КУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЯ И КОНФЛИКТОЛОГИЯ

UDC 241

L. M. Dovga

PHILOSOPHICAL CONCEPTUAL APPARATUS FORMATION IN UKRAINIAN LITERARY WORKS OF THE 17TH CENTURY: 'DOBRO' AND 'BLAHO'[1]

The history of the formation of theological and philosophical apparatus in the Ukrainian literary works in early modern era period remains today almost untouched field of humanitarian studies. Meanwhile the ratio to the text and to the word, understanding its (word) significance, search of the semantic relations between different words/concepts/terms as well as the establishing semantic fields of individual lexemes are the signs that signal about the type of cultural area, thinking practices that prevalent in it, finally, about the formation of their own philosophical discourse within the particular culture. The article defines the semantic fields and the principles of use of lexemes "dobro" and "blaho" in the Ukrainian publications of the first quarter of the 17th century, in particular in the book "Likarstvo na ospalyi umysl cholovichyi" (Ostrog, 1607). On the basis of the conducted analysis the following conclusions are offered: 1) in texts written in Church Slavonic there is a trend towards diluting the semantic field of lexemes "blaho" and "dobro", where the first is reserved for the defining of the area of the sacred, and the second describes all the positive things that occurs in life on earth; 2) the texts written in old Ukrainian language, completely missing the lexeme "blaho", in return "dobro" applies to the sacred, and morally advanced plots in the profane world; at the level of everyday usage this lexeme is usually replaced by the synonyms of the other, not symbolic order; 3) the difference between the discourse that operates with the concepts and everyday language is less fixed on the choice of language (sacral, Church Slavonic or just "simple" old Ukrainian), but on the level at verbalized intellectual activity, fixed in the specific variations of word usage within every linguistic usage. Refs 20.

Keywords: Ukrainian culture, lexeme, concept, sacred, Good, good.

Л. М. Довга

ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ ФИЛОСОФСКОГО ПОНЯТИЙНОГО АППАРАТА В УКРАИНСКОМ РАННЕМОДЕРНОМ БОГОСЛОВСКОМ ДИСКУРСЕ XVII ВЕКА: «ДОБРО» И «БЛАГО»

История формирования богословского и философского аппарата в дискурсе украинских раннемодерных книжников доныне остается одной из малоизученных сфер в гуманитарных исследованиях. Хотя рецепция текста и слова, понимание его (слова) знаковости, поиск семантических связей между разными словами/понятиями/терминами, как и определение смысловых полей отдельных лексем, — это и есть маркеры, указывающие на тип культурного пространства и превалирующие в нем мыслительные практики, а также на формирование в границах той или иной культуры собственного философского дискурса. В представленной

Dovga Larysa M. — PhD, Associate Professor, National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, 2, Skovoroda str., Kyiv, 04070, Ukraina; larysa.dovga@gmail.com

[1] Both lexemes may be translated by English as 'good'.

 DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu17.2017.110

статье определяются смысловые поля и принципы употребления лексем «добро» и «благо» в украинских старопечатных книгах первой четверти XVII в., в частности в издании «Лекарство на оспалый умысл чоловичый» (Острог, 1607). На основании проведенного анализа предлагаются такие выводы: 1) в текстах, написанных церковнославянским языком, фиксируется тенденция к разведению смысловых полей лексем «благо» и «добро», причем первая резервируется для сферы сакрального, а вторая описывает позитивные явления земной жизни; 2) в текстах, написанных староукраинским языком, полностью отсутствует лексема «благо», а лексема «добро» касается и сакрального, и морально совершенного в профанной жизни; на уровне разговорной речи эту лексему, как правило, вытесняют синонимы иного, не знакового порядка; 3) размежевание между дискурсом, оперирующим понятиями, и будничным языком фиксируется не столько на уровне выбора языка (сакрального церковнославянского или литературного староукраинского), сколько на уровне вербализованной мыслительной деятельности, закрепленной в специфических вариациях словоупотребления в границах каждого языкового узуса. Библиогр. 20 назв.

Ключевые слова: украинская культура, лексема, понятие, сакральное, благо, добро.

Problem statement

The research problem, the basic parameters of which I would like to discuss stands at the crossroads of philosophy, history, culture and linguistics. The point is to interpret the language written by the early modern era Ukrainian intellectuals not in contemporary categories, but in accordance with the meanings of certain words / concepts / terms that were used in the 17th — 18th centuries. It's not about translating 'obsolete' words, but the ones used now, some lexemes, being under the illusion that their semantic content was always the same as the present meaning. This leads to the fact that while working with the old texts, we fill them with wrong meanings, thus upgrading (and sometimes, distorting) culture of that time.

Preliminary analysis of a number of concepts from the sphere of values and morality convincingly has shown that, firstly, the importance of the relevant words and concepts denoted by them were not constant but varied depending on the time of writing the text or purpose; secondly, changes in the semantic content of concepts usually appear as the signal of some progress in the consciousness of the Ukrainian elite of the 17th century.

Based on the works of the Ukrainian intellectuals of the 17th century the analysis of abstract concepts with established lexemes which gradually acquire terminological nature may arouse great interest in the context of studying the history of Ukrainian philosophy. Nowadays debates about possibility of discussing Ukrainian philosophical thought in the early modern period are renewed. It seems that philosophical mindset can be seen at the level of lexicology: the ability to feel the nuances of philosophical (or philosophical-theological) notions clearly indicates the specific skills in 'philosophizing' and conscious reception of the 'alien' heritage from the sources having different confessional and language characteristics, together with understanding of subtle semantic text modulations.

Therefore, we can cautiously assume that disciplined word usage with delimitation of meanings when lexemes may be left at the level of everyday speech or reserved for the 'high' style or theological / philosophical issues representation — is the signal point, when we notice consciously philosophizing based on conceptual apparatus. In this case, the 'word' means the "structural and semantic unit of language used for naming objects and their properties, phenomena, or reality relations" [1] and under the 'concept' we understand "common name which has a relatively clear and consistent sense and relatively clearly defined scope" [2] and at the same time a kind of "thought form", being a gener-

alization concerning certain objects or phenomena (virtual entities) and indicating their essential common features [3, p. 801]. As to attempt to capture the 'beginning' of concept creation it is particularly important to know the way the word meaning is changing / stabilizing and also the scope of the concept when certain phenomena, designated previously by the same lexeme remain outside the concept (or get another lexeme) as inappropriate for certain characteristics.

It is necessary to mention that this research rises the texts written by Ukrainian intellectuals in Old Ukrainian or Church Slavonic languages, which still had no strictly established norms for usage of philosophical and theological concepts and terms, and the conceptual (and later terminological) unit was formed right as it became needed, when the work on translations of Greek and Latin theological and moral didactic literature at the end of the 16th — early 17th centuries was started, and soon original Ukrainian theological texts appeared. Although these texts, unlike the Latin philosophy courses by professors of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy are not thoroughly philosophical, they do provide an opportunity to estimate authors' thinking discipline, and identify the transition from student-like adoption of 'Latin erudition' to beginning of its creative adaptation, forming own 'agenda' of issues and finally retransmission of the new knowledge to the audience, which was wider than philosophy students circle of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy.

Sources

As 17th century Ukrainian texts available for researcher are abundant, I would like to define the source frameworks of further observations. They are based on printed Cyrillic theological books (as we know, there were no philosophical Cyrillic works at the time[2]). I take into account both original and translated texts published in different sites of the Kyiv Orthodox Metropolis. The lower time limit is the date when "Instructive Gospel" Учителное Євангелие (укр.) (Krylos, 1606) was issued, the text of which is stated to be identical to the "Instructive Gospel" Учителное Євангелие (укр.) printed in Zabludiv in 1569 [4, p. 34(67)]. It allows us to trace word usage continuity from the last third of the 16th century. Actually this tradition in book publishing was continued in the first quarter of the 17th century in Ostroh, Lviv, Vilno, Derman, Stryatyn communities. An important edition was also Pamvo Berynda's "Lexicon Slovenoroskyi" published in 1627 by the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra printing house. As the author indicated it was a result of the 30-years work on translations of Greek, Latin and Church Slavonic books and search of equivalents to foreign lexemes in Old Ukrainian language [5, p. 243]. Therefore, we can assume that interpretative part in the dictionary entries generalized the late 16th — early 17th cent. practice of Ukrainian written language.

For the upper time limit we accepted the end of the 80-ies of the 17th century when, firstly, the transition of Kyiv Metropolis under the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate caused the outflow of promising minds of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy to Moscow, and,

[2] Secular texts should be considered separately, because secular and theological works have different discourses, target audiences and the purposes of writing. Obviously, for better understanding of sacred and profane worlds as they were coexisting, intersecting, conflicting and becoming reconciled in everyday life of the early modern Ukrainian society it would be interesting to compare the way of the word usage and different meanings of the same lexemes used by authors of theological and secular works (such analysis should also include manuscripts, i. e. diaries, letters, court cases etc.); unfortunately, such task still cannot be performed due to the lack of research in this area.

secondly, when a lot of theologians of Peter Mohyla circle who, being representatives of certain intellectual trend, continued implementing changes started by Mohyla in Church organization, education, book printing, theology etc. making more or less uniform intellectual environment finished their path of life.

Moreover, a new generation of "Kyiv erudition" representatives had other priorities due to their mental and organizational incorporation into the process of the development of Russian Orthodox Church.

Method of analysis

Text analysis was carried out on several stages. The first one requires search of certain lexemes, taking into account the context of their use. In the second stage the contextual analysis of the semantic content of lexemes and their classification into those belonging to everyday speech and those that designate certain theological / philosophical concepts is taking place. Fragments in which the word is used in its everyday sense remain aloof, while statements, which show denoting a concept, are subjected to the further logical and semantic analysis. Based on the fact that the word can change its meaning depending on the context of the sentence in which it is used, and the concept has to be constant in terms of its content and scope, it is expected to reveal the maximum number of semantic variations of the same lexemes, to classify them regarding the proximity of their meaning, to determine their scope and, finally, identify (a) whether it is right to argue that the texts of Ukrainian intellectuals of the 17th century influenced the theological / philosophical conceptual apparatus formation; (b) if so, whether principles of using certain words denoting definite concepts change according to different situations of speaking; (c) if they change, what caused it and how this process affected positioning semantic accents; is it possible to determine the moment at which the use of lexeme denoting definite concept becomes quite consistent; (d) whether lexemes that act as synonyms in everyday speech are used to describe the same concept in Ukrainian early modern texts, or the scopes of concepts denoted by them are different; (e) what is the semantics of mentioned concepts and how their scope is being formed and what are its nuances. Finally, on the basis of the research results and referring to the common cultural and historical context of analyzed works, it might be possible to outline ways of forming philosophical definitions and identify the notion of some concepts (universals or categories) common for Ukrainian intellectual elite of the 17th century, such as: 'Blaho\blaho' (Good\good), 'Istyna\istyna' (Truth\truth), 'dobro' (good), 'pravda' (veracity), 'spravedlyvist' (justice), 'svoboda' (freedom), 'vola' (will), 'chesnota (dobrochesnist)' (virtue), 'virnist' (faithfulness), 'chest' (honor), 'beschest' (dishonor), 'zrada' (infidelity), 'zlo' (evil) etc.

I realize that may be a question of whether it was really principled for the Ukrainian early modern texts establishing certain proportions of lexemes with their semantic fields and if we do not add the newest linhvosemiotic issues on considerably otherwise perception of language? Answering on this favorable note, I'd like to emphasize the fact that it was the 17th century when the so-called 'second scholasticism' elaborated the doctrine of concept, interpreting it as permanently significant 'signs' that reflect certain phenomena and through which these phenomena can become objects of human knowledge [6, p. 188]. However, unlike modern semiotics, scholasticists focus on the opposition and interaction of the natural and the arbitrary in language, build a "theory of speech as im-

plementation of language into real human communication" [6, p. 206]. This observation is very important for us, because, first of all, most of Kyiv intellectuals of the 17th century got just scholastic philosophical training, and, secondly, the research of semantic modulations that indicate formation of terminology will be carried out by selection from the natural speech practice.

Selective texts' analysis

I would like to give an example, which I think can illustrate the philosophical conceptual apparatus formation in the Ukrainian texts of the 17th century. It's a concept marked by the lexemes 'dobro' and 'blaho' and more precisely is a problem of dilution of the semantic fields between two lexemes, that five separate words (τὸ κάλλος, τὸ ἀγαθῶν, τὸ χρηστὸν, τὸ εὐ, ἡ ὡρα) answer in Greek at once, but there is only one analog in Latin — bonum.[3]

The reasons for choosing this particular example are the following:

1) The concept of 'blaho' / 'dobro' lies in the area of philosophical and theological issues and has a long tradition of thinking.
2) Ukrainian texts of the 17th century are commonly filled with these lexemes. It gives the possibility to verify hypotheses on a broad research field.
3) We have two lexemes denoting phenomena possessing some characteristics of 'the good' (благо, добро / τὸ κάλλος, τὸ ἀγαθῶν), both in Church Slavonic and Ukrainian (old and modern) languages. The coexistence of the lexemes 'blaho' (congeneric with 'blahe', 'blahist') and 'dobro' (congeneric with 'dobre', 'dobrist') indirectly verifies the semantic distance between phenomena marked by them.

I would also like to note that, although the new Ukrainian language dictionaries [8] do not reveal a distinction in semantic content of the words 'blaho' and 'dobro', the differentiation in the use of these lexemes is visible in the modern Ukrainian philosophical speech.[4] Dictionaries of the ancient Rus [9, p. 90&654] and old Ukrainian language [10, p. 92–93] & [11, p. 50–51] present these lexemes as the synonyms, fixing some minimal differences between them. In particular, to define charms' kingdom of heaven or a moral virtue we would rather use the lexeme 'blaho' than 'dobro'.[5]

Pamvo Berynda's "Lexicon" also presents them as synonyms [5, 7(5); 39(52)]. Therefore, we can cautiously assume that the author (also translator and publisher) did not observe or capture the semantic differences between lexemes 'dobro' and 'blaho'.

---

[3] In most modern European languages, as in Latin, to describe "dobro" and "blaho" also one lexeme is used, for example: English — good, French "le bien" or Polish — dobro. At this point, rightly pays attentionVolodymyr Shohyn [7]. However, the author argues that the differences between "dobro" and "blaho" at the lexical level is fixed only in the Russian language, forgetting not only about Ukrainian and Belarusian, where it is also present, but also about Greek, which obviously could (and had) to influence the formation of a theological conceptual apparatus, first Church Slavonic, and then the national (Ukrainian, Belarusian, Russian etc) languages.

[4] For example, Oleg Homa, pays attention to the fact that in the modern philosophical speech lexemes "blaho" and "dobro" are fairly close, but the first of them is the generic for the second, because "dobro" is almost always moral "dobro" [12, p. 447]. Compare Shokhyn also [7, p. 111].

[5] It should be noted that a detailed analysis of the theological texts shows rather the reverse: goodness as such is called a compound word with the component "dobro" ("dobro-ditel" or "dobro-ditelnost"), but not with the component of "blaho." Although the names of different types of virtues can be formed with component "dobro" and the component "blaho".

We have the possibility to check this out analyzing the language of the book named "Likarstvo na ospalyi umysl cholovichyi" (*The remedy on sleepy human thinking*) [13] which contains two texts ("Slovo do Fedora mnikha …o pokayanni" by John Chrysostom and "Testament" by Basil the Great) translated from Greek into Church Slavonic and Old Ukrainian languages. This publication is particularly demonstrative, because it allows us to compare the usage in two language systems, correlating it with the Greek original text.

The analysis shows that:

1. We see the prevalence of using the lexeme 'blaho' and its derivatives in Church Slavonic texts; however, in certain situations the lexeme 'dobro' is also used.
2. Old Ukrainian text has only the lexeme 'dobro', the lexeme 'blaho' was not registered at all.
3. Church Slavonic lexeme 'dobro' may correlate with 'dobro' in Old Ukrainian text or be replaced by other lexemes such as 'prystoyne', 'krasa', 'tsudnost', 'zatsnost'. The use of these analogues depends on the context.

Let's switch the attention to the context of these lexemes in both translations:

1. Church Slavonic option indicates the ultimate goal/value, heaven treasure, hope of the salvation etc. exclusively by using the lexeme 'blaho'. While in Old Ukrainian option the lexeme 'dobro' is used. (Ex.: **«вѣчныхъ** насъ сътворитъ въспрїати **благихъ»** [13, 26 зв.] \ «учинил дѣдичми **вѣчных добръ»** [13, 27 зв.]
2. With almost the same frequency both lexemes — 'blaho' and 'dobro' — are used in Church Slavonic text to designate the earth attractions, outer beauty, spiritual perfection and laudable deeds, while in Old Ukrainian part these features are denoted by the lexeme 'dobro'. (Ex.: «мало или велико съдѣлати **благо»** [13, 10 зв.] \ «нѣ малое, ни велікое **доброти** учинити» [13, 11 зв.]; «но убо твоя **доброта** не бѣ такова» [13, 49 зв.] / «леч оная твоя **доброть** не таковая была» [13, 58 зв.])
3. Sometimes in these both language usages the lexeme 'dobro' is used to describe the same thing; it marks some traits of people, their behavior or characteristics of the soul, certain daily phenomena. This is the case of 'everyday' use of the word. (Ex.: **«добро** естъ много мечтанное богатство» [13, 122 зв.] / «и на то повѣдают **добре** мѣти розмаитую маетность» [13, 123 зв.]).
4. There are cases when the Church Slavonic lexeme 'dobro' has other correspondences in old Ukrainian text, such as: 'tsudnyi', 'lipshyi', 'zatsnyi', 'potikha', 'rozkish'. Such expressions are commonly confined to the 'everyday' language and dnot involve emphasis. (Ex.: «**доброту** угасшую» [13, 8 зв.] / «многые **цноты и цудности**, а все увянуло» [13, 9 зв.]; «яко никако же та скончаются **добрая»** [10, 49 зв.] / «же тым **потѣхам** нѣкгды конца не будет» [13, 50 зв.]).

If we compare the translation with the Greek text[6] [14], it may be noted that where the Church Slavonic text offers the lexeme 'blaho', the Greek original usually contains the lexeme τὸ ἀγαθῶν or its derivatives. In cases where the lexemes 'blaho' and 'dobro' are synonyms — in the Greek text we see the lexemes τὸ κάλλος / τὸ χρηστὸν or its derivatives. The forms based on the Greek τὸ εὐ are usually translated as 'dobro' in the Church Slavonic language but as 'tsudnost', 'zatsnost' in the Old Ukrainian. Nevertheless, we cannot say that certain lexemes are completely confined to certain meanings.

[6] I would like to express my sincere gratitude to prof. Roksolana Olishchuk for the assistance with the analysis of the Greek text.

In summary, I would like to note the following:

1. Church Slavonic translation in most cases (not always) is closer to the original text, especially regarding the distinction between the concepts of lexemes 'blaho' and 'dobro' in the high style of the speech.
2. Old Ukrainian texts do not show conceptual distinction between these 'signs', however they demonstrate greater variety and greater proximity to the original at the level of everyday speech.
3. The Greek texts could serve as an example for distinguishing between the lexemes 'blaho' and 'dobro' at the conceptual level. Nevertheless, both Church Slavonic and Old Ukrainian texts do not follow this example literally.
4. Attempts to separate 'high', theological, and 'lower' levels of speaking are registered in both translations. However, the lexeme 'blaho', which belonged to the usage of other language system, is missing in the old Ukrainian text.
5. The vocabulary for different levels in both texts is as follows:

Levels	Church Slavonic	Old Ukrainian
High (concept)	Blaho	Dobro
Middle	Blaho / Dobro	Dobro
Low (everyday life)	Dobro/ Krasa	Dobro — 'zatsnost' — 'tsudnost' — 'uroda' — 'potikha'– 'roskosh'…

The performer of the Church Slavonic translation works in the context of the theological discourse, more scrupulously separating lexemes that denote transcendental concepts (for them 'blaho' is reserved) from those denoting phenomena of terrestrial scope but concerning morality or church life (here he uses 'blaho' and 'dobro') and, finally, from lexical units of everyday speech (in such cases his choice is 'dobro' and sometimes 'krasa'). The distinction between high and medium levels of speech is much more consistent than between the medium and low ones. Number of used lexemes is very limited, and the new lexemes generally occur as the complex words, the first part of which also contains 'blaho' or 'dobro' ('blaho-rodiye', 'dobro-ditelnost', 'blaho-lipiye' etc.).

The Old Ukrainian translation demonstrates the switches of the speech register, when the distinction is lost on (or between) the higher and the middle level, while ordinary speech becomes enriched with the new words ('zatsnyi rid', 'tsnota', 'tsudnost' etc.). The old Ukrainian language rather shows direct reaction to the variety of everyday practice of searching the adequate vocabulary for denoting this kind of diversity than formation of the conceptual apparatus. Therefore, these languages are used in different areas.

It is possible that intellectuals of the Kyiv Orthodox Metropolis in 17th century, when preparing to print the works of Greek theologians could use Latin publications. Comparison of the Latin [15] and Greek [14] texts: The words of John Chrysostom "Do Fedora mnikha…" shows that the Greek τὸ ἀγαθῶν (dobro, blaho) is usually transmitted by the Latin bonum, τὸ ἀγατοτγς (dobrota) — bonitas, ἀγαθῶς (dobryi) — bonus. But the bonus is translated as adjectives χρηστὸς and κάλλος, which is not quite accurately conveys the Greek meaning of the relevant lexemes. There is a case where the adjective χρηστὸς is translated in Latin as suavis (pryiemnyi, pryvablyvyi), which also doesn't corresponds to the meaning of Greek χρηστὸς. Via bonum is also transmitted the Greek τὸ κάλλον (dobro, blaho). There is a case where τὸ κάλλον is transferred to the Latin

by noun commodum — perevaga, koryst, vygoda. The noun τὸ κάλλος (krasa) is transferred as much as by three synonyms: pulchritude (often), and forma decus.

This comparison does not allow to find a direct influence of the Latin text on Church Slavonic translations. The impact on translations into Old Ukrainian language is also quite conditional. Almost the only parallel between the Latin and Old Ukrainian translations of the Greek lexemes consist in that the lexeme τὸ κὰλλος (krasa), which is translated in Church Slavonic as "dobrota", in Ukrainian mostly matches "tsudnost, ozdoba" (which is correct).

I should add that performed in Church Slavonic edition of the "Besidy na 14 poslaniy Apostola Pavla" [16] and "Besidy na diyannya sv.Apostoliv" [17] by John Chrysostom, made by the Kiev-Pechersk Lavra in 1623 and 1624 , the use of lexemes "dobro" and "blaho" generally corresponds to what was given. But in Church Slavonic part of the publication "Commentary on the Apocalypse" by Andreas of Caesarea (Kyiv, 1625 [18] the lexemes "dobro" and "blaho" are never used as synonyms. For "dobro" is reserved the exclusive meaning of sphere "earthly" instead for "blaho" — the sphere of heaven. The only exception is the block that can be called "uchunku" and not less conventionally attributed to "earthly", because really we are not talking about ordinary actions/ thoughts but for those aimed to implement the commandments of God and approaching the "будущаго Вѣка благъ". Therefore, with high probability we can assume that there is already a serial dilution of the words "dobro" and "blaho" according to linguistic usage (the Old Ukrainian or Church Slavonic), but in accordance with the semantic field of each lexemes. Therefore, I can cautiously assume that the lexeme "blaho" gradually gets narrow semantic field, is assigned to the sphere of transcendental and acquires features of the concept.

However, the language of the old Ukrainian edition of the "Tlumachen" coincides with the situation recorded in "Likarstvo": the complete lack of lexem "blaho" and not clear definition of the semantic field of the lexeme "dobro".

* * *

Are these data valid for all the 17th century? When did this 'semantic switch' happened in the Ukrainian intellectual discourse, so that the lexeme 'dobro' gradually acquired the right to describe moral virtues and earth attractions, and the lexeme 'blaho' in its turn became confined to describing heaven (metaphysical) gifts and expectations of forthcoming bliss? The questions are still open. Looking ahead, I should say that Anthoniy Radyvylovskyi's and Innokentiy Gizel's texts convincingly show that:

1. The text, written in Church Slavonic language (Gizel) [19] demonstrates the prevalence of using the lexeme 'blaho' and its derivatives above the lexeme 'dobro'; the lexeme 'blaho' is also strictly reserved for the highest linguistic register, while the middle register has much more space for the lexeme 'dobro'.
2. The lexeme 'blaho' used for describing theological concepts appears in the text written in Old Ukrainian language (Radyvylovskyi) [20], while the sphere of using the lexeme 'dobro' becomes rather restricted and 'low'.
3. The demarcation line in different kinds of speech, that captures the distinction between the high theological discourse, that operates with the concepts and everyday language, passes mostly not at the level of the choice of language (sacred Church Slavonic or 'simple' Old Ukrainian), but at the level of the verbalized men-

tal activity fixed in specific common variations of word usage within each language system.

References

1. *Lingvisticheskii entsiklopedicheskii slovar'* [*Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary*]. Moscow, Sovetskaya Encyclopedia, 1990. Available at: http://tapemark.narod.ru/les/464c.html (In Russian)

2. Ivin A., Nikiforov A. *Slovar' po logik* [*Dictionary of Logics*]. Moscow, VLADOS, 1997. Available at: http://logic.slovaronline.com/ (In Russian)

3. *Vsemirnaia entsiklopediia. Filosofiia* [*The World Encyclopedia. Philosophy*]. Moscow, AST, 2001. 1312 p. (In Russian)

4. Zapasko Y., Isayevych Y. *Pam'jatky knyzhkovogo mystectva: katalog starodrukiv, vydanyh na Ukrai'ni* [*Monuments of book art: catalog of early printed books published in Ukraine*], book 1, (1574–1700). Lviv, Vyshča shkola, 1981. 135 p. (In Ukrainian)

5. Berynda Pamvo. *Leksikon slavenorosskij y ymen tlkovanie*. Kyi'v, Drukarnja Kyjevo-Pechers'koi' lavry Pechersk Lavra, 1627. 477 p. (In Ukrainian)

6. Vdovina G. *Iazyk neochevidnogo. Ucheniia o znakakh v skholastike XVII veka* [*The language of the non-obvious. The doctrine of signs in the scholastic of the XVII century*]. Moscow, Izd-vo Instituta filosofii, teologii i istorii sv. Fomy, 2009. 552 p. (In Russian)

7. Shokhin V. *Agatologiia. Sovremennost' i klassika* [*Agatology. Modernity and the classics*]. Moskov, Kanon+, 2014. 359 p. (In Russian)

8. *Slovnyk ukrai'ns'koi' movy: akademichnyj tlumachnyj slovnyk* [*Ukrainian dictionary: academic explanatory dictionary*], in 11 vols. Available at: http://sum.in.ua/ (In Ukrainian)

9. Sreznevsky I. *Dictionary Old Russian language*. In 3 volumes. Vol. 1. Reprint. — Moskov, Book, 1989. 771 p. (In Oldslavonic)

10. *Slovnyk ukrai'ns'koi' movy XVI — pershoi' polovyny XVII st.* [*Ukrainian Dictionary 17th — first half 18th*], is. 2. L'viv, In-t ukrai'noznavstva im. I. Kryp'jakevycha NANU, 1994. 151 p. (In Ukrainian)

11. *Slovnyk ukrai'ns'koi' movy XVI — pershoi' polovyny XVII st.* [*Ukrainian Dictionary 16th — first half 17th*], is. 8. L'viv, In-t ukrai'noznavstva im. I. Kryp'jakevycha NANU, 2001. 255 p. (In Ukrainian)

12. Khoma, O., Chukhray, Y. Moral'na teologija Serve Pinkersa i pytannja pro sens zhyttja suchasnoi' ljudyny [Servais Pinckaers' Moral Theology and the question about the meaning of life of a modern person]. Pinkers S. *Dzherela hrystyjans'koi' morali: i'i' metod, zmist ta istorija* [*The Sources of Christian Ethics*]. Kyi'v, Duh i litera publ., 2013, pp. 441–448. (In Ukrainian)

13. *Likarstvo na ospalyj umysl cholovichij* [*The remedy on sleepy human thinking*]. Ostrog, 1607. 183 sheet. (In Oldslavonic & Ukrainian)

14. John Chrysostom. Paraenesis sive adhortatio ad Theodorum. Lapsum I. *Patrologiae Graecae*. Vol. 47: John Chrysostom. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1863. Available at: https://archive.org/details/patrologiae_cursus_completus_gr_vol_047 (In Greek)

15. Joannis Chrysostomi. Paraenesis sive adhortatio ad Theodorum. Lapsum I. *Patrologiae Graecae*. Vol. 47: John Chrysostom. Paris: J.-P. Migne, 1863. Available at: https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=ZHz3OF_VORsC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad (In Latin)

16. John Chrysostom. *Homilioe in omnes epistolas Pauli*. Kyiv, Drukarnja Kyjevo-Pechers'koi' Lavry, 1623. 1642 p. (In Oldslavonic)

17. John Chrysostom (1624). *Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles*. Kyiv, Drukarnja Kyjevo-Pechers'koi' Lavry, 1624. 534 p. (In Oldslavonic)

18. Andreas of Caesarea. *Commentary on the Apocalypse***.** Kyiv, Drukarnja Kyjevo-Pechers'koi' Lavry, 1625. 256 p. (In Oldslavonic)

19. Gizel I. Peace with God for Man, or Holy Penance That Reconciles Man with God. I. Gizel. *Selected works in 3 volumes*. [L. Dovga]. Vol. 1. Book 2. Kyiv, Lviv, Svichado, 2009, 358 p. (In Oldslavonic)

20. Radyvylovskyy A. *Venets Khristov* [*Crown of Christ*]. Kyiv, Drukarnja Kyjevo-Pechers'koi' Lavry, 1688. [20], 544 sheet. (In Ukrainian)

For citation: Dovga L. M. Philosophical conceptual apparatus formation in ukrainian literary works of the 17th century: 'dobro' and 'blaho'. *Vestnik SPbSU. Philosophy and Conflict Studies*, 2017, vol. 33, issue 1, pp. 98–106. DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu17.2017.110.

Статья поступила в редакцию 13 августа 2016 г.
Статья рекомендована в печать 28 октября 2016 г.