union, the Church canon and the parental objection; and in his work they appear as impediments to the marriage of Mazepa and Matrena. Froembgen had Matrena's parents intervene in the love affair
and restrict Matrena to the parental home just as the Kochubeys did to Motrja.

Froembgen eliminates the episode of Motrja's escape and chooses instead a less climactic ending to the affair. Matrena is led by her parents to believe that Mazepa is no longer interested in her, and that he is in love with a Polish woman. Broken-hearted and disillusioned, Matrena consents to marriage with a man of her parents' choice. Mazepa gives up suit, although the image of Matrena embeds itself deeply into his soul:

Es war tief in der Nacht. Mazeppa fand die Ruhe nicht. Er fürchtete den Schlaf. Im Traum erschien ihm Matrena, und dem Erwachen würde es wie fürchterlicher Hohn des Schicksals sein.23

Froembgen introduces the Mazepa-Matrena affair into his novel in order to rouse Kochubeys anger against Mazepa, which then leads him to appear in front of the Tsar and reveal the existence of Mazepa's alliance with the Swedes. This act of betrayal is a precursor to the tragic string of events leading to the defeat at the Battle of Poltava.

Adolf Müzelburg uses the Mazepa-Motrja affair as the theme for the marriage episode in his novel—a locked-away bride, Jadwiga, and her groom's, Mazepa's, attempt to free her. Müzelburg uses this theme, embellished by details of his own making, to test Mazepa's maturity. The circumstances and obstacles placed before Mazepa in winning the hand of Jadwiga, the daughter of Zernicky, tests Mazepa's growing sense of balance between thought and action, emotion
and reason. In restraining his emotions, in using cunning instead of aggression, and in placing faith and trust in those who can help, Mazepa displays an inner harmony of all his faculties.

The details of Mazepa's quest for the hand of Jadwiga, in Mūzelburg's novel, begin when Mazepa learns that Jadwiga is engaged to marry his mortal enemy, Rotoff. Mazepa is determined to save her:

\[\ldots\text{ daß sie [Jadwiga] die Gattin eines Menschen werden sollte, den er hätt[e], verabscheute, der für ihn der Inbegriff alles Schlechten und Gemeinen war, das die Erde barg--nein, das ertrug er nicht. Das durfte nicht sein! Noch war es Zeit. Mit Gewalt mußte Jadwiga zurückgehalten werden das Jawort zu sprechen! Er mußte sie retten, sollte er auch darüber untergehen.}\]

Mazeppa, however, does not plunge into thoughtless action, as was his practice earlier. He does not allow impulse to reign over reason and masters his emotions:

So harrte er, bis die Fluth versonnen, bis sein Geist wieder klar geworden, bis er im Stande war, ganz ruhig zu denken un zu Überlegen. Sein Herz zitterte noch unter dem gewaltigen Schlage, den es erhalten. Aber sein Geist leuchtete siegend durch die Wolken, die ihn plötzlich verschleiert.

Mazepa decides that he must journey to Polonne, Zernicky's estate, and confront Jadwiga. His journey, however, is interrupted by threatening weather conditions. Mazeppa is forced to take refuge in a cloister. To his surprise, Jadwiga is also in the cloister. She is, however, closely guarded by the mother superior, a distant relative of Rotoff. In order to make contact with Jadwiga,
Mazepa resorts to craftiness. He poses as Rotoff's distant relative, and requests permission to see Jadwiga, the bride to be.

Der Versuch, Jadwiga zu sprechen, mußte gemacht werden und vielleicht werden und vielleicht war dies nicht so schwer, als er glaubte. Wenn Iwan sich für einen entfernten Verwandten Rotoffs ausgab, so war am Ende nichts einfacher, als daß wünschte, der Braut seines Verwandten seine Aufwartung zu machen.26

Mazepa has the foresight to have an alternative plan ready in case the first fails. If the mother superior does not grant him permission to see Jadwiga, Mazepa will get the cloister guard to carry a letter to Jadwiga:

Gelang es ihm auf diese Weise nicht, Jadwiga zu sehen, so wollte er sich dem Klosterwart entdecken und ihn bitten, dem Fräulein einen Brief heimlich zu übergeben, in welchem er Jadwiga bitten wollte, ihre Verbindung aufzuschieben, bis er Gelegenheit gehabt, mit ihr zu sprechen.27

To Mazepa's dismay both plans fail. He is, however, even more determined than ever to stop the marriage when he learns that Jadwiga consented to the union only because she believed Mazepa was dead: "... Fräulein Jadwiga betrauert ihn [Mazepa] schon seit dem Sommer des vergangenen Jahres als todt!"28

Mazepa's fortune takes a lucky turn when he learns that Celesta, his friend from the Polish King's court, is also at the cloister where she has taken her vows. Mazepa sets a meeting with Celesta to engage her assistance in reaching Jadwiga. Celesta puts Mazepa to the ultimate test of self-control. She promises to help Mazepa; however, she
cannot reveal her plans. She commands Mazepa to be patient and trust her: "Wollen Sie mir vertrauen, Iwan? Wollen Sie Ihr Schicksal in meine Hände legen?"

The day of the wedding arrives and Celesta has still done nothing. The ceremonies begin and Celesta remains silent. Mazepa's self-control is pushed to the brink. He is plagued with doubt:

Aber vielleicht war sie [Celesta] verhindert worden, zu erscheinen? Eine peinliche Unruhe bemächtigte sich jetzt des Jünglings, der die Ceremonie forschreiten sah und sich doch wie gelähmt fühlte.30

Mazepa, however, restrains all impulses to intervene. Just at the moment when Jadwiga and Rotoff are to exchange their vows Celesta acts. She voices an objection to the union on grounds of Rotoff's previous marriage:

...meinen Einwand erhebe ich gegen den Grafen Matthias Rotoff. Ich beschuldige ihn, unrechtmäßiger und betrügerischer Weise eine zweite Ehe einzugehen, da er doch bereits vor mehreren Jahren eine rechtmäßige Ehe mit Celesta Schütz, ... geschlossen hat, ... .31

Mazepa now sees fit to add to Celesta's accusation and denounces Rotoff's devious political career. With the power invested in him as the King's servant and otaman of the kozak host, Mazepa has Rotoff arrested. He hands Rotoff over to the King's representative to escort Rotoff to the King's court of justice in Warsaw. There are no more obstacles to Mazepa's union with Jadwiga, and the two lovers are joined in matrimony.

The thematic incorporation of the Mazepa-Motrja romance into Münzelburg's novel is not governed by the
author's attempt to simulate historical facts, but by the author's poetic vision and the principles of the apprenticeship novel which subordinate all the events and actions of the novel to the development of the hero's, Mazepa's, potential.
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CHAPTER VII
MAZEP A AND VASYL KOCHUBEY

The historical Vasyl Kochubey, Chief Secretary of the kozak host, was one of Mazepa's oldest friends. Their friendship dated back to the time when both men served together under Hetmans Petro Doroshenko and Ivan Samoilovych. Friendship, however, was not their only bond. There were also family ties. Mazepa had been chosen to act as godfather to Kochubey's youngest daughter Motrja, and Kochubey's older daughter, Hanna, married Mazepa's nephew, Ivan Obidovsky.

When Mazepa became Hetman, Kochubey's position improved too. Mazepa helped enrich his old friend by obtaining a charter for new lands from Tsar Peter which improved considerably Kochubey's financial status. Mazepa also promoted Kochubey from Chief Secretary to Chief Judge, which made Kochubey second in power to the Hetman himself. Mazepa thus included Kochubey in the politics of the day. The friendly relationship between Mazepa and Kochubey became strained when Mazepa asked for the hand of Kochubey's sixteen year old daughter, Motrja. The marriage proposal led to a quarrel which, however, subsided once the affair was brought to an end. In fact, the entire incident seemed
not to have soured the relationship between Mazepa and Kochubey:

After the emotional storm between Mazepa and Motrja there seemed to be a calmness and serenity. Outwardly it seemed that the relationship between Mazepa and Kotchubey was not affected. They still visited with each other, and Mazepa, when participating in Peter's wars, would delegate the civil administration to Kotchubey.¹

A normal relationship was maintained between Mazepa and Kochubey's family. Furthermore, Kochubey, as a friend and member of the government, was included in the political plans concerning the Swedish alliance.

In 1708, with no warning, Kochubey turned against Mazepa, and with the aid of supporting kozak officers, he exposed Mazepa and the Swedish alliance before the Tsar. Although some historians, such as Clarence Manning, link Kochubey's denunciation to the unfortunate love affair,² other historians, particularly O. Ohloblyn, link his denunciation with his ambition of becoming hetman.³

Whatever Kochubey's true motive was, he failed. The Tsar believed in Mazepa's loyalty and would not be swayed. Instead, Kochubey was tried for treason and returned to Mazepa with the Tsar's orders for execution. On July 14, 1708, Kochubey was beheaded at Bila Tserkva.

Vasyl Kochubey plays an important role in the works of Andreas May, Rudolf Gottschall, and Johann Froembgen. In the work of Adolf Müzelburg he plays no role at all. In fact, Kochubey and his denunciation of Mazepa are not even
mentioned. Müzelburg's novel focuses on the development of Mazepa's total personality, not his political program. Mazepa's political endeavors, therefore, and Kochubey's role in undermining those endeavors remain outside the realm of the work.

