

Kochubey T. D.

**THE REFLECTION OF THE CULTURE OF THE UKRAINIAN BAROQUE
IN THE PHILOSOPHICAL THOUGHT OF KYIV-MOHYLA ACADEMY**

Each nation has its own culture, and philosophy acts as its consciousness. This also applies to the Ukrainian philosophy. As it develops in the mainstream of the world philosophical culture, Ukrainian philosophy has its history and established traditions. Among them, a prominent place is given to the man's inner world, the definition of the relationships between the human life, God, and the environment. This is the core theme of the Ukrainian culture at the end of 17th – beginning of 18th Centuries. For a long time, its study remained far from being objective, and the names of Ukrainian philosophers, their works and views were unknown to the general public.

Therefore, the aim of the article is to uncover the nature and the main features of the Ukrainian Baroque culture, characterize the peculiarities of the formation of philosophy in this period, as well as to reveal the content of the Baroque thinking drawing on the example of the ideas of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy professors.

The idea of the dependence of the social progress on the spread of education, special attention to the development of the Ukrainian culture, the idea of the value of Man, striving for the lofty consciousness and human dignity, concentration of enlightened absolutism, etc. testify to the presence in the culture of the Cossacks times of the ideas keeping with the ideology of the early Enlightenment, which were spreading in Western Europe at that time. Just like the anti-feudal ideology, which appealed to the broader use of the human mind for social progress, asserted the need for the elimination of all forms of unfreedom through the moral improvement of the human race, the early Enlightenment emerges as a synthesis of the two previous social and political movements – Humanism and Reformation.

The complex synthesis of the core ideas of these three social movements – Humanism, Reformation and early Enlightenment – can be seen in the philosophical systems of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy professors. This synthesis, the uniqueness of which was rooted in the then spiritually alive tradition of the national culture that was based on the achievements of the period immediately preceding the foreign domination of Ukraine in the mid-14th Century, added a unique coloring to the Ukrainian culture. It has become a prerequisite for viewing it as the Ukrainian (Cossack) Baroque. From the 1630s to the end of the 18th Century, the culture of Baroque defined the texture of the spiritual life of Ukrainians.

In contrast to the Renaissance, which proceeded from the idea of the identical to the reality Ratio, in other words, the “naturalized”, reduced to the mechanical nature, and, therefore, “de-spiritualized” Spirit, the Baroque restored the Spirit (“inner Man”, “heart”) in its uniqueness and individuality, insisted on the unity of the Spirit and nature, but simultaneously on their fundamental disability to merge. Yet the Baroque does not oppose the Antiquity and Christianity, but harmonizes them. From the 17th Century, the Ukrainian philosophy and culture become “not just cordocentric (“philosophy of the heart”), but Baroque-cordocentric” [3, p. 1114].

Reviewing this period, the national philosopher V. Gors’ky notes that, as a reflection of the complex and controversial process of the social life of the Ukrainian people of that time defined by the peculiarities of the Ukrainian mentality, “this culture is similar to the processes that took place in the spiritual life of Europe at that time” [2, p. 68].

In Western Europe, the Baroque frame of reference was shaped by B. Spinoza, B. Pascal, B. Gracián, E. Tesauro, et al. The philosopher and writer K. Stavrovets’ky was one of the leaders of the Ukrainian Baroque. An important contribution to the development of the Ukrainian Baroque was made by the professors of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy: I. Giesel, S. Yavorsky, F. Prokopovich, G. Konisski, M. Kozachyns’ky, et al. Among other figures of that time, D. Czyzevs’ky names M. Smotrytsky, P. Mohyla, but especially H. Skovoroda, “in whose frame of reference the Ukrainian

Baroque-cordocentric culture acquires a special, signature for the Ukrainian culture interpretation” [7, p. 243 – 244].

The question of free will was one of the most challenging in the European anthropology of the 17th Century. As the process of the independent formation of the scientific thought, the separation of philosophy from theology in the Ukrainian culture at that time were not complete yet, Kyiv-Mohyla professors viewed free will not only with respect to Man relative to nature, but also to God. In contrast to the inherent in the medieval philosophy dualistic opposition of God and nature, earth and heaven, they attempted, on the one hand, to converge and equal them and, on the other, differentiate them, which leads to the establishment of a self-sufficient nature, relative to which God is limited to being the creator or the original cause [2, p. 72].

