HALYNA NAIENKO

Kijevo nacionalinis Taraso Ševčenkos universitetas, Ukraina
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

PAMOKSLŲ RINKINIO „DIOPTRA ARBA PASAULYJE GYVENANČIO ŽMOGAUS VEIDRODIS" FILOSOFINĖS IDĖJOS IR XVII–XVIII A. MOKSLINIO DISKURSO KALBA

The Philosophical Ideas in "Dioptra or, the Mirror of Human Living in the World" and the Language of the Scientific Discourse in the 17th–18th Centuries[1]

SUMMARY

The article is devoted to the analysis of the collection of sermons, *Dioptra* (1612), written by Vitalij. The author of the article views the collection as part of the Ukrainian philosophical tradition of the 17th century. The use of either Church Slavonic language or the so called "prosta mova" variant (i. e. plain Ukrainian speech used in books) in different types of scientific texts was determined by socio-cultural factors. The graphic and orthographic features of the collection of sermons "Dioptra" show that the book was written using the Ukrainian version of the Church Slavonic language, which was influenced by both the "prosta mova" and the languages spoken in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. Most of these features are reflexes of prehistoric East Slavic changes, preserved in some archaic northern Ukrainian and southern Belarusian dialects, for instance, dispalatalization of hissing consonants, the change *ę > e and other features. The author of the article examines concepts of self-awareness and the internal spiritual man which were typical of the philosophical discourse of the time. The relevance of the philosophical reflections of Vitalyj's work is confirmed by the fact that this work was published more than once, and the ideas presented in it formed the basis for the perception of European Protestantism until the 18th century.

SANTRAUKA

Straipsnyje analizuojamas Vitalijaus pamokslų rinkinys „Dioptra" (1612), kurį straipsnio autorė laiko neatskiriama XVII a. Ukrainos filosofinės tradicijos dalimi. Įvairių rūšių mokslinių tekstų kalba buvo arba bažnytinė slavų kalba, arba vadinamoji „prosta mova", t. y. knygose vartojama ukrainiečių kalba. Šį pasirinkimą lėmė socialiniai ir kultūriniai veiksniai. Grafiniai ir ortografiniai pamokslų rinkinio „Dioptra" požymiai rodo, kad knyga parašyta vartojant ukrainietiškąjį bažnytinės slavų kalbos variantą, kuriam įtakos turėjo ir „prosta mova", ir kalbos, kuriomis kalbėta Lietuvos Didžiojoje Kunigaikštystėje. Dauguma šių bruožų – tai priešistorinių Rytų slavų kalbų pokyčių refleksai, išlikę, pavyzdžiui, kai kuriose archajiškose Šiaurės ukrainiečių ir Pietų baltarusių tarmėse (šnypščiančių priebalsių dispalatalizacija, akavimas, refleksija *ę > e ir kiti bruožai). Straipsnio autorė atkuria nagrinėjamo laikotarpio filosofinio diskurso pasaulėžiūrines savęs pažinimo sąvokas, vidinį žmogų. Vitalijaus kūrinio filosofinių apmąstymų aktualumą patvirtina tas faktas, kad šis kūrinys buvo leidžiamas ne vieną kartą, o jame pateiktos idėjos sukūrė pagrindą Europos protestantizmo suvokimui iki pat XVIII a.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most efficient approaches to the study of texts extant from the previous ages is the cultural one. It comes as no surprise that the Russian philosopher Mixail Bakhtin argued that "by growing out of linguistics, the theory of text becomes a kind of the proto-theory of a cultural object in general" (Kasavin 2008: 152).

