

ИСТОРИОГРАФИЯ, ИСТОЧНИКОВЕДЕНИЕ И МЕТОДЫ ИСТОРИЧЕСКОГО ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ

The Discussions on the Educational Model of the Orthodox Academy of the Eighteenth Century

L. Yu. Posokhova

For citation: Posokhova L. Yu. The Discussions on the Educational Model of the Orthodox Academy of the Eighteenth Century. *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*, 2019, vol. 64, issue 1, pp. 177–191. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2019.110>

The historiography of the Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium (Academy), Moscow Slavic Greek Latin Academy, and the Chernihiv, Kharkiv, and Pereiaslav Collegiums comprise hundreds of works where many valuable ideas and observations have been accumulated. At the same time, a number of diverging judgments coexist in literature regarding certain key characteristics of these educational institutions, such as estate-based vs. socially inclusive (*soslovnyi* or *vsesoslovnyi*) or progressive vs. archaic. Some of these interpretations date back to the nineteenth century and are still treated as axioms today. The purpose of this article is to discover the main enduring historiographical stereotypes that influence how the nature of the Orthodox academies (collegiums) in the Eighteenth-Century Russian Empire is understood and to offer an explanation for them. By pinpointing differences in the interpretation of the characteristic features of the academy (collegium) model such stereotypes are identified. The common post-Soviet approach to the analysis of historiography, which involves segregating periods of study and grouping works by the topic or level of generalization, means that historiographical overviews rarely touch on the issue of the essential traits of an educational model. Evaluations of these institutions in terms of semantic-structural and semantic-axiological dichotomies, such as East-West, indigenous-alien, or progressive-archaic, I view as obsolete. Overcoming rigid linear oppositions and reorienting research towards interpenetration as opposed to unyielding polarity will help us better to understand the peculiarities of the phenomenon of the Orthodox academy (collegium) and to compare its features to the basic features of the analogous Western European educational institutions, such as the Jesuit collegium or pre-classical university.

Keywords: history of education, Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, Moscow Slavic Greek Latin Academy, Orthodox collegium, pre-classical university, Jesuit collegium.

Liudmila Yu. Posokhova — Doctor in History, Professor, V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, 4, Svobody pl., Kharkiv, 61022, Ukraine; lposokhova@karazin.ua

Людмила Юрьевна Посохова — д-р ист. наук, проф., Харьковский национальный университет им. В. Н. Каразина, Украина, 61022, Харьков, пл. Свободы, 4; lposokhova@karazin.ua

© Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет, 2019

Дискуссии об образовательной модели православной академии восемнадцатого века

Л. Ю. Посохова

Для цитирования: *Posokhova L. Yu.* The Discussions on the Educational Model of the Orthodox Academy of the Eighteenth Century // Вестник Санкт-Петербургского университета. История. 2019. Т. 64. Вып. 1. С. 177–191. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2019.110>

Историография Киево-Могилянского коллегіума (академии), Московской славяно-греко-латинской академии, Черниговского, Харьковського и Переяславского коллегіумов насчитывает сотни работ, накоплено немало ценных выводов и наблюдений. При этом в литературе сосуществует ряд противоречивых оценочных суждений, относящихся к ключевым характеристикам этих образовательных институций («сословные» / «всесословные», «прогрессивные» / «архаические» и т. п.). Некоторые из оценок возникли еще в XIX в. и сегодня используются авторами как аксиомы. Это свидетельствует о слабости историографической рефлексии, о наличии различных методологических подходов, которые далеко не всегда осознанно применяются исследователями. Цель статьи — выявить основные устойчивые историографические стереотипы, влияющие на трактовку сущности православных академий (коллегіумов) в Российской империи XVIII в. и предложить их объяснение. Фиксация таких стереотипов осуществлялась путем установления различий в трактовках характеристических особенностей модели академии (коллегіума). Распространенный на постсоветском пространстве подход к анализу историографии с выделением периодов исследования (дореволюционный, советский, современный) и группировкой работ по темам или степени обобщения (по истории образования или церкви, конкретного учебного заведения или развития образования и культуры в целом) приводит к тому, что в историографических обзорах редко затрагивается вопрос о сущностных характеристиках образовательной модели. В результате и сегодня продолжают применяться определения уровня программы обучения в академии (коллегіуме) в категориях «общеобразовательный», «средний», «высший». Проявлением устаревшего подхода автор считает попытки оценивать эти учебные заведения, ориентируясь на дуальные семантико-структурные и семантико-аксиологические оппозиции: Восток — Запад, «свой» — «чужой», прогрессивный — архаичный. Преодоление жестких линейных оппозиций, переориентация исследования на взаимопроникновение и разрушение противостояния *vis-à-vis* позволит лучше понять особенности феномена православной академии (коллегіума), а также сопоставить их с признаками аналогичных западноевропейских учебных заведений (иезуитский коллегіум, доклассический университет). Такой подход дает возможность проследить направления трансфера идей и опыта, выявить механизмы адаптации европейских культурно-образовательных форм и традиций на восточноевропейском пространстве.

Ключевые слова: история образования, Киево-Могилянская академия, Московская славяно-греко-латинская академия, православный коллегіум, доклассический университет, иезуитский коллегіум.

In the eighteenth century, the most important educational centers in the Russian state, influencing all aspects of cultural life, were the Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium (Academy)¹ and Moscow Slavic Greek Latin Academy. No less significant, though not as widely

¹ The Kiev (Mohyla) collegium received the status of “academy” first in the Polish Commonwealth and then in the Russian state as well.

known, were the three Orthodox collegiums — in Chernihiv, Kharkiv, and Pereiaslav². Their founders used the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy as the basic template. The historiography of these establishments comprises hundreds of works³, including many specialized studies dealing with different periods in their history, their curriculum, pedagogical practices, faculties and student bodies, cultural impact on the wider society, and prominent personalities. Many valuable ideas and observations have been accumulated over more than a hundred years of research on these and other topics. But at the same time, a number of contradictory judgments and interpretations regarding the typology and basic features of these educational establishments continue to exist in the literature side by side. Some controversial definitions of the Orthodox academies and collegiums were put forward in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and are still in use today: estate-based (clerical) vs. socially inclusive (*soslovnyi/vsesoslovnyi*); progressive vs. archaic. The educational stage, which these institutions corresponded to, has also been estimated differently, with the use of such terms as “general,” “secondary,” or “higher education” (*obshcheobrazovatelnyi, srednii, or vysshyi*). Unfortunately, many long-lived historiographical clichés are still employed by scholars without reflection, as axioms.

Such a considerable range of definitions applicable to the distinguishing features of this type of educational institution, in our view, is indicative of something of a methodological crisis, and the established historiographical commonplaces have to be replaced. The coexistence of diametrically opposed views concerning the basic characteristics of these schools signals a “methodological confusion” and calls into question the use of a number of existing interpretations in the study of the more general educational and cultural developments in the eighteenth-century Russian Empire. Serious divergences in assessment make it difficult to analyze and, even more so, compare educational and cultural phenomena in the west and east of Europe.

The purpose of this article is to locate the main persistent historiographical stereotypes influencing the interpretation of the nature of the Orthodox academies (collegiums) and to offer an explanation for them. We identify such stereotypes by establishing a number of defining points in the discussion of the parameters and characteristic features of the model of the academy (collegium). The checklist of these “markers” does not always coincide with the repertoire of questions that have at different times become objects of

² Appeared (in that order) in 1700, 1726, and 1738. There were no other “Orthodox collegiums” in the Russian Empire. Further, in the documents of the Synod they were often referred to as “academies.” For the Kyiv Academy, along with the term “academy”, such names as “collegium,” “collegia,” and “schools” are found in the paperwork of the Synod throughout the eighteenth century.

