# An Analysis of the Note on Languages in Philosophical Courses at the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries[1]

Mykola Symchych

*Skovoroda Institute of Philosophy, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine*
msymchych@gmail.com

**Abstract:**
*This article examines the note on languages in eleven philosophical courses taught in the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This small textual fragment, which discusses from which old languages newer languages came, is studied in the context of the Mohylian doctrine of signs, especially the question whether words are "natural" or "conventional" signs. The author provides a classification of the eleven courses under study and examines the textual differences between them. He also investigates the origin of the note, the ways in which it came to the Mohylians, and, most importantly, how Mohylian philosophical courses influenced each other. Finally, the author discusses the role of "lingua Ruthenica" and its place in the classification of languages developed by the professors of the Kyiv-Mohyla academy.*

**Keywords:**
*Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, early modern scholasticism, philosophy, language, signs, Ruthenian language*

The philosophical course taught in 1691-93, at the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, by Stefan Iavors′kyĭ, the future Moscow Patriarch *locum tenens* and head of the Most Holy Governing Synod, included one short but interesting note about the classification of the world's languages:

> *Sic Haebraica lingua matrix est et genitrix Siriacae, Chaldaicae, Arabicae;*
> *Graeca lingua matrix est Doricae, Jonicae, Aeolicae, Atticae;*
> *Latina matrix est Italicae, Valachicae, Galicae, Hispanicae;*
> *Sclavonica lingua matrix est Polonicae, Bohemicae, Moravicae, Bolgaricae, Moldavicae, Lithuanicae, Moschoviticae;*
> *Germanica – Helveticae, Saxonicae, Anglicae, Scoticae, Sueticae, Belhicae;*
> *Tartarica – Turcicae, Sarzamenicae etc, etc.*[2]

This note appears in the context of Iavors′kyĭ discussion of his doctrine of signs. To historians and linguists, it poses several questions, different by their complexity. Is this classification original to Iavors′kyĭ himself or did he borrow it from someone else? If the latter, where is its origin? Why do the languages called "*Moldavica*" and "*Lithuanica*" belong to the Slavic group? Is there a language that Iavors′kyĭ considered his native?

This interesting note was already investigated by the prominent linguist Serhii Vakulenko, who wrote two articles about it and, more broadly, about the semiotics in Kyiv-Mohyla

---

[2] Institute of Manuscript Vernads′kyĭ National Library of Ukraine, fonds 8, 60, fol. 150v. and fonds 306, 152, fol. 164v. Citing this and other quotations from Kyiv-Mohylian philosophical courses, I tried to reproduce as much as I can the orthography of the manuscript. In this case, it is a combined text from two manuscripts (cf. the critical text of this fragment in footnotes 88–95). The punctuation and italicization are mine.

philosophical courses.[3]  As he pointed out, since similar notes can be found in the philosophy courses of other Mohylian professors, their comparison and analysis can throw light on many aspects of the professors' worldview. Vakulenko's 2010 article tries to show the place of Kyiv-Mohylian classification of languages in the context of scholastic philosophy, especially early modern scholasticism. He studied eight Mohylian courses: Krokovs′kyĭ (1686-88 a[cademic].y[ear].), Iavors′kyĭ (1691–93 a.y.), Popovs′kyĭ (1699–1702 a.y.), Charnuts′kyĭ (1702–04 a.y.) – in the article wrongly attributed to Turoboĭs′kyĭ, Charnuts′kyĭ (1704–06 a.y.) – erroneously attributed to Iaroshevyts′kyĭ, Levyts′kyĭ (1719–21 and 1723–25 a.y.), and Dubnevych (1727–29 a.y.). Vakulenko researched not only into the lists of languages in those courses, but also examples of interlingual homonymy. Among other things, he succeeded in tracking the roots of Mohylian classification of languages down to the French Benedictine exegete and Orientalist Gilbert Génébrard. However, in the dozen years since the publication of Vakulenko's article on "Sprachklassifikationen in den ukrainishen handschriftlichen Logikkursen," new research has revealed important information about Kyiv-Mohylian philosophical courses. For example, while Vakulenko worked with eight Mohylian courses, it is now possible to consider a total of 23 courses that have a section on language signs. Furthermore, because he trusted the erroneous attribution of some courses done by previous researchers, it was nearly impossible for him to understand the textual relations between specific courses (i.e., which Kyiv-Mohylian professors used the courses of their predecessors in their teaching practice). Taking all this into consideration, there are good grounds for a new study of this topic and an opportunity to look at the problem from a different, comparative perspective.

## Kyiv-Mohyla Philosophy Courses: General Characteristics

Before approaching this question, I want to give some general information about Mohylian philosophical courses and, in this way, to place the note on languages in a broader context. The Kyiv-Mohyla College, later Academy (KMA), was established by the Kyivan Orthodox Metropolitan Petro Mohyla in 1632. Philosophy was taught there already in the first decade of its existence. Due to this fact, KMA became the first Orthodox educational institution with systematic teaching of philosophy. More than a hundred manuscripts of Mohylian philosophical courses have been preserved in Ukrainian and Russian libraries. Most of them (about 90 manuscripts) are located in the Institute of the Manuscript of Vernads′kyĭ National Library of Ukraine (IM VNLU). These manuscripts are a perfect source to study Mohylian philosophy and the way it was taught in KMA.

The attribution of the manuscripts reveals that 31 philosophical courses of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries have survived.[4] The results of the attribution are presented in Table 1:

### Table 1: KMA Philosophy Courses, 1639-1753

---

[3] Serhiĭ Vakulenko, "Slov'ians′ka hrupa mov u klasyfikatsiĭnykh sprobakh kyïvs′kykh profesoriv filosofiï (kinets′ XVII – persha tretyna XVIII st.)," in *Současná ukrajinistika: Problémy jazyka, literatury a kultury Sborník článků IV. Olomoucké sympozium ukrajinistů* 28. – 30. srpna 2008 (Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého v Olomouci, 2008), 555–59.  For the much bigger and more substantial version, see Serhij Wakulenko, "Sprachklassifikationen in den ukrainischen handschriftlichen Logikkursen vom Ende des 17. bis zum ersten Drittel des 18. Jahrhunderts," *Language & History* 53, no. 2 (November 2010): 115–26, https://doi.org/10.1179/175975310X12798962415260.

[4] For a detailed discussion of the attribution of Kyiv-Mohylian philosophical courses, see Mykola Symchych, Philosophia rationalis *u Kievo-Mohylians′kiĭ akademiï. Komparatyvnyĭ analiz kursiv lohiky kintsia XVII – pershoï polovyny XVIII st.* (Vinnytsia: O. Vlasiuk, 2009), 175–229.

| | Teacher | Academic years | Surviving parts of courses[5] |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Ĭosyf Kononovych-Horbats′kyĭ | 1639/40 | dialectic, logic[6] |
| 2. | Inokentiĭ Gizel′ | 1645/46–1646/47 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics[7] |
| 3. | Ĭoasaf Krokovs′kyĭ | 1684/85–1685/86 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics[8] |
| 4. | Ĭoasaf Krokovs′kyĭ | 1686/87–1687/88 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics[9] |
| 5. | Stefan Iavors′kyĭ | 1691/92–1692/93 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics[10] |
| 6. | Probably Prokopiĭ Kalachyns′kyĭ | 1693/94–1694/95 | dialectic, part of logic, fragment of physics[11] |
| 7. | Unknown professor | ca 1700 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics[12] |
| 8. | Inokentiĭ Popovs′kyĭ | 1699/1700–1701/02 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics[13] |
| 9. | Khrystofor Charnuts′kyĭ | 1702/03–1703/04 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics[14] |

---

[5] The list of courses is assembled mainly on the basis of manuscripts preserved in Kyiv. However, the data from Russian libraries are also included. The Russian data were provided by Konstantin Sutorius, to whom I am deeply grateful. Since the level of preservation of the Russian manuscripts is unknown for me, the list does not show which parts of courses are extant in those manuscripts. The manuscripts used in this article are underlined. Later references to those courses will be indicated by the name of professor and the chronological order of the course. In those cases when I worked with two manuscripts of the same course (Iavors′kyĭ, Charnuts′kyĭ 1), the signature of the manuscript will be included.

[6] Kononovych-Horbatskyĭ: IM VNLU, fonds 303, 126, fol. 1–446v.

[7] Gizel′: IM VNLU, fonds 303, 128, fol. 1–678v.

[8] Krokovs′kyĭ 1: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 88, p. 1–754 – dialectic, logic (incomplete). 2) Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kyiv (CSHAK), fonds 222, catalogue 2, 18a, fol. 1–525v – full course; 3) The National Library of Russia (NLR) (St. Petersburg), fonds of Novgorod Theological Seminary, 6739.

[9] Krokovs′kyĭ 2: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 312, 617, fol. 1–398 – logic, physics, metaphysics; 2) CSHAK, fonds 222, catalogue 2, 18a, fol. 526–748 – dialectic, logic, physics (incomplete).

[10] Iavors′kyĭ: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 305, 152, fol. 1–585v – full course; 2) IM VNLU, fonds 312, 619, fol. I–XXVI and 1–161 – dialectic and logic; 3) IM VNLU, fonds 312, 618, fol. 1–309 – physics (incomplete); 4) IM VNLU, fonds 8, 60, fol. 2–576 – full course; 5) NLR, Fonds of St. Petersburg Theological Academy, БII/9; 6) NLR, fonds of Novgorod Theological Seminary, 6745.

[11] Kalachyns′kyĭ: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 620, fol. 1–191 – dialectic, logic (incomplete), physics (fragment); 2) The Library of the Russian Academy of Sciences (LRAS) (St. Petersburg), fonds of Arkhangel′sk Theological Seminary, 289.

[12] Unknown professor (ca. 1700): IM VNLU, fonds 301, Petrov′s catalogue, 42, fol. 1–616.

[13] Popovs′kyĭ: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 307, 442, vol. I, fol. 1–256v, vol. II, fol. 257–486v, vol. III, fol. 486–686v – full course; 2) IM VNLU, fonds 307, 443, vol. I, fol. 1–192v, vol. II, fol. 1–176, vol. III, fol. 1–155 – full course; 3) IM VNLU, fonds 312, 622, fol. 1–631 – full course; 4) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 150, fol. 149–597 – physics, metaphysics; 5) IM VNLU, fonds 312, 544, fol. 371–474 – physics (fragments), metaphysics; 6) LRAS, fonds of Arkhangel′sk Theological Seminary, 271.

[14] Charnuts′kyĭ 1: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 97, fol. 1–739 – full course; 2) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 98, fol. 1–825 – full course; 3) IM VNLU, fonds 312, 625, fol. 1–611 – full course; 4) IM VNLU, fonds 312, 624, fol. 1–322 – dialectic and logic; 5) LRAS, Q 140.

| 10. | Ilarion Iaroshevyts′kyĭ i Khrystofor Charnuts′kyĭ[15] | 1704/05–1705/06 | Iaroshevyts′kyĭ: dialectic, logic (fragment)[16]; Charnuts′kyĭ: logic, physics, metaphysics[17] |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11. | Teofan Prokopovych | 1707/08–1708/09 | logic[18], physics (incomplete), mathematics, ethics (fragment)[19] |
| 12. | Syl′vestr Pinovs′kyĭ | 1711/12–1712/13 | physics (incomplete), metaphysics[20] |
| 13. | Syl′vestr Pinovs′kyĭ | 1713/14–1714/15 | dialectic, logic[21] |
| 14. | Ĭosyf Volchans′kyĭ | 1715/16–1716/17 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics[22] |
| 15. | Ĭosyf Volchans′kyĭ | 1717/18–1718/19 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics[23] |
| 16. | Ilarion Levyts′kyĭ | 1719/20–1720/21 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics[24] |
| 17. | Platon Malynovs′kyĭ | 1721/22–1722/23 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics[25] |
| 18. | Ilarion Levyts′kyĭ | 1723/24–1724/25 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics[26] |

[15] The course was started by Ilarion Iaroshevyts′kyĭ, who taught dialectic and started logic. However, at the very beginning of logic (he had completed about one tenth of it), the professor died (see the note in IM VNLU, fonds 301, Petrov's catalogue, 564, fol. 79). Khrystofor Charnuts′kyĭ, who was the prefect at that time, finished the course after Iaroshevyts′kyĭ, teaching logic (from the very beginning), physics, and metaphysics.

[16] Iaroshevyts′kyĭ: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 301, Petrov's catalogue, 564, fol. 1–79 – dialectic, logic (beginning); 2) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 99, fol. 1–48 – dialectic; 3) IM VNLU, fonds 307, 444, fol. 1–54v – dialectic; 4) IM VNLU, fonds 312, 627, fol. 1–38v – dialectic.

[17] Charnuts′kyĭ 2: 1) <u>IM VNLU, fonds 306, 100, fol. 1–394v</u> – logic, physics, metaphysics; 2) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 99, fol. 50–254v – logic; 3) IM VNLU, fonds 312, 627, fol. 39–654v – logic, physics, metaphysics; 4) IM VNLU, fonds 312, 628, fol. 1–215v – physics (incomplete); 5) IM VNLU, fonds 307, 444, fol. 56–366 – logic, metaphysics; 6) IM VNLU, fonds 307, 445, fol. 9–528v – physics (incomplete), metaphysics (fragment); 7) IM VNLU, fonds 305, 156, fol. 65–258 – logic; 8) IM VNLU, fonds 305, 157, fol. 1–463v – physics and metaphysics; 9) IM VNLU, fonds 305, 158, fol. 2–503v – physics and metaphysics; 10) IM VNLU, fonds 305, 159, fol. 1–417v – physics, metaphysics (incomplete).

[18] Prokopovych included the traditional course of dialectic in the course on logic (the first four books).

[19] Prokopovych: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 301, Petrov's catalogue, 43, fol. 1–253v – logic (incomplete), physics (defected), mathematics, ethics (fragment); 2) <u>NLR, Fonds of St. Petersburg Theological Seminary, 64, fol. 1–175v; 224.</u> – logic, physics (incomplete), mathematics (fragment).

[20] Pynovs′kyĭ 1: IM VNLU, fonds 307, 446, fol. 65–400v – physics (incomplete) and metaphysics.

[21] Pynovs′kyĭ 2: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 307, 446, fol. 1–62 – dialectic; 2) <u>IM VNLU, fonds 306, 103, fol. 1–216</u> – dialectic and logic.

[22] Volchans′kyĭ 1: 1) <u>IM VNLU, fonds 306, 108, fol. 1–472 – full course</u>; 2) IM VNLU, fonds 301, Petrov's catalogue, 44, fol. 1–467v – full course.

[23] Volchans′kyĭ 2: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 305, 164, fol. 1–472 – full course; 2) IM VNLU, fonds 305, 165, fol. 1–364 – full course; 3) <u>IM VNLU, fonds 307, 447, vol. I, fol. 1–174v</u> – dialectic and logic; 4) IM VNLU, fonds 307, 450, vol. II, fol. 301–322 – metaphysics.

[24] Levyts′kyĭ 1: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 110, fol. 1–710 – full course; 2) <u>IM VNLU, fonds 306, 111, fol. 1–603 – full course</u>; 3) IM VNLU, fonds 307, 449, vol. I, fol. 1–224 and vol. II, fol. 1–300v – full course; 4) IM VNLU, fonds 301, Petrov's catalogue, 45, fol. 1–417v – dialectic, logic, physics.

[25] Malynovs′kyĭ: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 305, 166, fol. 1–448 – full course; 2) IM VNLU, fonds 307, 450, vol. I, fol. 1–210v; vol. II, fol. 1–300 – dialectic, logic, metaphysics, physics; 3) <u>IM VNLU, fonds 306, 115, fol. 1–264v</u> – dialectic, logic, metaphysics; 4) IM VNLU, fonds 307, 448, vol. II, fol. 1–260 – physics.

[26] Levyts′kyĭ 2: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 305, 167, fol. 1–473 – dialectic, logic, metaphysics (incomplete); 2) <u>IM VNLU, fonds 312, 631, fol. 1–663</u> – full course; 3) IM VNLU, fonds 307, 451, fol. 1–251 – dialectic, logic, physics (incomplete)

| 19. | Amvrosiĭ Dubnevych | 1725/26–1726/27 | dialectic, logic (incomplete), physics (incomplete)[27] |
|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | Amvrosiĭ Dubnevych | 1727/28–1728/29 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics[28] |
| 21. | Stefan Kalynovs'kyĭ | 1729/30–1730/31 | dialectic, logic, ethics (incomplete)[29] |
| 22 | Ieronim Mytkevych | 1733/34–1734/35 | dialectic, logic (incomplete)[30] |
| 23 | Syl'vestr Kuliabka | 1735/36–1736/37 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics (incomplete)[31] |
| 24 | Syl'vestr Kuliabka | 1737/38–1738/39 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics, ethics[32] |
| 25 | Mykhaĭlo Kozachyns'kyĭ | 1739/40–1740/41 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics, ethics[33] |
| 26 | Mykhaĭlo Kozachyns'kyĭ | 1741/42–1742/43 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics, ethics[34] |
| 27 | Mykhaĭlo Kozachyns'kyĭ | 1743/44–1744/45 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics, ethics[35] |
| 28 | Hedeon Slomyns'kyĭ | 1745/46–1746/47 | dialectic, logic[36] |
| 29 | Georgiĭ Konys'kyĭ | 1747/48–1748/49 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics, ethics[37] |
| 30 | Georgiĭ Konys'kyĭ | 1749/50–1750/51 | dialectic, logic, physics, metaphysics, ethics[38] |

---

and metaphysics; 4) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 117, fol. 4–476v – dialectic, logic, physics (incomplete), metaphysics (incomplete); 5) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 116, fol. 1–38v, 275–513 – dialectic, physics, metaphysics; 6) LRAS, Q 521.

[27] Dubnevych 1: IM VNLU, fonds 305, 200, fol. 277–528.

[28] Dubnevych 2: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 301, Petrov's catalogue, 49, fol. 1–535 – full course; 2) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 119, fol. 1–285v – dialectic and logic (incomplete); 3) IM VNLU, fonds 307, 452, fol. 1–425 – physics and metaphysics.

[29] Kalynovs'kyĭ: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 123, fol. 1–338 – dialectic, logic, ethics (unfinished); 2) IM VNLU, fonds 305, 169, fol. 1–32 – dialectic; 3) NLR, fonds of Novgorod Theological Seminary, 6745.

[30] Mytkevych: IM VNLU, fonds 305, 170, fol. 1–321 – dialectic and logic (incomplete); 2) LRAS, Q 563.

[31] Kuliabka 1: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 124, fol. 1–375 – dialectic, logic, metaphysics (incomplete); 2) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 125, fol. 2–422v – physics.

[32] Kuliabka 2: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 301, Petrov's catalogue, 50, fol. 1–820v – full course; 2) IM VNLU, fonds 305, 169, fol. 33–587v – logic, metaphysics, physics.

[33] Kozachyns'kyĭ 1: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 126, fol. 5–408v – dialectic, logic, ethics; 2) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 127, fol. 2–305v – full course.

[34] Kozachyns'kyĭ 2: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 306, 128, fol. 2–312 – dialectic, logic, metaphysics, physics; 2) IM VNLU, fonds 301, Liebiediev's catalogue, 331, fol. 1–237 – full course; 3) NLR, Fonds of St. Petersburg Theological Academy, 203.

[35] Kozachyns'kyĭ 3: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 301, Petrov's catalogue, 52, fol. 2–239 – full course; 2) IM VNLU. fonds 305, 171, fol. 1–274 – full course; 3) IM VNLU, fonds 305, 172, fol. 1–171v – dialectic, logic, ethics; 4) IM VNLU, fonds 305, 173, fol. 1–184 – physics.

[36] Slomyns'kyĭ: 1) Lobachevskiĭ Scientific Library (Kazan'), 1579 – dialectic and logic; 2) Russian State Library (RSL) (Moscow), fonds 183, 1875.

[37] Konys'kyĭ 1: RSL, fonds 152, 130.

[38] Konys'kyĭ 2: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 301, Petrov's catalogue, 51, c. 1a–334 – full course; 2) IM VNLU, fonds 312, 635, fol. I–Vv, 1–163v – dialectic, logic, ethics, physics; 3) IM VNLU, fonds 301, Petrov's catalogue, 565, fol. 2–104 – dialectic and logic; 4) NLR, Fonds of St. Petersburg Theological Academy, 202.

| 31. | Georgiĭ Shcherbats′kyĭ | 1751/52–1752/53 | logic, metaphysics, physics, ethics[39] |
|---|---|---|---|

The attributed sources described in Table 1 show an interesting time pattern. There are two courses from the first half of the seventeenth century (1639/40 and 1645/46–1646/47 academic years), when Petro Mohyla was still alive, and Kyiv belonged to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. After that there is a hiatus of almost forty years. It was the time of the Khmel′nyts′kyĭ Uprising (the Cossack-Polish War) and the prolonged state of chaos that contemporaries called "the Ruin." It is difficult to say whether the lack of surviving manuscripts is due to bad preservation of documents from that turbulent time or because philosophy was not taught at KMA at that time at all. After 1684, there are a good number of surviving manuscripts, and in the first half of the eighteenth century there are philosophical courses for almost every academic year.

At KMA, the course of philosophy continued for two academic years.[40] The course consisted of four parts: dialectic, logic, physics, and metaphysics. In 1737, besides these four, ethics entered the curriculum. The parts of the philosophical course differed in length and content. Dialectics was short (the course continued about one-two months); it contained the material of formal syllogistic logic and was structured according to mediaeval textbooks of logic (*summulae*). Logic continued about seven-eight months; it dealt only with some logical problems, but mostly contained metaphysical and epistemological material; it was structured according to the traditional order of books in Aristotle's *Organon*. Physics was the longest part of the philosophical course (lasting about nine-ten months); it contained material of the philosophy of nature, but also some science, such as physics, astronomy, and biology; it was structured according to the traditional order of Aristotle's books on natural philosophy. Metaphysics was the shortest part of the philosophical course (lasting about a month); it dealt with one main question: on being in general. Ethics considered different ethical questions and had a loose connection with the structure of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*. It varied significantly in length among different professors.

In the second half of the eighteenth century, KMA professors started to use standard textbooks, instead of creating their own course materials. Initially the textbook of the Cartesian Edmond Pourchot (Purchotius)[41] was used by Georgiĭ Shcherbats′kyĭ (1751/52–1752/53 a.y.); then the textbook of the Wolfian Johann Winckler by Davyd Nashchyns′kyĭ (1753/54–1754/55 a.y.);[42] and finally, in 1755, after some dispute between the prefect and philosophy professor Davyd Nashchyns′kyĭ and the Kyiv Metropolitan Tymofiĭ Shcherbats′kyĭ, the textbook of the Wolfian Friedrich Christian Baumeister was approved, and was routinely used at KMA up to first decades of the nineteenth century.[43]

Whereas Wolfian philosophy absolutely predominated at KMA in the second half of the eighteenth century, Jesuit philosophy reigned supreme in the first half of that century. Ever

---

[39] Shcherbatskyĭ: 1) IM VNLU, fonds 307, 454, fol. 1–183v – full course; 2) IM VNLU, fonds 305, 174, fol. 1–93v – logic (fragment), metaphysics, physics, ethics.

[40] There is only one exception: the philosophical course of Inokentiĭ Popovs′kyĭ, which was taught for three years (1699/1700–1700/1701–1701/02). Most probably it was the case because there was no professor who could take over philosophy from Popovs′kyĭ.

[41] Edmundus Purchotius, *Institutiones philosophicae ad faciliorem veterum ac recentiorum philosophorum lectionem comparatae, editio tertia locupletior* (Lugduni: Antonius Boudet, 1711).

[42] Johann Heinrich Winckler, *Institutiones philosophiae Wolfianae utriusque contemplativae et activae usibus academicis accomodatae* (Lipsiae, 1735).

[43] Friedrich Christianus Baumeister, *Institutiones Philosophiae Rationalis Methodo Wolfii Conscriptae* (Vitembergae, 1742).

since the course by Stefan Iavors′kyĭ (1691–93 a.y.), it is possible to notice a clear pattern of composition for most courses: different courses went through the same questions and often the answers to those questions were similar. However, the courses of different professors usually were textually different, and sometimes it is possible to find differences in philosophical positions among the professors. Looking at the positions of the Mohylian professors, it easy to notice the conceptions of a number of Jesuit philosophers: Francisco Suárez, Pedro Hurtado de Mendoza, Rodrigo de Arriaga, Francisco de Oviedo, Thomas Compton Carleton, Francisco Soares (Suárez Junior or Lusitanian Suárez, as he was called by the Mohylian professors), Adré Sémery, etc. The lack of unanimity in this group of philosophers and theologians was reflected in different positions of the Mohylian professors. A comparison of the Mohylian courses with those courses in Jesuit educational institutions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth has revealed significant similarities, which suggests that the Mohylian standard came from there.[44]

In the period when the Jesuit type of philosophy prevailed at KMA, there were two courses which differed from the general pattern by structure and content: the courses by Teofan Prokopovych (1707–09 a.y.) and Stefan Kalynovs′kyĭ (1729–31 a.y.). As was established by Mykola Fediaĭ, Kalynovs′kyĭ taught his course following the textbook by the French philosopher François le Rées.[45] It is unknown what Prokopovych's course was based on, but probably on Protestant philosophy. It is reasonable to suppose so from constant accusations against Prokopovych of pro-Protestant sympathies by his Mohylian colleagues and from his further actions later in life.[46]

The departure from Jesuit philosophy occurred in the 1740s. It is first noticeable in the philosophical courses taught by Mykhailo Kozachyns′kyĭ. He is the only professor who taught three philosophical courses at KMA. The first two courses fitted a traditional model very well, but the third one was different. It turned out that the third course (1743–45 a.y.) followed almost verbatim the textbook on philosophy composed by Gervasius Brisacensis, a Capuchin friar from Alsace, in which Scotistic tendencies are noticeable.[47]

After Kozachyns′kyĭ, Gedeon Slomyns′kyĭ taught philosophy in 1745–47 a.y. His course's content and structure are also significantly different from the traditional Mohylian pattern. As its title indicates the course is based on "very prominent authors, especially the most famous logician Bartholomäus Keckermann."[48] Bartholomäus Keckermann (1672–1609) was a Calvinist author who lived in Gdansk and was the author of several textbooks on logic.

---

[44] Symchych, Philosophia rationalis *u Kyievo-Mohylians′kiĭ akademiï*, 84, 89, 96–97.

[45] Kalynovs′kyĭ's course corresponds almost verbatim to *François le Rées' Cursus philosophicus*, which was published in four volumes and had several editions. As in Kyiv, only dialectics, logic, and a part of ethics is preserved, which corresponds to vol. 1 and the first part of vol. 2 of *Fraciscus le Rées, Cursus philosophicus in quatuor tomos distibutus, Editio secunda* (Parisiis: Matteaus Guillemot, 1648). The turn to a hardly known text of French origin is intriguing, because it shows a deviation from the Jesuit tradition in KMA. For although le Rées was a Catholic, he did not belong to any monastic order and did not directly support any school of scholastic philosophy.

[46] Andrey V. Ivanov, *A Spiritual Revolution: The Impact of Reformation and Enlightenment in Orthodox Russia* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2020), 56–121.

[47] Gervasius Brisacensis, also known as Gervasius von Breisach, born as Johann Martin Brunk (1648–1717) is known for his two textbooks: philosophy in three volumes (Gervasius Brisacensis, *Cursus philosophicus brevi et clara methodo in tres tomulos distributus* [Coloniae Agrippinae: Joannis Schlebusch, 1699]), initially printed in Solothurn, 1687; and theology in six volumes (Gervasius Brisacensis, *Cursus theologicus, brevi et clara methodo in tres partes et sex tomulos distributus.*, vol. Tomulus primus partis secundae De Deo et visione Dei… [Solodori: Petrus Josephus Bernhardus, 1689]). On Kozachyns′kyĭ's use of Gervasius Brisacensis' textbook see Symchych, Philosophia rationalis *u Kyievo-Mohylians′kiĭ akademiï*, 61.

[48] "[…] *celeberrimorum authorum commentationibus, in primis clarissimi logici Bartholomaei Keckermani, quo ad fieri potuit tritus.*" Slomyns′kyĭ, fol. 1.

However, Slomyns′kyĭ's course does not follow any of them. Most probably, he used a textbook of some of Keckermann's followers.

The next two courses were taught by Georgiĭ Konys′kyĭ. In the first one (1747–49 a.y.), he followed verbatim the course of Teofan Prokopovych.[49] In the second one (1749–51 a.y.), the influence of Prokopovych is still very significant, and some passages precisely correspond to Prokopovych. However, here Konys′kyĭ made some changes to Prokopovych's text, and sometimes even deviated from his philosophical position.[50]

Hence, in the 1740–50s, Mohylian teachers gradually stopped using the Jesuit type of philosophy and accepted Wolfianism. They also gradually moved away from the tradition of composing their own courses and accepted a standard textbook, which, probably, everyone could interpret in his own way orally. But before that moment, the originality of their courses was not always very genuine. Each professor had to compose his own course, which he later dictated to his students in class (different manuscripts of the same course are the result of this practice). However, he usually used the text of his predecessors in this process. In doing so, he introduced changes of a different level of complexity and conceptual gravity to the primary text. That is why, for the correct understanding of Mohylian courses, it is very important to find the primary sources and to analyse changes made to them. Table 2 describes what we currently know about the textual connections between the following courses of philosophy:

**Table 2: Textual connections between KMA courses on philosophy**

| Influencing | Depended |
|---|---|
| Iavors′kyĭ (1691–93) | Popovs′kyĭ (1699–1702) |
| | Unknown professor (ca 1700) |
| | Pinovs′kyĭ (1711–13) |
| | Levyts′kyĭ (1719–21) |
| | Levyts′kyĭ (1723–25) |
| Charnuts′kyĭ (1704–06) | Levyts′kyĭ (1719–21) |
| | Levyts′kyĭ (1723–25) |
| Malynovs′kyĭ (1721–23) | Mytkevych (1733–35) |
| Dubnevych (1725–27) | Kuliabka (1735–37) |
| | Kuliabka (1737–39) |

---

[49] The text of the first course of Konys′kyĭ is so close to Prokopovych that it was used for the critical edition of the introductory part of Prokopovych's course. See, Teofan Prokopovych, "*In universam philosophiam prooemium* / Vstup do zahal′noï filosofiï: krytychnyĭ tekst i pereklad," trans. Mykola Symchych, *Sententiae* 39, no. 1 (2020): 109–25, https://doi.org/10.31649/sent39.01.109.

[50] A very close connection between Prokopovych's course and the second course of Konys′kyĭ is visible from the treatise "*De infinitio*," a part of physics. For the comparative edition of that treatise, see Mykola Symchych, "Krytychne porivnial′ne vydannia tekstiv Teofana Prokopovycha i Heorhiia Konys′koho pro neskinchennist′ i ïkhnikh naiavnykh ukraïns′kykh perekladiv," *Sententiae* 38, no. 1 (2019): 41–121, https://doi.org/10.22240/sent38.01.041. For an analysis of the comparison, see Mykola Symchych, "Porivnial′nyĭ analiz filosofs′kykh kursiv Teofana Prokopovycha i Heorhiia Konys′koho na prykladi rozdilu "Pro neskinchennist′"," *Sententiae* 38, no. 1 (2019): 122–36, https://doi.org/10.22240/sent38.01.122. For an analysis of Prokopovych and Konys′kyĭ teachings on the soul, which shows that Konys′kyĭ departed from Prokopovych's scholastic interpretation of the soul and accepted some modern tendencies, see Iaroslava Stratiĭ, "Interpretatsiia dvokh modusiv zhyttia i vital′noho kharakteru piznannia u mohylians′kykh traktatakh *"De anima"* XVII–XVIII st.," in *Filosofs′ka dumka Ukraïny XI–XVIII st.: vid patrystyky do skholastyky* (Kyïv: Natsional′na akademiia nauk Ukraïny, 2021), 263–416.

| Dubnevych (1727–29) | Kozachyns′kyĭ (1739–41) |
|---|---|
| | Kozachyns′kyĭ (1741–43) |
| Prokopovych (1707–09) | Konys′kyĭ (1747–49) |
| | Konys′kyĭ (1749–51) |

The connection between the courses mentioned in Table 2 might vary from almost verbatim copying to retelling with substantial changes. Sometimes a Mohylian professor could use several courses as his primary sources. For example, Ilarion Levyts′kyĭ (in both courses) used the courses by Charnuts′kyĭ (1704–06 a.y.) and Iavors′kyĭ (1691–93 a.y). Moreover, there is a textual connection between Mohylian courses and courses from Polish Jesuit colleges. It is clear, for example, that the first Charnuts′kyĭ's course is textually connected to the course taught by Jerzi Gengell in Jarosław Jesuit College in 1690–93 a.y.[51] This connection is not surprising as in his text Charnuts′kyĭ calls Gengell his teacher and is highly appreciative of him.[52] All the mentioned connections between courses are important for the direct object of this article, the various interpretations of the note on languages.

## Words of a Language as Natural and Artificial Signs

The professors of KMA approached the question of languages mainly in the course on logic and, to a lesser extent, in dialectics. They dealt with it in the second part of logic in the context of the second operation of mind (*iuditio*). This part of the course was structurally connected to Aristotle's *De interpretatione*. However, as the main material of *De interpretatione* was already set forth in dialectics, in logic the chapter *De secunda mentis operatione* is quite short.[53] Here only a short list of questions was considered, centred around two topics: the nature of semiotic systems and the truth of propositions. Among others, the following topics were treated: What is a sign? What kinds of signs can exist? What are the properties of linguistic signs (i.e., words)? What do words signify: concepts or things? What is the formal truth of propositions? Can a proposition change from true to false and back? Can propositions about future contingent events be definitely true or false? The discussion of the above-mentioned questions is in all Mohylian courses, except the course by Prokopovych and those of Konys′kyĭ which depended on him, where the question of signs was not taught.[54]

Considering the question of signs, the professors of KMA mention very different divisions of signs. Among them, the most important is the division into natural (*signum naturale*) and conventional signs (*signum ad placitum* or *signum per conventionem*). Natural signs, as the name implies, are formed by the nature and exist independently of human traditions and conventions. For instance, smoke is a sign of fire, a cough of a cold, a moan of pain, etc. A conventional sign, on the other hand, is culturally related. According to a standard Mohylian example, ivy growing next to the door of a house signals that wine is sold in the house.