According to I. Giesel, God created nature, while the processes occurring in the material world do not depend on Him, but on the “secondary”, nature-related causes. In the course of philosophy that the scholar offered his students, he diverges from the anthropomorphic understanding of God, who is defined as a self-sufficient entity, eternal, infinite, and endlessly creative and beyond human understanding. I. Giesel substantiated the hierarchical structure of the five worlds: uncreated world; intelligible world, which is identified with the divine mind; angelic world; elementary world, which consists of four primary elements; and microcosm (man) and the macrocosm, which covers the Earth, the heaven, and all that is contained between them.

The ethical views of I. Giesel were associated with an attempt to solve the problem of the meaning of life, possibility of achieving happiness, interrelations between will and mind. Just as all Kyiv-Mohyla scholars, he saw the meaning of life in a creative work, aimed at the personal and public good. Proceeding from the philosophical tendencies of the Baroque era, he was convinced that happiness can be achieved through a compromise in satisfying the needs of different parts of the soul, both bodily and spiritual.

Referring to the relationship between will and mind, I. Giesel claimed that, although intelligence sometimes prevails over will and sometimes yields to it,

intelligence, nonetheless, is nobler than will. So, in a certain sense, will is more important than intelligence because it inherently possesses the virtue (charitas), which is nobler than any other virtues. [1]

At the same time, according to I. Giesel, will seems more powerful than intelligence because “it concentrates the power that people have over their acts”. However, intelligence is the ability of the highest order, because it is “full of light, whereas will itself is blind”. Hence, intelligence, through “its light”, directs the will, other spiritual potencies, and itself. The intelligence’s modus operandi is nobler than that of the will since intelligence “masters things around through comparison” and the will “admires the view of the good in front of it”.

The material object of the will is everything that can be interpreted as a good or bad object because, according to the thinker, the good appears a formal basis with regard to which the will is directed at an object.

I. Giesel saw freedom as an equal treatment of the act or omission, one or another action with regard to the specific circumstances. Hence, a free potency is defined as the one that “having weighed all needs for actions, may choose to act or not to act”. This distinguishes the free potency from a preordained one, which, having considered all needs for action, cannot act” [1, p. 94 – 97]. The philosopher claimed that freedom is inherent to people as they are intelligent. Therefore, “no other living creature, even possessing all the characteristics of humans, can be free because it is devoid of intelligence”. Therefore, I. Giesel makes a conclusion that Man himself cannot feel totally free without resorting to intelligence to some extent. Based on these assumptions, he believed that, “formally, freedom is associated only with the will” [1, p. 94 – 97].

Thus, recognizing the free will, I. Giesel gives priority to intelligence, which, in his opinion, provides will with various choices between the good and the bad and, thus, influences it morally.

This was the beginning of the division of philosophy and theology, as well as the reorientation from the comprehension of God to the cognition of nature and Man, awareness of the inherent value of the cognition of its laws. As a result, some new

questions arouse: the need to give a new interpretation of the Man's place in the Universe, clarify his relationship with nature and find what distinguishes Man from everything that surrounds him in the changeful and infinite world around. That is, the problem of "Man and the Universe" appears in the spotlight.

G. Konisski made an important contribution to the study of these issues. In the course of "Physics", he often identifies nature and matter, stresses that the name of nature corresponds to "the first matter", and denies the idea of the passivity of natural things: "the idea that establishes only the principle of the passivity of natural things cannot be proven", whereas "nature is the principle and cause of the motion and rest", "nature determines motion", because God created nature as requiring no further intervention into its processes [4].

He saw the driving forces and the motives of human action in Man himself, rather than in the stipulated above factors, extending the principle of self-development onto nature and Man. And although the philosopher regarded them as the worlds created by God, he nevertheless believed that they were endowed with their own internal activity and inherent laws of development that result from their own existence.

In his views, G. Konisski followed the principle of dualism and the ambiguity of the truth, showing the difference between the highest (God) and the natural world with its various "active" phenomena. Among the latter, he distinguished "sensual active phenomena" (fauna), or the world of nature, which did not "recognize the means to pursue... the goal, although applied them by a natural impulse (instinct); "inanimate things" deprived of intelligence and senses, which "act not recognizing the goal, but pursue it by the natural inclination". Man created by God belongs to "divine ethical" or "intellectual active" phenomena: God, angels, and people. These, in his opinion, are the most perfect active phenomena, because "they not only master the goal in the sense of the good, but also recognize its kinds and the combination of the means of mastering it... This method corresponds only to the intelligent nature" [4]. Recognizing the presence of the free will in humans, the philosopher nevertheless stressed that its execution requires that Man take responsibility for his own destiny

and actions not only to God in the afterlife, but here on the earth - to himself and the society.