The methodological premises of the study of linguistic and cultural phenomena in the diachrony are substantiated in modern historico-philosophical studies in as much as "today's change brings about a change in the perspective on the past which is determined by our time" (Ivin 2005: 2). Michel Foucault discussed a possibility of applying modern epistemic categories and methods to the study of the Middle Ages. He maintained that by way of a retrospective hypothesis and an interplay of formal analogies or semantic resemblances, literature and politics, as recent categories, can be applied to medieval culture, or even classical culture; however, neither literature, nor politics, philosophy or the science would articulate the field of discourse in the 17th or 18th century, as it happened in the 19th century (Foucault 1969: 33). Since the beginning of modern science is connected with the names of Mikołaj Kopernik and Galileo Galilei, the transitional period from the Middle Ages to modern times should be approached in a methodologically specific way.

The study of a collection of philosophical sermons, *Dioptra or, the Mirror of Human Living in the World*, by Vitalij from Dubno (Vevis, 1612) is therefore based on the principles of historicism and cognitive linguistics. One needs to take into consideration the variegated structure of the concept 'science' in the linguistic mentality of that time. As evidenced from relationships and contexts, the linguistic mentality clearly shows its connection with the internal form of the lexeme *science* since *science* is 'what one gets accustomed to'. Long before modernity, science was identified with the

Christian faith; indeed, new knowledge emerged because of the development of education and schools in the late 16th–early 17th century. The conceptual core of the notion 'science' is 'teaching', 'Christianity', and 'secular school subject', including such concepts as 'lecture', 'study text', 'guideline(s)'; the emotive core is characterized by such concepts as 'social value', 'benefit', while the imaginary core is determined by a metaphorical association of sciences with plants. The spread of Protestantism caused changes in the emotive core of the concept. The understanding of social value absorbed therefore the pragmatics of benefit in the intellectual sphere. At the same time, the imaginary core was shaped by the metaphorical association *sciences – garden* (Naienko 2012).

All the above allows us to treat the text of the *Dioptra* in the light of the contemporaneous scientific discourse. In this paper I explore the use of literary languages in scientific texts extant from the 17th–18th centuries and demonstrate functional differences between Church Slavonic and Ruthenian (the *prostaja mova*) in different types of texts. Orthographic and graphic peculiarities of the text are analyzed here from the point of view of the influence of Ruthenian and other vernaculars used in the territories of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania. My working hypothesis is that exactly this kind of influence tended to determine the nature of the local recension of Church Slavonic. The last section of this paper deals with the analysis of major features of the world view of Vitalij as reflected in the *Dioptra.*

SCIENTIFIC TEXTS AND LITERARY LANGUAGE IN THE MIDDLE UKRAINIAN PERIOD

Plurilingualism was a typical feature of the development of languages, including Slavic, spoken in Europe in the middle period (Tkachenko 2011: 132). The state of plurilingualism in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania has been actively discussed in sociolinguistic terms (e.g., Danylenko 2011, 2017) and as part of the contemporaneous multiculturalism (Khomenko 2012: 463). The unprecedented revival of Church Slavonic began in the late 15th century in the Kovel' circle of Prince Andrej Kurbskij and was taken over by the Ostrih circle of intellectuals supported by Prince Constantine of Ostrih in 1580. According to Shevelov (1979: 567), that was the response of the

Ukrainian clerical intelligentsia to Polish claims on the superiority of Latin; in fact, Church Slavonic was revived as a continuator, in its mission and its structure of Greek and as a common patrimony of all the Orthodox Slavs.

Leaving aside the Polish- and Latin-language scientific discourse (Vakulenko 2008, 2011), the distribution of literary languages in accordance with their functions can be tentatively explicated in the following way: Church Slavonic was primarily used in translations, original philosophical works, and grammars, Ruthenian was preferred in polemical works and translations of scientific works belonging to natural sciences. The distri-

bution can be expanded with the help of Ruthenian in explanations by Lavrentij Zizanij in his *Hrammatyka slovenska* (Vilna, 1596) and examples found in Meletij Smotryc'kyj's *Hrammatiki Slavenskię pravilnoe sintagma* (Vevis, 1618). In 1618, Kyrylo Trankvillion-Stavrovec'kyj published his *Zercalo Bohoslovija* in Ruthenian by merging philosophical components with natural science. The 1645 short catechism by Petro Mohyla and Isaja Troxymovyč-Kozlovs'kyj is exemplary from the point of view of the use of Ruthenian in explaining philosophical and theological concepts.