May, Gottschall and Froembgen extract two main themes from the historical Mazepa-Kochubey relationship—Kochubey's objection to Mazepa's violation of the propriety of his home by an undesired and illicit marriage proposal, and Kochubey's betrayal of Mazepa and the Swedish alliance before the Muscovite Tsar. Each author then shapes the characters and events which surround these to meet the dramatic structure of his respective work.

Extracting only themes and motifs from historical data is not an uncommon practice for writers of historical fiction. Friedrich Schiller, for example, saw in the historical trial of Maria Stuart the potential raw material for a literary tragedy. Schiller wrote: "...[ich habe] mich an eine Regierungsgeschichte der Königin Elizabeth gemacht und den Prozeß der Maria Stuart zu studieren angefangen. Ein paar tragische Hauptmotive haben sich mir gleich dargeboten und mir große Glauben an diesen Stoff gegeben, der unstreitig sehr viele denkbare Seiten hat..."4

Once an author extracts themes from historical materials he shapes the literary characters to fit those themes. Therefore, Andreas May's Kochubey is characterized
somewhat differently from the historical Vasyl Kochubey.
The forces which mold and guide Kochubey in May's drama are
security, material well-being and home. They lure him away
from the life of military enterprise:

... ich hatte just
Die Güter hier gekauft und zog hierher,
Dem Herrendienst und tollen Weltgetreibe
Auf ewig Abschied sagend.5

In domestic bliss he finds contentment and gratification:
"... [ich sehe] in dem friedlichen Genuß eines reichen
Besitzes und in dem Glücke [meines] Kindes jeden Wunsch
des Lebens befriedigt."6 He also concentrates his
efforts on the acquisition of material goods which he will
bequeath to his daughter Natalie:

Bemüht' ich mich, ihr ein entsprechend Erbe
Zu hinterlassen. Es sind nicht allein
Die ausgedehnten Länderei'n, die Dörfer
Und Seelen, die ich eigen nenn'; ich hab' ihr
Auch andre Schätze noch gesammelt, --Kisten
Voll Gold, Juwelenhausen, --Schätze, die
Dem Czaren selbst zu scheellem Blicke zwängen.7

Finally, he resists efforts to be engaged in Mazepa's
political plans on the grounds that his parental duty
forbids political involvement:

... vergib', wenn ich dir jeden Antheil
Und jede Hilf' zu deinem Werk versage.8

... Nenn' es keine Feigheit,
Daß ich mich fürchte, dieses Loos zu theilen.
Es ist der Vater, der dir widersteht.9

Kochubey's domestication and his parental instincts
are character modifications and poetic exaggerations which
May creates to further his dramatic design. May's emphasis
on Kochubey's obsession with family and home is necessary in order to justify his role as instigator and traitor. Only in this light are Kochubey's actions self-justifiable. It is, therefore, predictable that Mazepa's abduction of Natalie, a scene based entirely on May's literary fantasy, would precipitate Kochubey's rage. At first he lashes out at Natalie for betraying his trust: "Und dieses Kind hat mich verraten! Meine / Natalie mich! Mich! Und für wen?"\textsuperscript{10}

Then he plots to destroy Mazepa. Kochubey's indignation leads him directly to the Tsar:

\begin{quote}
Jetzt fort! Jetzt folgt mir zu des Czaren Lager. 
Sein erster Günstling hat ihn schändlich verraten. 
An Schwedens König ist das Reich verkauft. 
Ha, Schurke, Alles will ihm offenbaren, 
Meineid für Meineid! Folgen mir zum Czaren!\textsuperscript{11}
\end{quote}

Kochubey's actions are all in character with the persona which May created. The sanctity of his home has been violated by Mazepa's outrageous abduction of Natalie, and his honor has been further debased by his daughter's willingness to comply with the old Hetman. Kochubey's acts of revenge are thus a natural outflow of his parental hurt and rage. May's fusion of the abduction and denunciation into a single timeframe, into an action-reaction sequel, is, therefore, a logical progression of his dramatic structure.

Historically, the Mazepa-Kochubey relationship climaxed in Kochubey's denunciation of Mazepa before the Tsar. Kochubey's treacherous act boomeranged, and the Tsar delivered Kochubey back into the hands of Mazepa. May takes
advantage of this historical blunder and uses it to set the stage for the unraveling of the Mazepa and Natalie love affair. Kochubey's treason forces Mazepa and Natalie into an antagonistic confrontation, the result of which is political and personal tragedy.

Gottschall follows May's pattern, altering only the settings. In Gottschall's work Kochubey is replaced by Iskra. Ignorant of what has transpired he suddenly discovers that his daughter, Matrena, is living at Mazepa's residence in Baturin. He is shocked by the incestuous relationship and denounces his daughter, Mazepa, and the union:

Sie wohnt in deinem Schloß—dreifach Schmach!
Kein Priester segnet diesen Bund, ihm folgt
Nicht nur der Kirche Fluch, ihm folgt die Aechtung
Der Welt, die noch an Ehr' und Sitte glaubt.12

Iskra is so infuriated by this union of Mazepa and Matrena, that he changes allegiance: "Weih ich nur Gott noch und dem Dienst des Czaren!"13 and rushes off to betray Mazepa's plan to the Tsar.

Like May, Gottschall uses Iskra's anger as a prelude to the tragic outcome of the Mazepa-Matrena love affair, which then leads to the tragedy of Poltava. Gottschall, like May, alters the historical timetable of events in order to sustain the logical progression of action in his play.

Unlike May and Gottschall, Froembgen does not
reshape the figure of Vasyl Kochubey, or fabricate an abduction or incestuous union. Instead he narrates the events as they actually occurred, altering only the timeframe. He, like May and Gottschall, merges the initiation of Kochubey into Mazepa's political scheme, the Mazepa-Matrena affair, and the betrayal of Mazepa into a single timeframe, that is, into an action-reaction sequel.

Froembgen uses the Mazepa-Kochubey relationship to focus attention on the character of Mazepa and the general atmosphere which prevailed in Ukraine in the early eighteenth century. In the following dialogue between Mazepa and Kochubey, Froembgen illuminates Mazepa's character as the Ukrainian Hetman reacts to the code of behavior as prescribed by the eighteenth century Orthodox Church. In the dialogue, Froembgen makes it clear that the obstacle to the union of Mazepa and Matrena is the Orthodox Church canon. Mazepa is, however, portrayed as intoxicated with Matrena's beauty, and unwilling to recognize the authority of the Church.

"Das Gesetz der Kirche—? Ich verbrenne jede Kirche, die sich uns verschließt. Ich lasse jedem Popen, jedem Bischof, der den Mund zum Fluche öffnen will den Kopf zu Füßen legen. Ich erzwinge jeden Segen, mache mir die Kirche hörig, denn es geht um mich, mein Glück, mein Seelenheil—"14

Mazepa's unwillingness to subordinate his passion to an accepted code of behavior is the tragic flaw which jeopardizes his relationships with the community, whose support is necessary for his political success. Froembgen thus makes
Mazepa himself responsible for the tragic events which follow and lead him to his political demise.

Froembgen, unlike May and Gottschall, attempts to recreate the general atmosphere which prevailed in Ukraine, and goes beyond the description of Kochubey's denunciation of Mazepa. In his novel, Kochubey, bent on revenge, undermines Mazepa's support from within and from without the kozak host by gathering the kozak officials, Iskra (not to be confused with Iskra in Gottschall's drama) and Ossipow, and disclosing the Mazepa-Matrena affair. The affair is an insult to the kozak code of morality, and thus the officers themselves reject Mazepa as their leader: "Ein Gottesfrevler und ein Schänder unserer Kirche kann nicht länger Otaman sein."15 Kochubey further fans the anger of the officers by exposing Mazepa's union with Karl as a betrayal: a sell-out of Ukraine to the Poles, the political aggressor on Right Bank Ukraine. Kochubey encourages the officers to spread the word of Mazepa's betrayal among the common kozaks: "So geht denn hin und meldet den Kosaken, daß der Otaman mit Polen einen heimlichen Vertrag geschlossen hat, der ihnen uns und die Ukraine überliefert."16

Kochubey's revelation spreads quickly and effects the intended results. Mazepa's distressed Secretary, Orlyk, reports rebellion among the kozaks and also rising hostility among the Ukrainian people. The kozaks, says he, "treiben Rebellion,"17 and the people are turning against Mazepa:
"Das Gift ist ausgestreut. Es nistet in den Seelen
Du giltst als ein Hetzer und ein Satansjünger. Niemand
schenkt dir Glauben. Kotchubeij, Ossipow und Iskra
wärmen älteste Geschichte auf. Sie halten sich an alle,
denen du nicht Land und Geld genug gegeben hast. Die
schwedische Partei verliert von Tag zu Tag an Boden.
Einer nach dem andern sucht das Heil in Moskau. Man
steht auf und geht, wenn wir erscheinen. Man bekreuzigt
sich. Die Bauern fliehen von den Äckern, wenn wir nahen,
able sähen sie des Teufels Ehrengarde—"18

By demonstrating the ease with which Kochubey could
betray Mazepa and plant the seed of rebellion among the
kozaks and the Ukrainian people, Froembgen points to the
unstable atmosphere which prevailed in Ukraine during the
time of Mazepa. His novel reflects the historical socio-
political conditions in Ukraine. In this respect
Froembgen's novel is true to life.
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CHAPTER VIII

THE TRAGIC OUTCOME OF THE MAZEPA-NATALIE/MATRENA LOVE AFFAIR

The tragic outcome of the Mazepa-Natalie/Matrena love affair in the works of Andreas May and Rudolf Gottschall is pure literary fiction. Historically, Mazepa's affair with Motrja Kochubei ended abruptly in 1704, a year after it began, and the relationship had no bearing on Mazepa's political engagement: Motrja was never an active participant in Mazepa's political program, and at no time did she share his political ambition or in any way interfere in its realization. Vasyl Kochubei's betrayal of Mazepa and the Swedish alliance occurred four years after the termination of the affair, and his motives remain unclear.