---

[51] There are two manuscripts of Gengell's course in IM VNLU: fonds 1, 4406 (dialectic and logic) and fonds 1, 4408 (metaphysics and dialectic).

[52] "*Meus in philosophicis professor R*[everendus] *P*[ater] *Georgius Gengell, vir sublimitate ingenii, sollemnitate doctrinae Polonae Provinciae theologus non postremus.*" (Charnuts′kyĭ 1, fonds 312, 625, fol. 97)

[53] According to the scholastic tradition, the Mohylians accepted three operations of the mind (*tres operationes mentis / intellectus*): the first is a term (*terminus*), the second a proposition/judgment (*propositio/iuditio*), the third a syllogism.

[54] The treatise on signs is also absent in courses Kalachyns′kyĭ, Dubnevych 1 and Mytkevych, since those courses are not preserved in full, and the corresponding parts are lost.

Certainly, this sign has a significant cultural background connected to the ancient god Dionysus, the god of wine and fertility, and is not intuitively understandable to people from other cultures. It is even not known for certain whether this sign was grasped in the Ukrainian culture of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It might well be that the Mohylians just retranslated this example from courses of Western scholastics.

The division of signs into natural and conventional had a long tradition, which went back to St. Augustine. In *De Doctrina Christiana*, Augustine makes a distinction between natural and given signs (*signa naturalia et signa data*).[55] This division was later accepted in scholastic philosophy. However, while the naming of "a natural sign" was preserved, "a given sign" (*signum datum*) was renamed *"signum ad placitum."* The phrase *"ad placitum"* can be translated as "for convenience," but probably a more correct translation is "by convention." We cannot exclude the possibility that the Latin phrase has both meaning: a conventional sign exists because of a convention, in a very broad sense, among people, and is used for convenience of those who use it. In the courses of the KMA professors, other synonymic phrases with *placitum* are used as well: *ex placito, iuxta placitum*, just *placito* (Ablativus) or *ex bene placito hominum.*

The division of signs into natural and conventional is important for the explanation of various types of signs, including language signs (words of a language). In this connection, Mohylian professors, as well as other scholastic philosophers, raised the question of whether words of different languages are natural or conventional signs. Among the main scholastic authorities of the sixteenth—eighteenth centuries, there is almost an absolute consensus on the answer to this question: words are conventional signs. Their courses differ only in how much attention is paid to this question: some philosophers devote entire treatises to this topic,[56] and some, just a few sentences.[57] Yet even a short mention is enough to completely reveal their position. That fact they spend so little time on this issue suggests that it was not then considered to be of interest; it was settled in favour of the conventional theory of language. It is possible to suppose that such unanimity among scholastics is connected to the position of Aristotle, who clearly says that names have their meaning not naturally but by convention (*De interp.* 16a19–28). However, the background for the dispute was already formed by Plato. In *Cratylus*, Plato puts a question whether language signs are natural or conventional. The two heroes of the dialogue take opposite positions: Hermogenes defends a

---

[55] *De doctr. christ.*, II, 1, 2.

[56] This question is set out in detail in courses by Arriaga, Lynch, John of St. Thomas, Sémery, Soares, Śmiglecki. See Rodericus de Arriaga, *Cursus Philosophicus, Iam Noviter Maxima Ex Parte Actus, et Illustratus, et a Variis Obiectionibus Liberatus, Necnon a Mendis Expurgatus* (Lugduni: Ioannes Antonius Huguetan et Guillielmus Barbier, 1669), 215–16. (Logica, Disp. 8, Sec. 1, Subsec. 3); Richardus Lynceus, *Universa philosophia scholastica*, vol. Tomus primus (Lugduni: Philippus Borde etal., 1654), 207–16. (Logica, Libr. 6, Tra*c*. 2); *Joannes de st. Thoma, Cursus philosophicus Thomisticus, Nova editio ad Lugdunensem anni 1663 accuratissime expressa* (Parisiis: Ludovicus Vives, 1883), 624–31. (Logica, Pars 2, Quaest. 22, Art. 5); Andreas Semery, *Trienium philosophicum, Secunda hac editione ab Authore recognitum et auctum* (Romae: Felix Caesaretti, 1682), 646–50. (Logica, Disp. 5, Quest. 1, Art. 2); Fraciscus Soares, *Cursus philosophicus in quatuor tomos distributus*, vol. Tomus primus (Conimbrigae: Paulus Craesbeeck, 1651), 211–13. ((Logica, Tract. 6, Disp. 5, §6); Martinus Smiglecius, *Logica*, vol. Pars altera (Ingolstadii: Elisabetha Angermaria, 1618), 9–10. (Disp. 12, Quaest. 2).

[57] Petrus Hurtado de Mendoza, *Universa philosophia* (Lugduni: Ludovicus Prost, 1624), 107 (Logica, Disp. 8, Sec. 1); Thomas Comptonus Carleton, *Philosophia universa* (Antverpiae: Iacobus Mauresius, 1649), 157 (Logica, Disp. 42, Sec. 1. III); Bartholomaeus Mastrius and Bonaventura Belluti, *Philosophiae ad mentem Scoti cursus integer, Editio novissima a mendis, quae prius irrepserant, expurgata*, vol. Tomus primus (Venetiis: Nicolaum Pezzana, 1757), 3. (Dialectica, Tract. 1, Cap. 2).

conventionalist position and Cratylus, the naturalistic one. Socrates' position, through whom Plato speaks, criticizes and partially reconciliates both positions.[58]

Some KMA professors solved this problem in a way that was standard for early modern scholasticism, i.e., they supported the theory of conventionality. According to the standard procedure, they defended their position with clear arguments, then put forward counterarguments and refuted them. Early Mohylian professors (Ĭosyf Kononovych-Horbats'kyĭ, Inokentiĭ Gizel', Ĭoasaf Krokovs'kyĭ) certainly dealt with the question in this way.[59] For example, after discussing all the subtleties of the question, Inokentiĭ Gizel' briefly summarized his position: "We conclude that human words signify things and objective concepts by convention."[60] Ĭoasaf Krokovs'kyĭ clarified this stance by adding the phrase: "by convention of free human institutions."[61] In essence, a word in a particular human language has its meaning solely because people decided what the word should mean due to their free will.

However, in philosophy courses influenced by Polish Jesuit tradition—from Stefan Iavors'kyĭ (1691–93) to Mykhaĭlo Kozachyns'kyĭ (1741–43)—the solution of the problem is somewhat different.[62] These professors agreed that words in contemporary languages have their meanings by human convention. But, as they pointed out, this was not always the case, since the very first language had its meaning due to divine institution. Stefan Iavors'kyĭ formulated his opinion on the matter in this way: "The articulated words of the first languages have their signification not from human institution, but divine."[63] This position was echoed by almost all professors of the above-mentioned period.[64] It must be noted that in Iavors'kyĭ's thesis, the term "*vox*," which can be translated here as "word," has a prime meaning of "voice"—a meaning that, to some extent, was already present in scholastic usage. So, Iavors'kyĭ used the phrase "articulated word" (*vox articulata*) to indicate that he meant a word as an element of language. He agreed with Gizel' that some of the sounds produced by man (sighs, coughs, groans) are natural sounds. If so, then a cough signifies a cold, a sigh sadness, etc. The second detail present in Iavors'kyĭ's thesis—the notion of the first languages—is especially interesting and brings us to the question of how languages were classified in Mohylian philosophy courses, which is of direct import to the note on languages that is the object of this article.

According to the Mohylians who supported the divine origin of language, God charged Adam with giving names to all animated souls, as the Bible says (Gen. 2:19).[65] The first language was Hebraic. Afterwards, during the building of the Tower of Babel, God confused people's tongues and from the original Hebrew there emerged 72 languages—the very same number as the descendants of Noah [= 15 for Japhet's, 30 for Ham's, 27 for Shem's] (Gen. 10)

---

[58] Modern researchers still cannot reach agreement how Plato's position must be understood: as a mild semiotic naturalism or to some extent conventionalism. See D. N. Sedley, "Plato's Cratylus," *Cambridge Studies in the Dialogues of Plato* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

[59] Kononovych-Horbats'kyĭ, fol. 319v; Gizel', fol. 124v; Krokovs'kyĭ 1, c. 755; Krokovs'kyĭ 2, fol. 121.

[60] "*Concludimus, quod voces humanae ex placito signficant res et conceptus obiectivos.*" Gizel', fol. 124v.

[61] "[...] *ad placitum ex liber hominum institutione.*" Krokovs'kyĭ 1, p. 755.

[62] As we will see below, among this group, there are several which resolve the issue in the traditional way: the course by Kalynovsky and both courses by Kuliabka.

[63] "*Voces articulatae linguarum primarium habent significationem non ex institutione humana, sed divina.*" Iavors'kyĭ (fonds 8, 60), fol. 150v.

[64] Unknown professor (fonds 301, Petrov's catalogue, 42), fol. 215; Popovs'kyĭ, fol. 188; Charnuts'kyĭ 1, fonds 312, 625, fol. 235v; Charnuts'kyĭ 2, fol. 104v; Pinovs'kyĭ, fol. 200; Volchans'kyĭ 1, fol. 162; Volchans'kyĭ 2, fol. 156v; Levyts'kyĭ 1, fol. 246; Malynovs'syĭ, fol. 197; Levyts'kyĭ 2, fol. 221v; Dubnevych 2, fol. 233v–234; Kozachyns'kyĭ 1, fol. 277; Kozachyns'kyĭ 2, fol. 118v.

[65] "[...] *omne enim quod vocavit Adam animae viventis, ipsum est nomen eius*" (Vulgata Clementina).

and the apostles sent by Jesus to convert different nations (Luke 10:1). Since the words in all those languages emerged due to God's will, they also had their meanings by divine institution. The Mohylians did not typically mention all 72 primal languages. Instead, they named only some of them, and from these primal languages they went on to deduce the genealogy of the other ones. The note on languages cited at the beginning of this article is devoted precisely to this topic.

Here it may be useful to discuss the origins of the theory supported by most Mohylians. Although Stefan Iavors′kyĭ claimed that his thesis (*conclusio*) on the primary languages was confirmed by the whole Patristic tradition,[66] in fact, it depended on the work of one Church Father in particular, namely, St. Augustine of Hippo. The first place where the Mohylian teaching about the primary languages depends on this Latin Church Father concerns the very number of languages. This proposition derives from *The City of God,* in which Augustine counted the number of Noah's descendants as 72, or, more precisely, 72 families or nations which had separate languages.[67] The Mohylians mentioning this number refer specifically to Augustine of Hippo.[68]

The same thing applies for the notion of first languages. Unlike Iavors′kyĭ, Khrystofor Charnuts′kyĭ and Ilarion Levyts′kyĭ gave a much more precise reference to their source for this idea: Book 8, Chapter 16 of St. Augustine's *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*.[69] In that work, St. Augustine turns to the question of how Adam and Eve were able to understand God's commandment when there was no language at that time. The Bishop of Hippo answers: it was not a problem for God to teach our forefathers the language, i.e., God implanted the knowledge of language in Adam and Eve. Hence, it seems that the theory of the divine origin of language also belonged to Augustine of Hippo.

