

## **Continuity of Scientific Traditions and Philosophical Culture in the Activities of the Kyiv-Mohyla and Slavic-Greek-Latin Academies in 17th Century Russia**

**Selikhov Egor Alexandrovich<sup>1</sup>, Korableva Elena Valentinovna<sup>2</sup>, Lavrova Irina Anatolyevna<sup>3</sup>, Biryukova Kristina Viktorovna<sup>4</sup>, Kopaeva Nina Viktorovna<sup>5</sup>, Shakolyukova Valentina Dmitrievna<sup>6</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup>PhD in History, Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, History, and Intercultural Communication, Moscow Technical University of Communication and Informatics

<sup>2</sup>Doctor of Philosophy, Professor, Head of the Department of Philosophy, History and Intercultural Communications, Moscow Technical University of Communication and Informatics

<sup>3</sup>PhD in History, Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, History, and Intercultural Communication, Moscow Technical University of Communication and Informatics

<sup>4</sup>PhD in History, Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, History, and Intercultural Communication, Moscow Technical University of Communication and Informatics

<sup>5</sup>PhD in History, Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, History, and Intercultural Communication, Moscow Technical University of Communication and Informatics

<sup>6</sup>PhD in Philosophy, Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, History, and Intercultural Communication, Moscow Technical University of Communication and Informatics

---

### **ABSTRACT**

The history of any nation constitutes an inseparable part of its being. Historical processes influence all aspects of life, both within individual states and humanity at large. These processes include internal and external politics, socio-economic development, the culture of specific historical periods, and much more.

This article focuses on the history of social thought, specifically on the development of philosophical culture and worldview among Russian philosophers of the 17th century. The selected time period is not coincidental. Numerous events of the 17th century served as a precursor to the transformations of Peter the Great's era. For a long time, it was erroneously believed that prior to Peter's reforms, Russia lagged behind European countries in all areas, including the development of scientific knowledge addressing cosmological questions.

Notably, the 17th century marked the emergence of academic institutions of a university status in Russia. These included the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, established in 1632, and the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy, founded in Moscow in 1687.

This study examines the genesis of philosophical thought and scientific worldview as reflected in the perspectives of scholars and philosophers from the Kyiv-Mohyla and Slavic-Greek-Latin Academies. An attempt is made to trace the continuity of scientific knowledge between the Kyiv and Moscow academies. Emphasis is placed on the distinctive nature of Russian philosophy and its scientific worldview during this period. In addition to the main directions of philosophical development, the article explores the conditions under which these institutions arose, as well as their unique characteristics that influenced subsequent activities.

At the conclusion of the study, the following reasoning is presented: Philosophical thought in 17th-century Russia was marked by its distinctiveness and uniqueness. The worldview paradigm of this period fully aligns with the concept of "unity in diversity." The philosophy of the 17th century was grounded in an idealistic understanding of the world, yet early echoes of materialist teachings began to emerge. It is emphasized that the scientific breakthroughs achieved during and after Peter the Great's era were founded on the fundamental knowledge developed by the scholars of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy.

#### **Research Objective:**

To highlight the uniqueness and specificity of the development of philosophy and worldview in 17th-century Russia.

#### **Research Tasks:**

1. Analyze the characteristic features of the development of philosophy and social thought in 17th-century Russia.
2. Identify the causes and conditions that led to the establishment of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy.
3. Define the main issues that concerned Russian philosophers in the 17th century.
4. Evaluate the activities of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy.
5. Demonstrate the significance of the achievements of 17th-century philosopher-scholars for the subsequent development of science in Russia.

#### **Methodology:**

This research is based on the following methodological principles:

- Identifying the causes that determined the direction of the development of Russian philosophy in the 17th century.

- Defining the causes and specific features of the establishment of the Kyiv-Mohyla and Slavic-Greek-Latin Academies, as well as the key philosophical issues discussed within their walls.

- Analyzing the distinctive features and achievements in the fields of philosophy and worldview in 17th-century Russia.

#### **Scientific Novelty:**

- The specific character of the development of Russian philosophy in the 17th century is determined.