May and Gottschall condense the time sequence of historical events in order to create a love affair that would be simultaneous with the realization of Mazepa's alliance with the Swedes, and Kochubei's betrayal of the alliance just prior to the Battle of Poltava. The historical characters Mazepa, Motrja, and Vasyl Kochubei are taken out of the historical context and reassigned roles in a semi-historical aggregate of events and conditions, but more attention is focused on characters and their interplay.
rather than on the historical events.

Focus on characters and their interplay rather than on historical events is a common feature of historical fiction. For example, in *A Tale of Two Cities* history supplies only the backdrop while Dickens fixes his eyes more steadily upon his principal characters and his main issues. Characters whose fate is the theme of the novel live against the backdrop of the Revolution which sets the conditions for their involvement.²

Similarly, in May's and Gottschall's dramas the focus is on the characters. The tragedy of the Mazepa-Natalie/Matrena love affair, as contrived by May and Gottschall, is rooted in the characters' opposing attitudes toward personal suffering. Whereas Mazepa accepts and transcends affliction in pursuit of his goal, May's Natalie and Gottschall's Matrena lack the vigor to overcome their pain. They fall victim to their emotions, which ultimately destroy both them and Mazepa. This opposition between Mazepa and Natalie/Matrena is not brought out in the first part of the dramas. It appears only when Natalie's and Matrena's fantasies are disrupted by the shock of the father's curse.

Until confronted by Kochubey's/Iskra's curse, both Natalie and Matrena cling to the illusion that they are controlling their own destinies. They perceive their actions as voluntary, self-determined, and in harmony with
Mazepa. The father's curse, however, shatters their illusion, and they wake up to discover feelings of guilt and mounting psychological conflict. As a result, Natalie, in May's drama, can no longer participate in Mazepa's vision. Mazepa realizes this and laments:

Die Sonne des jungen Steppenreiches geht auf, geht heute frei vor Europa auf! Wie fühlt' ich mich ein Gott in dieser Morgenröthe! Ob es Natalie begreifen und mitfühlen wird? Ob ihr auch dieser Augenblick nicht die Tränen über den Fluch des Vaters trocknen wird, durch welche sie mir die süßesten Stunden der Zärtlichkeit vergiftet hat?

In Gottschall's drama the slow realization that she cannot act independently and is bound to her father's will is devastating to Matrena, and she drowns herself in tears of remorse:

Laut klopfen meine Pulse! Rausch und Fieber!
Nach gold'nnen Zielen treibt's mich glühend hin,
Das Ungemeine, Große reißt mich fort—
Und doch—wie pocht dabei des Herz so bang!
Im Traum verfolgt mich meines Vaters Bild,
Und seine zürtend ausgestreckte Hand.
Da bin ich nur ein arm verloren Kind,
Und netz! mit heißen Tränen Bett und Kissen.

The heroines are incapacitated when they have to choose between parental obedience and personal desire.

The father's curse produces the first conflict in Natalie and Matrena. Fate resolves their dilemma when Kochubey/Iskra denounces Mazepa and the Swedish alliance to the Tsar. While trying to destroy Mazepa, they destroy themselves. Mazepa is forced to sacrifice Kochubey/Iskra to the greater cause of freedom for Ukraine as Mazepa makes
clear in Gottschall's drama:

Wie wenig wiegt ein Leben in der Wage  
Des Weltgeschicks, wie wenig tausende!  
Das ist schon mit verrechnet in den Plan.  
Wer Reiche stif tet, Kronen raubt, der weiß  
Voraus, wieviel es kostet!5

This brings a violent reaction from Natalie and Matrena  
neither of whom is willing to justify the sacrifice of her  
father for what to her is merely a political illusion. They  
turn against Mazepa and his iron will:

Natalie: . . . Mein Auge  
Sah einen Gott und stieß auf einen Dämon.6

Matrena: Zu wem denn sprech' ich? Himmel, ist's ein Traum?  
Das ist der Mann nicht, dem mein Herz gehört,  
Und dem ich alles hingepfert! Nein!  
Dieses Steingebild hat Leben mir gelogen,  
Jetzt schau' ich in die starren, kalten Züge,  
Und mir entgegen starrt der eig'ne Wahn!7

An irrevocable breach is created in the marriage.

This breach, stemming from Natalie's and Matrena's  
inability to see beyond a personal loss, ultimately defines  
their character. Neither Natalie nor Matrena share Mazepa's  
sense of purpose. Their vision of the kingdom to be erected  
by Mazepa is titillated by a fallacious fancy which, blinded  
by its own enthusiasm, focuses only on the glorious end and  
not on the bloody means by which that end must be achieved.

Matrena, for instance, only sees that:

Das wird ein Riesenreich, das weit hinein  
Sich in den Osten dehnt, ein Reich der Steppen,  
Das zu den fernen Hochgebirgen reicht!  
Die ungeheuern Stämme folgen alle  
Dem Wink des Fürsten, der ein fliegender Roß  
Auf seine Fahnen malt.8

Natalie and Matrena are dreamers, not revolutionaries.
Their commitment, therefore, can not withstand the harshness of reality. Mazepa, on the other hand, is a revolutionary who has to use every means to try to achieve his desired political end. He is inspired by his love for freedom and believes that anyone could and should be sacrificed in furtherance of the greater cause of liberty. Therefore, Mazepa's choice in favor of the future of Ukraine over Kochubey's life is a natural result of his philosophy.

May and Gottschall create a dramatic sequence of events which leads to tragedy. Mazepa's actions against their fathers violates Natalie's and Matrena's sense of filial attachment and they feel obligated to act on behalf of their fathers. Their behavior becomes openly antagonistic toward Mazepa. In a way they even resemble him in that they do what they feel they must do. In their plotting against Mazepa they, like Mazepa, are merely fulfilling an inner necessity dictated by their sense of filial obligation.

May's and Gottschall's dramas culminate in tragedy and death. Natalie's intention to drug Mazepa in order to effect her father's escape from prison ultimately leads to Mazepa's death, while Matrena's revenge ends in murder and suicide.

The tragedy of the Mazepa-Natalie/Matrena love affair in the works of May and Gottschall is explicable in purely human terms. Mazepa and Natalie/Matrena are individuals,
whose aspirations were thwarted by overwhelming circum-
stances which plunge them unexpectedly into a conflict of 
wills and attitudes, choices and consequences. They are 
catched up in nothing more than the frailties of their human 
nature pitted against the historical background of the 
Ukraine-Swedish alliance and the Battle of Poltava.

Neither Froembgen nor Műzelburg deals with the 
dramatic aspect of Mazepa's love affair in his work. 
Froembgen uses the love affair as a single episode which 
ends in the unhappy, but not tragic, separation of the 
 mismatched lovers. Műzelburg creates a fictitious love 
affair for Mazepa which culminates in marriage and 
happiness.
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CHAPTER IX
MAZEPÁ, KARL XII, AND THE BATTLE OF POLTAVA

Historically, Ivan Mazepa established contact with the Swedes through the Polish princess Anna Dolska. She was the widow of Prince Wisniowiecki, and the aunt of the Swedish appointed King Stanislaw Leszcynski. The friendship between Dolska and Mazepa dated back to Dolska's first marriage to Christof Wisniowiecki. As a young man Mazapa "had been very friendly with her first husband. He spent the summer of 1663 with them. He knew intimately the estates and traditions of the family."1 It wasn't, however, until 1705, in Dubno at the christening of her grandchild, that Dolska offered to become an intermediary between Mazapa and the Swedish throne. She began supplying Mazapa with invaluable political information. Dolska was nicely paid for her services:

She charged and collected well for every piece of information which passed through her hands. One time the Hetman sent her 100,000 Carolinen in Czech money. Another time he casually left 10,000 ducats at one of her estates.2

The negotiations with the Swedes took four years, during which time Karl waged military campaigns in Europe, leaving Russia for the last. Karl first dealt with Denmark, then proceeded to Narva, where he defeated Peter, then
turned to Poland and Augustus. Finally Karl again turned against his archenemy, Muscovy. Karl's fatal mistake, however, was that he allowed for a lapse of seven years from the time of the Battle of Narva until the time he decided to march against Muscovy. This gave Peter the necessary time to reorganize and retrain his army and to meet the Swedish invasion with new military tactics. As Karl marched toward Moscow, he was confronted by Peter who "ravaged and devastated the country through which Karl had to march."3

Hunger among the troops forced Karl to turn to Ukraine, and in 1708 he entered Ukraine "lacking supplies and leading tired and starving troops."4 His sudden change of course forced his General Loewenhaupt, who was advancing toward Moscow, to also suddenly change his course. This led him into an unexpected confrontation with the Muscovites. Loewenhaupt was defeated and the entire Swedish convoy was destroyed. Out of 11,000 men, 6,000 men finally found their way to Karl. This considerably weakened Karl's forces and the morale of the troops.