Developing his views, G. Koniski, for the first time in the national scholarly thought, provides an in-depth analysis of the mechanisms of the human activity, which is quite close to its modern understanding. Human activity is seen by him as “the most perfect”, conscious activity; it has a “goal”, means to achieve it, “the good” as the need that can be satisfied recognizing it as the initial goal (goal-setting) and realized through the appropriate means. “At the output”, there is a result, where “the good” is no longer a motivating need, but a materialized subject for its satisfaction.

According to G. Koniski, intelligence and mind are the decisive criteria in the understanding of Man. He believes that the “most correct” definition of Man is the following: Man “is an intelligent being ... because the mind and the will relate to each other, and there is no way that anyone deprived of the free will would be given the light of intelligence. Animals do not act freely and at will...” [4].

Therefore, G. Koniski elevates Man above other creatures, because he possesses “the structural perfection of the body and thought”. When “nature deprived humans of clothing and weapons, it gave them talent and intelligence” by means of which people “can prepare everything necessary for living and preserving life”, because “they are able to survive in the heat and in the cold, can win the most daring and wild animals; weak and slow, they chase the fast” [4].

Just like I. Giesel, G. Koniski believed that mortal life is the meaning of the human good, or happiness, as the highest good that “God prepared for Man” in the afterlife does not deny the necessity of a worldly happiness. The human good presupposes health, virtue, food, procreation, sensual pleasures, and a sense of well-being and happy fate, as well as requires mental effort, etc. But all of these should be pursued reasonably, without vengeance, as both excess and scarcity of the good make Man unhappy. He should strive for pleasure, but not absolutize it, not make it a goal in itself; on the other hand, he shouldn't be ascetic and apathetic to life because it is, too, unnatural of Man: human mind, freedom of choice, and common sense should determine the reasonable amount of the worldly good. Criticizing the Stoics for their

rigorism, preaching dispassion, apathy, and the moral ideal, which they saw in getting rid of affects, G. Konisski emphasized that this dogma “suppresses the love of parents to children, devotion to the homeland, and sympathy for the destitute and the downtrodden and, under the guise of resilience, teaches roughness and cruelty” [4].

Evaluating the work of Konisski as a representative of the Ukrainian Baroque, we share the view of those national researchers who emphasize his high humanistic culture as the inventor of the ideology of the Ukrainian Baroque [6, p. 132]. It is no exaggeration to consider G. Konisski to be one of the first Ukrainian thinkers who drew attention to the value of human life, which he called the good; he implemented a multilateral analysis of Man to prove once again that the Ukrainian philosophical and pedagogical thought of the Baroque era was on the way to humanization, developed towards the study of Man and the society.

In this context, it is important to look into the works of F. Prokopovich, another professor of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, particularly his “Spiritual Regulations”, in which he criticizes various attempts of “the princes of the church” to rise above the secular authority, condemns them for abuses, and requires that the clergy take care of education and enlightenment. These views and demands resulted from “his sympathy with the traditions of Renaissance humanists, European science and education” [6, p. 127]. F. Prokopovich emphasized the importance of the human mind and its endless cognitive opportunities, condemned a blind fanaticism and asceticism with its suppression of natural human feelings and abandonment of earthly pleasures.

In another work “Reflections on Godlessness”, he wrote that nature itself gave Man passions, and they “are not bad and harmful” because they depend on Man. F. Prokopovich depicts hermits and self-torturers with irony and sarcasm: “Everything good, happy, and glorious seems sinful and bad to them, even though it is righteous and true and not ungodly at all...”. Along the same lines, the author notes that, seeing somebody in good health and in good spirits, although not holy, they wish “that all people were ugly, hunchbacked, miserable, unhappy, and, perhaps, it is only in this condition that they would love them. The Hellenes called such people misanthropist, i.e., man-haters” [5].

He saw Man as an integral part of nature who follows its laws. However, if the only attribute of the surrounding nature is its extension, Man's essential feature is also thinking. This determines the exceptional place of Man in the Universe, which unites him with God. F. Prokopovich claimed that "Man is an undersized part of the visible and invisible world, since he has something of the bodily, not spiritual substance, and of the living matter, and of the sensual human substance, and, in addition, of what spirits themselves have. Therefore, ancient philosophers were right to call Man "a microcosm", i.e., a small, or encapsulating in miniature, world" [5].

Thus, giving much attention to the study of Man, F. Prokopovich understood him as a bearer of the divine and the natural, as a piece of "the visible and the invisible world", which has the elements of the bodily (devoid of the spiritual), living matter and human senses. He shared the view of Man as a small microcosm, or a unique world. However, the recognition of free will did not mean that this recognition would be automatically applied to the independence of human behavior from the Man's own nature and the society. F. Prokopovich notes that "autocracy" requires certain conditions under which Man can decide what to do. As part of nature, Man was introduced to the system of the world causal relationship, i.e., was considered free in his actions relative to God and unfree relative to nature.