- The emergence of elements of rationalism and teachings on matter within the framework of the idealistic worldview characteristic of the period is confirmed.

The practical value of this study lies in the fact that the presented materials can be utilized for further research in the fields of philosophy, the history of science, and Russian history. Additionally, the data discussed in the article can be incorporated into academic courses on philosophy, Russian history, cultural studies, and related disciplines.

The author concludes that the development of science during Peter the Great's transformative era, as well as in subsequent periods, was largely built upon the foundation established by 17th-century philosopher-scholars.

**Keywords:** Philosophy, worldview, academy, matter, consciousness, theology, divinity, rationalism, uniqueness, science.

#### **Introduction**

This article aims to highlight the shared historical, cultural, and ideological roots of the three Eastern Slavic fraternal nations: Russians, Ukrainians, and Belarusians. The shared history, geographic proximity, linguistic similarities, religion, and more indicate a profound closeness and historical-cultural unity among these communities.

While the study of the Eastern Slavic ethnos is multi-faceted, the focus here is on the general trends in the development of philosophy, social thought, and worldview in the Russian state during the 17th century. This period was chosen deliberately. In the 17th century, Russian philosophical culture largely retained its uniqueness

and adherence to traditions. The subsequent era of Peter the Great's reforms introduced new narratives into Russia's philosophy, scientific worldview, and culture.

As is well known, Peter's reforms brought innovations to all spheres of societal life in the first half of the 18th century, including government administration, trade and economic relations, military affairs, as well as science and culture. In the realm of philosophy, social thought, and worldview, the ideas of Western European rationalism and pragmatism gradually began to take hold, along with an increasingly materialistic understanding of the world. Science and education also began to adopt a more secular character.

These philosophical and worldview trends of the 18th century elicited mixed reactions. Representatives of certain currents within Russian social thought argued that Russian philosophical culture had lost its historical uniqueness and vitality due to its unproductiveness following the Westernization introduced by Peter's reforms. However, this perspective is not entirely accurate. Echoes of 17th-century philosophical thought resonated in the ideas of Slavophilism and soil-based movements in the 19th century, as well as various conservative currents.

### **Characteristic Features of the Genesis of Philosophy and Worldview in the 17th Century**

Turning to the main question regarding the development of philosophical culture in the 17th century, it is crucial to note that this period saw the establishment of two academic and educational centers within the Russian state, comparable in status to European universities. These were the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, founded in the lands of Little Russia, and the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy, established in Moscow in the 1680s.

This article does not aim to provide a detailed analysis of the philosophical views of individual thinkers associated with these institutions. Instead, it seeks to explore the direction of the Kyiv-Mohyla and Slavic-Greek-Latin Academies' activities, considering the general trends in the development of philosophical thought in 17th-century Russia.

When examining Russian philosophy of the 17th century, it is logical to recall certain features of its origin and subsequent evolution through different stages of historical development. Due to its geographical, historical, and cultural context, Russian social thought exhibited a set of specific features that distinguished it from the philosophical worldview prevailing in medieval Europe. The roots of Russian philosophical thought can be traced back to earlier chronicles and hagiographies, which were predominantly idealistic in nature [11, pp. 217-218].

However, it is important to note that 17th-century philosophical thought was by no means static, confined to a particular time or place. Despite the era and its distinguishing characteristics, the scientific and philosophical framework of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, and later the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy, was continually updated in response to the passage of time. New courses in logic, ontology, natural philosophy, and other disciplines were introduced.

Researchers have identified two distinct worldviews characteristic of the feudal period: the Latin and Greco-Slavic types. Among certain scholars studying the philosophical and ideological heritage of the Kyiv-Mohyla and Slavic-Greek-Latin Academies, there is a persistent view that the Greco-Slavic type of philosophical culture was somewhat backward. However, such a characterization warrants scrutiny. When examining the genesis of the historical-philosophical process, it is

necessary to focus on the unique features of the historical development of Western Europe and the Slavic world.