Karl's sudden change of course also posed a direct threat to Mazepa:

Мазепа відмовляв короля від задуманого походу в Україну. Мазепа проти походу мав два аргументи. Перший був той, що шведське військо вечірне в Україну Петра з його армією, і тоді цар визьмется підпалицю атом речем і мечем українського населення, організація українських земель стане неможлива, бо сильні московські війська спаралізують цілу акцію гетьмана. Другий аргумент-це була справа Полтави, що по переході гетьмана до шведів мусіла була залишитися на московському боці. Справа
In response to Karl's march into Ukraine, Mazepa was forced to side prematurely with the Swedes and to declare an open break with Muscovy, despite the fact that his troops were not yet prepared for battle:

Mazepa's declaration of transfer of allegiance forced him to flee Baturin prematurely. His flight was further prompted by the news that Muscovite troops led by Menshikov were on their way to the Hetman's estate. Mazepa had no time to prepare his kozaks who were, unfortunately, unaware of the details of the secret negotiations:

Baturia fell to the Muscovites; Starodub followed. The two strongest fortified Ukrainian military posts were lost.

Although both the Ukrainians and the Swedes suffered unexpected losses, the meeting of the two sovereigns—Mazepa and Karl XII—was the crowning point of Mazepa's political
career. Mazepa was received as:

Hetman of an independent Ukraine by Charles XII, the King of the Swedes, Goths, and Vandals and the leading military figure of the day. The Hetman had achieved something that had not been granted even Bohdan Khmelnytsky or any of his successors, the recognition of the sovereignty of his people by a sovereign of the West.8

The historical flow of events which followed the meeting of the sovereigns was tragic. A cold winter decimated Karl's troops and contact with Sweden and Poland, his support countries, had been cut off: "Men died of freezing and starvation and their loss was irreplaceable now that . . . no reinforcements were to be expected from Sweden."9

A further blow to the Ukrainian forces was Peter's destruction of the Zaporozhian kozak river fleet in 1709. This cost Mazepa the support of the Crimean Tartars and Zaporozhian kozaks, who then lost faith in the strength and success of the Ukrainian-Swedish alliance.

The deciding battle was fought in 1709 near Poltava. The outcome was dramatically affected by a single event. On June 28th, a bullet struck Karl XII in the foot and penetrated it from the toe to the heel, forcing him to transfer command of his troops to Marschal Rehnskiold. Because of an unfortunate misunderstanding, a rumor of Karl's death had spread. Chaos broke out among the troops precipitated by the fact that:

The young monarch kept his own counsel. He not only concealed his moves and his plans from the enemy but also from his own officers. He planned his campaign himself and then ordered his staff to prepare the technical
detail without informing them of his general purpose. No one knew when a march started, in which direction it was going or what was its destination.10

The Swedish troops fled panic-stricken and within hours the Battle of Poltava was lost. Peter's victory established his supremacy in Europe. The vision of a free Ukraine as dictated in the terms of the negotiation between Mazepa and Karl was lost forever:

Україна і землі, до неї прилучені, мають бути вільними й незалежними; король шведський зобов'язується оберіга-ти їх від усіх ворогів; зокрема, король має вислати туди негайно помічні війська, коли того буде вимагати потреба та коли цього будуть домагатися гетьман та йо-го стани / ... /. Усе завойоване на території Росії, але колись належне "руському" (українському) народові, має бути повернене до князівства Українського; ...

Andreas May, Rudolf Gottschall and Johann Froembgen focus attention in their works on Mazepa, Karl XII, their Ukrainian-Swedish alliance, and the Battle of Poltava. Each author's approach to these historical figures and events, however, is different, and the point of emphasis shifts from work to work.

Andreas May is not interested in the historical rendition of events which led Mazepa into a union with the Swedes. His attention, rather, is focused on Kochubey's betrayal of Mazepa and the imaginary effects of that betrayal on the union with the Swedes and the Battle of Poltava.

In order to enhance the impact of the tragedy of Kochubey's betrayal, May first underscores the promise of
the political union between Mazepa and Karl XII. Attention is focused on Mazepa and the readiness of his troops:

Gleich einer Schlachtengöttin
Steht die Ukraine kämpfgerüstet da,
Befestigt ist mein Hauptsitz Baturin.
Die ganze Streitmacht der Kosaken liegt
Vereint und nur meines Winks gewärtig,
Ein Heer von dreißig Tausenden, am Dniper.12

May then extols Mazepa's ally, Karl XII, the military genius of Europe and greatest foe of Peter the Great.

Der Schwedenkönig Karl, der Held von Narwa,
Der neue Alexander, Rußlands Schrecken,
Czar Peters Feind und böser Geist ist mein Verbündeter, mein Freund!13

The combination of these forces, as presented by May, translates in the reader's mind into a virtual guarantee of victory.

At the very height of the reader's anticipation of victory for Mazepa, Kochubey's betrayal comes about. It destroys the strength of the union and the promise it held, and sets a time bomb under Mazepa's plans. Furthermore, it robs him of his most valuable commodity: time. Mazepa is prematurely forced into political action which leads to his demise:

Dein Verrath hat mich
Gezwungen, früher als beschlossen war,
Die Maske des Gehorsams abzustreifen.
Du machtest es dem Czaren möglich, mich
Vor der Vereinigung mit Schwedens König
Zu überraschen. Darum bracht' ich ihm
Nur steche Trümmer eines Heeres zu.
Karl mußte selbst aufbrechen, eh' er seine Armee gesammelt hatte, Peter bot
Uns vor Poltawa's Mauern eine Schlacht.
The Battle of Poltava is lost. Kochubey's motive for the betrayal is all too clear to Mazepa:

Die \textit{ser Mann [Kotchubei]} hat mir seine Hilfe verweigert, weil er für die Ruhe seines Schlafes fürchtete; dieser Mann hat euch verrathen, weil ich seine Tochter zu eurer Königin machen wollte.\textsuperscript{15}

May purposely manipulates the effect of Kochubey's betrayal on the course of the events culminating in the Battle of Poltava. Historically, Kochubey's betrayal in 1708 had little, if any impact on the events that transpired in 1709. May, however, places Kochubey's vengeful action in the same timeframe as the creation of the Swedish alliance and the Battle of Poltava, and attributes their failure to Kochubey's treachery. Kochubey's betrayal is deliberately placed opposite the love affair and the parental rage and revenge which ensued. May disregards historical truth in order to enhance the dramatic unity of his work.

Gottschall uses the events leading to the alliance with the Swedes and the Battle of Poltava to create a historical background against which he can weave his plot which is full of fictitious characters and flights of imagination. His emphasis is on historicity, and so he alters but a few details in reconstruction of those events.

Gottschall accurately lists the points of the Ukrainian-Swedish alliance, highlighting Karl's promise to
Mazepa: "Der Ukraine Freiheit." Gottschall makes time to be the element of crucial import in Mazepa's political maneuverings:

Mich bestimmt erklären, kann
Und darf ich nicht--nicht jetzt! Die Zeit nur wir
Entscheidungen bringen.17

He makes it clear that Karl's unexpected appearance forces Mazepa into a premature declaration of allegiance.

Der Schwedenkönig steht bei Mohilew!
Die Botschaft, die er sandte, lautet dringend!
Erklärt Euch ohne Zaudern fest und klar!18

Gottschall, however, attributes the defeat at the Battle of Poltava to more than faithful concurrence of historical circumstances. It is the work of Matrena, who, in an attempt to avenge her father's death, sets to undo Mazepa's plans. She appeals to Gordienko, leader of the Zaporozhian kozaks, to withdraw his troops and abandon Mazepa's cause at a moment critical to Mazepa's success. This literary invention serves two purposes: it allows Matrena to fulfill her drive for vengeance, and secondly, it brings Mazepa's political endeavor to its tragic, poignant climax. Mazepa is thwarted not by fate, not by the enemy, but by the very people whom he set out to liberate.

Another historical deviation by Gottschall is the substitution of the character of Kasimir, in the place of the historical Dolska, as the Polish intermediary between Karl and Mazepa. His role in the drama as Karl's messenger is to inform the audience of Karl's political intentions and
the conditions designated by the King for Mazepa's involvement in the Great Northern War:

Versprecht uns Freundschaft
Und Hülfe, gebt uns Baturin zum Pfande—
Und Schwedens König führt sein Heer zu Euch,
Und dringt mit dem befreiten Volk der Steppen
Von hier nach Moskau vor.19

Kasimir's role as Karl's messenger in the drama is secondary to his role as Lodoiska's lover.

Froembgen narrates the historical events as a mixture of fact and fiction. He uses the historical events as a background setting for the arena in which a human tragedy is played out. Froembgen focuses attention on Mazepa's emotions, rather than on the purely historical elements of drama in order to place the tragedy of history into the context of a personal, human tragedy.