This determines the complex structure of the human soul, which contains parts endowed with various nature – vegetative, animal, human, and divine. These components can exist both in harmony and in hostility to each other. Therefore, a calling of "a heroic Man" in the Baroque philosophy was to reach a reasonable compromise between the desire and motive of each part of the soul, without denying any of them. The latter is "inherent to the Baroque view of the world in contrast to the medieval or more recent, classical, view, which gave preference to one of the extremes through suppressing other aspirations - such as spirituality and serving God, public duty, etc." [2, p. 78 – 79].

Revealing the mechanisms and the meaning of human activities in "Ethics", F. Prokopovich claimed that each person acts because "she/he wants something, has a reason to act". Achieving one's ambition is happiness, but people do not always

understand what fits their idea of happiness. Therefore, acting hurried and wrong, people mistake their desires and fail to reach happiness. The professor of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy saw the main task of ethics, which controls human behavior, in “exploring and teaching what the highest good, or the highest happiness and bliss, are. The only way to reach this goal is to understand what most fits Man” [5].

The duty of ethics, F. Prokopovich stressed, was “to teach the rules of good behavior instead behaving good”. The latter applies to all men, whereas the former – only to philosophers. Thus, the scholar distinguishes ethics as the science of the rules of behavior from the ethical behavior itself, since the purpose of “the good behavior is happiness or bliss”. This was a step of the national science toward the separation of the moral theory (ethics as a science) and moral actions and behavior. As F. Prokopovich himself wrote, “... ethics is considered in two ways – in general and in particular”, or as a science “about the aim of human actions, that is about happiness and means of human behavior” and as the human behavior itself.

In evaluating these views of the scholar, it is worth recalling the words of modern Ukrainian researchers that “a distinction between the theoretical and the practical (sometimes ontological) is typical for F. Prokopovich’s works, since he views the category of theory as a certain way “to act or to perform” or as a sum of many concepts, which, although directed to some kind of a cause, can exist without this cause. Practice is perceived as the pursuit of the cause, which is guided by theoretical rules” [6, p. 128].

Noteworthy is also the idea of F. Prokopovich that the cognitive and practical functions of science should be moral, associated with the virtue, because the aim of science “should be nothing but what the purpose of good deeds is”. This idea inaugurated a new approach that analyzed science not simply as a means of human activities in general, but was seen in the context of morale and values as a creative endeavor aimed at doing “a good deed”.

The commitment of the philosophical knowledge to the problem of “Man and the Universe” determines an increased focus on epistemological issues. In the courses conducted by the professors of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, particularly in Psychology

and Logic, the characteristics of human condition occupied an important place. Senses, perception, memory, imagination, language, thinking, features of the cognitive process itself were studied extensively. Logic was interpreted as a means of obtaining new knowledge, a cognitive tool and was seen as a guarantor of overcoming difficulties, which Man faced in the process of cognition. As G. Koniski stated: “The purpose of logic is the acquisition of knowledge” [4].

The peculiarities of the Baroque thinking predetermined a significant attention to the study of language and its relation to thinking. Language was viewed as an artificial sign system that people use to communicate. Words are the signs of things that are reflected in the concepts. The meaning of a sign-word is established through its relationship with the object that it denotes. Language was seen as the basis for abstract thought, without which the latter cannot realize itself.

In summary, we conclude that the main features of the Ukrainian Baroque period were the adjustment and supplementation of the traditional methodology; new paradigm principles, which put nature to the fore in the study of Man and cognition, acquired an increasing importance. The general direction of the Baroque outlook put epistemology and logic under the study of the essence of Man and his place in the boundless Universe. A perfect Man (“heroic man”), who embodied not only an imaginary ideal, but the one achievable in the mortal life, was the central object of the Ukrainian Baroque culture. In our further studies, we will attempt to substantiate the development of the all-European science, which intensively developed and used new methodological and theoretical principles of natural and social sciences free of fatalism and mysticism and focused on the naturalistic paradigm.