³ Here we will cite only the principal works, in which overviews of historiography can be found. On Kiev Academy: *Ševčenko I.* The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla // Harvard Ukrainian Studies. The Kiev Mohyla Academy. 1984. Vol. 8, no. 1/2. P. 9–44; *Sysin F.* Peter Mohyla and the Kiev Academy in Recent Western Works: Divergent View on Seventeenth Century Ukrainian Culture // Harvard Ukrainian Studies. The Kiev Mohyla Academy. 1984. Vol. 8, no. 1/2. P. 155–187; *Sharipova L.:* 1) Eshche o “Cheloveke mnogikh mirov”: Petr Mogila — traditsionalist, reformator, opportunist // Ab Imperio. 2000. No. 1. P. 53–73; 2) Latin Books and the Eastern Orthodox Clerical Elite in Kiev, 1632–1780. Manchester, 2006; *Iaremenko M.* “Akademiki” ta Akademiia. Sotsialna istoriia osviti i osvichenosti v Ukraini XVIII st. Kharkiv, 2014. On the Moscow Academy: *Andreev A. Yu.* Nachalo universitetskogo obrazovaniia v Rossii v otechestvennoi i zarubezhnoi istoriografii // Otechestvennaia istoriia. 2008. No. 4. P. 157–169; *Larionov A. A.* Reformy Moskovskoi Slaviano-greko-latinskoi Akademii (vtoraia chetvert XVIII — nachalo XIX v.) v kontekste razvitiia vysshego obrazovaniia v Rossii // Vestnik of the Orthodox St. Tikhon Humanities University. History of the Russian Orthodox Church. 2014. Iss. 4 (59). P. 74–84. On the collegiums: *Posokhova L. Iu.* Pravoslavnye kollegiiumy na peresechenii kultur, traditsii, epoch (konets XVII — nachalo XIX v.). M., 2016.

scholarly reflection. We believe that accomplishing our goal will make it possible not only to evaluate more correctly the phenomenon of the Orthodox academy (collegium) itself and to verify the existing interpretations, but also to incorporate this institutional model into the general course of the development of education in Central and Eastern Europe in the eighteenth century.

1

First of all, it appears necessary to identify the historiographical “framework” that up to this day has defined the parameters of the study of theological schools in the eighteenth-century Russian Empire. We should note that the common post-Soviet approach to the analysis of historiography, which involves differentiating periods of study (pre-revolutionary, Soviet, and post-Soviet) and grouping works by degree of generalization (history of education or church history, history of a particular academy), means that the cardinal “points of tension” disappear from view, and no polemics develop around them⁴. In studying the details of the instructional process, specifics of the course offerings in connection with the development of scientific knowledge, or the work of particular personalities, scholars have often been unconcerned about correlating the data they received with the typological characteristics of the school. On the other hand, the conclusions of researchers working on school courses of rhetoric, poetics, philosophy, and theology⁵, and using highly specialized methods in their analysis of lecture notes and manuscript books are not always taken into account by historians dealing with more general issues of education. The prevalence of this or that stereotype can also be conditioned by the current general approaches to the history of education, which, in their turn, are part and parcel of the socio-cultural context of their era. Let us turn to the identification and analysis of these basic approaches. Given the extensive historiography, in this article we will limit ourselves to typical examples taken from different periods of study.

2

The efforts to fit the curriculum of the Orthodox academies and collegiums into one of the stages and varieties of modern formal education — “general,” “secondary,” or “higher” — stem from the desire to determine their place in the “educational system” of the Russian Empire in the eighteenth century. The urge to build a similar “system” was evident

⁴ Rare exceptions are those works in which the academies are shown in connection with the development of the European academic (university) tradition: *Sazonova L. I. Vostochnoslavianские akademii XVI–XVIII vv. v kontekste evropeiskoi akademicheskoi traditsii // Slavianovedenie. 1995. No. 3. P. 46–61; Andreev A. Yu. Nachalo universitetskogo obrazovaniia v Rossii v otechestvennoi i zarubezhnoi istoriografii. P. 157–169.*

⁵ Here are some of these works: *Masliuk V. P. Latinomovni poetiki i ritoriki XVII — pershoi polovini XVIII st. ta ikh rol u rozvitku teorii literatury na Ukraini. Kiev, 1983; Simchich M. Philosophia rationalis u Kievo-Mogilianskii akademii. Vinnitsia, 2009; Sutorius K. V. Bogoslovie v Kievo-Mogilianskoi akademii v 1751–1763 gg. // Religioznoe obrazovanie v Rossii i Evrope v kontse XVIII — nachale XIX v. / ed. by E. Tokareva. M.; SPb., 2009. P. 127–202; Siedina G. The Reception of Horace in the Courses of Poetics at the Kyiv Mohyla Academy: 17th — First Half of the 18th Century: doct. diss. Harvard University, 2014; Sutorius K. V. Moral Theology in the Kiev-Mohyla Academy Based on Manuscript Sources // Vestnik of Saint-Petersburg University. History. 2018. Iss. 1. P. 5–28.*

in scholarship as early as the nineteenth century. In those cases where authors outlined a succession of “educational rungs,” they sought to fill them with specific types of schools, which also meant trying to place into the “system” the educational establishments that are the subject of our article. Regarding the “academy,” nineteenth- and twentieth-century historians were unanimous in classifying it as an institution of higher learning⁶. At the same time, the curriculum level of the “collegium” was identified by most nineteenth-century authors as “higher”⁷, with only some relegating it to “secondary education”⁸. Opinions of Soviet and present-day historians have varied. One can come across definitions of collegiums as schools of “higher”⁹ or “secondary education”¹⁰ or “establishments of higher type”¹¹.

It is notable that, even when the fact is acknowledged that in the eighteenth-century Russian Empire the educational system as such did not yet take shape, modern students of the history of education often insist on drawing a line from the primary link in the educational chain through the secondary (collegiums) to the higher (academies)¹². Still, in the last decades we have been able to observe a certain expansion of the categorical apparatus. Thus, in present-day Russian historiography some authors call the eighteenth-century Kyiv and Moscow Academies “higher specialized educational institutions”¹³, and others — an embodiment of the “general-education school,” which, even while offering classes in theology, did not pursue only narrowly professional goals¹⁴.

Until the end of the eighteenth century, a system of education in which schools would correspond to clearly defined stages, and a continuity of rungs would be observed did not exist in the Russian Empire (although several projects were prepared and certain steps were taken in this direction). All the elements necessary for a “system” came together only at the beginning of the nineteenth century in the course of the large-scale reforms in the field of education that unfolded at the time. But more importantly, we should not forget that the eighteenth-century academies and collegiums, as syncretic institutions, incorporated under their roof several stages of formal education, from elementary to “higher” sciences (philosophy and theology). That is why their “diplomas” issued to students

⁶ Larionov A. A. Reformy Moskovskoi Slaviano-greko-latinskoi Akademii (vtoraia chetvert' XVIII — nachalo XIX v.) v kontekste razvitiia vysshego obrazovaniia v Rossii. P. 75; Fedotov V. E. Kievo-Mogilianskaia akademiia posle Petra Mogily // Vestnik of O. N. Nekrasov Kostroma State University. 2016. No. 2. P. 26.

⁷ Rozhdestvenskii S. V. Ocherki po istorii sistem narodnogo prosveshcheniia v Rossii v XVIII i XIX vekakh. Vol. 1. SPb., 1912. P. 68; Bagalii D. I. Istoriia Slobidskoi Ukraini. Kharkiv, 1990. P. 193.