Some external factors, in particular the use of Latin as a language of instruction, put a halt to the introduction of Ruthenian into schooling. To some extent, the foundation of the Kyivan Mohyla College (Collegium Kijoviense Mohileanum) heralded a transition from the so-called "Greek-Slavonic" period to the "Latin-Slavonic" one in the cultural life of Ukrainians (Vakulenko 2004: 549). Church Slavonic translations of John of Damascus, especially those linked to the circle of Prince Andrej Kurbskij, were part of the curriculum at the Kyivan Mohyla College. Petro Mohyla, metropolitan of Kyiv, is known to have used one of the witnesses of the *Bohoslovije* and *Dialetyka*. Later, Ioannykij Galjatovskij made use of the *Lohika* by John of Damascus and structured one of the sermons in his *Ključ razumenija* (1659) in accordance with the list of Aristotle's categories.

In the second part of the 18th century, when scientific research was centered at the educational institutions, at the Kyivan Mohyla College, treaties were written in Latin while scientific genres were composed in Church Slavonic. The latter group of works is best represented by the *Synopsis or, A Short Collection* (1674, 1678, and 1680) and *Man's Peace with God* (1669) by Innokentij Gizel; one can also add a series of popular theological texts authored by Teodosij Safonovyč, Josyf Šumljans'kyj, and others. However, the sociolinguistic situation in Russian-ruled Ukraine in the 18th century drastically changed as a result of heavy linguistic Russiafication in the years 1720–1790s (Danylenko, Naienko 2019: 24).

During the Middle Ukrainian period, philosophical courses were commonly prepared in Latin. The trilingual publication of Myxajlo Kozačyns'kyj's *Aristotle's Philosophy* in Latin, Polish, and Church Slavonic was an exception. It is not either accidental that the author had his work printed in L'viv in order to avoid possible censorship by the Russian authorities (Vakulenko 2004: 551).

Called by Dmytro Čyževs'kyj "an incomplete nation", Ukrainians did not have full-fledged literature in the majority of fields. Due to a lack of educational institutions and scientific-theoretical output, outdated manuscripts were circulating instead. In the 18th century, translations set an outside model, a matrix for textual creativity, which served as a driving force behind the development of scientific language. It is sufficient to mention literature of practical purpose, translated from Polish, as well as textbooks and treaties translated from Russian. Save for the works authored by Hryhorij Skovoroda, there was no original scientific output at that time (Naienko 2013: 67–86).

UKRAINIAN FEATURES OF THE CHURCH SLAVONIC
OF THE *DIOPTRA*

We take into consideration different recensions of Church Slavonic based on graphic and phonetic-orthographic traits of the corresponding texts (Keipert 2017: 37). We treat orthographic peculiarities of the *Dioptra* as a result of the interrelation between Church Slavonic and Ruthenian and the influence of vernaculars on the written norm of Church Slavonic.

The bulk of features of the Church Slavonic of the *Dioptra* is linked to reflexes of older East Slavic phenomena as attested in North Ukrainian. Such features are shared by some southern Belarusian dialects (Moisiienko, Nika 2013: 15). Among them one can name dispalatalization of consonants as in *съгараетъ*, *о(л)таръ* (D: 15), *въ высочайшомъ, нежели въ нижайшомъ сану* (19); *мачость* (44v), *божой* (53r), *помощъ* (13v), *червъ* (27),

скорбъ (45r), *цр͠ковъ* (48), the so-called *akannja*, e.g., *помагаетъ* (68v), *съгараетъ* (68v), cf. hyperistic spelling in *полаты* 'chambers' (72), *е* instead of **ę* as in *паме(т)ки год(ъ)ный* (2). All these features match those which constitute the so-called Polissian standard of Ruthenian in the 14th–16th centuries (Danylenko 2006, 2011: 149–150), cf. (Moisienko 2016: 33–122; Nika 2020: 68–69).