References

1. **Giesel I.** Tvir pro filosofiyyu. Rozdil pro volyu abo pro rozumove prahnennya [Essay on Philosophy. The Section on Freedom or Mental Aspirations] History of Ukrainian Schools and Pedagogy: Chrestomathy. Kyiv. *Znannya*. 2005. 676 p. (ukr)

2. **Gors'ky V. S.** Istoriya ukrayins'koyi filosofiyi: kurs lektsiy [History of Ukrainian Philosophy: a Course of Lectures]. Kyiv. *Naukova Dumka*. 1997. 286 p. (ukr)
3. **Istoriya filosofiyi: slovnyk** [History of Philosophy: dictionary] Ed. by Yaroshovets' V. I. Kyiv. *Znannya Ukrayiny*. 2006. 1200 p. (ukr)
4. **Konisski G.** Moral'na filosofiya, abo etyka [Moral Philosophy, or Ethics]. *Philosophical Thought*. 1979. No. 3. (ukr)
5. **Prokopovich F.** Filosofs'ki tvory [Philosophical Works]: in 3 vol. Kyiv. 1981. (ukr)
6. **Zakharchenko M. V.** et al. Sotsiolohichna dumka Ukrayiny [Sociological Thought of Ukraine]: study guide. Kyiv. *Zapovit*. 1996. 424 p. (ukr)
7. **Chyzhevs'ky D.** Istoriya ukrayinskoyi literatury: Vid pochatkiv do doby realizmu [History of Ukrainian Literature: from the Beginning to the Era of Realism]. Ternopil'. *Present*. 1994. 478, [2] p. (ukr)

Кочубей Т. Д. Відображення культури українського бароко у філософських поглядах професорів Києво-Могилянської академії

У статті розглянуто сутність та основні ознаки культури українського бароко, схарактеризовано особливості становлення філософії як складника загальної культури України у цей період. На прикладі ідей професорів Києво-Могилянської академії розкрито зміст барокового мислення, яке визначало своєрідність духовного життя українського народу протягом цієї доби. Особливості цього мислення зумовлювали значну увагу до проблем мови, її зв'язку з мисленням. Мову вважали штучною знаковою системою, яку люди використовують для спілкування. Зроблено висновок, що основними ознаками періоду українського бароко було коригування й доповнення традиційної методології, дедалі більшої значущості набували нові парадигмальні принципи, згідно з якими природа виходила на перший план у дослідженні людини й пізнання. Проблеми теорії пізнання й логіки відповідно до загального

спрямування барокового світогляду були підпорядковані проблемам усвідомлення сутності людини, її місця в безмежному Всесвіті.

Ключові слова: культура, українське бароко, філософія, Києво-Могилянська академія, людина і Бог, людина і природа.

Кочубей Т. Д. Отображение культуры украинского барокко в философских взглядах профессоров Киево-Могилянской академии

В статье рассмотрены сущность и основные признаки культуры украинского барокко, охарактеризованы особенности становления философии как составляющей общей культуры Украины в этот период. На примере идей профессоров Киево-Могилянской академии раскрыто содержание барочного мышления, которое определяло своеобразие духовной жизни украинского народа на протяжении этого периода. Особенности этого мышления обусловили значительное внимание к проблемам языка, его связи с мышлением. Язык считался искусственной знаковой системой, которую люди используют для общения. Сделан вывод о том, что основными признаками периода украинского барокко была корректировка и дополнение традиционной методологии, все большую значимость приобретали новые парадигмальные принципы, согласно которым природа выходила на первый план в исследовании человека и познания. Проблемы теории познания и логики согласно общему направлению барочного мировоззрения подчинялись проблемам осознания сущности человека, его места в безграничной Вселенной.

Ключевые слова: культура, украинское барокко, философия, Киево-Могилянская академия, человек и Бог, человек и природа.

Kochubey T. D. The Reflection of the Culture of the Ukrainian Baroque in the Philosophical Thought of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy

The article examines the essence and the key features of the Ukrainian Baroque culture. It also characterizes the qualities that are distinctive of the formation of

philosophy as a component of the general culture of Ukraine during the period under consideration.

The ideas of the professors of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy taken as an example help the author reveal the content of the Baroque thinking in general. Defining the spiritual life of the Ukrainian people during this period, this thinking revolved around the problems of language, the relationship between language and thinking; that said, language was viewed as an artificial semiotic system used by people for communication.

The author concluded that, among the main characteristic features of the period of the Ukrainian Baroque, the modification and modernization of the traditional methodology were most common. At the same time, new paradigmatic principles, which proclaimed the priority of nature in the study of the human being and cognition, were becoming more and more significant. The frame of the Baroque worldview, however, required that the issues of the theory of cognition and logics be viewed as ancillary to the comprehension of the human nature, his/her place in the infinite macrocosm.

Key words: culture, Ukrainian Baroque, philosophy, Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, man and God, man and nature.

The article was received by the Editorial Office on 18.12.2013

The article was put into print on 01.11.2013

Peer review: Loboda S. M., Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor