

UDC 930.1

DOI 10.31733/2786-491X-2022-2-37-47



Mykola SLOBODYANYUK[©]

D.Sc. in History,

Professor

(Ukrainian State University of Science and
Technologies),
Ukraine

HISTORIOSOPHICAL VIEWS OF I. GIESEL IN THE PUBLICATIONS OF CONTEMPORARY RESEARCHERS

Abstract. *The aim of the research* is to analyze the degree of research of the historiosophical ideas of I. Giesel in modern historiography, to define the role and place of these ideas in the sociopolitical thought of the eighteenth century, to determine the relevance of the conceptual provisions of this person in the context of Ukrainian-russian relations.

The research methodology is based on the principles of historicism, scientific objectivity, a specific historical systematicity, and also the use of general scientific (analysis, synthesis, generalization) methods. While making this study there were applied general historical methods of making a historiographical and terminological analyses, and also the comparativistics method.

The scientific novelty. The author for the first time carried out a comprehensive analysis of modern scientific literature on the study of the views of I. Giesel on the relationship between God and human, on the one hand, and also the state and human, on the other hand. It has been established that modern researchers have not fully covered the role and influence of Giesel's work on Ukrainian-russian relations and the collective memory of both nations.

Conclusions. Modern scholars agree that the historiosophical works of I. Giesel aimed at transforming society on the basis of Christian morality and faith in God. An important role in the implementation of this task should have been played by both sovereigns in state-political area and clergy in the areas of church and morality. At the same time, contemporary authors do not have a single opinion regarding the political views of I. Giesel, his vision of the future of Ukrainian lands and the Giesel's place in the formation of russian historiography and in the formation of russian historical myth.

On the example of I. Giesel, it becomes obvious that the pro-moscow orientation of a significant part of Ukrainians and the phenomenon of "Little russianism", cannot be explained only by russification or mercantile interests. The reasons for the popularity of these ideas lie much deeper and often go beyond the rational. Without an impartial study of these phenomena, it is impossible to find ways of consensus and consolidation of the Ukrainian nation.

Keywords: *historiosophy, historiography, Synopsis, Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, Ukraine, russia.*

Introduction. The turbulent social processes, worldview discussions, and search of a common basis for collective memory in contemporary Ukraine inspire historians to historiosophical rethinking of the past of Ukraine. In recent years, problems of national-religious nature, such as the difficulty of Orthodox-Catholic dialogue and inter-Orthodox conflict over the autocephaly of the national church,

have become particularly prominent. In this context, work and heritage of a church leader, theologian, and philosopher I. Giesel, whose anthropological and historiographical views have had a significant influence on socio-political, historical and philosophical thought in Ukraine and Russia, are relevant.

The purpose of the article is to find out the exploration degree of the historiosophical ideas of I. Giesel in contemporary historiography (since 1992), as well as to express the author's view on the role and place of works of this thinker in the Ukrainian and Russian socio-political thought of the second half of the 17th century.

Analysis of recent research and publications. Many researchers have turned to the study of the theological, philosophical and historical works of I. Giesel. The problem of his worldview's formation and influence of other people, environment, and socio-political sentiment was of great interest.

First of all, one cannot ignore the personal influence Inokentii's patron and teacher, who also was the peer of Kyiv Metropolitan P. Mohyla. This manifested itself in four aspects: protection of Orthodoxy; openness to Western European influences; a firm belief that the spiritual and moral revival of the Orthodox Church is impossible without the development of modern education; efforts to streamline religious practices and systematize doctrines. Like P. Mohyla, I. Giesel was educated not only in Orthodox but also in Catholic schools. Being acquainted with the Catholic doctrine and Western European culture enabled him to acquire the necessary breadth of worldview, but at the same time maintain his devotion to Orthodoxy.

The high level of I. Giesel's education led to his understanding the need to continue P. Mohyla's policy of the development of Orthodox education in Ukraine. In particular, his efforts were aimed at supporting the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. Metropolitan of Kyiv P. Mohyla was a consistent defender of the "Russian faith" and a staunch opponent of Catholicism and the Union. However, it did not prevent him from lifting the Orthodox education out of self-isolation from the best achievements of the world science, in which it was, wanting nothing to do with the Catholic world. The new approach made it possible to create according to the Western European model a fundamentally different educational institution, the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, which has become a model for the science and education of all Eastern Slavs and the entire Orthodox world.