In feudal Europe, philosophy for a long time served as a "handmaiden" to theology, despite its evolution as a separate form of social consciousness. In contrast, the Greco-Slavic type of worldview was characterized by the development of philosophical elements within the framework of religious consciousness, not yet distinct from theology or literature as an independent form of social consciousness [11, p. 220].

The founding of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy in 1632 was a natural step in the evolution of Russian philosophical consciousness. It drew on earlier traditions established by fraternal schools, polemic writers, and folk culture [11, p. 222].

Many authors emphasize the extensive historical, cultural, philosophical, and scientific connections between the professors of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and scholars from Russia and neighboring states [11, pp. 215]. It is precisely due to the existence and robustness of these connections that the legacy of the academy is fundamentally integrated into the global historical, philosophical, and scientific process [11, pp. 215–216]. Notably, representatives of Eastern Slavic nations had their own distinct philosophical traditions. As evidence, researchers cite conclusions reached by Ukrainian Academy of Sciences philosophers in the 1980s.

The above points directly confirm that Russian, Ukrainian, and

Belarusian philosophical traditions are deeply rooted in history, extending even further back than the 17th century, when the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy was established in 1632 in the lands of Little Russia. A striking testament to this is the research conducted by the scientists of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, who identified approximately 350 manuscripts representing courses taught by professors of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy [11, pp. 217–218].

When examining the scientific and philosophical traditions and connections of the Kyiv-Mohyla and Slavic-Greek-Latin Academies, it is essential to highlight the contributions of outstanding philosophers of the time, such as Theophylact Lopatinsky. Lopatinsky later became a professor of philosophy at the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy and was instrumental in advancing philosophical thought. His intellectual development was significantly influenced by Theophan Prokopovich, who established a philosophical circle at the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy to study the intellectual heritage of the past, particularly the works of Theophylact Lopatinsky [11, p. 218].

There is a viewpoint regarding the influence of German Protestant and Polish Catholic ideas on the scientific worldview of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy scholars. According to V.M. Nichik, the philosophical culture within the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy at a certain stage experienced significant influence from German and Polish philosophical schools. This is evidenced by the fact that many academy graduates

continued their studies at universities in Lublin, Kraków, and Zamość [11, p. 219].

The aforementioned data and conclusions must be taken into account, yet there is a need for further clarity and specificity. Regarding the European influence and the penetration of anthropocentric and rationalist ideas into the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, there is unequivocal evidence in favor of such a claim. This is substantiated by the earlier mentioned facts of European university professors delivering lectures at the academy and the further education of some academy students in Europe. It is also essential to consider the fact that the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy was established during a period when the lands of Little Russia were part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.

At the same time, while acknowledging the influence of German and Polish philosophical schools on the activities of the Kyiv Academy, one must not overlook the cultural and spiritual uniqueness of Little Russia. A critical fact highlighting the distinctiveness of the Kyiv Academy's philosophical thought is that the vast majority of its scholars held clerical ranks and were ordained as priests according to the Orthodox rite. These factors allow us to conclude that the general directions of the philosophical schools in the Kyiv Academy aligned with the development of philosophical thought in the Russian state.

Thus, the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy represented a unique synthesis of various ideological

influences and the philosophical traditions of different nations. At the same time, one cannot ignore the fact that the flourishing of distinctively Russian philosophical thought within the academy coincided with the period of opposition between the lands of Little Russia and the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. This inevitably suggests a resistance to the forced Polonization of Russian spiritual culture [5, p. 225].

This perspective has substantial grounds. It is worth noting that the establishment of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy approximately coincided with the onset of another large-scale confrontation between Ukraine, led by the Zaporozhian Cossacks, and the Polish government, which was marked by its intolerance toward the Orthodox population of Little Russia. One cannot discount the possibility that it was precisely during this period of conflict with Poland that an institution like the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy emerged in Kyiv. Its activities were aimed at defending the cultural and historical uniqueness of the Ukrainian population, employing the tools of philosophy, history, natural sciences, and other disciplines.

The profound scholarly connections between the academics of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and the faculty of European universities should not be overlooked. Due in large part to the traditions of Polish academic philosophy, the mid-17th century marked the beginning of a tendency in the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy to separate philosophy from theology in its lecture courses [5, p. 230].