Some rarely attested reflexes can also be viewed as Ukrainian such as the change **ѣ** > [i] in *растицаем(ъ)са* (55v), *аще бы ра(з)смотрилъ* (57), *процвите добродѣтель* (83), *не процвисти* (83), *пращати обѣди* (27r), and the confusion of the letters <**и**> – <**ы**> which reflects the Ukrainian sound [ẏ]: *лукавїи*, *лукавыи* (10v), *похвалаеми* (11v), *агг͠ли* (17), *въспрїймеши* (17v), *раби* (nom.pl.) (30), *зиблющееса* (74).

VITALIJ'S OUTPUT AND THE PHILOSOPHICAL DISCOURSE
IN THE 17TH–18TH CENTURIES

Vitalij's *Dioptra* is commonly viewed as part of the conservative philosophical trend typical of the late 16th–early 17th centuries, according to which salvation could be achieved through paucity, rejection of secular temptations, self-humiliation. Vitalij's religious and philosophical ideas, connected with the circle of Ostrih, were close to those of Ivan Vyšens'kyj (*c*.1550–1620) and Isaija Kopyns'kyj (d. 1640).

The *Dioptra* was discovered by the Ukrainian scholar Volodymyr Peretc

(Peretc 1911: 24-25). Today we have at our disposal a possible original – the 1604 codex, which was described by Peretc, and several old publications of this work going back to 1612 (Vevis), 1651 and 1654 (Kutejn), 1698 (Mohyliv). Remarkably, this work was mentioned by Ivan Vyšens'kyj and Zaxarija Kopysten-s'kyj who in his *Palinode* extolled the piety of Vitalij (Mytsko 2019: 77–81; Naienko 2011).

Ivan Franko assessed Vitalij's poetry rather skeptically (Franko 1981: 158, 164,

172), although modern scholars treat his literary output in a more objective way, while emphasizing the baroques features of his poems (Borysenko 2008: 9; Krysa 2017). Vitalij treated his own work as mere translation or compilation. However, today we have not yet a comprehensive study of his writings.

While stressing the relationship between the Ukrainian religion and Protestantism, Leonid Uškalov heeded the significance of Vitalij's work from the point of view of the continuity of the philosophical tradition. To adduce a few examples, Symon Todors'kyj, who was a teacher of Hryhorij Skovoroda, translated protestant spiritual poetry and the major work, *The True Christianity*, by the Lutheran theologian Johann Arndt; Semen Hamalija translated works of the German Christian mystic Jakob Böhme; remarkably, the German protestants published three times Theophan Prokopovyč's *Christianae Orthodoxae Theologiae*. At the library of the Kyivan Mohyla Academy they held a copy of Jakob Böhme's *Misterium Theologiae*, while August Hermann Francke, the leader of the pietists at Halle, had a copy of Vitalij's *Dioptra* (Ushkalov 2012: 23). Symon Todors'kyj could be familiar with the *Dioptra* which, reprinted several times, was very close to the German pietist beliefs about sin and redemption, piety and moral improvement.

THE CENTRAL QUESTION(S) OF PHILOSOPHY

The moralizing and instructive culture produced texts whose deep sense was hidden behind the façade of literal meaning (Popovych 2001: 196). Correspondingly, the understanding of philosophical ideas was dependent on the comprehension of philosophy as a kind of art. The prominent place among other scholarly problems was held by the concept of self-knowledge. This Delphi principle, according to which a man becomes aware of his mortality, was further developed in Christianity, namely, perception in your own soul of all what can be a result of mistakes, weaknesses, and lapses from virtue (Fuko 2007: 16, 456).