However, Western borrowing was not limited to education. P. Mohyla attempted to introduce parish registers. He, under the influence of the dominant Latin in Europe, first used the civil type in the printing, which was borrowed by Russia in 1724. The desire to regularize and systematize religious practices and doctrines was manifested in the convocation of the Kyiv Orthodox Assembly in 1640. It was supposed to resolve differences and unify church dogmas and canons. The assembly resulted in the adoption of a catechism, dubbed the Orthodox Confession of Faith and translated into several European languages.

Petro Mohyla's *Trebnik* (1646) was published for the same purpose. It was intended to purify and protect church ordinances from errors and inconsistencies. The book became the first of its kind in the Eastern Slavic countries. It also contained borrowings from Catholic rites. I. Giesel continued the publishing activity of P. Mohyla, continuing the work of systematizing and conceptualizing the Orthodox doctrine. In particular, under his leadership in 1661 and 1678 *Kyiv Patericon* was published – a popular collection of stories about the monks of the

Kyiv Pechersk Monastery. Undoubtedly, the worldview of the future Archimandrite of the Kyiv Pechersk Lavra and the Rector of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, born about 1600, was influenced by the ideas of the Baroque, the Enlightenment and the Reformation. V. Pavlov tried to reveal the influence of the Baroque on the I. Giesel's philosophy (Pavlov, 2007). However, he did this absolutely unconvincingly. He relied only on his own feelings, without confirmation of his discussion theses with specific examples and almost without reference to either sources or other researchers.

The turbulent military and political events of that time also could not but affect the formation of the thinker. Giesel's views were formed against the background of the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) and the Counter-Reformation (mid-16th – mid-17th centuries). These two events of a pan-European scale were accompanied by an intense feud between the Protestants and the "Papists", as the followers of the Reformation called the Pope's followers. The Protestant origin of the Giesel family influenced the firm anti-Catholic stance of Inokentii, since at that time the confrontation between Protestants and Catholics was no less tense, and the difference in religion was greater than political and theological conflicts between Catholics and Orthodox. Protestants were deeply convinced that the Pope is the epitome of the Antichrist. In the fight against Catholics, Orthodox readily used this thesis.

The fact that young Inokentii converted from Protestantism to Orthodoxy probably also heightened his anti-Catholic sentiment. After all, neophytes are usually more committed to their ideas than those who have been in the Orthodox environment since birth. In addition, the pan-European confrontation between Catholics and Protestants during the Thirty Years' War was immediately changed by another continent-wide event, the Ukrainian National Revolution of 1648 – 1676. B. Khmelnytskyi's uprising grew not only into a national liberation war and the bourgeois revolution, but also became an irreconcilable 28-year religious war between Catholics and Orthodox. Thus, for the Orthodox priesthood (and for Giesel as well), the anti-Catholic position became an existential issue. Therefore, his "spiritual eyes" turned to the Orthodox East.

N. Yakovenko argued that the Moscow tsar seemed to the Kyiv church intellectuals to be the guarantor of stability as opposed to the "elite of Cossack officers enraged by passions", as well as a defender from the Islamic threat. It was these motives that formed the basis for the historical views of I. Giesel and his associates. In addition, the author made the right observation that most "people in the church" sympathized with a strong monarchical power (Yakovenko, 1997).

The article by Z. Kohut is devoted to a comprehensive analysis of the political situation of the 1660^s and 1670^s, on the background of which the text of Synopsis was created. The author has consistently considered the geopolitical situation in the region, the interests of the Ukrainian Orthodox clergy, the mediating role of I. Giesel himself between his own church corporation and Moscow. Finally, Z. Kohut came to the conclusion that the publication of Synopsis was a reaction to the political challenges of the 1660^s and 1670^s (Kogut, 2011).

Formulation of the main material. It is worth noting that a significant part of Orthodox clergy in Ukraine at the time of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth had pro-Moscow sentiments. Their hopes for Moscow protection were prompted by the fierce pressure of the Polish authorities on the Orthodox Church, which, after the Union of Brest, was outlawed.

Attempts by clerics and Cossacks to achieve the legalization of Orthodoxy have failed for a long time. S. Plokhii noted in this connection: “The Seim’s refusal in 1623 to positively address the issue of legalization of the new Orthodox hierarchy ... contributed to the spread of hopelessness concerning the prospects of the Orthodox cause in Kyiv circles” (Plokhyy, 2001) So the question of the very existence of the Orthodox Church in Ukraine was on the agenda.