However, if we look at the same work of St. Augustine and read a bit further (lib. 9, cap. 12, nom. 20), we can see that the Latin Church Father could also argue in support of the opposite conclusion.[70] In this section of his commentary on Genesis, Augustine raised the question of how to understand the biblical passage describing the way man gave names to different animals. People call animals by different names according to various languages on the Earth. Once there was one language that, after the Tower of Babel, was divided into many: "But is it possible to believe that in that language the names of fish were given not by man, but by God and man learned them from God's teaching?" And the situation is similar for other animals. So, it seems that St. Augustine considered that Adam gave names deliberately; they did not come from divine institution.

---

[66] "*ita communis SS. Patrum tradition*" Iavors′kyĭ, fonds 8, 60, fol. 150v.

[67] "Ex illis igitur tribus hominibus, Noe filiis, septuaginta tres, uel potius, ut ratio declaratura est, septuaginta duae gentes totidemque linguae per terras esse coeperunt, quae crescendo et insulas impleuerunt. Auctus est autem numerus gentium multo amplius quam linguarum. Nam et in Africa barbaras gentes in una lingua plurimas nouimus." *De civitate Dei*, lib. 16, cap. 6, in *S. Aurelii Augustini OPERA OMNIA*, accessed November 23, 2022, https://www.augustinus.it/latino/cdd/index2.htm.

[68] Charnuts′kyĭ, fonds 312, 625, fol. 235v.

[69] Charnuts′kyĭ refers to book eight of St. Augustine's commentary on Genesis in both his courses. However, in the first course says: "*Ita S. Augustinus lib. 8vo De Genesi cap. 26to.*" The same is written in different manuscripts of the course (fonds 312, 625, fol. 235 and fonds 306, 97, fol. 252). The second course says: "*ita Santus Augustinus, libro 8vo De Genesi, cap 16*" (Charnuts′kyĭ 2, fol. 104v). Levyts′kyĭ also refers to the 16th chapter of Book 8 (Levyts′kyĭ 1, fol. 246). For the original Latin text, see "*De Genesi ad Litteram libri duodecim,*" in *S. Aurelii Augustini OPERA OMNIA*, accessed November 23, 2022 https://www.augustinus.it/latino/genesi_lettera/genesi_lettera_08.htm.

[70] For the text of the commentary on Gen. 9, 12, 20, see *S. Aurelii Augustini OPERA OMNIA*, accessed November 23, 2022, https://www.augustinus.it/latino/genesi_lettera/genesi_lettera_09.htm.

Although St. Augustine's position on the divine origin of languages might be ambiguous, in the Middle Ages, certainly, there were theologians who strongly supported it. Galina Vdovina, who studied semiotics in early-modern scholastics, cites a place from the commentary on Genesis by the medieval Franciscan theologian Peter John Olivi (1247/48–1298), where he clearly claims that the Hebrew language was given by God. Moreover, the researcher adds that many medieval authors supported this theory.[71] However, it seems improbable that the professors of KMA used the commentaries by Olivi or any other medieval theologians.

## The Note on Language Classification

In his first course on philosophy, Khrystofor Charnuts′kyĭ, saying that the Hebrew language was the mother of all languages, makes a passing reference to "Genebrard" and "Cornelius de Lapide."[72] The KMA professor meant, of course, Gilbert Génébrard (1535–1597), the French Benedictine author of commentaries on various Bible books, in particular the famous *Chronographiae libri IV* (1580), and Cornelius a Lapide, original name Cornelis Cornelissen van den Steen (1567–1637), a Flemish Jesuit exegete and author of commentaries on almost all Bible books, including the Pentateuch (1616). It was Génébrard who in his *Chronographia* included a note about the classification of languages;[73] and a Lapide who cited in his commentary.[74] As we know, Génébrard's text was cited by other early-modern commentaries on Genesis, including Benedicto Pereira.[75] And, as Valukenko discovered, it was also cited by the Mohylians.[76]

It must be pointed out, however, that the note on languages is included only in those philosophy courses that supported the divine origin of the primary language,[77] rather than in all of them. For the sake of clarity, the list of those courses is represented in Table 3. Note that the eleven courses that have the note on language classification are in bold. The last column indicates the position of the professor on the question of language origin: 1) *ad placitum* – all

---

[71] G. V. Vdovina, *Iazyk neochevidnogo: Uchenie o znakakh v skholastike XVII v., Bibliotheca Ignatiana - Nauka* (Moscow: Institut filosofii, teologii i istorii sv. Fomy, 2009), 269–70.

[72] Charnuts′kyĭ, fonds 312, 625, fol. 235v.

[73] Gilbertus Genebrardus, *Chronographiae libri quatuor* (Parisiis: Martinus Iuvenes, 1580), 12: "*Hebraica genitrix Syriacae, Arabicae etc.; Latina Italicae, Valachicae, Gallicae et Hispanicae; Graeca Doricae, Ionicae, Aeolicae, Atticae; Slavonica Polonicae, Boëmicae, Moschoviticae etc.; Germanica Helveticae, Anglicae, Flandricae etc.; Tartarica Turciae, Sarmacanicae etc.; Abyssina Aethiopicae, Sabeae etc.*"

[74] Cornelius a Lapide, *Commentarius in Pentateuchum Moysis*, Secunda editio (Venetii: Hieronymus Albritius, 1717), 110. (Genesis, cap. 11).

[75] Benedictus Pererius, *Commentarii et disputationes in Genesim*, vol. 2 (Lugduni: Ex officina iuntarum, 1598). p. 528. (Lib. 16, Disp. 10.) The authoritative philosophical courses of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries do not usually have this kind of note; an exception is the eighteenth-century Bavarian Jesuit Anton Meyer. See Antonius Mayr, *Philosophia peripatetica aniquorum principiis et recentiorum experimentis conformata*, vol. Tomus 1 (Ingolstadii, 1739), 359. (Pars 1, Disp. 5, Quaest. 1, Art. 3). However, Mayer's classification differs significantly from both those of Génébrard and the Mohylians. Unlike the Mohylians, Mayer clearly supported the conventional theory of language.

[76] A copy of a Lapide's commentary on the Pentateuch (now in the Vernads′kyĭ National Library of Ukraine) was once held in the library of Ĭoasaf Krokovs′kyĭ, the Archimandrite of Kyivan Caves Monastery. And it is very probable that Iavors′kyĭ could have used the books that belonged to Krokovs′kyĭ. Wakulenko, "Sprachklassifikationen in den ukrainischen handschriftlichen Logikkursen vom Ende des 17. bis zum ersten Drittel des 18. Jahrhunderts," *op. cit.*, 119.

[77] Iavors′kyĭ, fonds 8, 60, fol. 150v; Unknown professor (Petrov's catalogue, 42), fol. 215; Popovs′kyĭ, fol. 188; Charnuts′kyĭ 1, fonds 312, 625, fol. 235v; Charnuts′kyĭ 2, fol. 103v; Pynovs′kyĭ, fol. 200; Levyts′kyĭ 1, fol. 246; Levyts′kyĭ 2, fol. 221v–222; Dubnevych 2, fol. 234; Kozachyns′kyĭ 1, fol. 277–277v; Kozachyns′kyĭ 2, fol. 118v.

languages are conventional; 2) *divino instituto/ad placitum* – the first language is instituted by God, but later languages are conventional. An empty line shows either that this course (or a part of it) is not preserved or the professor did not teach on languages. The blue arrows indicate the textual dependence of courses.

**Table 3: KMA Philosophy courses with a chapter about signs (languages)**

| ¤ | | Professor¤ | Academic·years¤ | ¤ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.→¤ | | Ĭosyf·Kononovych-Horbatskyĭ¤ | 1639/40¤ | ad·placitum¤ |
| 2.→¤ | | Inokentiĭ·Gizel'¤ | 1645/46-1646/47¤ | ad·placitum¤ |
| 3.→¤ | | Ĭoasaf·Krokovs'kyĭ¤ | 1684/85-1685/86¤ | ad·plactitum¤ |
| 4.→¤ | | Ĭoasaf·Krokovs'kyĭ¤ | 1686/87-1687/88¤ | ad·plactitum¤ |
| 5.→¤ | | **Stefan·Iavors'kyĭ** | 1691/92-1692/93¤ | divinito·instituto/ad·placitum¤ |
| 6.→¤ | | ¤ | ¤ | ¤ |
| 7.→¤ | | **Unknown·professor¤** | ca·1700¤ | divinito·instituto/ad·placitum¤ |
| 8.→¤ | | **Inokentiĭ·Popovs'kyĭ¤** | 1699/1700-1701/02¤ | divinito·instituto/ad·placitum¤ |
| 9.→¤ | | **Khrystofor·Charnuts'kyĭ¤** | 1702/03-1703/04¤ | divinito·instituto/ad·placitum¤ |
| 10.»¤ | | **Khrystofor·Charnuts'kyĭ¤** | 1704/05-1705/06¤ | divinito·instituto/ad·placitum¤ |
| 11.»¤ | | ¤ | ¤ | ¤ |
| 12.»¤ | | ¤ | ¤ | ¤ |
| 13.»¤ | | **Syl'vestr·Pinovs'kyĭ¤** | 1713/14-1714/15¤ | divinito·instituto/ad·placitum¤ |
| 14.»¤ | | Ĭosyf·Volchans'kyĭ¤ | 1715/16-1716/17¤ | divinito·instituto/ad·placitum¤ |
| 15.»¤ | | Ĭosyf·Volchans'kyĭ¤ | 1717/18-1718/19¤ | divinito·instituto/ad·placitum¤ |
| 16.»¤ | | **Ilarion·Levyts'kyĭ¤** | 1719/20-1720/21¤ | divinito·instituto/ad·placitum¤ |
| 17.»¤ | | Platon·Malynovs'kyĭ¤ | 1721/22-1722/23¤ | divinito·instituto/ad·placitum¤ |
| 18.»¤ | | **Ilarion·Levyts'kyĭ¤** | 1723/24-1724/25¤ | divinito·instituto/ad·placitum¤ |
| 19.»¤ | | ¤ | ¤ | ¤ |
| 20.»¤ | | **Amvrosiĭ·Dubnevych¤** | 1727/28-1728/29¤ | divinito·instituto/ad·placitum¤ |
| 21.»¤ | | Stefan·Kalynovskyĭ·¤ | 1729/30-1730/31¤ | ad·placitum¤ |
| 22.»¤ | | ¤ | ¤ | ¤ |
| 23.»¤ | | Syl'vestr·Kuliabka·¤ | 1735/36-1736/37¤ | ad·placitum¤ |
| 24.»¤ | | Syl'vestr·Kuliabka·¤ | 1737/38-1738/39¤ | ad·placitum¤ |
| 25.»¤ | | **Mykhaĭlo·Kozachyns'kyĭ·¤** | 1739/40-1740/41¤ | divinito·instituto/ad·placitum¤ |
| 26.»¤ | | **Mykhaĭlo·Kozachyns'kyĭ·¤** | 1741/42-1742/43¤ | divinito·instituto/ad·placitum¤ |
| 27.»¤ | | Mykhaĭlo·Kozachyns'kyĭ·¤ | 1743/44-1744/45¤ | ad·placitum¤ |
| 28.»¤ | | Hedeon·Slomyns'kyĭ·¤ | 1745/46-1746/47¤ | ad·placitum¤ |
| 29.»¤ | | ¤ | ¤ | ¤ |
| 30.»¤ | | ¤ | ¤ | ¤ |

Note that five arrows in Table 3 go to Row 5 (Iavors'kyĭ): from row 7 (Unknown professor), row 8 (Popovs'kyi), row 13 (Pinovs'kyĭ), row 16 and row 18 (both Levyts'kyĭ); one arrow goes from row 10 to row 9 (both Charnuts'kyĭ); and two arrows from rows 25 and 26 (both Kozachyns'kyĭ) to row 20 (Dubnevych).