⁸ Parkhomenko V. K. Istoriia obrazovaniia na Ukraine // Kievskai starina. 1905. No. 9. P. 242.

⁹ Vozniak M. S. Istoriia ukrainskoi literaturi. Vol. 3. Viki XVI–XVIII. Lviv, 1924. P. 14; Grushevskii O. Zmini shkilnoi sistemi na Livoberizhzhzi v XVIII v. // Ukraina. 1924. Kn. 1–2. P. 83; Popov P. M. Z listuvannia G. S. Skovorodi // Radianske literaturoznavstvo. 1955. No. 18. P. 58; Bogoliubov A. N. Rossiiskaia nauka XVIII veka // Voprosy istorii. 1980. No. 4. P. 92; Ship N. A. Russko-ukrainskoe kulturnoe sotrudnichestvo v XVIII — pervoi polovine XIX v. Kiev, 1988. P. 9; Istoriia ukrainskoi kulturi. Vol. 3. Ukrainska kulturi drugoi polovini XVII–XVIII st. / ch. ed. B. E. Paton. Kiev, 2003. P. 692; Mikhashchenko A. L. Dukhovnoe obrazovanie v Rossiiskoi imperii. Kurgan, 2005. P. 78.

¹⁰ Sliusarskii A. G. Slobidska Ukraina. Istorichnii naris KhVII — KhVIII st. Kharkiv, 1954. P. 203–204; Mikitas V. Davnoukrainski studenti i profesori. Kiev, 1994. P. 138; Popovich M. Naris istorii kulturi Ukraini. Kiev, 2001. P. 247; Aleksiuk A. M. Pedagogika vishchoi osviti Ukraini. Istoriia. Teoriia. Kiev, 1998. P. 62.

¹¹ Medynskii E. N. Shkola i pedagogika v Rossii v pervoi polovine XVIII v. // Ocherki po istorii pedagogiki / ed. by N. A. Konstantinov. M., 1952. P. 86.

¹² See for instance: Istoriia ukrainskoi kulturi. Vol. 3. P. 432.

¹³ Avrus A. I. Istoriia rossiiskikh universitetov. Ocherki. M., 2001. P. 15.

¹⁴ Sukhova N. Iu. Vysshiaia dukhovnaia shkola: problemy i reformy (vtoraia polovina XIX veka). M., 2012. P. 33, 37.

methodically listed the courses (“schools”) each student had completed. Such a common trope, found in many works today, as naming renowned personalities who “graduated from the academy” without specifying the “school” of sciences in which these individuals obtained their education does not provide sufficient understanding of the level of knowledge gained. Applying the terms “secondary,” “higher,” or “general education school” to the academies and collegiums of the eighteenth century leads to modernization of the past in later-period categories and ignores the actual early modern educational practices.

3

The second dimension of the ongoing academic discussion regarding this educational model is connected with the interpretation of the character of the Orthodox academy or collegium as either “estate-based” or “pan-estate” / “estate-neutral” (socially inclusive) (*soslovnyi, vsesoslovnyi, or vnesoslovnyi*). In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, historians wrote a lot about the “pan-estate (socially inclusive) nature” (*vsesoslovnost*) of Kyiv Academy and the collegiums as their characteristic trait, distinguishing them from seminaries and other schools in the Russian Empire. It would seem that during the Soviet period the dominant class approach would have required historians to take an unequivocal stance on this question, but, notably, we continue to observe diametrically opposing assessments in Soviet historiography. Parallel definitions of these educational institutions as either “estate-based clerical establishments” or “pan-estate (socially inclusive) educational institutions” persisted. Surprisingly, we still find such characterizations in academic literature — used as a rule without any reflection, as self-evident. Today, most researchers call Kyiv Academy and the collegiums “pan-estate (socially inclusive) centers of enlightenment”¹⁵, although in specialized works one can sometimes come across such definition as “estate-neutral (socially inclusive) theological institution”¹⁶. In descriptions of Moscow Academy, this feature has not been brought to the forefront. Significantly, one of the latest special works on the subject concludes that Moscow Academy was a pan-estate (socially inclusive) higher institution in the first half of the eighteenth century, but later on “the status of a clerical educational establishment began to be attached to it”¹⁷.

It should also be clarified that the “estate” character of a school in this case traditionally means the inherited status of those who attended it. However, it is important to consider this problem not only in terms of the opportunities and desire on the part of members of different estates to study at these academies (collegiums), but also in terms of their prospects to leave “their own” estate. As far as Kyiv Academy and the collegiums are concerned, recent studies testify that throughout the eighteenth century they could be attended by people of different estates, and all of them (including students of clerical and Cossack descent) after graduation had extensive opportunities to gain secular office and change their estate status¹⁸.

¹⁵ *Liubzhin A. I.* Kharkovskii kollegium v XVIII — nachale XIX v. // *Voprosy obrazovaniia*. 2008. No. 3. P. 255.

¹⁶ *Andrushchenko M.* Parnas virshotvornii. Kievo-Mogilianska akademiia i ukrainskii literaturnii protses XVIII st. Kiev, 1999. P. 158.

¹⁷ *Larionov A. A.* Reformy Moskovskoi Slaviano-greko-latinskoi Akademii (vtoraia chetvert XVIII — nachalo XIX v.) v kontekste razvitiia vysshego obrazovaniia v Rossii. P. 75, 78.

¹⁸ *Iaromenko M.* “Akademiki” ta Akademiia. Sotsialna istoriia osviti i osvichenosti v Ukraini XVIII st. P. 416–426. — As for the Moscow Academy, conclusions have been advanced concerning changes in the

The same line of discussion continues in the attempts to evaluate the general tendency and nature of teaching in the collegiums within the framework of the “progressive-archaic” dichotomy. Naturally, Soviet scholars were unanimous in interpreting the academies and collegiums as archaic institutions. But even in the latest historiography, one can come across the opinion that in their structure and the direction of their curriculum these schools belonged to the archaic type¹⁹. In this regard, it is important to note that the epithet “archaic” is used when the Orthodox academies and collegiums are juxtaposed with the model of the “classical” university, whose features started to take shape in the second half of the eighteenth century. But the era of the “classical” university would truly begin only at the turn of the nineteenth century. Therefore, the Orthodox academies and collegiums should rather be compared to the corresponding “pre-classical” stage in the evolution of the European university and to other types of educational establishments in early modern Europe (as is well known, the “pre-classical” university and the church were so inextricably linked that trying to draw a boundary between them would be pointless; this type of university is often referred to as “clerical”).

4

The assessment of the Orthodox academies and collegiums depends on scholars’ answer to another question — whether this was a borrowed model or the result of indigenous creative efforts. Already in the nineteenth century, historians working on Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and the collegiums noted and began to analyze the common features of Orthodox and Jesuit collegiums. A study by the Polish historian A. Jabłonowski generated discussions in its time for the stress on the colossal influence of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy as an intermediary in the translation of the Jesuit teaching conventions onto the broad expanse of Eastern Europe²⁰. During the same period, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Russian/Ukrainian scholars concluded that Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and the Orthodox collegiums adopted the Jesuit model and the Western European (Jesuit) educational tradition²¹. It was this train of thought that prompted historians for the first time to raise the question of the content of the terms “collegium” and “academy” and stimulated closer comparisons with Jesuit and other schools²². In essence, Jesuit and Orthodox collegiums began to be viewed as phenomena of the same nature (although at the turn of the twentieth century this idea was not so clearly articulated).

In the history of Moscow Slavic Greek Latin Academy, the arrival of “Kyiv scholars” was associated with the beginning of a new, “Latin” period, as opposed to the previous

makeup of the student body, but students’ subsequent life trajectories have not been explored in sufficient depth.

¹⁹ *Lapteva L. P. Istorii Rossiiskikh universitetov XVIII — nachala XX veka v noveishei otechestvennoi literature (1985–1999 gody). Rossiiskie universitety v XVIII–XX vekakh. Iss. 5 / ed. by V.I. Chesnokov. Voronezh, 2000. P. 17.*

²⁰ *Jabłonowski A. Akademia Kijowsko-Mohilanska. Zarys historyczny na tle rozwoju cywilizacji zachodniej. Krakow, 1899–1900. S. 229–276.*

²¹ *Solntsev P. Ocherk istorii Kharkovskogo kollegiuma. Kharkov, 1881. P. 1; Petrov N.I. Znachenie Kievskoi Akademii v razvitii dukhovnykh shkol v Rossii s uchrezhdeniia Sv. Sinoda v 1721 godu i do poloviny XVIII veka. Kiev, 1904. P. 29, 50.*

²² *Petrov N. I. Kievskaiia akademiia vo vtoroi polovine XVII veka. Kiev, 1895. P. 65.*

“Greek” one²³. Further, as early as the nineteenth century, some scholars observed that the acceptance of the “Latin template” led to the distortion of the national norms²⁴. Soviet historiography typically denied any orientation toward Jesuit schools as models for imitation in the Slavic lands in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and tried to emphasize indigenous priorities rather than study the mechanisms and effects of Western cultural influence²⁵. An approach stressing the struggle between two directions of “enlightenment” (“Greek” and “Latin”) as the dominant thread running through the early modern educational developments is characteristic of modern Russian historiography as well²⁶.

As part of the emergence of a new national narrative, the most recent Ukrainian historiography has begun to write about the articulation of the “Ukrainian type of education” and “the making of a national school of higher type” as the chief regional trend in the eighteenth-century education²⁷. However, the thesis about the progressive “Ukrainian model” can also be found in a very recently defended Russian dissertation on this topic²⁸. And yet, the “Latin” schools and medieval and pre-classical universities of Europe did not have a “national” coloring²⁹. Regionalization intensified in line with the confessionalization of education in the Reformation era and its aftermath, and strictly national models are a phenomenon of a later time.

Recognizing the significant influence of Kyiv Academy, Russian historiography nowadays often puts forward a thesis that the *problem* of higher clerical school at the turn of the nineteenth century lay in its “historically developed dependence on the Western scholastic tradition”³⁰.

5

The key discussion points mentioned above, in our view, testify to the crisis of those approaches that have focused on trying to evaluate educational institutions on the basis of dual semantic-structural and semantic-axiological oppositions: East-West, indigenous-alien, or progressive-archaic. Overcoming rigid linear oppositions and reorienting research toward the fusion and erosion of contrarities will make it possible not only to better understand the peculiarities of the model of the educational institutions in question

²³ Smirnov S. K. *Istoriia Moskovskoi slaviano-greko-latinskoi akademii*. M., 1855. P. 34–35.

²⁴ *Vladimirskii-Budanov M.* Gosudarstvo i narodnoe obrazovanie v Rossii XVIII veka. Iaroslavl', 1874. P. IV.

²⁵ *Medynskii E. N.* Bratskie shkoly Ukrainy i Belorussii v XVI–XVII vv. i ikh rol v vossoedinenii Ukrainy s Rossiei. M., 1954. P. 4–5.

²⁶ *Bogdanov A. P.* Iz predystorii petrovskikh preobrazovaniy v oblasti vysshego obrazovaniia // *Reformy vtoroi poloviny XVII–XX vv.: podgotovka, provedenie, rezultaty* / ed. by F. V. Shelov-Kovediaev. M., 1989. P. 45; *Petrov F. A.* Zarozhdenie sistemy universitetskogo obrazovaniia v Rossii // *Universitet dlia Rossii: Vzgliad na istoriiu kultury XVIII stoletiiia* / eds V. V. Ponomareva, L. B. Khoroshilova. M., 1997. P. 67.

²⁷ *Pakhlovskia O.* Kievo-Mogilianska akademiia iak faktor formuvannia natsionalnoi samobutnosti ukrainskoi kulturi // *Ukraina: Kulturna spadshchina, natsionalna svidomist, derzhavnist*. Iss. 5. Proshponema: istorichni ta filologichni rozvidki, prisviacheni 60-richchiiu akademika Ia. Isaevicha. Lviv, 1998. P. 461; *Istoriia ukrainskoi kulturi*. Vol. 3. *Ukrainska kulturi drugoi polovini XVII–XVIII st.* / ch. ed. B. E. Paton. Kiev, 2003. P. 431.

²⁸ *Fedotov V. E.* Kievo-Mogilianskaia akademiia i razvitie obrazovaniia na Ukraine XVII — nachalo XVIII v.: diss. ... kand. ist. nauk. SPb., 2018. P. 196.

²⁹ *Andreev A. Iu.* Rossiiskie universitety XVIII — pervoi poloviny XIX veka v kontekste universitetskoi istorii Evropy. M., 2009. P. 94.

³⁰ *Sukhova N. Iu.* Vysshiaia dukhovnaia shkola: problemy i reformy (vtoraia polovina XIX veka). P. 52.

and to compare them to the features of analogous Western European schools, but also to trace the directions of transfer and to identify the mechanisms involved in the adaptation of Western European cultural and educational forms and traditions to the Eastern European terrain.

Still, as V. Friyhoff has rightly noted, we should recognize that problems with typology and difficulties in using the traditional terminology, especially in defining the term “university,” are most evident in Eastern Europe³¹.

Efforts to initiate a conversation about the Orthodox academies from other methodological positions, using terms and approaches developed in the twentieth-century European historiography of universities, arose in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Ukrainian and Canadian historians began to compare the results of the study of the history of educational institutions and instructional practices in the Ukrainian lands with the conclusions of “Western” historiography concerning the European humanistic school and universities of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries³². In the subsequent years, Ukrainian historiography clearly showed a desire to take into account the common European achievements in the history of education when describing the model of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy³³. A vivid example of a consistent application of the comparative approach to the history of education in the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth centuries in Russian historiography is a monograph by A. Yu. Andreyev, offering a comparative history of European and Russian universities³⁴.

We feel compelled to mention here a few other important works that have particularly influenced this type of scholarly inquiry in the post-Soviet terrain. Among them is a fundamental general work by European scholars on the history of the university, considering it a social institution³⁵. Several works by J. Kusber are devoted to the transfer of educational forms and ideas from Western Europe to Russia³⁶. Equally important is the emphasis on the role of educational institutions in the penetration of Enlightenment ideas (pietism, rational philosophy) into the Russian Empire³⁷. Studies of Jesuit education in the

³¹ *Friihhof V.* Nachalo Novogo vremeni: patterny // *Alma Mater*. 1999. No. 3. P.43.

³² *Pylypiyk N.*: 1) *The Humanistic School and Ukrainian Literature of Seventeenth- and Eighteenth Century: Unpublished PhD Diss., Harvard University*. Harvard, 1989; 2) *Pedagogichna teoriia i ukrainska literatura XVII–XVIII st.* // *Ukrainske barokko: materiali I kongresu Mizhnarodnoi asotsiatsii ukrainistiv / ed. by O. V. Mishanich*. Kiev, 1993. P.71–76; *Iakovenko N.* Latinske shkylnistvo i “shkilnii gumanizm” v Ukraini kintsia XVI — seredini XVII st. // *Kiivska starovina*. 1997. No. 1/2. P.11–27.

³³ *Gorskii V.* Evropeiska akademichna traditsiia v Kievo-Mogilianskii akademii // *Religiino-filosofska dumka v Kievo-Mogilianskii Akademii: evropeiskii kontekst / ed. by V. S. Gorskii*. Kiev, 2002. P.7–38; *Poliakov N. V., Savchuk V. S.* Klassicheskii universitet: ot idei antichnosti k ideiam Bolonskogo protsessa. Dnepropetrovsk, 2007; *Iaromenko M.* “Akademiki” ta Akademiia. Sotsialna istoriia osviti i osvichenosti v Ukraini XVIII st.

³⁴ *Andreev A. Yu.* Rossiiskie universitety XVIII — pervoi poloviny XIX veka v kontekste universitetskoi istorii Evropy.

³⁵ *A History of the University in Europe. Vol. 1. Universities in the Middle Ages / ed. by H. Ridder-Symoens*. Cambridge, 1992; *A History of the University in Europe. Vol. 2. Universities in Early Modern Europe (1500–1800) / ed. by H. Ridder-Symoens*. New York; Cambridge, 1996.

³⁶ *Kusber J.*: 1) *Eliten- und Volksbildung in Zarenreich während des 18. und in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Studien zu Diskurs, Gesetzgebung und Umsetzung*. Stuttgart, 2004; 2) *Individual, Subject, and Empire. Toward a Discourse on Upbringing, Education, and Schooling in the Time of Catherine II // Ab Imperio*. 2008. No. 2.

³⁷ *Mühlpfordt G.*: 1) *Russlands Aufklärer und die Mitteldeutsche Aufklärung: Begegnungen, Zusammenwirken, Partnerschaft // Deutsch-russische Beziehungen im 18. Jahrhundert / Hrsg von C. Grau*. Wiesbaden, 1997; 2) *Sistema obrazovaniia v Galle i ee znachenie dlia Rossii 1696–1831 gg. (uchenye, uchitelia,*

Polish Commonwealth by modern Polish historians have enhanced our understanding of the nature of the model of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and other schools in Ukraine and the directions of their evolution³⁸.

It is currently a widely held opinion among Ukraine's early modern historians that Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, Chernihiv, Kharkiv, and Pereiaslav collegiums had a genetic connection with the Jesuit collegiums of the Polish Commonwealth, which manifested itself in all elements of the organization and content of instruction and guidance. Many authors regard Kyiv Academy as a fully "western" educational institution, in both content and forms of instruction³⁹. At the same time, a synthesis of the achievements of European education on the basis of the Orthodox-Rus' cultural tradition is noted. Among modern scholars, there is now a broad agreement that the status attained by Kyiv Academy after gaining its privileges was similar to the status of a university-type institution that had evolved in Western Europe in the earlier centuries⁴⁰, to a higher-education establishment⁴¹, or "true university"⁴².

Many Russian historians today see Moscow Slavic Greek Latin Academy as a "university" ("pre-classical" university more precisely). This idea is found in a number of works by A. P. Bogdanov, B. L. Fonkich, A. Yu. Andreyev, and A. A. Larionov⁴³. A. Yu. Andreyev associates the concept of "Orthodox university" with the phase of confessional universities (such as Catholic, Lutheran, or Calvinist) in Western Europe. The term "Orthodox university," in his view, implies the status of Orthodoxy as the school's official religion. This term is not identical to "clerical university" or "university of the Russian Orthodox Church." It is broader because the university was created with the participation of both church and state and served the interests of both — quite like other universities of the "pre-classical" era⁴⁴.

However, the formulation of this important thesis did not end the discussion. Thus, A. Andreyev pointed out that "it is not entirely clear just to what extent the features of the 'pre-classical' university were really reflected in the practice of Moscow Academy at the

uchilishcha, shkolnye reformy, knigi, didaktika) // *Nemtsy v Rossii: rusско-nemetskie nauchnye i kulturnye svyazi* / ed. by G. I. Smagina. SPb., 2000. P. 159–169.

³⁸ For an overview of the modern Polish historiography of the problem, see: *Grzebiel L. Dotychczasowa literatura o wkładzie jezuitów polskich do nauki i kultury // Wkład Jezuitów do nauki i kultury w Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów i pod zaborami* / ed. by I. Stasiewicz-Jasiukowej. Kraków; Warszawa, 2004; *Chynczewska-Hennel T. Akademia Kijowska-Mohylańska w polskiej literaturze historycznej // Kiewska Akademia*. 2006. Iss. 2–3. P. 197–207.

³⁹ Compare: *Okenfuss M. J. The Jesuit Origins of Petrine Education // The Eighteenth Century in Russia* / ed. by J. G. Garrard. Oxford, 1973. P. 110, 114; *Raeff M. Russian intellectual history: an Anthology*. New Jersey, 1978. P. 13; *Isaevich Ia. Osvitnii rukh v Ukraini XVII st.: skhidna traditsiia i zakhidni vplyvi // Ukraina XVII st. mizh Zakhodom ta Skhodom* / ed. by O. Mishanich. Kiev, 1996. P. 117; *Nalivaiko D. Poetiki i ritoriki epokhi baroko // Ukrainske baroko. Vol. 1* / ed. by D. S. Nalivaiko. Kharkiv, 2004. P. 220.

⁴⁰ *Popovich M. Naris istorii kulturi Ukraini*. Kiev, 2001. P. 248.

⁴¹ *Zashtovt L. Liudvik Ianovskii i pochatok polskikh doslidzhen istorii universitetiv Rosiiskoi imperii // Kharkivskii universitet na pochatku svogo isnuvannia (1805–1820)* / ed. by L. Ianovskii. Kharkiv, 2004. P. XXX.

⁴² *A History of the University in Europe. Vol. 2*. P. 48.

⁴³ More on these and other studies: *Andreev A. Iu. Nachalo universitetskogo obrazovaniia v Rossii v otechestvennoi i zarubezhnoi istoriografii*. P. 167.

⁴⁴ *Andreev A. Yu. "Ideia universiteta" v Rossii (KhVIII — nachalo KhKh v.) // "Byt' russkim po dukhu i evropeitseem po obrazovaniiu": Universitety Rossiiskoi imperii v obrazovatelnom prostranstve Tsentralnoi i Vostochnoi Evropy XVIII — nachala XX v.* / ed. by A. V. Doronin. M., 2009. P. 11–12.

beginning of the eighteenth century”⁴⁵. N. Yakovenko and M. Yaremenko expressed a similar idea with regard to Kyiv Academy, observing that its real status in the Russian Empire was not on par with that implied by the Western European university model⁴⁶. Obviously, adopting the characterization “university” requires further analysis of a number of historical and legal terms describing “status” — their content and the ways in which these privileges and functions were understood, interpreted, and applied throughout the eighteenth century by both governments and representatives of the academic circles. Of course, we should remember that the eighteenth century marks the sunset of the “pre-classical university”, and therefore it is pointless to demand any “purity of the model”.

6

The identification and characterization of the main features of the academy (collegium) are closely associated with the delineation of the main phases and features of the transfer and adaptation of the “university idea” in Eastern Europe and the development of university education in the Russian Empire⁴⁷. A thesis has been voiced in recent historiography that there existed two vectors (or paths) of the transfer of the humanistic school and university idea into the Eastern European arena: south-western and north-western⁴⁸. Historically, the Orthodox academies and collegiums, created under the influence of Jesuit collegiums (universities), personified the south-western (chronologically earlier) vector of the advance of the European pre-classical university. Universities proper, which appeared in the Russian Empire in the second half of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, represented the other, later vector (north-western), coming from the already largely “modernized” German universities.

In the context of the debates regarding the ways in which university ideas were transferred to the Eastern European lands, it is worth adding a few words about the variety of approaches to the periodization of the history of the Orthodox academy (collegium). For nineteenth- and early twentieth-century scholars it was based on key events in church history and the activities of individual hierarchs who headed these schools. In the Soviet era, socio-political developments and the emergence of secular schooling became the criteria of periodization. Still, at least some historians paid attention to the issue of internal

⁴⁵ *Andreev A. Yu.* Nachalo universitetskogo obrazovaniia v Rossii v otechestvennoi i zarubezhnoi istoriografii. P. 167.

⁴⁶ *Iakovenko N.*: 1) Kiiivski profesori za lashtunkami Gadiatskoi ugodi (pro sprobu peretvorennia Mogilianskoi Kolegii na universitet) // 350-letcie Unii Hadziackiej (1658–2008) / ed. by T. Chynczewska-Hennel. Warszawa, 2008. S. 305–326; 2) Chi buv 1701 r. rubizhnim dlia Mogilianskoi akademii u spriiniatti kiiivskikh profesoriv KhVIII st.? // *Ibid.* S. 636–637.

⁴⁷ Important theoretical questions were raised during the work on the international project “Ubi Universitas, ibi Europa. Transfer and Adaptation of University Education in the Russian Empire,” sponsored by the German Historical Institute Moscow and Gerda Henkel Foundation (the author of this article was one of the participants). Several publications came out of the project: *Feofanov A. M.* Studenchestvo Moskovskogo universiteta XVIII — pervoi chetverti XIX veka. Moscow, 2011; *Universitet v Rossiiskoi imperii XVIII — pervoi poloviny XIX veka* / ed. by A. Iu. Andreev, S. I. Posokhov. M., 2012.

⁴⁸ In the course of work on the project it was decided to name the vectors of transfer after wind directions (see *Posokhova L. Iu.* Transformatsiia obrazovatelnoi traditsii v Vostochnoi Evrope XVII–XVIII vv. // “Byt’ russkim po dukhu i evropitsem po obrazovaniuu”: Universitety Rossiiskoi imperii v obrazovatelnom prostranstve Tsentralnoi i Vostochnoi Evropy XVIII — nachala XX v. / ed. by A. V. Doronin. M., 2009. P. 51; *Universitet v Rossiiskoi imperii...* P. 13.

changes dictated by the logic of institutional development. As an important marker, they pointed to the fact that since the mid-eighteenth century the Orthodox academies and collegiums had been actively seeking ways of revitalizing themselves. Historians analyzed several plans for the transformation of Kyiv and Moscow academies, as well as Chernihiv, Kharkiv, and Pereiaslav collegiums, into “true universities”⁴⁹. While these projects were not destined to happen, they reflected not only uncertainty concerning the path to be chosen and the basis on which universities were to be created, but also the local elites’ familiarity with the work of individual universities and the principles of their organization and functioning. This familiarity was the basis for the desire to have “real”, full universities.

The second half of the eighteenth century is important for the assessment of the nature of these educational institutions because during that period their instructional strategies began to reflect the achievements of early modern science. The curriculum was expanded, a number of “real” disciplines and new languages were included in it, and a transition was made to teaching the rational philosophy of Leibniz-Wolff. These developments show that the Orthodox academies and collegiums had the potential to become the basis for the creation of “full” universities. Compared to these institutions, the “pre-classical” Western European university does not appear a fundamentally different phenomenon — rather, it looks like the form that the Orthodox academies and collegiums had approached by the middle of the eighteenth century, having completed a historical trajectory of their own.

Thus, throughout the existence of the Orthodox academies and collegiums up to the beginning of the nineteenth century, two alternative paths of their possible transformation can be outlined: one is their conversion into “full-scale” (modernized) universities, and the other — their reorganization into estate-based professional establishments for the training of clergy⁵⁰. The second option eventually became a reality. The academies and collegiums were turned into higher and secondary theological educational institutions — theological academies and seminaries — and filled the corresponding niche in the modernized educational system of the Russian Empire as it emerged in the early nineteenth century. The theological school reform that began in the Russian Empire in 1808 became an integral part of the overall changes in the sphere of education. It aimed at the professionalization of theological education and unification of theological schools and altered all the parameters of the model of the eighteenth-century Moscow and Kyiv Academies and collegiums.

Modern historiography has come a long way in rethinking the phenomenon of the Orthodox academy/collegium. We can assert that research and thinking in this field have risen to a new level. Yet historiographical stereotypes are still quite often found in scholarly literature. Their existence is objective since specialized studies represent the “cutting edge of scholarship”, and it takes time for the wider academic community to absorb innovations. Nevertheless, in our view, focusing on the historiographical aspects of the

⁴⁹ *Rozhdestvenskii S. V.* Ocherki po istorii sistem narodnogo prosveshcheniia v Rossii v XVIII i XIX vekakh. Vol. 1. SPb., 1912. P.197, 250–313; *Milovidov L.* Proekti universitetu u Kievi u drugii polovini XVIII v. // *Kiivski zbirniki istorii i arkheologii, pobutu i mistetstva*. 1930. Vol. 1. P.295–306; *Sukhova N. Iu.* Vysshaia dukhovnaia shkola: problemy i reformy (vtoraia polovina XIX veka). P.43. On projects dealing with the collegiums see: *Posokhova L. Iu.* Pravoslavnye kollegiумы na peresechenii kultur, traditsii, epokh (konets XVII — nachalo XIX v.). M., 2016. P.411–416.

⁵⁰ *Posokhova L. Iu.* Pravoslavnye kollegiумы na peresechenii kultur, traditsii, epokh (konets XVII — nachalo XIX v.). P.434.

problem can give an additional push to the process of updating the general picture of the development of education and culture across the vast expanse of Eastern Europe.

References

- Aleksiuk A. M. *Pedagogika vyshchoi osvity Ukrainy. Istorii. Teorii*. Kiev, Libid', 1998, 560 p. (In Ukrainian)
- Andreev A. Iu. "Ideia universiteta" v Rossii (XVIII — nachalo XX v.). "Byt' russkim po dukhu i evropeitseem po obrazovaniiu": *Universitety Rossiiskoi imperii v obrazovatel'nom prostranstve Tsentral'noi i Vostochnoi Evropy XVIII — nachala XX v.* Ed. by A. V. Doronin. Moscow, ROSSPEN, 2009, pp. 9–31. (In Russian)
- Andreev A. Iu. Nachalo universitetskogo obrazovaniia v Rossii v otechestvennoi i zarubezhnoi istoriografii. *Otechestvennaia istoriia*, 2008, no. 4, pp. 157–169. (In Russian)
- Andreev A. Iu. *Rossiiskie universitety XVIII — pervoi poloviny XIX veka v kontekste universitetskoj istorii Evropy*. Moscow, Znak, 2009, 640 p. (In Russian)
- Andrushchenko M. *Parnas virshotvornyi. Kyievo-Mogylianska akademiia i ukrains'kii literaturnii protses XVIII st.* Kiev, Ukrains'ka kniga, 1999, 208 p. (In Ukrainian)
- Avrus A. I. *Istorii rossiiskikh universitetov. Ocherki*. Moscow, Izdatel'skii tsentr nauchnykh i uchebnykh programm, 2001, 192 p. (In Russian)
- Bagalii D. I. *Istorii Slobids'koi Ukraini*. Kharkiv, Osnova, 1990, 256 p. (In Ukrainian)
- Bogdanov A. P. Iz predystorii petrovskikh preobrazovani v oblasti vysshego obrazovaniia. *Reformy vtoroi poloviny XVII — XX v.: podgotovka, provedenie, rezul'taty*. Ed. by F. V. Shelov-Kovediaev. Moscow, Institut istorii SSSR, 1989, pp. 44–63. (In Russian)
- Bogoliubov A. N. Rossiiskaia nauka XVIII veka. *Voprosy istorii*, 1980, no. 4, pp. 82–94. (In Russian)
- Chynczewska-Hennel T. Akademia Kijowsko-Mohylańska w polskiej literaturze historycznej. *Kiivs'ka Akademiia*, 2006, iss. 2–3, pp. 197–207.
- Fedotov V. E. *Kievo-Mogilianskaia akademiia i razvitie obrazovaniia na Ukraine XVII — nachalo XVIII v.* Diss. ... kand. ist. nauk. St. Petersburg, 2018, 225 p. (In Russian)
- Fedotov V. E. Kievo-Mogilianskaia akademiia posle Petra Mogily. *Vestnik of O. N. Nekrasov the Kostroma State University*, 2016, no. 2, pp. 25–28. (In Russian)
- Feofanov A. M. *Studenchestvo Moskovskogo universiteta XVIII — pervoi chetverti XIX veka*. Moscow, Orthodox St. Tikhon University of Humanities Press, 2011, 253 p. (In Russian)
- Friikhof V. Nachalo Novogo vremeni: patterny. *Alma Mater*, 1999, no. 3, pp. 41–46. (In Russian)
- Gors'kyi V. Evropeis'ka akademichna traditsiia v Kyievo-Mogylianskaii akademii. *Religiino-filosofs'ka dumka v Kyievo-Mogylianskaii Akademii: evropeis'kii kontekst*. Ed. by V. S. Gors'kii. Kiev, Kievo-Magilianskaia Akademiia, 2002, pp. 7–38. (In Ukrainian)
- Grushevs'kyi O. Zminy shkil'noi systemy na Livoberizhzhii v XVIII v. *Ukraina*, 1924, vol. 1–2, pp. 82–87. (In Ukrainian)
- Grzebień L. Dotychczasowa literatura o wkładzie jezuitów polskich do nauki i kultury. *Wkład Jezuitów do nauki i kultury w Rzeczypospolitej Obojga Narodów i pod zaborami*. Ed. by I. Stasiewicz-Jasiukowej. Kraków; Warszawa, WAM, 2004, s. 31–68.
- Iakovenko N. Kyivs'ki profesory za lashtunkamy Gadiats'koi ugody (pro sprobu peretvorennia Mogylianskaii Kolegii na universytet). *350-letcie Unii Hadziackiej (1658–2008)*. Ed. by T. Chynczewska-Hennel. Warszawa, DiG, 2008, s. 305–326. (In Ukrainian)
- Iakovenko N. Latyns'ke shkil'nytstvo i "shkil'nyi gumanizm" v Ukraini kintsia XVI — seredyiny XVII st. *Kiivs'ka starovyna*, 1997, no. 1/2, pp. 11–27. (In Ukrainian)
- Iarenenko M. "Akademiky" ta Akademiia. *Sotsial'na istoriia osvity i osvichenosti v Ukraini XVIII st.* Kharkiv, Akta, 2014, 534 p. (In Ukrainian)
- Iarenenko M. *Chy buv 1701 r. rubizhnym dlia Mogylianskaii akademii u spriniatti kiivs'kykh profesoriv XVIII st.? 350-letcie Unii Hadziackiej (1658–2008)*. Ed. by T. Chynczewska-Hennel. Warszawa, DiG, 2008, s. 623–637. (In Ukrainian)
- Isaievich Ia. Osvitnii rykh v Ukraini XVII st.: shkidna traditsiia i zakhidni vplyvy. *Ukraina XVII st. mizh Zakhodom ta Shkhodom*. Ed. by O. Mishanich. Kiev, Institut literatury im. T. G. Shevchenka NAN Ukrainy, 1996, pp. 114–135. (In Ukrainian)
- Jabłonowski A. *Akademia Kijowsko-Mohylańska. Zarys historyczny na tle rozwoju ogólnego cywilizacji zachodniej na Rusi*. Kraków, W. L. Anczyc i Spółka, 1899–1900, 318 s.
- Kusber J. Individual, Subject, and Empire: Toward a Discourse on Upbringing, Education, and Schooling in the Time of Catherine II. *Ab Imperio*, 2008, no. 2, pp. 125–156.

- Kusber J. *Eliten- und Volksbildung in Zarenreich während des 18. und in der ersten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts: Studien zu Diskurs, Gesetzgebung und Umsetzung*. Stuttgart, Franz Steiner, 2004, 497 S.
- Lapteva L. P. *Istoriia Rossiiskikh universitetov XVIII — nachala XX veka v noveishei otechestvennoi literature (1985–1999 gody). Rossiiskie universitety v XVIII–XX vekakh*. Ed. by V. I. Chesnokov. Voronezh, Voronezh State University Press, 2000, iss. 5, pp. 3–28. (In Russian)
- Larionov A. A. Reformy Moskovskoi Slaviano-greko-latinskoi Akademii (vtoraia chetvert' XVIII — nachalo XIX v.) v kontekste razvitiia vysshego obrazovaniia v Rossii. *Vestnik of St. Tikhon Orthodox Humanities University. History. Russian Church History*, 2014, iss. 4 (59), pp. 74–84. (In Russian)
- Liubzhin A. I. Khar'kovskii kollegium v XVIII — nachale XIX v. *Voprosy obrazovaniia*, 2008, no. 3, pp. 240–263. (In Russian)
- Masliuk V. P. *Latynomovni poetyky i ritoryky XVII — pershoi polovyny XVIII st. ta ikh rol' u rozvytku teorii literatury na Ukraini*. Kiev, Naukova dumka, 1983, 234 p. (In Ukrainian)
- Medynskii E. N. Shkola i pedagogika v Rossii v pervoi polovine XVIII v. *Ocherki po istorii pedagogiki*. Ed. by N. A. Konstantinov. Moscow, Izdatel'stvo Akademii pedagogicheskikh nauk RSFSR, 1952, pp. 83–86. (In Russian)
- Mikhashchenko A. L. *Dukhovnoe obrazovanie v Rossiiskoi imperii*. Kurgan, Kurgan State University Press, 2005, 186 p. (In Russian)
- Miul'pfordt G. Sistema obrazovaniia v Galle i ee znachenie dlia Rossii 1696–1831 gg. (uchenyie, uchitelia, uchilishcha, shkol'nye reformy, knigi, didaktika). *Nemtsy v Rossii: rusko-nemetskie nauchnye i kul'turnye sviazi*. Ed. by G. I. Smagina. St. Petersburg, Dmitrii Bulanin, 2000, pp. 159–169. (In Russian)
- Mühlpfordt G. Russlands Aufklärer und die Mitteldeutsche Aufklärung: Begegnungen, Zusammenwirken, Partnerschaft. *Deutsch-russische Beziehungen im 18. Jahrhundert*. Hrsg. von C. Grau. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1997, S. 83–171.
- Mykytas' V. *Davnoukrains'ki studenty i profesory*. Kiev, Abris, 1994, 288 p. (In Ukrainian)
- Mylovdyov L. Proekty universytetu u Kievi u drugii polovyny XVIII v. *Kiiv's'ki zbirnyky istorii i arkhologii, pobutu i mystetstva*, 1930, vol. 1, pp. 295–306. (In Ukrainian)
- Nalyvaiko D. Poetyky i ritoryky epokhy baroko. *Ukrains'ke baroko*. Vol. 1. Ed. by D. S. Nalyvaiko. Kharkiv, Akta, 2004, pp. 217–264. (In Ukrainian)
- Okenfuss M. J. The Jesuit Origins of Petrine Education. *The Eighteenth Century in Russia*. Ed. by J. G. Garrard. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1973, pp. 106–130.
- Pakhlov's'ka O. Kyievo-Mogylians'ka akademiia iak faktor formuvannia natsional'noi samobutnosti ukrains'koi kul'tury. *Ukraina: kul'turna spadshchyna, natsional'na svidomist', derzhavnist'*. Iss. 5. Proshonema: istorychni ta filologichni rozvidky, prysviacheni 60-richchiiu akademika Ia. Isaievycha. L'viv, Naukova dumka, 1998, pp. 453–464. (In Ukrainian)
- Parkhomenko V. K istorii obrazovaniia na Ukrainie. *Kievskaiia starina*, 1905, no. 9, pp. 235–247. (In Russian)
- Petrov F. A. Zarozhdenie systemy universitetskogo obrazovaniia v Rossii. *Universitet dlia Rossii: vzgliad na istoriiu kul'tury XVIII stoletii*. Eds V. V. Ponomareva, L. B. Khoroshilova. Moscow, Russkoe slovo, 1997, pp. 64–101. (In Russian)
- Petrov N. I. *Kievskaiia akademiia vo vtoroi polovine XVII veka*. Kiev, Tip. G. T. Korchak-Novitskii, 1895, 171 p. (In Russian)
- Petrov N. I. *Znachenie Kievskoi Akademii v razvitiu dukhovnykh shkol v Rossii s uchrezhdeniia Sv. Sinoda v 1721 godu i do poloviny XVIII veka*. Kiev, I. I. Gorbunov Tip., 1904, 110 p. (In Russian)
- Poliakov N. V., Savchuk V. S. *Klassicheskii universitet: ot idei antichnosti k ideiam Bolonskogo protsessa*. Dnepropetrovsk, Dnepropetrovsk State University Press, 2007, 596 p. (In Russian)
- Popov P. M. Z lystuvannia G. S. Skovorody. *Radians'ke literaturoznavstvo*, 1955, no. 18, pp. 57–70. (In Ukrainian)
- Popovych M. *Narys istorii kul'tury Ukrainy*. Kiev, ArtEk, 2001, 727 p. (In Ukrainian)
- Posokhova L. Iu. *Pravoslavnye kollegiiumy na persechenii kul'tur, traditsii, epokh (konets XVII — nachalo XIX v.)*. Moscow, ROSSPEN, 2016, 550 p. (In Russian)
- Posokhova L. Iu. Transformatsiia obrazovatel'noi traditsii v Vostochnoi Evrope XVII–XVIII vv. "Byt' russkim po dukhu i evropitsem po obrazovaniuu". *Universitety Rossiiskoi imperii v obrazovatel'nom prostranstve Tsentral'noi i Vostochnoi Evropy XVIII — nachala XX v.* Ed. by A. V. Doronin. Moscow, ROSSPEN, 2009, pp. 32–51. (In Russian)
- Pylyp'iuk N. Pedagogichna teoriia i ukrains'ka literatura XVII–XVIII st. *Ukrains'ke barokko: materialy i kongresu Mizhnarodnoi asotsiatsii ukrainistiv*. Ed. by O. V. Mishanich. Kiev, Institut ukrains'koi arkhieografii, 1993, pp. 71–76. (In Ukrainian)
- Pylypiuk N. *The Humanistic School and Ukrainian Literature of Seventeenth- and Eighteenth Century*: unpublished PhD Diss. Harvard, Harvard University, 1989, 401 p.