The development of a scientific worldview in the 17th century cannot be understood without considering the philosophical perspectives of Yuriy Krizhanich. He was among the first scholar-philosophers to introduce elements of natural science and dialectics into the intellectual foundation of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. In his works and statements, Krizhanich championed the uniqueness of the Slavic world, emphasizing its distinct historical and cultural development and the specific character of Slavic philosophical thought. These ideas formed the cornerstone of Krizhanich's philosophical teachings, which later significantly influenced the philosophical thinking of scholars at both the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy in Moscow. The study of Krizhanich's works began in the 19th century, attracting the attention of researchers from various scientific disciplines [4, p. 179].

In the context of the 17th century, when philosophy in the Russian state largely bore a religious-theological character, Krizhanich's views appear remarkably progressive, elevating Russian philosophical thought to a new level of historical development.

Among materialist philosophers, there remains an effort to contrast Krizhanich's ideas with the theological traditions of 17th-century Russian philosophical thought, particularly concerning the interpretation of the cosmos. However, such an opposition may not be entirely

justified. It should be remembered that Krizhanich considered the presence of Higher Powers as the primary cause of the universe. While this notion aligns with medieval scholasticism, it is more reflective of the unique characteristics of 17th-century Russian philosophical thought. The spiritual principle, as an undeniable first cause of existence, served as the fundamental basis of Krizhanich's worldview [4, pp. 179–180].

In other words, on the question of the primacy of matter or spirit, Krizhanich unequivocally adhered to the dominance of the latter, thereby aligning with an idealistic interpretation of the world.

At the same time, the materialistic elements in Yuriy Krizhanich's philosophical teachings should not be dismissed. A defining aspect of his philosophy is the emphasis on the essence, or the internal structure, of things. Krizhanich devoted significant attention to the question of the primary causes of things, processes, and phenomena as the foundation of existence. According to Krizhanich, "One who does not know the causes does not know the thing itself" [7, p. 457]. In other words, Krizhanich's views already reveal traces of an understanding of the causal relationships inherent to specific things or phenomena.

Krizhanich's teachings also explore the concept of the universe's motion as an essential condition for its existence and development. "The world," he declares, "is in continuous motion" [7, p. 180]. A crucial element of Krizhanich's philosophical worldview

is his emphasis on understanding the surrounding reality through experience. He urged, "Learn wisdom from diligent observation" [8, p. 107].

In examining Krizhanich's intellectual legacy, one cannot overlook his views on the mutability of scientific knowledge. He argued that knowledge is transmitted from generation to generation, accumulating over time to create a foundation for the scientific worldview at a particular stage of historical development. In Krizhanich's reflections on tradition and innovation, the concept of continuity in knowledge as the basis of existence is evident. He stated, "Wisdom moves from one nation to another" [8, p. 107].

This assertion clearly illustrates two intertwined ideas: the continuity of scientific knowledge passed down through generations within a single nation, in this case, the Russian people, and the universality of scientific knowledge shared among all nations. Based on these insights, it can be argued that the rationalism, which would become the core principle of the scientific worldview in the 18th century, finds its roots in Krizhanich's scientific perspectives. By addressing such concepts as motion, experience, and the continuity of knowledge, Krizhanich elevated Russian scientific thought and philosophy to a new level.

Krizhanich's ideas also engage with the issue of the revival of Slavic peoples, which he examines from the perspective of unity in diversity. For Slavic nations, he emphasized shared historical and cultural development, a common worldview, a shared destiny, and, consequently, a promising

collective future. In his writings, Krizhanich clearly identifies the oppressed status of the Slavic people in the 17th century. "No nation under the sun has been so wronged and humiliated by foreigners as we Slavs, by the Germans" [7, p. 497].