As Table 3 demonstrates, Stefan Iavors'kyĭ was the first KMA professor who included this note in his philosophy course. However, as we can see from a side-by-side comparison (Table 4), Iavors'kyĭ's version of the classification of languages differed significantly from Génébrard's:[78]

---

[78] Genebrardus, *Chronographiae libri quatuor*, 12.

## Table 4: Note on Classification of Languages

| Génébrard | Iavors′kyĭ[79] |
|---|---|
| *Hebraica genitrix Syriacae, Arabicae etc.* <br><br> *Latina Italicae, Valachicae, Gallicae et Hispanicae,* <br><br> *Graeca Doricae, Ionicae, Aeolicae, Atticae;* <br><br> *Slavonica Polonicae, Boëmicae, Moschoviticae etc.;* <br><br> *Germanica Helveticae, Anglicae, Flandricae etc.;* <br><br> *Tartarica Turciae, Sarmacanicae etc.* <br><br> *Abyssina Aethiopicae, Sabeae etc.* | *Sic Haebraica lingua matrix est et genitrix Siriacae, Chaldaicae, Arabicae;* <br><br> *Graeca lingua matrix est Doricae, Jonicae, Aeolicae, Atticae;* <br><br> *Latina matrix est Italicae, Valachicae, Galicae, Hispanicae;* <br><br> *Sclavonica lingua matrix est Polonicae, Bohemicae, **Moravicae, Bolgaricae, Moldavicae, Lithuanicae**, Moschoviticae;* <br><br> *Germanica – Helveticae, **Saxonicae**, Anglicae, **Scoticae, Sueticae**, Belhicae;* <br><br> *Tartarica – Turcicae, Sarzamenicae etc, etc.*[80] |

As Table 4 demonstrates, Iavors′kyĭ made no changes to the Greek and Latin groups. But he not only left out an entire group of languages (Abyssinian), but also made additions to several other groups. Specifically, he added Chaldaic to the Hebraic group of languages (Semitic according to the contemporary classification). Most of the changes, however, were reserved for to the German and Slavic groups. Both authors have English and Helvetic (i.e. Swiss) in the German group; but Iavors′kyĭ also added Saxonian, Scottish (*Scotica*, presumably Lowland Scottish, since Gaelic belongs to the Celtic languages), and Swedish (*Suetica*), so that now all three of these languages are considered as dialects of German. Finally, he renamed Génébrard's Flemish, deciding to call it *Belhica*, rather than *Flandrica*. It should be noted that in both Iavors′kyĭ's manuscripts the latter is spelled as *Belhica*, not *Belgica*, casting the light on that phoneme pronunciation in Ukraine in the seventeenth century.

But Iavors′kyĭ reserved his most significant changes for the Slavic language group. In fact, his additions nearly doubled Génébrard's list. To complement the two West Slavic languages on the original list (Polish and Czech), Iavors′kyĭ added Moravian (*Moravica*), a dialect of Czech. He also added Bulgarian, which represents South Slavic languages, completely omitted by Génébrard. However, the most interesting development was his decision to include two non-Slavic languages: Moldavian (*Moldavica*) and Lithuanian (*Lithuanica*). As is well known, Moldavian is a variety of the Romanian language and belongs to the Romance languages. Moreover, both Génébrard and Iavors′kyĭ reasonably include Wallachian, the language of the southern Romanian principality, to the list of languages that derive from Latin. Indeed, because of a substantial influence of neighboring Slavic countries and the Orthodox faith, Romanian was highly Slavicized. But were the languages of Moldova and Wallachia so different? It is possible to suppose that from his personal experience, Iavors′kyĭ considered the language of Moldova as Slavonic. This might be because Moldavian-speakers used Church-Slavonic in their liturgical tradition. Probably, he did not know much about Wallachia and therefore trusted Génébrard or some other authoritative sources. The Lithuanian

---

[79] Iavors′kyĭ, fonds 8, 60, fol. 150v and fonds 305, 152, fol. 164v.
[80] Iavors′kyĭ, fonds 8, 60, fol. 150v and 152, fol. 164v.

language, however, cannot possibly belong to the Slavic group, since, according to the contemporary classification it is part of the Baltic family of languages. Most likely by *"lingua Lithuanica"* Iavors'kyĭ meant not Lithuanian, but Belarusian, i.e., the Slavic language of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

Comparing Iavors'kyĭ's text to that of Génébrard suggests that that *Chronographia* was not, in fact, the direct source of Iavors'kyĭ's note. It is more likely that Iavors'kyĭ used someone else's interpretation of Génébrard. But, at the moment, we do not know who that might have been. There is, however, one seventeenth-century western author who compiled a list of Slavic languages that included both Lithuanian and Moldavian languages. In the introduction to his *Thesaurus Polyglottus*, a multilingual dictionary containing dozens of languages, Heronym Megiser inserted a series of tables showing different languages families (mostly European, but also some Asiatic). I want to cite his Slavic table in full, preserving text formatting:

> *Sclavonica seu Illyrica lingua longe lateque patet per Europam et Asiam. Cujus Dialectici potissimum hae sunt:*
> *Dalmatica: Epidauriorum seu Ragusaeorum: Iaderensium, Arbensium, Epirotatum hodierna: Macedonum mediterraneorum.*
> *Serviorum vel Soraborum.*
> *Bessorum vel Bosnensium.*
> *Bulgarorum seu Rasciorum.*
> *Moldavorum, Mysiorum, Gepedum.*
> *Transylvanorum.*
> *Croatica, Istrianorum, Carsorum, Jazygum, Illyriorum.*
> *Besiatica, qua propria est Sclavorum Hungariae conterminorum.*
> *Carnorum, Carniolanorum, Iapygum, Goritiensium, Forojuliensium.*
> *Carinthorum, Ciliensium.*
> *Bohemica, Moravorum seu Marcomanorum, Silensiorum partis.*
> *Lusatica.*
> *Polonica, Podoliorum, Plescoviensium, Sarmatica.*
> *Lithuanica, Iaczvingerorum, Samogitarum.*
> *Livonica, Osnensium, Curorum, Culmiorum.*
> *Vandalica, Rugiorum, Cassubiorum, Pomeranica, Obotritarum, seu Meckelburgensium, Prussica seu Prutenica.*
> *Moscovitica, Hamaxoviorum.*
> *Ruthenica.*
> *Circassiorum, Gazarorum vel Abgezerorum, Mengreliorum.*

As we can see, Megiser's list of languages is much more extensive than the usual Mohylian one. But there is no evidence that either Iavors'kyĭ or any other Mohylian professor used Mesier's very impressive book.[81]

Although we do not know who influenced Iavors'kyĭ, we know for sure that Iavors'kyĭ himself influenced many Mohylian professors. We can check this additionally in the note on languages. As we can see from the following table (Table 5), this place is almost identical in five philosophy courses taught at KMA:

---

[81] Hieronymus Megiserus, *Thesaurus Polyglottus Vel Dictionarium Multilingue Ex Quadringentis Circiter Tam Veteris, Quam Novi (Vel Potius Antiquis Incogniti) Orbis Nationum Linguis, Dialectis, Idiomatibus Idiotismis Constans* (Francofurti ad Moenum, 1603), Tabula quinta. I am grateful to one of the anonymous reviewers from *Vivliofika* about the reference to Megiser's work.

## Table 5: Note on Classification of Languages at the KMA

| Iavors'kyĭ[82] | Unknown professor[83] | Popovs'kyĭ[84] | Pinovs'kyĭ[85] | Levyts'kyĭ 1[86] | Levyts'kyĭ 2[87] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Sic Haebraica lingua matrix est et genitrix Siriacae, Chaldaicae, Arabicae;* | *Sic Haebraica lingua matrix est Siriacae, Chaldaicae, Arabicae;* | *Sic Hebraica lingua matrix est et genitrix Siriacae, Chaldaicae, Arabicae;* | *Sic Haebraica lingua matrix est Siriacae, Chaldaicae, Arabicae;* | *Haebraica lingua matrix et genitrix est Syriacae, Chaldaicae, Arabicae;* | *Hinc lingua Haebraica matrix est Syricae, Chaldaicae, Arabicae;* |
| *Graeca lingua matrix est Doricae, Ionicae, Eolicae, Atticae;* | *Graeca lingua matrix est Doricae, Ionicae, Eonicae, Atticae;* | *Graeca lingua matrix est Doricae, Ionicae, Eotricae, Atticae;* | *Graeca lingua matrix est Doricae, Ionicae, Eolicae, Atticae;* | *Graeca lingua matrix est Doricae, Ionicae, Eonicae, Atticae;* | *Graeca lingua matrix est Doricae, Ionicae, Aeonicae, Atticae;* |
| *Latina matrix est Italicae, Valachicae, Galicae, Hispanicae;* | *Latina lingua matrix est Italicae, Valachicae, Gallicae, Hispanicae;* | *Latina matrix est Valaticae, Italiae [sic], Gallicae, Hyspaniae [sic];* | *Latina lingua genitrix est Italicae, Valachiae [sic], Galiae [sic], Hispaniae [sic];* | *Latina lingua matrix est Italicae, Valachicae, Gallicae, Hyspanicae;* | *Latina lingua genetrix est Italicae, Valachicae, Gallicae, Hispanicae;* |
| *Sclavonica[88] lingua matrix est Polonicae, Bohemicae,[89] Moravicae,[90] Bolgaricae, Moldavicae,[91]* | *Sclavonica lingua est matrix Polonicae, Bohemicae, Moralicae, Volgaricae,* | *Sclavonica lingua matrix est Polinicae, Bohemicae, Moraviae [sic], Bolgaratae,* | *Sclavonica lingua matrix est Polonicae, Moravicae, Bolgaricae, Moldaviae* | *Sclavonica lingua matrix est Polonicae, Bohemicae, Lithuanicae, Moschovitica* | *Sclavonica lingua est matrix Polonicae, Moravicae, Bolgaricae, Moldavicae,* |

[82] The text of the note is published with the critical apparatus to show the differences in spelling the names of languages in the manuscripts: Iavors'kyĭ, fonds 8, 60, fol. 150v and 152, fol. 164v.
[83] Unknown professor (Petrov's catalogue, 42), fol. 215.
[84] Popovs'kyĭ, fol. 188.
[85] Pynovs'kyĭ, fol. 200.
[86] Levyts'kyĭ 1, fol. 246.
[87] Levyts'kyĭ 2, fol. 221v – 222.
[88] Sclavonica ] Sclawonica (fonds 8, 60).
[89] Bohemicae ] Bohaemicae (fonds 305, 152).
[90] Moravicae ] Morawicae (fonds 8, 60).
[91] Moldavicae ] Moldowicae (fonds 8, 60).