Harvard University Professor S. Plokhii also noted that in the year of Synopsis publication, Cossack-moscow forces urgently strengthened Kyiv, awaiting a Turkish offensive. At the same time, Poland demanded from moscow to turn the city over, as the Andrus armistice implied. It is with these events that the historian relates the publication of at least six books and pamphlets of the pro-moscow direction in 1674. Therefore, being threatened to fall under the authority of a Catholic king or a Muslim sultan, the Kyiv clergy sought to persuade a coreligionist Orthodox king not to surrender them. It was Synopsis that was called upon to show that “Kyiv is the cradle of the Russian dynasty, state, nation and religion”, which in no way can be given to foreigners (Plokhyy, 2006).

At the same time, despite political loyalty to the russian tsar, the Ukrainian clergy for a long time fought against the subordination of the Kyiv metropolis to the moscow Patriarch. Ukrainian priests and Orthodox fraternities sympathized with coreligious moscow and pointed to the unity of the origin of the two peoples. Many church hierarchs of the “Greek faith” sought moscow patronage. At the same time, such aspirations were combined with the firm position of the Kyiv metropolitans for the continued subordination of their metropolis to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Almost all leaders of the Ukrainian church of the 17th century were convinced of this: Job Boretsky (Metropolitan in 1620-1631), Isaiah Kopynsky (1631-1633), Petro Mohyla (1633-1647), Sylvester Kosiv (1647-1657), Dionisii Balaban (1657-1663), Joseph Nelyubovich-Tukalsky (1663-1676), Anthony Vinnytsky (1676-1679), and archbishop Lazar Baranovych, deputy Patriarch. I. Giesel held the same opinion. The situation changed only in 1685 and Metropolitan Hedeon Svyatopolk-Chetvertynskyi recognized the superiority of the moscow Patriarch over his church.

The situation in the Cossack environment was similar. From Hetman D. Baida-Vyshnevetskyi through P. Sahaidachnyi to B. Khmelnytskyi, the Cossacks periodically sent embassies to moscow with assurances of their desire to serve the sovereign there. Although the political orientation of Cossack leaders often changed to diametrical, it still reflected and created appropriate social sentiments that could not but affect individual members of this society. Sympathies with russia were also widespread among Ukrainian burghers.

It may seem a strange contradiction to the political loyalty of the Ukrainian clergy to the russian tsar and active resistance to the moscow Patriarch. However, in fact, there is no dissonance in this position. The transition to the rule of the autocrat was understood as an instrument of preserving the ancient rights and privileges of the Ukrainian people (first of all, the Cossacks) violated by the Polish authorities. Thus, Ukraine’s accession to russia was not as an unconditional and complete absorption of the smaller into the larger, but as an incorporation of a territory endowed with special rights and freedoms. It must be admitted that within the russian federation, the Cossack Nation received the autonomy that in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth Ukrainians could not even dream of, neither before nor after the Liberation War.

The Ukrainian clergy also held similar expectations. The absorption of the Kyiv metropolis by the moscow Patriarchate would mean complete merger and assimilation with it, which eventually happened. The Ukrainian church could only preserve its “rights and freedoms” by remaining a part of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Therefore, the struggle of the hierarchs of Kyiv for maintaining their autonomy cannot be considered by the hidden anti-moscow “fronde”.

After the accession of the Left Bank and Kyiv to russia, the Ukrainian priesthood mainained its pro-moscow orientation, but some nuances of its outlook and political position became apparent. In particular, Yale University Professor T. Snyder noted that “after Andrusov, Ukrainian clergymen sought to enlist the support of their new sovereign, rewriting the history of Muscovy so as to unite the Church and the state and give dignity to their own position. Their collaboration with the moscow dynasty was linked to the invention of Russian history” (Snyder, 2003).

Not all researchers considered the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy to be an independent intellectual unit that could “invent history”, influence peoples, or great powers. In particular, H. Antoniuk argued that in the 19th and first half of the 20th century the research environment was dominated by the view that the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy’s heritage is scholastic, blindly copied from Western samples, detached from the culture of its people and social demands. In support of this thesis, the author quoted I. Franko, who wrote in one of his articles: “Having said the truth, there was nothing to be glorified by that Mohyla college... Neither Mohyla himself... neither Trofymovych and Kosov, nor Giesel and Baranovych were so enlightened people that they could put a new school on new grounds, combine modern requirements with the needs of the Ukrainian people... They were content by mechanical copying an old Jesuit-Polish school template with its scholastic formalism, by filling a memory with empty forms, by complete disregard for life ... by contempt for boyhood and simplicity, by pride for their own scholarship and with claims for income, titles and positions for that seemed like scholarship. Only a few such as the skeptic Feofan Prokopovych were able to... reach a real worldview and influential work – though not to the benefit of Ukraine; most of the students of the Mohyla Academy were stuck ... in dead scholasticism, in complete inactivity of mind and heart, in complete uncritical thought; the Academy was not a source of education and development for Ukraine, but a musty swamp that spread spiritual demoralization, passivity and prostration instead of maintaining the spirit of initiative and criticism ... All heavy books written by members and students of that college in the second half of the 18th century have no literature cost” (Antoniuk, 2013).

In our opinion, I. Franko’s strict assessment of passivity and scholasticism was largely correct. It is significant that the idea of creating one’s own patriarchate was born and realized in moscow. The plans for a united patriarchate for Orthodox and Greek Catholics have been cherished for some time by the Catholic elite of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. But none of the “mohylians” dared even express the idea of the Kyiv Orthodox patriarchy, which testified to the limited intellectual horizons of the Ukrainian elite. On the other hand, I. Franko’s poor assessment of the intellectual level of the Academy is too categorical and is explained by his anti-clerical and socialist views. After all, during the 17th– first half of the 18th century Kyiv-Mohyla was the center of cultural life of Ukraine and russia.

It is difficult to deny the influence of the Academy on the formation of such bright personalities as O. Bezborodko, I. Hryhorovych-Barskyi, A. Vedel, M. Lomonosov, I. Mazepa, P. Orlyk and H. Skovoroda, and the publication of Grammar by M. Smotrytskyi and Synopsis was evidenced by the ability of “mohylians” to create a high-quality intellectual product.

In the context of the chosen problem, the historiosophical views of I. Giesel concentrated in Synopsis (Kyiv Synopsis) first published in 1674 are of interest. Some researchers have questioned Giesel’s authorship of this work. O. Syrtsova denied the opponents’ arguments and insisted that it was I. Giesel who authored Synopsis. To confirm this, she draws attention to the identity of Giesel’s argument with the argument of his another work, the theological-philosophical treatise *Prawdziwa Wiara Stara* (Syrtsova, 2011).

Without getting into discussion on this issue, we should note that whether he was the author of this work or only its editor, it is doubtless that I. Giesel’s influence as a Rector of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (where the work on the book took place) on the ideology of Synopsis became decisive. And more broadly, the history of I. Giesel largely reflected the historical and political views of the Ukrainian Orthodox clergy. On this basis, we have every reason to explore the historiosophy of the thinker through the analysis of the designated historical work.

There are three main evidences of the high intellectual quality of Synopsis. First, it is popular in the Eastern Slavic region, as well as in Bulgaria and Serbia. The book withstood about 30 reprints during the 17th-19th centuries, became the first and main textbook on Russian history until the appearance in 1760 of the *Short russian Chronicler* by M. Lomonosov. The book is also mentioned in all contemporary Russian and Ukrainian courses in historiography and source studies. Second, none of the Ukrainian intellectuals could write another fundamental historical work that would represent an alternative concept of Ukrainian or Russian history. Third, historiosophical ideas embedded in the work remain relevant today.

According to P. Magocsi, Synopsis became the most important and influential historical work of its time, being the first attempt “to completely trace the course of history of the Eastern Slavs from ancient times to the 17th century, which, moreover, justified the claims of Muscovy to Kyiv’s heritage”. The historical concept of Synopsis implied that the power of the Moscow rulers originated from the Grand Dukes of Kyiv. Thus, Moscow, as the capital of all Russia, is the natural and legal heir to the “mother of Russian cities”.

It follows that the unification of Cossack Ukraine with Muscovy is a logical process of restoring the unity of Russian lands and unification of the “Slavic-Russian” people in one state. I. Giesel decided to support these theses by the toponymic myth of Mosokh, the sixth son of Japheth, who allegedly founded Moscow. This gave reason to legitimize Moscow, and through him Moscow as the ancestor and ancestral homeland of Russia, from a biblical and religious point of view. It is also possible to agree with P. Magocsi’s thesis that, through Synopsis, the Orthodox cultural environment of Kyiv “formulated the first comprehensive historical scheme, which subsequently evolved into a Russian imperial vision of Eastern European history – that is, a consistent transfer of the power centers from Kyiv to Vladimir-on-Klyazma then to Moscow and finally to St. Petersburg” (Magocsi, 2007). In Synopsis, a completely new historical concept was formulated, the quintessence of which, according to N. Yakovenko, is laid out in its very name: “Synopsis or short collection of different chroniclers about the

beginning of the slavico-russian people and the original dukes of the prospering city of Kyiv, about the life of the Holy Blessed Grand Duke of Kyiv and All Russia, the first autocrat Volodymyr and the heirs of his pious Russian state to our noble Russian Duke Oleksii Mykhailovych, of all Great and Little, and White Rus autocrat". The researcher claimed that the authors of the work only briefly mentioned the history of the Kingdom of Galicia–Volhynia and completely ignored the thesis Halych is the second Kyiv traditional for Ukrainian historiography of the 17th century. Right after that, Synopsis details the events in Muscovy and defends Moscow's status as Third Rome. The wars of the second half of the 17th century are interpreted in the context of the return of Kyiv invaded by foreigners to the legitimate authority of the Moscow tsar as the heir of the ancient Dukes of Kyiv. N. Yakovenko noted that "looking at the history of Great, Little and White Russia as an indivisible dynastic-territorial heritage of the Moscow scepter allows the author to assert the existence of a single political body – the Russian people with a common historical root and common modernity" (Yakovenko, 1997).

From the point of view of V. Hotsuliak, at the end of 16th – the first half of 17th century in the context of religious and administrative pressure on Orthodoxy by Poland, Ukrainian intellectuals and church leaders (H. Balaban, L. Baranovych, Y. Boretskyi, M. Kozachynskyi, I. Kopynskyi, S. Yavorskyi, V. Yasynskyi and others) are reviving the myth of a common spiritual heritage, of Little Russia as an integral part of Great one, "seeking support in Moscow and reminding the Moscow tsar of the commonality of faith and spiritual affinity" (Gotsuliak, 2019).

Ukrainian intellectuals, religious and political figures at the end of 17th-18th centuries did not pursue the goals of forming Ukrainian identity. Due to the orientation towards a coreligious Moscow, a significant number of Ukrainians were not aware of their national identity at that time. As in previous times, Orthodoxy remained the main factor in ethnic unity. As a result, the national development of Ukraine, its culture, and the state idea was significantly slowed down, and even stopped. Moreover, it is the Ukrainian T. Prokopovych who formulated the principles of Russian statehood and Russian absolutism in the 18th century. He substantiated the concept of Russian absolutism, the realization of which ended with the denial of the very fact of the existence of the Ukrainian state and Ukrainians as a separate ethnos (Gotsuliak, 2019).

Actually, I. Giesel advocated the Moscow protectorate over Ukraine, did not recognize the Treaty of Hadiach in 1658, did not approve the activities of Hetman P. Doroshenko. At the same time, he firmly defended the rights and privileges of the Kyiv metropolis, which were justified by the idea of continuity of Russian history and the supremacy of Kyiv as the political, spiritual and church center of Russia (Gotsuliak, 2019). That is, the author or authors of Synopsis have developed a view on the history of the Eastern Slavs as the development of a unified (triumph) people centered in Kyiv, whose historical heritage rightfully belongs to Moscow and the genealogical right to the Ukrainian and Belarusian lands to the Russian tsar. Thus, in the mass consciousness, the myth of Kyiv origin of the Russian people was established. In addition, according to S. Plokhii, the concept of "slavico-russian nation used in Synopsis implied much closer affinity of Ruthenians and Muscovites than previously assumed". This position was "reinforced by an ethnogenological legend which said that all Slavs and Slavic Russians, in particular, descended from the biblical Meshech ("Mosokh" in the East

Slavic tradition), the son of Japheth, and the “forefather” of the moscow nation (“moscow-people”) and all “Slavic russians” (Plokyh, 2006). K. Kysliuk distinguished two branches in the Cossack officers’ historiography: “Great russian” (Synopsis – Chronicles of Eyewitness – Chronicle Narrative about Little russia and its People” by O. Rigelman – History of Little russia by D. Bantysh-Kamenskyi) and “Ukrainian-russian” (Chronicle of S. Velychko – Chronicle of H. Hrabianka – History of russians – History of Little russia by M. Markevych). There was a significant gap between these two branches, which was formed by the difference in views regarding the degree of detachment of Ukrainian history – from the idea about russia’s “restitution” of its “coreligious” part to the claim about “Ukrainian autocracy”, the voluntary reunification with Moscow and the equality of partnership with it (Kysliuk, 2008).

According to the author, the “Great russian” branch was started by Synopsis of I. Giesel and substantially resonated with the then official moscow historiography, especially in the part of the inheritance of the concepts “Mosoch-moscow” and “royal City of moscow”, as well as the legend of receiving royalties from Constantinople (Kysliuk, 2008). However, Z. Kohut insisted that the work was not created as “all-russian” grand narrative, written for the tsar or at his request. Synopsis merely provided the historical and ideological bases of the political program of the Kyiv Pechersk Lavra, which was actively implemented by its archimandrite I. Giesel (Kogut, 2011).

O. Syrtsova also denied the thesis about the pro-moscow nature of Synopsis “because of the emphasized alternative to the efforts of moscow Patriarchs to take over the hierarchy over the Metropolitanate of Kyiv and Lavra”. Another manifestation that there as no pro-moscow orientation of the Ukrainian clergy, O. Syrtsova, considers the initial refusal of the Kyiv hierarchs, led by Metropolitan S. Kosov, to swear allegiance to the russian tsar on January 18, 1654, after the Treaty of Pereyaslav. Although the swear took place the following day, a mission to Moscow in July of the same year by an embassy headed by I. Giesel to confirm the liberty of the Metropolis of Kyiv testified to the desire of the clergy to preserve church self-government. According to O. Syrtsova the idea of Volodymyr’s autocracy as an ideal form for the prosperity of Orthodoxy is equally essential to understanding the general orientation of Synopsis. The text refers to “glorious Kyiv autocracy”, “autocratic kingdom”, “Orthodox tsars”, “highly state reign of Orthodox autocrat” of “all Great and Little and White russia’s autocrat”, but never to “moscow autocracy”.

According to such ideology, “Synopsis” could not also be “pro-Hetman”, since the elective Hetman’s rule did not meet the monarchical ideals of the author. This is why O. Syrtsova explains the neglect or insignificant attention to the Cossacks, Khmelnytskyi and Hetman in Synopsis of 1674. In her view, such a double suspension from Moscow and Chyhyryn could not be acceptable for either the moscow or the Cossack officers (Syrtsova, 2011). Not only historiographical works but also publications of anthropological nature came from the pen of I. Giesel. His theological and philosophical works developed Christian ideas about the interconnection of man and God, interpersonal relations, the inner world of man. The views of the thinker are concentrated in the writings On True Faith, Old Faith, Peace with God to Man. N. Priadko devoted her thesis to the reconstruction of Giesel’s worldview in context of God-world-man paradigm, the study of the moral and ethical aspect of the religious-philosophical doctrine of I. Giesel,

the analysis of the basic criteria for the formation of the ontological status of man in the religious and philosophical reflection of clergyman. According to her fair conviction, the anthropological doctrine of Giesel was formed on the basis of a synthesis of the Ukrainian spiritual tradition and Western European humanist philosophy. At the same time, one cannot disagree with the thesis of the researcher that “in the philosophy of Giesel, pantheistic and deistic elements, which were inherent in the interpretation of the relation between God and nature, man and the universe, become dominant”. After all, for a Christian, and even more, church minister, pantheism and deism are absolutely unacceptable in terms of church teachings. Their violations in the field of doctrine would inevitably lead to dismissal and excommunication (Priadko, 2005).

V. Hotsuliak carried out a detailed analysis of the clergyman’s work in his thesis. The author emphasized that for Giesel, the knowledge of man by himself was more important than the knowledge of the world around him. This self-knowledge is a way to approach to God, a way of finding God in one’s soul. According to Giesel, the contradictory place of man in the world is determined by the fact that his existence is connected with different kinds of values – simple, generated by the body (“earthly bread”) and higher – spiritual, which are determined by Scripture or Holy Tradition. Man must constantly decide what values are of priority. In accordance with Christian doctrine, a man is endowed with the ability to judge good and evil, interpret God’s commandments and church ordinances at his own discretion, and has the will to implement them in his life.

One of the main anthropological works of Giesel was the treatise *Peace with God to Man*. Its purpose was to develop such moral principles on the basis of which the society of that time could function and develop. Explaining the basic Christian principles, I. Giesel called for common sense. For example, when it comes to observance of strict fasting for hard-working people, punishing those who have committed a crime of fear of starvation, and the like. Similarly, murder to defend one’s life cannot be considered a sin. The author sought to draw the attention of the authorities to the need to combat evil. The main criterion of good and evil is the conscience of man, and the main basis of human activity. I. Giesel considered the principle of common good. It is on his achievements that the rulers should direct their efforts on. He criticized the powerful for their abuse: deceiving ordinary people, lawmaking not for the common good, but for their own enrichment. He saw the role of the clergy in the care of the education of people and the eradication of moral defects. At the same time, clergymen should not interfere in secular affairs, strive for power or for secular benefits. After writing the treatise *Peace with God to Man* was sent to Moscow’s Tsar Oleksii Mykhailovych, but soon the book was forbidden and condemned as heretical. Finally, V. Hotsuliak concluded that “the theory of I. Giesel is imbued with the ideas of Christian humanism and morality. The clergyman focused his efforts on improving a man, on making him better, instilling in him self-belief, and through him improve the state of Ukrainian society as a whole” (Gotsuliak, 2019).

Conclusions. Summarizing the analysis of the historiosophical view of I. Giesel in the works of modern researchers, we note that the written heritage of the thinker has aroused the interest of many scholars. The analysis of his ideas is devoted to scientific articles, sections of monographs, PhD and doctoral theses. In general, the life and work of I. Giesel have been researched at the proper level. However, a generalized view of his role and place in the socio-political thought of

Ukraine and Russia in the second half of the 17th century, as well as the influence of his ideas on contemporary Ukrainian-Russian relations, are still not fully enlightened. In our opinion, the publications of I. Giesel of anthropological and historiosophical nature were intended to improve the Ukrainian society contemporary to the thinker on the basis of Christian morality and belief in God. At the same time, both secular rulers in the state-political sphere and clergymen in the spheres of church and morality had an important role in the realization of this task. Turning to the analysis of the main historical work of Giesel, it should be noted that it is not possible to establish the true motives for the creation and publication of *Synopsis*. Due to the lack of sources, we cannot determine exactly what the creative and political idea of the book was. In view of this, it is not important whether *Synopsis* was created as a Russian historical myth or became just a political manifesto of the Kyiv Pechersk Lavra. The main thing is what *Synopsis* actually was. The work became the first textbook on the history of Russia and retained this status for almost the whole 18th century. And the most important: the historiosophical views of I. Giesel were the basis of Russian historiosophy. In addition to the idea of a triune Russian people, *Synopsis* has become a source of popularization and other historiosophic concepts: Moscow is the third Rome; Kyiv is the second Jerusalem; ancient Russian nationality; “Little Russian” identity. *Synopsis* not only promoted these ideas, it also confirmed their already existing popularity. The relevance of the work is not lost. It is evidenced by the fact that today millions of people and influential elite groups in different countries of the world are under the influence of these ideologies.

Undoubtedly, the views of I. Giesel and a large part of the Ukrainian Orthodox clergy were pro-Moscow. It is obvious that *Synopsis* and the ideas contained therein encourage a thorough scientific study and explanation of such related phenomena as “pro-Moscow orientation of Ukrainians”, “Little Russianism”, “the influence of the Russian language, history and culture on Ukraine”. In our view, the spread of ideas of unity with other East Slavic peoples in the 17th century was not only related to the pressure of difficult external circumstances. The pro-Moscow orientation of part of Ukrainian society is recorded by sources from the times of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania to the present. It cannot be explained only by Russification, lack of information or mercantile interests. The reasons for the popularity of these ideas lie much deeper and often go beyond the rational. Without realizing this long-lasting and complex phenomenon, it is impossible to find ways of sustainable national consensus and consolidation of the Ukrainian nation.

Conflict of Interest and other Ethics Statements

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- Antoniuk, G. (2013). “Osvitnia praktyka Kyievo-Mogylianskoi akademii v konteksti zakhidnoevropeiskogo skholastynogo dyskursu” [Educational practice of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy in the context of Western European scholastic discourse]. *Pedagogika i psykholohiia profesynoi osvity* [Pedagogics and Psychology in Higher Education], 2, 189–199. [in Ukr.].
- Gotsuliak, V. (2019). “Teoretyko-metodologichne osmyslennia suspilno-politychnoi dumky ranniomodernoi Ukrainy” [Theoretical and methodological understanding of socio-political thought of early modern Ukraine] (*Doctor's thesis*). Kyiv. [in Ukr.].
- Kysliuk, K. (2008). *Istoriiosofia v ukrainskii kulturi: vid kontseptu do kontseptsii* [Historiosophy

- in Ukrainian culture: from concept to concept]. Kharkiv: KhDAK, 288 p. [in Ukr.].
- Kogut, Z. (2011). Vplyv polityky na Inokentiiia Gizelia ta vydannia kyivskogo Synopsysu: nove osmyslennia [The Influence of Politics on Inokentiy Giesel and the Publication of the Kyiv Synopsis: A New Understanding]. In *Inokentiy Gizel. Vybrani tvory v 3-kh tomakh. T. 3: Doslidzhennia ta materialy* (pp. 9–30). Kyiv–Lviv: Svichado. [in Ukr.].
- Magocsi, P. (2007). *Istoriia Ukrainy* [History of Ukraine]. Kyiv: Krytyka, 639 p. [in Ukr.].
- Pavlov, V. (2007). Barochnye motyvy v filosofii Innokentiiya Gizelya [Baroque motifs in the philosophy of Inokentiy Giesel]. In *Chelovek v kulture russkogo barokko: sbornik statey po materialam mezhdunarodnoy konferentsii* (pp. 216–224). M., IF RAN.
- Plokyh, S. (2001). *The Cossacks and Religion in Early Modern Ukraine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 401 p. [in English] doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199247394.001.0001
- Plokyh, S. (2006). *The Origins of the Slavic Nations Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 379 p. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511496837.
- Priadko, N. (2005). “Liudyna u konteksti religiyno-filosofskoi refleksii I. Gizelia” [Human in the context of religious and philosophical reflection of I. Giesel] (*Extended abstract of Candidate’s thesis*). Kyiv. [in Ukr.].
- Snyder, T. (2003). *The Reconstruction of Nations. Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569–1999*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 367 p.
- Syrtsova, O. (2011) “Tekstologiiia ta istoriosofiiia Synopsysu Inokentiiia Gizelia v argumentatsii avtorskoi identychnosti tvoruu” [Textology and historiosophy of Synopsis by Inokentii Giesel in the argumentation of the author's identity of the work]. *Kyivska Akademiia [Kyiv Academy]*, 9, 78–86. [in Ukr.].
- Yakovenko, N. (1997). *Narys istorii Ukrainy z naydavnishykh chasiv do kintsia XVIII stolittia* [Essay on the history of Ukraine from ancient times to the end of the 18th century]. Kyiv: Geneza, 312 p. [in Ukr.].

Микола СЛОБОДЯНЮК
ІСТОРИОСОФСЬКІ ПОГЛЯДИ І. ГІЗЕЛЯ У ПРАЦЯХ
СУЧАСНИХ ДОСЛІДНИКІВ

Анотація. Мета дослідження – проаналізувати ступінь дослідженості історіософських ідей І. Гізеля в сучасній історіографії, встановити роль і місце цих ідей в суспільно-політичній думці XVII ст., визначити актуальність концептуальних положень цього мислителя в контексті україно-російських відносин. *Методологія дослідження* ґрунтується на принципах історизму, системності, науковості, об’єктивності, а також на використанні загальнонаукових (аналіз, синтез, узагальнення) методів. При проведенні цього дослідження були застосовані загальноісторичні методи історіографічного, порівняльного, термінологічного аналізів. *Наукова новизна.* Автором вперше проведено комплексний аналіз сучасної наукової літератури, присвяченої дослідженню поглядів І. Гізеля на взаємини Бога і людини, з одного боку, а також держави і людини, з іншого боку. Встановлено, що сучасними дослідниками не повною мірою висвітлені роль і вплив творчості І. Гізеля на україно-російські відносини і колективну пам’ять обох народів.

Висновки. Сучасні дослідники сходяться на думці, що історіософські праці І. Гізеля мали на меті перетворення суспільства на основі християнської моралі та віри в Бога. Важливу роль в реалізації цього завдання повинні були грати як світські володарі в сфері державно-політичній, так і священнослужителі в сферах церковній і моральній. У той же час, у сучасних авторів немає єдиної думки щодо політичних поглядів І. Гізеля, його бачення майбутнього українських земель і місця мислителя у становленні російської історіографії і в формуванні російського історичного міфу. На прикладі І. Гізеля стає очевидним, що промосковську орієнтацію значної частини українців і феномен малоросійства не можна пояснити виключно русифікацією або меркантильними інтересами. Причини популярності цих ідей лежать значно глибше і часто виходять за межі раціонального. Без неупередженого вивчення цих явищ неможливо знайти шляхи консенсусу та консолідації української нації.

Ключові слова: історіософія, історіографія, Синопис, Києво-Могилянська академія, Україна, росія.

Submitted: 01.10.2022

Revised: 17.10.2022

Accepted: 24.10.2022