The aforementioned principle is found at the top of epistemic values in the theology of Vitalij, according to whom,

„most important was self-discovery; deep respect and love were more harmful than haste; also, persecution was useful inasmuch it tended to subdue a man, make him to understand himself; this is why love blinded you and made you not to know yourself" (D: 48).

Self-knowledge is more important than the secular science since it leads a man to truth:

„The Christian wisdom lies in a true self-knowledge. In comparison with this wisdom any learning is a lack of knowledge […] More important is one single bit of the Christian wisdom rather than the vast sea of the wisdom of this world: a true wisdom is the utmost destruction of oneself. The more you know, the more ignorant and dead you are in this world" (D: 43v–44).

The only way to become close to God is the following:

„The more you know yourself, the better you know God […] By applying self-knowledge you will become obedient, and you will be afraid of God in this way since fear of God is the beginning of wisdom. It befits you to begin with self-knowledge" (D: 139v).

These processes are interconnected: „Open your eyes and learn that from the knowledge of God you follow an instance of self-knowledge" (D: 142v). The way of knowing yourself is based on the cognizance of your weaknesses, foibles, and an ultimate victory over yourself:

„In work, freedom and power of a good man can be realized in a victory over himself. Whether you wish to obtain more power, control yourself, and this is what the wisdom says. If you gain a perfect victory over yourself, then you will achieve everything" […] (D: 138–138v).

Interestingly, the concept of the human's two natures is presented by Vitalij metaphorically:

„For the sake of this, the Apostle gave them various names, by naming one the spirit, and the other the flesh, one the mind, the other the body, one the law of mind, the other the law of body" […] (D: 138).

As evidenced in his writings, Vitalij used to explain concepts of his theology with the help of metaphors. One can concur with the scholars who argue that conceptual metaphors are primarily used in the process of reasoning and behavior (Arutiunova 1998: 375–380; Riabtseva 2005: 525).

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the *Dioptra* proved to be very popular in the 17th century and later. The significance of the author's philosophical ideas was the reason behind several reprints of this work until the 18th century.

Speaking in linguistic terms, the choice of Church Slavonic in the philosophical discourse in the early 17th century, in particular for the *Dioptra*, was quite natural since this language was used as a token of *Slavia Orthodoxa* as compared with the Latin language in *Slavia Latina* (Picchio 1984). The Ukrainian recension of Church Slavonic as used in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania was influenced by Ruthenian and, remarkably, North Ukrainian. The influence of Ruthenian, Latin, and Greek, in the morphosyntax and vocabulary in the *Dioptra* warrants further research.

References

Arutiunova Nina D. 1999 – Арутюнова Нина Д. 1999. *Язык и мир человека* [Language and man's world], Москва: Языки русской культуры.

Borysenko Kateryna H. 2008 – Борисенко Катерина Г. 2008. *Prosimetrum в українській літературі барокової доби* [*Prosimetrum* in the Ukrainian literature of the Baroque period]. Донецьк: Норд-прес.

Danylenko Andrii. 2006. Prostaja Mova, *Kitab*, and Polissian Standard. *Die Welt der Slaven*, 51: 80–115.

Danylenko Andrii. 2011. Linguistic and cultural border crossings in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania or, can the Grand Duchy of Lithuania be defined as a Sprachareal? In *Langues baltiques, langues slaves*. Paris: CNRS éditions: 141–173.

Danylenko Andrii. 2017. A missing chain? On the sociolinguistics of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania, *Acta Baltico-Slavica*, 41: 31–57.

Danylenko Andrii, Naienko Halyna. 2019. Linguistic russification in Russia Ukraine: languages, imperial models, and policies, *Russian Linguistics* 43 (1): 19–39.

Foucault Michel. 1969. *L'Archéologie du savoir*. Paris: Gallimard.