Froembgen begins by using the historical contacts between Dolska and Mazepa to focus attention on the character of Mazepa, and places the narrative emphasis on Mazepa's emotions as they arise in response to Dolska's proposal.


Mazepa's response:

"Der Gedanke war berauschend. Er ließ eine wundersame Vision aufleuchten: Die versunkene Ritterherrlichkeit des alten Landes Rus. Kiew
Froemberg focuses on the escalation of Mazepa's emotions, precipitated by Dolska's proposal, making clear to the reader the intensity of Mazepa's emotions and the intensity of his despair as he sees his dream crushed by the force of history.

Froemberg depicts Karl as recorded in history:


He correctly renders the sequence of historical events which led Karl into Ukraine. However, he does alter historical facts when he insinuates that Mazepa was pleased to receive Karl's message that he must change his course and enter Ukraine:

Mazeppa faltete die Depeschen. Es funkelte in seinen Augen. Mars reichte ihm die Hand! Der König kam und rief ihn auf zur Waffenbrüderschaft.

Froemberg also erroneously asserts that the Swedish troops which marched into Ukraine were a strong force:

Der König führt mehr als 40 000 Mann heran. . . . es ist die schönste und beste Armee, die jemals von Menschenaugen erblickt wurde. Sie marschieren und reiten wie ein Heer von Kriegsgöttern, mit wehenden Fahnen und dröhndem Paukenschall.

Froemberg manipulates these historical facts in order to sustain the expectation of victory. Although historical events indicate otherwise, Froemberg is not yet
ready to destroy Mazepa's good faith in the Swedish alliance. Froembgen focuses again on Mazepa's emotions in building an emotional crescendo in Mazepa before allowing him to plummet into the depths of despair. Froembgen allows Mazepa and the reader to wallow in the vision of an anticipated victory before orchestrating the emotional denouement.

Froembgen begins the emotional denouement by depicting with historical accuracy three incidents which undermined the strength of the Ukrainian-Swedish alliance: Loewenhaupt's defeat, the fall of Baturin, and Mazepa's flight. Froembgen uses these three incidents to set a somber stage for the display of Mazepa's emotions as he joins the Swedish King in the long-awaited meeting:


Froembgen's emphasis is not on the historical meeting itself, but rather on Mazepa's anguish. For Mazepa had realized that after nourishing a life-long dream the hour of its realization had arrived and yet everything had gone wrong. It is a crushed and subdued Mazepa who stands before the Swedish King.

Froembgen continues to draw on history, and alters
no details, in narrating the unfortunate flow of events after the meeting of the two sovereigns. A cold winter and unexpected obstacles weaken Mazepa's and Karl's forces. Again Froembgen focuses on Mazepa's despair: "Das große Leichentuch! Gott hat es über unsere Träume, unsere Hoffnungen geworfen."

Just as emotions ebb to their lowest, Froembgen brings up two historical facts which gave Mazepa hope: the Zaporozhian kozaks and the Crimean Tartars had declared their support. Mazepa's ecstasy is, however, short-lived, as the final events of the novel unfold. The Zaporozhian river fleet is destroyed, kozak and Tartar support is lost, Karl is wounded, and the troops lose heart and flee the battle. The fluctuation of Mazepa's emotions between hope and despair is highlighted by battle scenes.

Throughout his work Froembgen focuses on the emotions which arise within Mazepa as a response to the events as they appear in recorded history. By shifting the emphasis from a mere historical narration of events to the area of human emotions, Froembgen places history in the context of human tragedy, revealing the inner life of the protagonist.

Adolf Müzelburg assigns no importance to the Battle of Poltava in his novel. He mentions it only casually at the end of his lengthy work as the culmination point of Mazepa's political career:
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CONCLUSION

It has been the purpose of this dissertation to study the relationship between history and literary imagination in the works of Andreas May, Rudolf Gottschall, Adolf Müzelburg, and Johann Froembgen, and to trace how history was incorporated into the body of their works in order to render a literary portrait of the historical Mazepa. Particular attention was paid to the utilization of the historical material related to the Ukrainian-Muscovite and Mazepa-Peter the Great relationships, Mazepa's Youth, the Mazepa-Motrja love affair, the Ukrainian-Swedish alliance and the Battle of Poltava.

A perusal of the works under consideration showed that the incorporation of history by May, Gottschall, Müzelburg and Froembgen occurred in any one or in a combination of four different ways: (1) the author recreated the facts of the past which either served as an historical backdrop, or provided a ready-made plot with a definite beginning and end; (2) the author utilized a conglomeration of historical situations, relationships and problems which gave rise to dramatic and romantic possibilities in story-making; (3) the author used history, historical anecdotes, or legends only as a springboard to weave a tale involving both historical
and fictitious characters; or (4) the author placed historical events in the context of personal experience and thus provided an internal view of the external world of historical "reality."

The incorporation of authentic historical incidents, conditions and relationships is most pronounced in the works of May, Gottschall and Froembgen in their presentation of the Ukrainian-Muscovite and Mazepa-Peter the Great Relationships. An accurate account (1) supplied the works with a strong aura of historicity; (2) provided the reader with an historical perspective which elucidated the process by which the past had influenced the present making it what it is today; (3) supplied a valid framework of cause and effect for each dramatic moment, i.e. Mazepa's secret alliance with Karl XII of Sweden; Mazepa's turning against Peter the Great; and (4) gave substance and historical veracity to the various secondary characters, scenes and events in the works. Most importantly, (5) it allowed the reader to feel that the story being told or acted out actually took place, and that the character of Mazepa is drawn from real life, that such a person really lived, although not all the episodes presented by the authors may be true.

In contrast to May, Gottschall, and Froembgen, Adolf Müzelburg did not use history to supply a special set of external circumstances with which the fate and fortune of the hero, Mazepa, was intrinsically connected but rather he
used history to recreate the atmosphere of an age and to supply a convenient setting so as to give free reign to imagination and fabricate conditions and relationships.

In their presentation of Mazepa's youth, all four authors used history, historical anecdotes or legends only as a springboard to create an adventurous tale, involving both historical and fictitious characters and events. Poetic license, however, was most prominent in the work of Adolf Müzelburg who transcended historical facts and legends in order to create characters and incidents specifically tailored to the peculiarities of the apprenticeship novel. In the spirit of such a novel Müzelburg concerned himself only with the presentation of the acquisition of values and lessons by the central character, Mazepa. Accordingly Müzelburg extracted from history only those ideas, characters and motifs which furthered the purpose of his work—the education of the hero. These he supplemented with fictitious events and characters whose function was to guide and aid Mazepa in the realization of his potential. The literary character of Mazepa which emerged from Müzelburg's novel, therefore, only carried a vague resemblance to the actual historical figure, and incidents surrounding him are only slightly reminiscent of actual historical events.

In the works of May, Gottschall, and Froembgen only one event from Mazepa's youth was presented—the legendary ride. Although each author made use of the legend each
utilized it for a different literary purpose. May used the legend not only to illuminate an aspect of Mazepa's character, but also to deliver Mazepa into the hands of the Ukrainian kozaks. Gottschall used the legend to create a subplot, which helped complete the picture of Mazepa's personality. Froembgen used the legend to expose the passionate side of Mazepa's nature and to launch Mazepa into his political career.

In their portrayal of Mazepa as a hetman of Ukraine, May, Gottschall, and Froembgen combined historical fact with fiction in order to produce a portrait which was historically recognizable, yet humanly plausible. To render an historically accurate portrait of Mazepa the authors drew heavily on historical data to achieve their purpose. From historical record they borrowed lists of Mazepa's military accomplishments (May), traced with accuracy his rise to power (Froembgen), correctly assessed the web of political intrigue he faced from foreign powers (Froembgen), and presented accurately the bleakness of his political situation as defined by the Pereyaslav Treaty (May, Gottschall, Froembgen).

To render a humanly definable portrait of Mazepa the authors placed historical events in a context of personal experience. Their creative imagination rose above that of the scientific historian who concerns himself primarily with the display of a certain policy of an historical figure.
May, Gottschall, and Froembgen used their literary imaginations to humanize history. Every historical decision which they reviewed revealed to them the state of mind of the man who made it and not simply an embodiment of the politics of the day. Behind the name Mazepa they saw a human being with a peculiar spirit and experience of life, and although history did not tell us directly about that spirit, the authors used their intuition and poetic imagination to perceive it and to project it into history. Thus, literature rounded out the personality of Mazepa bringing to the reader a deeper dimension which history failed to provide.

The love affair between Mazepa and Motrja Kotchubey would have seemed to provide a ready-made story to our authors. Instead, the historical events involved in the Mazepa-Motrja Kochubey relationship inspired May and Gottschall to create their own stories. In the actual situations and problems, they saw dramatic possibilities in a potential for literary tragedy. Extracting motifs—the clash of opinions, the clash of wills, the rule of passion over reason—from the general outline of historical events, their creative imagination organized these motifs into a plot which, although adhering somewhat to historical facts, still had an identity of its own.

The artistic representation of characters (i.e. Mazepa as a man who could not compromise but was compelled to pursue his dream to the end, even if it led him toward
catastrophe), the combination of characters and their strategic placement within the plot, and the condensing of the historical timetable all served the authors' poetic objective.