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lithuanicae,[92] Moschoviticae;[93] | Moldavicae, Lituanicae, Moschoviticae; | Moldaviae [sic], Litwanicae, Moschoviticae; | [sic], Litoanicae, Moschoviticae; | e, Dalmaticae; | Lituanicae, Moschoviticae; |
| Germanica – Helveticae, Saxonicae, Anglicae, Scoticae,[94] Sueticae, Belhicae; | Germanica lingua est matrix Helbaticae, Saxonicae, Anglicae, Scoticae, Sueticae, Belgicae; | <Germanica> – Saxonicae, Anglicae, Scoticae, Sueticae, Bellicae; | Germanica – Helveticae, Saxonicae, Anglicae, Scoticae, Sueticae, Belgicae etc, etc. | Germanica lingua matrix est Helveticae, Saxonicae, Anglicae, Scoticae, Sveticae, Balficae; | Germanica – Helveticae, Saxonicae, Anglicae, Scoticae, Sveticae, Belgicae etc. |
| Tartarica – Turcicae, Sarzamenicae etc, etc [95] | Tartarica lingua est matrix Turcicae, Sarthamenicae etc. | Tartarica – Turticae, Sarzamolicae etc. | | Tartarica matrix est Turciae, Sarmaticae;[96] <br><br> Abissinia lingua matrix est Ethiopiacae, Sabaae. | |

As we can see in Table 5, three KMA professors followed Iavors′kyĭ's text very closely. The unknown professor, whose course is extant in manuscript form (see IM VNLU, fonds 301, 42), kept the same list as Iavors′kyĭ. One thing which is different is spelling. The most interesting changes are the following: the Moravian language is spelled as *"lingua Moralica,"* Bulgarian *"Volgarica,"* which associates with the name of the river where the Bulgars used to live in the distant past. Inokentiĭ Popovs′kyĭ omitted mention of the Swiss language. However, this might be a mechanical mistake in the manuscript, which also omitted the word *"Germanica,"* from

---

[92] Lithuanicae ] Lythuanicae (fonds 305,152).
[93] Moschoviticae ] Moschowiticae (fonds 8, 60).
[94] Scoticae ] Scotycae (fonds 305, 152).
[95] Sarzamenicae ] Sarzamonicae (fonds 305, 152).
[96] Among the Mohylians, there are significant differences in the spelling of this language. Here Levyts′kyĭ spelled it as if it was the language of the Sarmatians, who used to live on the territory of Ukraine and Poland. It might well be that he indeed identified this language in this way. But in other courses it was spelled differently: Sarzamenica – Iavors′kyĭ, fonds 8, 60; Sarzamonica – Iavors′kyĭ, fonds 305, 152; Sarthamenicae – Unknown professor (ms 42); Saramatica – Popovs′kyĭ. Probably, the professors of KMA did not know what that language was. As Vakulenko proved (Wakulenko, "Sprachklassifikationen in den ukrainischen handschriftlichen Logikkursen vom Ende des 17. bis zum ersten Drittel des 18. Jahrhunderts', 121), it was the old language of Samarqand, also known as Chagatai.

_____

which other Germanic languages have their origin. Syl'vestr Pinovs'kyĭ left out Czech (*Bohemica*) but left Moravian, which might also be a mechanical mistake.

More significant changes were made by Ilarion Levyts'kyĭ in his first course on philosophy. Among the Slavic languages, he omitted Moravian and Moldavian, but added Dalmatian. Most probably, it was the Dalmatian dialect of Croatian, since the Dalmatian language, which was still alive in the eighteenth century, was a Romance language. He also added a new group: the languages which come from Abyssinian. This group was present in Génébrard's list but absent in Iavors'kyĭ's one. This suggests that Levyts'kyĭ used something other than the course of Iavors'kyĭ at the KMA as the model for his own. In his second course, Levyts'kyĭ sticks closer to Iavors'kyĭ's text but leaves out the group of languages originated from Tatar.

Among all Mohylians, Khrystofor's Charnuts'kyĭ's note of the classification of language is the closest to that of Génébrard. This text can be found in both of the philosophy courses taught by Charnuts'kyĭ. However, the list of languages comes to Charnuts'kyĭ not from Génébrard but via Jerzy Gengell. As was already mentioned, the first course by Charnuts'kyĭ greatly depended on the one taught by Charnuts'kyĭ's Jesuit teacher. This is most apparent from the comparison depicted in Table 6.

### Table 6: Charnuts'kyĭ's Note on Classification of Languages

| Génébrard | Gengell[97] | Charnuts'kyĭ 1[98] | Charnuts'kyĭ 2[99] |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Hebraica genitrix Syriacae, Arabicae etc.* | *Hebraica est matrix seu genitrix linguae Syriace, Chaldaicae, Arabicae;* | *Hebraica*[100] *lingua est matrix seu genitrix linguae Syriacae,*[101] *Chaldaicae, Arabicae;* | *Hebraica matrix et genitrix est linguae Syriacae, Chaldaicae, Arabicae;* |
| *Latina Italicae, Valachicae, Gallicae et Hispanicae,* | *Latina est matrix Italicae, Valachicae, Gallicae, Hispanicae;* | *Latina est genitrix Italicae, Valachicae, Gallicae, Hispanicae;* | *Latina est matrix Italicae, Valachicae, Gallicae, Hispanicae;* |
| *Graeca Doricae, Ionicae, Aeolicae, Atticae;* | *Graeca – Doricae, Ionicae, Aeolicae, Atticae;* | *Graeca lingua est genitrix Doricae, Ionicae, Eolicae, Atticae;*[102] | *Graeca – Doricae, Ionicae, Eolicae, Atticae;* |
| *Slavonica Polonicae, Boëmicae, Moschoviticae etc.;* | *Sclavonica lingua est matrix Polonicae, Bohemicae, Moscoviticae;* | *Sclavonica lingua matrix est Polonicae, Bohemicae,*[103] *Moschoviticae;* | *Sclavonica lingua matrix est Polonicae, Bohemicae,* |

_____

[97] Gengell, IM VNLU, fonds I, 4406, fol. 159.

[98] Charnuts'kyĭ 1, fonds 312, 625, fol. 235v and fonds 306, 97, арк.252.

[99] Charnuts'kyĭ 2, fol. 103v.

[100] Hebraica ] Haebraica (fonds 306, 97).

[101] Syriacae ] Syricae (fonds 312, 625).

[102] Atticae ] Apticae (fonds 312, 625).

[103] Bohemicae ] Bohaemicae (fonds 312, 625).

| | | | *Lituanicae,* *Moschoviticae;* |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Germanica Helveticae, Anglicae, Flandricae etc.;* | *Germanica – Elveticae, Saxonicae, Anglicae, Flandricae;* | *Germanica lingua matrix est Heveticae, Saxonicae, Anglicae, Flandricae etc.;* | *Germanica – Helveticae, Saxonicae, Anglicae,* ***Scoticae, Sueticae,*** *Belgicae;* |
| *Tartarica Turciae, Sarmacanicae etc.* | *Tartarica – Turcicae, Sarmacanicae;* | *Tartarica lingua genitrix est Turciae, Sarmacanicae;* | *Tartarica – Turcicae, Sarcamenicae;* |
| *Abyssina Aethiopicae, Sabeae etc.* | *Abyssyna – Aethiopicae, Sabeae etc. etc.* | *Abissina –*[104] *Aethiopicae,*[105] *Sabaeae etc.* | *Abissina – Aetiopicae, Sabaeae etc.* |

As we can see from Table 6, in his first course, Charnuts′kyĭ did not change Gengell's language list; he only made some stylistic changes. However, Gengell himself extended Générbrard's list, adding Chaldaic to the languages coming from Hebrew and Saxonian to the ones from Germanic. In his second course, Charnuts′kyĭ made three changes. He added Lithuanian to Slavic, and Scottish and Swedish to the Germanic ones. Those changes are interesting as they show that he was not completely satisfied with the text of Gengell and wanted to improve it somehow. We can suppose that he added Lithuanian because it was close to him. However, that seems to be unlikely in the case of Scottish and Swedish. Probably he consulted another text in preparing his new course. It might have been Iavors′kyĭ's course because, unlike Génébrard, all three languages were on Iavors′kyĭ's list. However, right now, there is no apparent influence of Iavors′kyĭ on the second course of Charnuts′kyĭ.

Nevertheless, Charnuts′kyĭ himself influenced other philosophy courses at the KMA. Ilarion Levyts′kyĭ, as already noted, was influenced by Iavors′kyĭ in his teaching on signs; however, in other parts of the course, especially in the theory of universals, the influence on him by the second course of Charnuts′kyĭ is easily visible. Thus, when Levyts′kyĭ adds a group of languages which originates from Abyssinian, it is extremely likely that he is doing so under the influence of the second course of Charnuts′kyĭ.

The most distant from Génébrard is the note on the classification of languages in the second course taught by Amvrosiĭ Dubnevych. A comparison between the two texts evinces several interesting details. First, Dubnevych limits himself to languages with which he is most familiar: Slavic, Romance, and Germanic. Moreover, the Slavic languages are set down first and the classification seems absolutely correct, even by modern standards. But the most important thing is that to the previously mentioned Slavic languages (Polish and Muscovite, which were included in every course), he adds Ruthenian (*lingua Ruthenica*). Unfortunately, he does not explain what language he meant: the "simple" office language (*prosta mova*) or the ordinary folk language. In any case, no known professor at the KMA before Dubnevych included the lingua *Ruthenica* in the list. How to explain this? Did the Mohylian professors not recognise it before the 1727/1728 academic year? We can answer these questions a bit later

---

[104] Abissina ] Abyssina (fonds 312, 625).
[105] Aethiopicae ] Aethyopicae (fonds 306, 97).

but let us first turn to the philosophy courses taught by Dubnevych's student, Mykhaïlo Kozachyns′kyĭ.

Kozachyns′kyĭ kept extensive notes of Dubnevych's second course.[106] After graduating from KMA, Kozachyns′kyĭ was sent to Karlovci Sremski to establish a school. He spent five years in Serbia (1733 until 1738), teaching different subjects, including rhetoric. After his return to Ukraine, in 1739, Kozachyns′kyĭ began teaching philosophy. Not surprisingly, he incorporated Dubnevych's course material, which he knew well, into his own teachings practice. A comparative analysis of the second course of Dubnevych and the first and second courses of Kozachyns′kyĭ demonstrates that the student mainly kept to his teacher's text. However, Kozachyns′kyĭ did make some changes in Dubnevych's text and compiled it with other as-yet-unidentified texts.[107] As for the note (Table 7), he repeated Dubnevych's text without changes in his first course. However, in the second one, he added the Serbian language to the Slavic group, probably recalling the five years spent in Serbia. Until then, none of the Mohylians had mentioned Serbian.

### Table 7: Kozachyns′kyĭ's **Note on the Classification of Languages**

| **Dubnevych 2**[108] | **Kozachyns′kyĭ 1**[109] | **Kozachyns′kyĭ 2**[110] |
|---|---|---|
| *ex Clavonica* [sic] *orta est lingua Polonica, Rutenica, Moschovitica, Bohemica;*<br><br>*ex Latina Gallica, Hyspanica, Valachica, Italica;*<br><br>*ex Germanica prodigit lingua Saxonica, Anglica, Svetica etc.* | *ex Clavonica* [sic] *orta est lingua Polonica, Rutenica, Moschovitica, Bohemica;*<br><br>*ex Latina Gallica, Hyspanica, Walachica, Italica;*<br><br>*ex Germanica prodiit lingua Saxonica, Anglica, Svetica etc.* | *ex Sclavonica orta est lingua Polonica, Ruthenica, Moschowytica, Bohemyca,* ***Serbyca****;*<br><br>*ex Latina Gallica, Hyspanica, Walachyca, Italyca;*<br><br>*ex Germanica prodiit lingua Saxonica, Anglyca, Suetyca etc.* |

I want to draw attention to another aspect of Dubnevych's teaching oeuvre. Thus far, my analysis of Dubnevych's courses was limited to the second of them. Unfortunately, it was impossible to include the first one in the study because it survives in only one manuscript, which does not represent the whole course (just dialectic and the first part of logic), i.e., the treatise on signs is absent. However, it is possible to have some ideas about Dubnevych's doctrine on signs in the first course. The later Mohylian professor Syl′vestr Kuliabka taught both his courses keeping closely to Dubnevych's first course. Both Kuliabka's courses correspond Dubnevych's course almost verbatim. It is reasonable to suppose that Kuliabka's courses match Dubnevych in those parts that are missing. However, the most interesting is

---

[106] IM VNLU, fonds 307, 452.