Franko Ivan Ya. 1981 – Франко Іван Я. 1981. Забутий український віршописець XVII в. [The forgotten Ukrainian poet of the 17th century] In Франко Іван. *Зібрання творів : у 50 т.* Київ: Наукова думка. Т. 31: 156–172.

Fuko Mishel 2007 – Фуко Мишель. 2007. *Герменевтика субъекта: курс лекций, прочитанных в Коллеж де Франс в 1981–1982 учебном году* [Hermeneutics of the subject: a course of lectures given at the College de France in the 1981–1982 academic year], Санкт-Петербург : Наука.

Ivin Aleksandr A. 2005 – Ивин Александр А. 2005. *Современная философия науки* [Modern philosophy of science]. Москва : Высшая школа.

Kasavin Ilia T. 2008 – Касавин Илья Т. 2008. *Текст. Дискурс. Контекст. Введение в социальную эпистемологию языка* [Text. Discourse. Context. An introduction to the social epistemology of language], Москва: Канон+РООН "Реабилитация".

Khomenko Irina V. 2012 – Хоменко Ирина В. 2012. Особенности религиозной полемики на Украине конца XVI–начала XVII в. [Features of religious polemics in Ukraine at the end of the 16th–early 17th centuries] In *Полемическая культура и структура научного текста в Средние века и раннее Новое время*. Москва: Нац. исслед. ун-т "Высшая школа экономики": 463–481.

Krysa Bohdana S. 2017 – Криса Богдана С. 2017. Епіграми Віталія Дубенського, або метафізика світла [Epigrams of Vitaliy Dubensky, or metaphysics of light], *Наукові записки Національного університету "Острозька академія", Серія філологічна*. Вип. 65: 40–46.

Keipert Helmut 2017 – Кайперт Гельмут. 2017. Церковнославянский язык: круг понятий [The Church Slavonic Language: A Concepts Circle], *Slověne* 1: 8–75.

Moisiienko Viktor M. 2016 – Мойсієнко Віктор М. 2016. *Історична діалектологія української мови. Північне (поліське) наріччя*. [Historical dialectology of the Ukrainian language. Northern (Polissya) Ukrainian]. Київ: ВЦ "Академія".

Moisiienko Viktor M., Nika Oksana I. 2013 – Мойсієнко Віктор М., Ніка Оксана I. 2013. *"Проста мова" в Україні та Білорусі XVI ст.* ["Prosta mova" in Ukraine and Belarus in the XVI century], Київ: НБУВ.

Mytsko Ihor 2019 – Мицько Ігор 3. 2019. Віталій [Vitaliy] In *Острозька академія: історія та сучасність культурно-освітнього осередку. Енциклопедичне видання* (І. Пасічник, П. Кралюк, Д. Шевчук та ін. ред.). Острог: Видавництво НаУОА: 77–81.

Naienko Halyna 2011 – Наєнко Галина 2011. Староукраїнська філософська традиція та аспекти наукового текстотворення [Old Ukrainian philosophical tradition and aspects of the creation of scientific texts], *Studia Linguistica* 5 (2): 444–450.

Naienko Halyna 2013 – Наєнко Галина М. 2013. *Науковий текст середньоукраїнського періоду в лінгвостилістичному, текстолінгвістичному й функціонально-комунікативному висвітленні* [Scientific Text of the Middle Ukrainian Period in the Linguistic-Stylistic, Textolinguistic and Communicative-Functional Context], Київ: Освіта України.

Naienko Halyna M. 2012 – Наєнко Галина М. 2012. Концепт *наука* в староукраїнській літературній мові [The concept *science* in the Middle Ukrainian literary language], *Мовні і концептуальні картини світу*, 42 (1): 181–189.

Nika O. 2020. Charters of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania in Volodymyr Rozov's Manuscript Archives: New Sources. *Logos* 104: 61–74.