In his views, the author arrives at the understanding that Russia, as the only Slavic country that had preserved its state independence throughout its history, was destined to become the spiritual and ideopolitical center for the revival of the Slavic world [4, p. 182]. In Krizhanich's perspective on Russia's internal organization, elements of statism and protectionism are evident. In his works, he pays particular attention to the issue of strengthening the Russian state as the driving force behind addressing key historical tasks, including the liberation and unification of the Slavic world. Krizhanich advocates for the consolidation of centralized state governance, the legal reinforcement of the rights and responsibilities of all social estates, the encouragement of trade and industrial development, and the advancement of science [4, pp. 182–183].

Krizhanich also engages with questions concerning the origins of the Slavs and the emergence of the ancient Russian state. According to B.D. Datsyuk, Krizhanich can rightfully be called "the founder of text criticism in Russian historiography" [2, p. 46]. He defends the idea of the autochthony of the Eastern Slavs as an indigenous people inhabiting a specific territory. In his reflections on the invitation of the Varangians, Krizhanich anticipated



M.V. Lomonosov's critique of the Normanist theory [9, pp. 10–15].

Overall, the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy holds immense significance in terms of the philosophical, historical, and ideological legacy of the culture of Eastern Slavs in the 17th and early 18th centuries. During this period, the academy was a defining factor in the development of the scientific worldview of the Eastern Slavic community [11, p. 215].

In our case, emphasis is placed on the high significance of the philosophical schools' legacy at the academy. The monumental studies conducted in the 17th century on the philosophical heritage of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy's scholars allow for a reevaluation and, often, a fresh perspective on the scientific worldview prevailing at the academy, particularly with respect to such a prominent 18th-century philosopher as Hryhorii Skovoroda [11, p. 215].

Based on the aforementioned facts, it is essential to highlight the multifaceted and diverse nature of the philosophical legacy of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. The scientific and ideological environment of the academy in the 17th century can be characterized as a mosaic structure, incorporating a blend of old and new philosophical trends. When examining the philosophical heritage of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, one can trace categories rooted in patristics, scholasticism, as well as tendencies linked to the Renaissance and Reformation movements [11, p. 215].

In defending the idea of the distinctiveness of Eastern European

and Slavic philosophical thought, it is also important to consider its integration into global philosophical heritage. This is evidenced by numerous interdisciplinary and cross-cultural connections, grounded in the exploration of shared issues between Russian and European philosophy. This assertion is clearly reflected in the presence of shared ideological paradigms and the cultural interaction between the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy, and representatives of European scientific schools.

### **Historical and Historiographical Issues in 17th- Century Philosophy**

When analyzing the genesis of scientific thought within the Kyiv-Mohyla and Slavic-Greek-Latin Academies, one must note the presence of historical and historiographical perspectives. This is undeniable evidence that Russian philosophical thought of the 17th and early 18th centuries addressed a wide array of scientific domains and existential issues. Despite the dominance of idealistic worldviews in the philosophical teachings of the period, many scholars and philosophers displayed a notable rational foundation in their work.

The growing interest in historical and historiographical problems of existence is often attributed by researchers to the external political situation at the time. As is well known, the Union of Brest was concluded in 1596, leading to the creation of the Uniate Church. In opposition to the demands and norms

of Uniatism in the Ukrainian territories, the activity of brotherhoods intensified, and educational publishing efforts, as well as polemical literature, experienced a rise. Special attention was paid to issues concerning the preservation and continued existence of a unified Slavic-Russian language in the lands of Little Russia [6, p. 140-141]. A distinctive feature of the scholars of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy in their ideological opposition to the Uniates was their historical and retrospective approach, returning to the roots and origins of the formation of Russian civilization during the times of Kievan Rus. According to M.V. Kashuba, the leaders of the Lviv and Vilnius brotherhoods developed ideas of opposing the Union through the cultivation of the native language, thereby defending the unity of the three East Slavic peoples – Russians, Ukrainians, and Belarusians. In contrast, the scholars of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy emphasized a return to the history of Kievan Rus [6, p. 142].