Neither Froembgen nor Müzelburg made the Mazepa-Motrja love affair central to their works. Froembgen used it to promote a clash between Mazepa and Kotchubey which led to Mazepa's political demise. Müzelburg used the love affair only as a theme to construct an episode which built and developed Mazepa's character.

The Ukrainian-Swedish Alliance, and the Battle of Poltava in the works of May, Gottschall and Froembgen brought the historical thread of events to a tragic end in which Ukrainian national liberty was thwarted. Each author, however, presented the same historical events from a different perspective. May and Gottschall fused fiction with history and presented the defeat of Poltava as the direct result of the triangular conflict among Mazepa, Kotchubey/Iskra, and Natalie/Matrena. Froembgen, on the other hand, presented the events through Mazepa's inner perspective, based on his experience and understanding. Froembgen employed the power of creative imagination to look beyond the bare facts, to fathom the mind and emotions of Mazepa to recreate the drama out of which the biography arose, to relive with the reader the emotions of the character as he, Froembgen, saw them.
Re-creation of historical events and persons in a work of art, such as an historical novel or play, is governed by the author's perception of reality, personal sensitivity, insight and poetic objective, and not so much by historical record. Each author interprets and re-arranges historical facts to fit the pre-conceived scheme of his work. The degree to which literary characters and events resemble their historical counterparts is determined by (1) the author's preference (psychological, philosophical, political) (2) the exigencies of the genre and (3) the author's aesthetic credo. The presentation of the literary figure of Ivan Mazepa in the works of Andreas May, Rudolf Gottschall, Adolf Müzelburg, and Johann Froembgen is an example of the interplay between historical facts and the literary imagination and of the degree and dimensions historicity allowed the imagination in the furtherance of a specific literary purpose.
APPENDIX

König der Steppe
(by Andreas May, a drama in five acts)

König der Steppe made its debut at the Hof--und National Theater in München, April 17, 1849. May wrote under the pseudonym Richard Francke. He was born November 12, 1817, in Bamberg. He studied law, first in Würzburg, and then München, where he served as "Rat am Obersten Gerichthof". May died January 7, 1899 in München.

A summary of the drama is as follows:

Act 1

Excitement is brewing in the home of old Kochubey. The legendary Mazepa, Hetman of Ukraine and Kochubey's esteemed friend, is to be the guest of honor. The two had not seen each other for many years. In celebration of the reunion, Kochubey has decided to announce the engagement of his beloved daughter, Natalie, to Dimitri, a longterm suitor.

Mazepa's visit, however, has an additional purpose. He is coming to solicit Kochubey's support for his most daring plan: the liberation of Ukraine from Muscovite oppression. Hastily swearing Kochubey to secrecy, Mazepa
discloses that he has entered into a secret alliance with the Swedish king, Karl XII. Together the Swedish and Ukrainian forces will challenge Muscovy.

Although sympathetic to Mazepa's vision, Kochubey refuses to get involved. He has spent his life building a home of peace, not war. His ambition is to secure the happiness of his daughter, Natalie, in a union with Dimitri. Mazepa becomes disillusioned with his old friend and decides to leave immediately. As he rushes to exit Kochubey's home he suddenly catches a glimpse of Natalie. Overwhelmed by her beauty, Mazepa is determined to include her into his vision. She will be his queen.

Act 2

The affection becomes mutual and Natalie allows herself to be abducted by the Hetman. Outraged by the sudden turn of events, Kochubey seeks revenge. He reveals Mazepa's secret plan to the Muscovite Tsar, Peter the Great.

Act 3

The Tsar, confident of Mazepa's unquestionable loyalty disbelieves Kochubey and surrenders him as prisoner to Mazepa. Ignoring Natalie's pleas for reconciliation, Mazepa throws Kochubey into a dungeon, and then rushes his troops to join the Swedes in the Battle of Poltava, where they suffer a humiliating defeat at the hands of the Muscovites.
Act 4

His troops demolished, a dejected Mazepa returns to his estate, Baturin. His last hope is to coerce Kochubey into surrendering the treasure he had accumulated for Natalie. These funds could be used to build an army in exile. Kochubey refuses and Mazepa decrees Kochubey's execution. Horrified by the course of events, Natalie decides to act on her own.

Act 5

Natalie slips Mazepa a sleeping potion and prepares to flee with her father. They are intercepted by Muscovite soldiers, led by Dimitri, who bears the Tsar's order: to bring him Mazepa's head. Mazepa awakens from his sleep as Dimitri reads the decree. Natalie becomes filled with remorse and throws herself at Mazepa to accompany him in death. Mazepa rejects Natalie. Only his vision will be his death's companion. He begs to be executed facing the steppe.

Mazeppa

(by Rudolf Gottschall, a drama in five acts)

Gottschall, a representative writer of the Junges Deutschland school, was born September 10, 1823 in Breslau. In 1846, he completed his doctoral degree in law at the
University of Berlin. In 1847, he moved to Königsberg, where he was employed as a producer at the municipal theater. In 1849, Gottschall moved to Hamburg, and in 1862 to Posen, where he edited the Ostdeutsche Zeitung. In 1865, he edited the Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung in Leipzig. His political posts were: "Weimarer Hofrat," 1864; and "Gen. Hofrat," 1875. In 1877, Rudolf Gottschall received the title of nobility from the German Kaiser. Gottschall died March 21, 1909 in Leipzig.

A summary of the drama is as follows:

**Act 1**

In the dark of the night an anxious Mazepa, Hetman of Ukraine, seeks a confirmation of his belief in victory from a soothsayer, Harpyna. He envisions a crown for himself and Iskra's daughter, Matrena, whom he had lured from the nunnery. The masked Matrena, whose identity was withheld from the kozak host, lives with Mazepa at Baturin, the Hetman's estate. As Mazepa confers with Harpyna, many kozak officials begin to assemble at Baturin. Among the officials is Gordienko, the Zaporozhian kozak otaman. He has been infatuated with Matrena and recognizes her despite the disguise. Unaware of the consequences, Gordienko reveals her presence to Iskra, Matrena's father and Mazepa's comrade.

Iskra is enraged by Mazepa's betrayal of their long-term friendship, and demands the return of his daughter. He
is infuriated when Matrena admits to him that she has followed Mazepa of her own free will. The humiliated Iskra retreats, cursing Matrena and promising that Mazepa would pay for his indiscretion. Although she is heavily saddened by her father's curse, Matrena, nevertheless, remains loyal to Mazepa. She shares his vision and encourages the realization of his plan.

Amidst the officials at Baturin, Kasimir arrives disguised as a beggar. He is the representative of the Swedish and Polish Kings and bears a secret message for Karl XII to Mazepa: in exchange for military aid and support for Swedish troops in Ukraine, Karl promises to free Ukraine from all foreign oppression and to acknowledge Mazepa as its King. Just as the offer is being made, Bulawin, the leader of the Don kozaks, appears before the Hetman and calls on Mazepa to incite a revolt among the kozaks against the Tsar. To help Mazepa, he pledges the support of his Don kozaks. Mazepa is threatened by Bulawin's premature proposal and has Bulawin imprisoned just as the Tsar unexpectedly arrives at Baturin. The Tsar has come to levy heavier taxes on the people and to recruit troops for his impending battle against Karl XII. Mazepa warns the Tsar of the Ukrainian people's discontent and the possibility of revolt. Angered, the Tsar pulls on Mazepa's beard. Mazepa is enraged by this abuse, and although outwardly feigning loyalty to the Tsar, he inwardly swears revenge.
Act 2

Pressured by both Kasimir and Bulawin Mazepa now feels ready to answer Karl. He promises to surrender to Karl the estates of Baturin, Starodub, and Romen, as well as to supply him with 20,000 kozak fighters. The pact is sealed by word of honor.

As Kasimir is leaving he meets Mazepa's daughter, Lodioska. The encounter results in a display of intense emotions on both sides, although Lodioska expresses some doubt as to her father's approval of the match. Her doubt is realized when Mazepa recognizes Kasimir as Sapieha's son. Sapieha is the Polish nobleman who, having caught his wife in Mazepa's arms, banished her from the court and sent Mazepa into the steppes bound to a wild horse. Mazepa forbids his daughter to marry Kasimir.

Meanwhile, Matrena, now free of her disguise, again encounters Gordienko among the kozak officials. He is still infatuated with her beauty and she decides to capitalize on his feelings. She reveals Mazepa's secret plans to Gordienko, and on the strength of his feelings for her makes him promise to support Mazepa. Before the officials can gather in meeting, Iskra once again appears at Baturin with a message from the Tsar: The kozak troops are to join the battle against Karl immediately. Mazepa feigns illness in order to procure time.
Act 3

The Tsar is disturbed by rumors of revolt and seeks from Harpyna a confirmation of Mazepa's loyalty. Harpyna declares Mazepa to be the Tsar's most loyal servant just as Iskra arrives to betray Mazepa's secret alliance with Karl XII. The Tsar's belief in Mazepa is reinforced by Harpyna's prophecy. The Tsar turns against Iskra, and condemns him to death for bearing false witness: he requests that Mazepa carry out the execution. Matrena begs Mazepa to stay the execution, but Mazepa refuses and Iskra is put to death.