Peretc Vladimir N. 1911 – Перетц Владимир Н. 1911. *Отчет об экскурсии семинария русской филологии в Житомир 21–26 октября 1910 года* [Report on the excursion of the seminary of Russian philology to Zhitomir, October 21–26, 1910], Киев: Тип. Императорского Ун-та св. Владимира.

Picchio Ricchardo. 1984. Guidelines for a comparative study of the language question among the Slavs. In: Goldblatt Harvey and Ricchardo Picchio (eds.), *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question*, vol. 1: *Church Slavonic – South Slavic – West Slavic*. New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies: 1–42.

Popovych Myroslav V. 2001 – Попович Мирослав В. 2001. *Нарис історії культури України* [Essay on the history of Ukrainian culture]. Київ: АртЕк.

Riabtseva Nadiezhda K. 2005 – Рябцева Надежда К. 2005. *Язык и естественный интеллект*.

[Language and natural intelligence], Москва: Academia.

Shevelov George Y. 1979. *A Historical Phonology of the Ukrainian Language*. Heidelberg.

Shevelov Yurii 2012 – Шевельов Юрій. 2012. Польська мова в Україні в XVI–XVII ст. (пам'яті Антуана Мартеля) [Polish language in Ukraine in the 16th–17th centuries (in memory of Antoine Martel)] In Шевельов Юрій. *Нарис сучасної української літературної мови та інші лінгвістичні студії (1947–1953 рр.)*. Київ: Темпора: 456–467.

Tkachenko Orest B. 2011 – Ткаченко Орест Б. 2011. Староукраїнська мова як цілісна традиція і причини її занепаду: Передісторія проблеми та її висвітлення на тлі особливостей формування слов'янських літературних мов [Middle Ukrainian language as a holistic tradition and the reasons for its decline: A prehistory of the problem and its coverage against the background of the peculiarities of the formation of Slavic literary languages] In *Життя – у слові: зб. наук. пр. на пошану акад. В. М. Русанівського* (відп. ред. В. Г. Скляренко). Київ: Вид-й дім Дмитра Бураго: 119–139.

Ushkalov Leonid 2012 – Ушкалов Леонід В. 2012. "Філософія серця" Тараса Шевченка [Taras Shevchenko's "philosophy of the heart"], *Слово і Час*, 9: 17–28.

Vakulenko Serhij 2008 – Вакуленко Сергій В. 2008. Слов'янська група мов у класифікаційних спробах київських професорів філософії (кінець XVII–перша третина XVIII ст.). [Slavic group of languages in the classification attempts of Kyiv professors of philosophy (late 17th–first third of the 18th century)], *Ukrainika III. Součsasna ukrajinistika. Problemy jazyka, literatury a kultury.* 2 čast: 555–559.

Vakulenko Serhij 2011 – Вакуленко Сергій В. 2011. Зі спостережень над присутністю португальських авторів в українському інтелектуальному полі XVII–XVIII ст. [From observations on the presence of Portuguese authors in the Ukrainian intellectual field of the 17th–18th centuries], *Збірник Харківського історико-філологічного товариства,* 14: 81–120.

Vakulenko Serhij V. 2004. Slavizzazione della terminologia scolastica nella Filosofia Aristotelica all'avviso dei Peripatetici di Manujlo Kozačyns'kyj. In *Mazepa e il suo tempo. Storia, cultura, società.* Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso: 541–563.

Abbreviation

D – Діѡптра сирѣчь Зєрцало. ал(ь)бо, изоѡбражєнїє извѣстноε живота члч(с)каго в(ъ) мирѣ. ѡ(т) многи(х) Ст̄ы(х) Бж̄(с)тве(н)ны(х) писані(й) и ѡ(т)чески(х) Догма(т) Съставле(н)наⱥ.

На слове(н)скїй язы(к), вѣчноε памети, Го(д)ны(м) ѡ(т)цемъ Виталіε(м) Ігумено(м) в(ъ) Дубнѣ преложена, и написана. Єв'є, 1612.

Endnotes