Some researchers are inclined to view the activities of Kyiv scholars as both a response to the foreign Brest Union and a tendency toward further reunification with brotherly Russia [12, p. 248]. While leaning toward the idea of preserving the cultural distinctiveness of the lands of Little Russia in opposition to the Brest Union, one must not overlook the fact that virtually the entire scholarly community of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy were active figures of their time. Among all the known scholars of that era, most adhered to an idealistic worldview, with many being ordained as clergy. This suggests that, above all,

in their works, they defended the idea of independence and the distinctiveness of Orthodox worship in contrast to the idea of Uniatism. By turning to the historical past of Kievan Rus, Kyiv scholars and philosophers defended the idea of spiritual sovereignty and the unity of faith among the three East Slavic peoples. Among the most notable works by the scholars of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy are the "Kroynika" by Feodosiy Sofonovich and the "Synopsis" by H. Konissky.

According to the researcher of Ukrainian chronicles, Yu.A. Mytsyk, Feodosiy Sofonovich's "Kroynika" can be considered a key work of Ukrainian historiography in the 17th century [10, p. 16].

The main idea of "Kroynika" revolves around political statism and the concept of the state as a creation bestowed from above. Delving into the historical past, the author emphasizes the roles of rulers such as Vladimir Monomakh and Ivan III, whose efforts were directed towards opposing the feudal lords in the unification of Rus' [6, p. 142-143].

In "Synopsis" by H. Konissky, the reader's attention is drawn to the right of the Russian tsars to the historically Russian lands of Little Russia, where the state of Kievan Rus' once existed. Beyond the spiritual unity of the three fraternal Slavic nations practicing Orthodoxy, the author highlights the idea of a blood kinship between the peoples of Great, Little, and White Rus' [3, p. 215]. From the aforementioned data, it can be concluded that by utilizing

philosophical, historical, and religious knowledge in opposition to the Brest Union, which sought to expand its influence over the Western Rus' territories, the figures of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy aimed to prevent the spiritual, cultural, and consequently, political division of the Russians, Ukrainians, and Belarusians.

At the same time, it would be limiting to reduce the focus of historical knowledge in the works of 17th-century scholars and philosophers solely to their attempts to counter the spiritual influence from Europe, as well as their desire to motivate the historical and cultural uniqueness of the East Slavic world. In our view, the issue appears to be broader.

Up until the period under consideration, the historical narrative was based on chronicle data and other documents, which led to a lack of systematization and, accordingly, a scientific approach in the development of historical knowledge. As an independent field of science, history in Russia took shape in the 18th century, coinciding with the transformations initiated by Peter I, which affected all aspects of state and society life. At the same time, it is important to note that the prerequisites for the reforms Peter undertook in the early 18th century regarding the development of science began to manifest themselves already in the 17th century. In our case, this can be observed in the development of historical knowledge, which can be explained as a natural progression of science and culture in Russia.

### **Enlightenment Activities at the Kyiv-Mohyla and Slavo-Greek-Latin Academies**

When considering the Kyiv-Mohyla and later, the Slavo-Greek-Latin Academies as a phenomenon in the formation and development of the Russian scientific thought system and, in particular, education, it is essential to focus on the educational process itself. In our case, attention should be directed to the process of instruction at the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, which, established in 1632, is rightfully considered the first higher educational institution in Russia. Despite some distinctive features, it can be fairly compared to European universities.

In the 17th century, the structure of the Academy consisted of eight grades, divided into junior – four grades, middle – two grades, and senior – two grades [1, p. 24]. The Academy offered courses in the Slavic, Greek, Latin, and Polish languages, as well as in grammar, rhetoric, poetics, philosophy, arithmetic, and more. Regarding its social origins, it is important to note that the students of the Academy were primarily children from the Cossack elite, the nobility, wealthy townspeople, and clergy [1, p. 24].

Peter the Great's reforms, which were grounded in the policy of westernization and Europeanization of Russia, significantly influenced both the political development of science and education and the philosophical and worldview aspects of Russian social thought.

The reforms implemented by Peter I played a major role in the

introduction of elements of Western spiritual culture into Russia, which, in terms of religious affiliation, included both Catholicism and Protestantism [1, p. 25]. In light of this, it is important to note that the distinctiveness of Russian philosophical culture and worldview was considerably diminished in the context of Peter's reforms.