Act 4

Matrena flees to Harpyna, where she remains under cover, hoping to avenge her father's death. This opportunity presents itself when Gordienko stumbles upon Matrena at Harpyna's hut. She recognizes her chance and reminds Gordienko of his devotion to her. She quickly obtains a pledge from him to betray Mazepa by withdrawing his troops.

Meanwhile, the political situation is getting tense. Karl is approaching Ukraine, and his troops are in need of supplies. Mazepa, no longer able to buy time, openly declares his alliance with Karl and assigns officers to guard the estates. As Mazepa gathers his troops, the great betrayal takes place. Gordienko, true to his pledge to Matrena, retreats with his troops. Skoropadsky, another otaman, follows Gordienko's example and suddenly half of Mazepa's troops are gone. Victory is impossible. Mazepa is
shattered, but nevertheless plunges into the Battle of Poltava.

**Act 5**

Fallen in battle, Mazepa barely escapes with his life. He is aided by an unknown warrior who leads him to the safety of Harpyna's hut. Here, he meets Matrena who begs Mazepa for forgiveness and reconciliation. Mazepa's love for Matrena flares again and he accepts an atonement drink from her. To his horror, she discloses that now, her revenge is complete. She has poisoned Mazepa. Herself unable to live, Matrena also drinks the poison.

Alone, Lodoiska and the unknown warrior fall to Mazepa's feet. The warrior drops his disguise and reveals himself to be Kasimir. He begs Mazepa for the hand of Lodoska. Harpyna then also drops her disguise, revealing herself to be Maria, the Polish nobleman's wife. In the name of love she begs Mazepa to forgive Sapiéha and bless the union of Lodoska and Kasimir. Mazepa consents and dies.

**Mazeppa**

(by Adolf Müzelburg, a novel)

Müzelburg was born in Frankfurt on January 3, 1831, and died in Berlin on January 17, 1882. Shortly after his birth, his family moved to Köningsberg where his father was
employed as a civil servant. Müselburg began his education at the Volksschule in Köningsberg. When Müselburg was thirteen, his family returned to Frankfurt where he continued his schooling at the Oberrealschule. At the age of eighteen, he left his family and moved to Berlin where he attended the university and worked on the editorial staff of a local newspaper. In 1851, Müselburg received an invitation from a Berlin publishing house to write historical novels. His first works were published anonymously, and thereafter were written under the pseudonym of Justus Servin or Karl Weber. Müselburg's initial production of novels was prolific. It was however, not until later that Müselburg took his writing more seriously and his works acquired literary value. His novel Mazeppa, written in 1861, is one of his mature and more distinguished works.

The summary of the novel is as follows:

**Volume I Chapter 1 Die Vetter**

A naive and youthful Ivan Mazepa flees from his estate following an attempt on his life by his wicked cousin Johan. Johan pursues him and, worn and fatigued, Mazepa almost falls into Johan's hands. However, he is rescued by Senator Zernicky and his daughter Jadwiga.

**Chapter 2 Das Haus des Starosten**

Zernicky and Jadwiga bring Mazepa to their estate,
where Zernicky hears the details of Mazepa's misfortune and advises him not to return home until Johan is brought to justice. Instead, Zernicky advises Mazepa to go to Warsaw and to take on the duties of a page at the court of King Kasimierz.

Shortly before Mazepa's departure there is a celebration at Zernicky's home. Many distinguished guests arrive, among whom are Starosta Krinecky, the King's secret advisor, and Rotoff, a Polish count. Inadvertently, Mazepa overhears a conversation between Krinecky and Rotoff in which Krinecky accuses Rotoff of conspiring against the Polish King. Rotoff denies the charges; however, when confronted with incriminating evidence, he pulls his dagger and attempts to murder Krinecky. Mazepa saves Krinecky, and Krinecky, in gratitude to Mazepa, offers to guide and advise Mazepa while he serves as page at the Polish court.

Chapter 3 Der Senator

Mazepa leaves for Warsaw early the next morning. His journey, however, is not without adventure. At the inn near Warsaw, Mazepa confronts Jablonsky, Zernicky's son-in-law, whose mistreatment of a servant girl arouses Mazepa's anger. The conflict is not serious; however, it does set Jablonsky, an influential lord in Warsaw, against Mazepa.

Chapter 4 Warschaw

Mazepa arrives at the Polish court where he begins
his service. Almost immediately he wins the respect and confidence of the King and the love of all the women. Warned by Krinecky, Mazepa successfully evades the intricate web of the courtly love intrigues. His heart belongs to Zernicky's young daughter Jadwiga, with whom he has fallen deeply in love.

One day Mazepa receives a curious letter inviting him for a rendezvous. The sender identifies himself as a lonely individual seeking good company. In the spirit of adventure Mazepa accepts the invitation and is secretly led by the sender's servant to the host's quarters.

Chapter 5 Celesta

Mazepa is surprised to discover that his host is Celesta, who is the king's mistress. Although charmed by Celesta, Mazepa is intent on never seeing her again. Fate, however, thwarts his good intentions. As Celesta's servant leads Mazepa back, Mazepa hears the sound of approaching voices. Afraid to be seen in the quarters restricted to pages, Mazepa quickly finds a hiding place. To his dismay, the approaching voices enter his hideout. Mazepa recognizes the voice of Rotoff. The other voices are those of the Swedish King's representative, Baron Bernskiold, and the Polish prince, Sapieha. The three men conspire to overthrow the Polish King Jan Kasimierz. Just as the conspirators are about to leave, they discover Mazepa. Mazepa flees but is
followed by Rotoff. The chase leads Mazepa and Rotoff into Celesta's quarters.

**Chapter 6 Im Palaste**

In order to prevent a deadly confrontation between the two men, Celesta summons the King's guard. Rotoff escapes and Mazepa is ordered to appear before the King. In an audience with the King, Mazepa reveals the details of the conspiracy. The King, however, is reluctant to believe Mazepa. Mazepa loses his ground when he covers for Celesta and refuses to render the King an explanation of the circumstances which led him to the restricted quarters. Outraged by Mazepa's insubordination, the King dismisses Mazepa from his service as a page. Krinecky suggests that Mazepa leave Warsaw and remain at Krinecky's estate until matters settle in Warsaw. As Mazepa rides out of Warsaw he is unexpectedly joined by a second rider—Celesta.

**Chapter 7 Die Geliebte des Könings**

Celesta reveals her tragic past to Mazepa and the circumstances which led her into becoming the King's mistress. To Mazepa's surprise she also reveals that she is Rotoff's wife. Mazepa is so moved by Celesta's misfortune that he vows his life to her.

**Volume 2 Chapter 8 Die Flucht**

As night falls, Mazepa and Celesta seek lodging. They find a room at a nearby inn; however, they are forced
to flee when Mazepa's cousin Johan, and his men take shelter at the same inn. Johan again pursues Mazepa and in the chase Mazepa is separated from Celesta. Unable to find Celesta again, a distraught Mazepa finds his way to Krinecky's estate where he remains for a year and a half.

Chapter 9 Vor Warsaw

As war breaks out between Poland and Sweden, Krinecky advises Mazepa to join King Kasimierz's army. This marks a turning point in Mazepa's life. As a military scout Mazepa again overhears Rotoff's conspiracy plans. This time Mazapa carefully plans a counter attack and is successful in thwarting the conspiracy.

Chapter 10 Der Tag des Glückes

The King is saved and Mazepa is hailed as a hero. The King forgives Mazepa his past transgression at the court and promotes him to the rank of captain. Krinecky adds to the honors. He makes Mazepa the legal heir of his title and his estate. As the masses cheer Mazepa, Zernicky and his daughter Jadwiga appear in the crowd. In an attempt to make contact with Zernicky and his daughter, Mazepa follows them to the home of Jablonski, with whom he had quarrelled at the inn years ago. Forgetting all caution, Mazepa enters the home of his adversary. This move proves to be a fatal mistake. Zernicky has left for his estate and his daughter who stayed behind is not Jadwiga, but her older married
sister. Mazepa is trapped by the unexpected arrival of the husband, Jablonsky.

Chapter 11 Der Todesritt

Jablonsky, ill-disposed toward Mazepa, hands him over to his friend and comrade—Rotoff. Rotoff, delighted to finally have Mazepa in his hands, wastes no time in his revenge. He binds Mazepa to the back of a wild horse and sends it galloping into the wilderness. The horse wanders for days and Mazepa is near death. He is saved only by the hand of fate which leads the horse to a host of kozaks. They unbind the delirious Mazepa and take him to their camp.

Chapter 12 Die Genesung

Mazepa remains with the kozaks for a year and a half. His good manners and intelligence win Mazepa the kozak's respect. An act of bravery on the day of the election of a new otaman, the chief executive of the kozak host, brings Mazepa a nomination for the post. The nomination is unanimously approved. Mazepa accepts his new post; however, before taking on the duties of his office, he has first to secure a dismissal from King Jan Kasimierz's service.