[107] Symchych, Philosophia rationalis *u Kyievo-Mohylians′kiĭ akademiï*, 60–61. He did not do this in his third course. Instead, as was mentioned above, he used the textbook of Gervasius Brisacensis, but, quite unexpectedly, almost verbatim.

[108] Dubnevych 2, fol. 234.

[109] Kozachyns′kyĭ 1, fol. 277–277v.

[110] Kozachyns′kyĭ 2, fol. 118v.

that the note on languages is absent in the courses of Kuliabka. He does not say anything about the divine origin of the first language. Kuliabka is unique among the Jesuit-influenced Mohylians who taught a purely conventional theory of language. If it is supposed that Kuliabka's theory of signs belongs to Dubnevych, then Dubnevych seems to have changed his position. Indeed, it was not something unusual for Mohylians to change their positions, and Dubnevych was not an exception.[111] In my opinion, nevertheless, this case deserves more study.

As mentioned above, most great scholastic authors of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, supported the conventional theory of language.[112] Moreover, the conventional theory prevailed even among the courses taught in the Jesuit colleges of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. Having looked through a number of handwritten philosophical courses from different Polish and Lithuanian Jesuit colleges of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries,[113] I found only one where the theory of divine origin of the first language was presented: the philosophical course of Gengell, which (as we saw) was used at KMA. This proves that the theory prevailing at KMA was not popular outside of it. How can that be explained? It is possible to make some suppositions about it. First, the theory of the divine origin of Adam's and Eve's language was rather conservative and theological. According to the Mohylians, it was based on the patristic tradition (as Stefan Iavors′kyĭ argued).[114] This might have been a very important consideration for the Orthodox priests who taught philosophy at KMA. But this supposition does not seem to be convincing enough. Why was this "pious" theory not supported by Ĭosyf Kononovych-Horbats′kyĭ, Inokentiĭ Gizel′, and Ĭoasaf Krokovs′kyĭ, who can hardly be accused of a secular way of thinking?

Second, the theory was introduced into KMA by Stefan Iavors′kyĭ, whom the Mohylian professors respected. As discussed above, that pattern which predominated at KMA in the first half of the eighteenth century, started with the course of Iavors′kyĭ. Furthermore, the very text of Iavors′kyĭ's course was used, to a greater or lesser extent, in five other Mohylian philosophical courses. Here it is worth recalling that in the Russian Orthodox Church of the 1710–1730s, there was a bitter struggle between the pro-Catholic faction of Stefan Iavors′kyĭ and the pro-Protestant faction of Teofan Prokopovych. This struggle was won by Prokopovych in Russia. However, at KMA, it was Iavors′kyĭ who won. Teofan Prokopovych taught philosophy at KMA in the academic years 1707–09. This course is significantly different from the courses taught in KMA after him. The Mohylians did not pay any attention to it for forty years (until Georgiĭ Konys′kyĭ). Instead, they were oriented towards Stefan Iavors′kyĭ, especially during his lifetime, but also after it. Even when Prokopovych was the rector of KMA, Syl′vestr Pinovs′kyĭ taught philosophy according to Iavors′kyĭ's course. Furthermore,

---

[111] For example, in the first course Dubnevych considers that the attribution object of logic is the right conclusion in the syllogism (Dubnevych 1, fol. 326v), whereas in the second course, it is the right actions of reason (Dubnevych 2, fol. 119). In the first course he claims that logic is a practical discipline (Dubnevych 1, fol. 315), whereas in the second one, it is practical and theoretical (Dubnevych 2, fol. 96).

[112] There is only one known exception among the great, Silvestro Mauro, who developed a theory very similar to the Mohylian one. See Silvestrus Maurus, *Quaestionum philosophicarum libri quatuor*, vol. Liber primus (Romae: Ignatius de Lazaris, 1658), 635 (Lib. 1 Quaest. 56).

[113] The theory on the conventional origin of any language (*ad placitum*) was stated in the courses of Sebastian Kleszczański (Lviv Jesuit College, 1679/1680–1680/1681 a.y.) – IM VNLU, fonds 306, 87, fol. 249; Jan Schiper (Niasvizh Jesuit College, 1687/1688–1688/1689 a.y.) – IM VNLU, fonds 306, 89, fol. 135; Unknown professor (Niasvizh Jesuit College, 1697/98–1698/99 a.y.) – IM VNLU, 95, fol. 77; Tomasz Krüger (Vilnius Jesuit Academy, 1713/1714–1714/1715 a.y.) – IM VNLU, fonds 305, 163, fol. 148; Tomasz Dunin (Lviv Jesuit College, 1718/1719–1719/1720 a.y.) – IM VNLU, fonds 306, 112, fol. 161v

[114] Iavors′kyĭ, fonds 8, 60, fol. 150v.

Iavors′kyĭ's course is much better preserved in manuscripts than Prokopovych's.[115] So, it is reasonable to suppose that Iavors′kyĭ established a kind of philosophical tradition in KMA and because of the authority of Iavors′kyĭ it was quite long lasting.

Thus, when in his first course on philosophy, Amvrosiĭ Dubnevych denied the theory of the divine origin of the first language, he appears it to have been going against KMA tradition. In his second course, however, some unknown factors forced him to return to the tradition established by Stefan Iavors′kyĭ.  It is possible that the text on languages, which was included in the second course, was his original contribution and that he inserted this passage when he rearranged his earlier course according to institutional demands. It was then that he created the note on language classification, drawing on his personal ideas about the languages of Europe.  At that point, the Slavic languages, among which was his native Ruthenian, assumed first place.

This raises the question: why is the Ruthenian language absent in the lists compiled by previous KMA professors? At this stage of the research, it is difficult to give a conclusive answer. It is possible that by the phrase *"lingua Lithuanica"* they understood the "simple" language, a common language for Ukrainians and Belarusians of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, used mainly in office administration.  If so, then *"lingua Lithuanica"* was used as a synonym to *"lingua Ruthenica."* At the same time, *"lingua Lithuanica"* is completely absent in the lists drawn up by Génébrard and Gengell. It appears first in Iavors′kyĭ's text and then in all courses depending on it. This phrase is also absent from the first course of Charnuts′kyĭ, where the list of languages is the same as Gengell's. But a reference to Charnuts′kyĭ's native language does appear in his second course, possibly as a personally meaningful addendum to the already existing material.

However, even if a professor did not mention either *"lingua Ruthenica"* or *"lingua Lithuanica"* in his list, it does not mean that he did not recognize the existence of those languages. This can be shown from the examples that KMA professors used to illustrate their philosophical positions. All the courses that argued for the divine origin of the first language claimed that contemporary languages were conventional. One of the arguments that they used to support this claim is the fact of interlingual homonymy. That is to say, when a word means one thing in one language but something else entirely in another, this shows that the meaning of that word is conventional, i.e., it is the result of agreements among people or traditions, but not of the natural order of things. The Mohylians usually supported this argument with different kinds of examples. One of the standard examples was taken directly from prominent philosophers of early modern scholasticism: the word *sus* means a "pig" in Latin, a "horse" in Hebrew, and "silence" in Flemish. But the Mohylians also supplemented such scholastic examples with illustrations from the languages that they knew best. For example, Stefan Iavors′kyĭ offered three additional examples.[116] The first one contrasts the Polish *garbaty* ("bent" [about a person]) with the Italian *garbato* ("polite"). The second one, the Polish personal pronoun *ja* ("I, me") and the German *ja* ("yes").  The third one was *topić* ("to flood something with water" in Polish and "to light a fire" in Ruthenian). It should be noted that all three examples are based on Polish, something that corroborates the importance of that languages in the Mohylian community at the end of the seventeenth century. The first two examples most probably came to Iavors′kyĭ from Polish sources. The

---

[115] As Table 1 demonstrates, there are four full text and two incomplete manuscripts of Iavors′kyĭ's course. Prokopovych's course is preserved only partially. Two manuscripts contain only parts of the course.

[116] *"nam sus Latinis porcum, Judaeis aequum, Flandris silentium significat; quod Polonis est gibbosus, Italis est egregius; ja Polonis significat pronomen ego, Germanis adverbum ita; itemque Polonis immergere Rutenis est calefacre etc."* Iavors′kyĭ, fonds 8, 60, fol. 150v.

illustration with *garbaty*, for example, was used by Śmiglecki.[117] However, the last example was most likely Iavors′kyĭ's own.

Charnuts′kyĭ, who listed neither *"lingua Lithuanica"* nor *"lingua Ruthenica"* in his first course, did give an example of the Latin-Ruthenian homonymy. The Ruthenian word *stupa* ("a mortar, stamp mill") means "coarse flax" or "oakum" in Latin.[118] But to explain this example to his students, Charnuts′kyĭ translates *stupa* from Latin into Polish *zgrzebie*. This, then, is one more example of the role of Polish at KMA at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Finally, I would like to draw attention to the fact that the example with *stupa* is Charnuts′kyĭ's own: it is absent from Gengell's text.

## Conclusion

This discussion of the note on language classification found in seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century philosophy courses taught by the professors of KMA has advanced three interrelated propositions. First, although the doctrine on the divine origin of the first language is not a novelty of the Mohylian professors, the frequency of its use at KMA is much higher than in other philosophy courses of the time. It can be supposed that presenting this doctrine was an element of the local teaching tradition. The establishment of this tradition and its longevity in Mohylian circles is likely connected to the authority of Stefan Iavors′kyĭ.

Second, in enumerating different languages, the Mohylians drew on the lists of other authors, but also added some new languages. Among the added languages was *lingua Lithuanica*. It is possible to suppose that KMA professors systematically added this language because they considered it native. In all likelihood, they used *lingua Lithuanica* and *lingua Ruthenica* as synonyms. If we suppose that *lingua Lithuanica* referred to the Belarusian language, which is more logical, then it is difficult to explain why such professors as Iavors′kyĭ and Charnuts′kyĭ did not include *lingua Ruthenica*, which is explicitly mentioned in their didactic examples. In the courses of Dubnevych (and related to him Kozachyns′kyĭ), the term *"lingua Ruthenica"* supplanted *"lingua Lithuanica"* in the list of languages. This fact suggests that by the 1720s–1740s, KMA professors considered *lingua Ruthenica* as a separate language, which cannot be confused with either *lingua Polonica* or *lingua Moscovitica*.

Third, the cases when the Mohylians cited the texts of other authors verbatim show that philosophy at KMA was not always very original. However, knowing the origin of a given text allows us to see what changes were made to it by a Mohylian professor. The identified changes can then serve as a means of determining both the philosophical position and the general worldview of the professor in question.

---

[117] Smiglecius, *Logica*, Pars altera: 9 (Disp. 12, Q. 2).

[118] *"Unde stupa Latinis alias zgrzebie significat, Rutenis significat vas, in quo funditur milium etc."* Charnuts′kyĭ 1, fonds 312, 625, fol. 236v.