Gradually, ideas of Western European rationalism began to influence Russian scientific schools, concentrated in the Kyiv-Mohyla and Slavo-Greek-Latin Academies, through intermediaries. According to V.A. Bashkalova, the consciousness of the faculty at the Kyiv and Moscow Academies gradually shifted from the conservatism of the Byzantine spiritual tradition towards the Western European model of scientific worldview, which is based on rationalism and pragmatism [1, p. 25].

This inevitably raises the question of the loss of the historical distinctiveness of Russian philosophical culture, which had been nurtured within the Kyiv-Mohyla and Slavo-Greek-Latin Academies. In our opinion, the situation is not so straightforward. As mentioned earlier, within the framework of 17th-century Russian idealist philosophy, the first hints of materialist thinking began to emerge. The example of the Kyiv Academy suggests that foreign influence started to manifest within its walls long before Peter's reforms. See above. Peter's transformations in the fields of science and education, in turn, enriched this direction, making it better adapted to the new conditions in terms of science, education, and worldview.

The direction of Russian idealist philosophy, largely based on theology, was not diminished by the introduction of Western European rationalist ideas into Russian thought and continued to develop, primarily within the sphere of spiritual education. A similar pattern was observed in the Moscow Slavo-Greek-Latin Academy, where the vast majority of scholars were graduates of the Kyiv Academy. Among those who studied at the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy were such renowned philosophers as S. Polotsky, E. Slavyinetsky, F. Lopatinsky, H. Skovoroda, F. Prokopovich, S. Yavorsky, and many others.

Returning to the main question of comparative analysis of the activities and certain continuity of traditions between the scientific schools and views of individual scholars at the Kyiv-Mohyla and Slavo-Greek-Latin Academies, the data presented by S.K. Smirnov is of particular interest. According to the researcher, between 1701 and 1763, the Slavo-Greek-Latin Academy saw the appointment of 21 rectors, of whom 18 were alumni of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy [13, p. 81-82]. During the same period, there were 25 prefects, of whom 23 came from the Kyiv Academy. However, it is important to note that the Slavo-Greek-Latin Academy was created under different geographical, historical, and political conditions than the academy in Kyiv.

Founded in 1687 by Simeon Polotsky and the Greek brothers Ioannikios and Sofronios Likhuda, the Slavo-Greek-Latin Academy was the second scientific and educational

institution in Russia and largely inherited the traditions of the philosophical schools of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. Established at the end of the 17th century, the Moscow Academy could have significantly influenced the development of philosophical culture during this period. The height of its activity would coincide with the first quarter of the 18th century and be closely linked to the reforms of Peter I in the fields of science and education.

### Conclusion

In conclusion, the main objective of this study is to highlight the peculiarities and key stages in the genesis of philosophical thought in 17th-century Russia. The author emphasizes the distinctiveness and uniqueness of the worldview paradigm in the activities of scholars whose work is connected to Russia's first scientific and educational institutions of the university type: the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and, later, the Slavo-Greek-Latin Academy. In examining the primary directions and stages in the development of philosophical culture and science in the 17th century, it is important to note that the Kyiv Academy, founded in 1632, undoubtedly plays the leading role in the study of philosophical thought. The Slavo-Greek-Latin Academy, established at the end of the 17th century, while an independent institution, largely continued the scientific traditions of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. Due to its time of establishment, the Moscow Academy could not play a decisive role in the

development of philosophical thought during this period.

In investigating the genesis of Russian philosophical thought in the 17th century, the activities of the Kyiv-Mohyla and, later, the Slavo-Greek-Latin Academy must be considered in light of the specific circumstances surrounding their establishment and subsequent operations.

The Kyiv-Mohyla Academy was founded in 1632, when the lands of Left-Bank Ukraine were formally part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. This is likely the direct confirmation of the Polish, German, and other foreign influences mentioned earlier, which affected the activity of the Academy in Kyiv. It is also crucial to consider that the Academy was established during a period of resistance by the Orthodox population of Left-Bank Ukraine against Poland. These events inevitably influenced the specific nature of the Academy's operations.