Chapter 13 Der Triumph

Mazepa is escorted to Warsaw by a host of kozaks. Weather conditions, however, force Mazepa and the kozaks to seek refuge at a nearby estate. In the home of his host,
Mazepa discovers that Rotoff is at Zernicky's estate and that he is going to marry Zernicky's daughter Jadwiga. Mazepa redirects his course to Zernicky's estate. He sets out with his kozaks early in the morning; however, he is separated from them while crossing a river with rising waters. Mazepa continues alone until he loses his horse. Forced to seek assistance, Mazepa finds his way to a cloister. To his delight he learns that Jadwiga is residing at the same cloister while waiting for her wedding day. All Mazepa's efforts to see Jadwiga, however, are deterred by the mother superior, a distant relative of Rotoff, who is in charge of keeping Jadwiga isolated from the outside world. Mazepa's situation brightens when he is informed that the long-lost Celesta, now a nun, also resides at the cloister. Although Celesta has no access to Jadwiga, she promises to help stop the marriage between Rotoff and Jadwiga. Unable to divulge her plan to Mazepa, she begs him to trust her.

All assemble at the church for the wedding and the ceremony commences as planned. However, just before Rotoff and Jadwiga are to exchange their vows, Celesta intervenes. She publicly accuses Rotoff of bigamy, identifying herself as his first wife. Mazepa adds to the accusation by exposing Rotoff's devious political past, and the ceremony is stopped. Rotoff denies the charges and orders his men to attack Mazepa. Just in time, the kozaks make their way to the church and defend Mazepa. The King's representative, a
guest in the ceremony, confirms Mazepa's accusations and arrests Rotoff. Zernicky and Jadwiga are overjoyed to see Mazepa, whom they thought had died. Mazepa and Jadwiga reaffirm their love for each other and Zernicky approves their engagement.

Mazepa returns to the kozaks to take on his duties as otaman. He is accompanied by his wife, Jadwiga. Their marriage is blessed with many children, and both Mazepa and Jadwiga live in happiness to a ripe old age. Mazepa's political career as otaman is uneventful except for his engagement with the Swedes and his defeat by Tsar Peter at the Battle of Poltava.

Der Teufelsjünger
(by Johann Froembgen, a novel)

Froembgen was born on June 22, 1902 in Essen. As a youth, he attended the Gymnasium in Essen. In 1921, he began his studies of German Philosophy at the University of Münster. In 1927, he completed his dissertation, E. M. Arndt und die deutsche Romantik, and received his Ph.D. He returned to Essen where he resided until 1940. He was the author of many short stories, biographies, and novels among which is Der Teufelsjünger written in 1941. He died in Russian captivity in 1948.

A summary of the novel is as follows:
Chapter 1

Pan Falboska, a Polish nobleman, takes leave of his wife and departs on a journey to Warsaw. Minutes after his departure his wife, Pani Falboska, dispatches a message to Mazepa, her lover, arranging a rendezvous. Unfortunately the message is intercepted by her husband who is still in the vicinity of the estate. Enraged at his wife's infidelity and by Mazepa's indecency, Pan Falboska plans to abuse Mazepa as he makes his way to the awaiting Pani Falboska. Unsuspecting, Mazepa falls victim to Pan Falboska's plot. Delighted, Pan Falboska humiliates Mazepa. He ties him naked to the back of a high spirited horse and sets it galloping into the wilderness. Sure that Mazepa will die, a satisfied Pan Falboska returns home to deal with his wife. Mazepa survives the ride; however, his pride is injured and he leaves Poland forever. Mazepa crosses into Ukraine and enters the service of Doroshenko, the kozak otaman of western Ukraine. This marks the beginning of Mazepa's political career.

Chapter 2

In Doroshenko's service Mazepa quickly rises to the post of Secretary General. An unfortunate series of political blunders and mishaps, however, forces Doroshenko to yield his power to Samoilovsky, the otaman of eastern Ukraine. In a quick switch of allegiance Mazepa enters the service of Samoilovsky.
Chapter 3

Samoilovych, unlike Doroshenko, is a vassal to the Tsar and his career is, therefore, affected by the events taking place in Muscovy. The Tsar has just died, and there ensues a tug of war for the throne. Tugging on one side are the Tsar's daughter, Sophia, and her lover Golitzyn; on the other side the Tsar's son, Peter. At first the scale tips in favor of Sophia and she gains power and control.

Chapter 4

To endear her lover to the Muscovites Sophia organizes a campaign against the Crimean Khan; the campaign is headed by Golitzyn and supported by Samoilovych and his kozak troops. The campaign turns out disasterously for both Golitzyn and Samoilovych. Golitzyn's advances are set back by steppe fires, and Samoilovych is made a scapegoat for Golitzyn's failure. Mazepa is the only one who profits from the entire affair. Backed by Golitzyn and the general consensus of the kozak host, Mazepa is elected the new otaman.

Chapter 5

While Mazepa rises to power, Peter and Golitzyn lose their own. Popular sentiment sways toward Peter, who is coming of age. As Peter gains more and more support, and it becomes obvious that he will become tsar, Mazepa begins to play his political game. He rushes to Moscow to be one of the first to congratulate Peter, acknowledge his rule and
gain his grace and trust.

Chapter 6

Peter ascends the throne with imperialistic aspirations. He wishes to acquire the northern territories with rights to the Baltic Sea, which brings him into direct confrontation with Karl of Sweden. As Mazepa's acknowledged sovereign, Peter now engages Mazepa and the kozaks in the war against Karl, which breeds resentment among the kozaks and puts Mazepa into a precarious position between the Tsar and the kozaks.

Chapter 7

Mazepa's position becomes further complicated when he is approached by Dolska, the Polish princess, who speaks in the name of Stanislaw Leszczyński, the Swedish supported King of Poland. She offers to serve as Mazepa's direct link through Stanislaw to Karl, the Tsar's arch-enemy. Dolska proposes that Mazepa free himself from the Tsar by supporting the Poles who are backed by Karl. Mazepa is intrigued by Dolska's proposal of alliance; but is also captivated by Dolska herself. Overcome by amorous feelings, Mazepa promises Dolska his support in exchange for her hand in marriage.

Chapter 8

Coded messages are exchanged between Dolska and Mazepa. Dolska begins to pressure Mazepa for a definite
commitment to the Polish cause, and Mazepa begins to squirm for time. Previous historical relations with the Poles have taught him not to trust them. Dolska is unable to transmit any direct messages from Karl verifying his desire for a political and military union with Mazepa. Dolska hands Mazepa empty promises. Leaks of the Dolska/Mazepa affair reach Moscovy and stir suspicion. Mazepa gropes in an attempt to reassure the Tsar of his loyalty and discloses Dolska's proposal to the Tsar, hoping thereby to cover his tracks. By being perfectly honest with the Tsar Mazepa hopes to dupe him. The Tsar, however, is playing his own game. While engaging the kozaks to fight his wars, he is planning to incorporate the kozak host into the Muscovite military with Menschikow as Commander-in-Chief. It is Dolska who first informs Mazepa of Peter's intentions, hoping to hasten Mazepa' break with the Tsar.

Mazepa is caught in a web. Until Karl makes contact, Mazepa has no ally against Peter. To turn against Peter on his own would bring destruction to Ukraine, generated by Peter's wrath. Tormented by political doubt Mazepa seeks the advice of his comrade-in-arms and best friend, Kochubey. Mazepa discloses to Kochubey his plan for a union with Karl, negotiated through the Poles. As Mazepa speaks with Kochubey he meets Matrena, Kochubey's daughter. Both Mazepa and Matrena are instantly attracted to each other.
Chapters 9, 10, 11

The infatuation leads to an affair and Mazepa finally asks Kochubey for Matrena's hand. Kochubey is outraged at such a preposterous proposal, since Mazepa is Matrena's godfather and at least three times her age. The proposal is rejected. Mazepa is dejected, and Matrena is made prisoner in her parents' home. The affair is squelched, but Kochubey's feelings of hostility remain.

Chapter 12

Mazepa finally gets a signal from Karl indicating his desire for an alliance. As Mazepa contemplates the conditions for the union, Kochubey takes his revenge. He rushes to the Tsar and betrays Mazepa's alliance with the Swedes. Unfortunately for Kotchubey, the Tsar is still convinced of Mazepa's loyalty and chooses to condemn Kotchubey for bearing false witness against the Tsar's most loyal servant. Kotchubey, the traitor, is returned to Mazepa for execution.

Chapter 13

As Karl sends a message that he is ready to march into Ukraine, Mazepa simultaneously receives an order from the Tsar summoning him to Muscovy to serve on Peter's war council. Mazepa has to remain in Ukraine to make contact with Karl. To buy time Mazepa feigns illness and sends an apology to the Tsar for postponing the discharge of his duty
in Muscovy. To his horror, Mazepa is informed that the Tsar has dispatched Menschikow to Baturin, Mazepa's estate, to confirm Mazepa's illness. Mazepa has now run out of time. He has to ride immediately to join the Swedes before Menschikow reaches Baturin. Unable to prepare sufficiently, Mazepa along with officers and a few thousand kozaks rides to the Swedish camp. Baturin falls to the hands of Menschikow. The Tsar is enraged at Mazepa's betrayal and orders the slaughter of all those who remain behind in defense of Baturin.

Chapter 14

The time draws near for confrontation as the Swedish-Ukrainian forces prepare to face the Tsar at Poltava. A series of misfortunes weaken the Swedish forces and Karl himself is wounded. This produces chaos and disorder on the Swedish front, which ultimately leads to the Swedish defeat. Peter's victory at Poltava is a victory for the Moscovite Empire. A defeated Karl and a devastated Mazepa flee to Turkey into political exile. Mazepa dies a broken man.
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