Founded in 1687 in Moscow, the Slavo-Greek-Latin Academy, while continuing many of the scientific traditions of its predecessor in Kyiv, had some distinct characteristics. While the Kyiv Academy was established in lands under Polish rule at the time and was significantly influenced by foreign powers, the Slavo-Greek-Latin Academy was founded in Moscow, the capital of the Russian Orthodox state, which was considered the Third Rome, in relatively peaceful conditions. The idea for the creation of the academy was proposed by the publicist and teacher of Tsar Feodor Alekseevich, Simeon Polotsky. The founders and

first professors of the academy were the Greek brothers Ioannikios and Sofronios Likhuda. All of these factors had a profound impact on the scientific and educational activities of the academy. While the Kyiv Academy experienced considerable Latin influence, particularly from Poland and Germany, the Slavo-Greek-Latin Academy, upon its establishment, embodied a Greek-Slavic Orthodox foundation.

In conclusion, the seventeenth century was a turning point both in the history of science, philosophical culture, and public thought, as well as in the history of the Russian state as a whole. It was during this time that two centers of scientific and educational activity, akin to European universities, emerged: the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy in Kyiv and, half a century later, the Slavo-Greek-Latin Academy in Moscow. Despite the fact that these institutions were established in different historical conditions and had some differences in their activities, the Kyiv and Slavo-Greek-Latin Academies complemented each other through their interaction, contributing to the development of science and enlightenment.

Thus, in terms of the development of philosophical knowledge in the 17th century, idealistic interpretations of the nature of the universe continued to predominate. The philosophical culture of Russia retained its distinctiveness and fidelity to tradition. The 18th century, rich in events, awaited on the horizon. The reforms carried out by Peter the Great would

bring significant changes to the development of science and public thought. The policy of Westernization in the early 18th century would introduce corresponding innovations in Russia, bringing elements of rationalism, anthropocentrism, and the beginnings of materialist explanations of the nature of the universe from Europe. However, this would not weaken, but rather enrich Russian science and philosophical thought. The legacy of the scholars and philosophers of the Kyiv-Mohyla and Slavo-Greek-Latin Academies would be further strengthened under Peter's efforts. Yet, all of this is the subject of another study.

### **References**

1. Bashkalova, V.A. Education and Philosophy in the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. Actual Problems of Socio-Humanitarian Knowledge, Moscow, 2006.
2. Datsyuk, B.D. Yuriy Kryzhanich and the Russian People. Slavyane, 1944, No. 3.
3. Yeryomin, I.P. On the History of Public Thought in Ukraine in the Second Half of the 17th Century. TODRL, Moscow, 1954, Vol. 10.
4. Zhulinetskaya, E.V. Philosophical and Sociological Views of Yuriy Kryzhanich. In Historical Traditions of the Philosophical Culture of the Peoples of the USSR and Modernity, Kyiv, Naukova Dumka Publishing, 1984.
5. Zakhara, I.S. The Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and Polish Culture at the End of the 17th and Early 18th Century. Historical Traditions of the

Philosophical Culture of the Peoples of the USSR and Modernity.

6. Kashuba, M.V. Interpretation of National History by the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Figures in the Struggle Against the Union. In Man and History in Medieval Philosophical Thought of the Russian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian Peoples, Kyiv, Naukova Dumka Publishing, 1987.
7. Kryzhanich, Y. Politics, edited by M.N. Tikhomirov. Moscow, 1965.
8. Kryzhanich, Y. The Russian State in the Mid-17th Century. Moscow, 1859, Vol. 1.
9. Mavrodi, V.V. Struggle Against Normanism in Russian Historical Science. Leningrad, 1949.
10. Mytsyk, Y.A. Ukrainian Chronicles of the 17th Century. Dnipro, 1978.
11. Nychik, V.M. Current Issues in the Study of the Philosophical Heritage of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. Kyiv, Naukova Dumka Publishing, 1984.
12. Nychik, V.M. From the History of Domestic Philosophy in the Late 17th and Early 18th Centuries. Kyiv, 1978.
13. Smirnov, S.K. History of the Moscow Slavo-Greek-Latin Academy. Moscow, 1855.