- Raeff M. *Russian Intellectual History: an Anthology*. New Jersey, Humanities Press, 1978, 404 p.
- Rodnikov V. *Ocherki po istorii russkoi pedagogii*. Kiev, Tip. Imperatorskogo universiteta, 1909, 119 p. (In Russian)
- Rozhdstvenskii S. V. *Ocherki po istorii sistem narodnogo prosveshcheniia v Rossii v XVIII i XIX vekakh*. Vol. 1. St. Petersburg, M. A. Aleksandrov Tip., 1912, 676 p. (In Russian)
- Sazonova L. I. Vostochnoslavianskie akademii XVI–XVIII vv. v kontekste evropeiskoi akademicheskoi traditsii. *Slavianovedenie*, 1995, no. 3, pp. 46–61. (In Russian)
- Sevcenko I. The many worlds of Peter Mohyla. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies. The Kiev Mohyla Academy*, 1984, vol. 8, no. 1/2, pp. 9–44.
- Sharipova L. Eshche o “Cheloveke mnogikh mirov”: Petr Mogila — traditsionalist, reformator, opportunist. *Ab Imperio*, 2000, no. 1, pp. 53–73. (In Russian)
- Sharipova L. *Latin Books and the Eastern Orthodox Clerical Elite in Kiev, 1632–1780*. Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2006, 259 p.
- Ship N. A. *Russko-ukrainskoe kul'turnoe sotrudnichestvo v XVIII — pervoi polovine XIX v.* Kiev, Naukova dumka, 1988, 112 p. (In Russian)
- Siedina G. *The Reception of Horace in the Courses of Poetics at the Kiev Mohyla Academy: 17th — First Half of the 18th Century*. Doctoral Diss., Harvard University. Harvard, 2014, 279 p.
- Sliusars'kyi A. G. *Slobids'ka Ukraina. Istorychnyi narys XVII–XVIII st.* Kharkiv, Kharkivs'ke knyzhkovo-gazetne vydavnytstvo, 1954, 280 p. (In Ukrainian).
- Smirnov S. K. *Istoriia Moskovskoi slaviano-greko-latinskoi akademii*. Moscow, V. Got'e Tip., 1855, 428 p. (In Russian).
- Solntsev P. *Ocherk istorii Khar'kovskogo kollegiuma*. Kharkov, Print. House of Imperial University, 1881, 76 p. (In Russian).
- Sukhova N. Iu. *Vysshaia dukhovnaia shkola: problemy i reformy (vtoraia polovina XIX veka)*. Moscow, Orthodox St. Tikhon University of Humanities Press, 2012, 658 p. (In Russian)
- Sutorius K. V. Bogoslovie v Kievo-Mogilianskoi akademii v 1751–1763 gg. *Religioznoe obrazovanie v Rossii i Evrope v kontse XVIII — nachale XIX v.* Eds E. Tokareva, M. Inglot. St. Petersburg, Russian Christian Academy of Humanities Press, 2009, pp. 127–202. (In Russian)
- Sutorius K. V. Nravstvennoe bogoslovie v Kievo-Mogilianskoi akademii po materialam rukopisnykh istochnikov. *Vestnik of Saint-Petersburg University. History*, 2018, iss. 1, pp. 5–28. (In Russian)
- Symchych M. *Philosophia rationalis u Kyievo-Mogylians'kii akademii*. Vinnitsia, O. Vlasiuk, 2009, 239 p. (In Ukrainian)
- Sysin F. Peter Mohyla and the Kiev Academy in Recent Western Works: Divergent View on Seventeenth Century Ukrainian Culture. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies. The Kiev Mohyla Academy*, vol. 8, no. 1/2, pp. 155–187.
- Vladimirkii-Budanov M. *Gosudarstvo i narodnoe obrazovanie v Rossii XVIII veka*. Yaroslavl', Fal'k Tip., 1874, 325 p. (In Russian)
- Vozniak M. S. *Istoriia ukrains'koi literatury*. Vol. 3. Viky XVI–XVIII. L'viv, Prosvita, 1924. 564 p. (In Ukrainian)
- Zashtovt L. Liudvik Ianovs'kyi i pochatok pol's'kykh doslidzhen' istorii universitetiv Rosiis'koi imperii. *Kharkivs'kyi universytet na pochatku svogo isnuvannia (1805–1820)*. Ed. by L. Ianovs'kyi. Kharkiv, Maidan, 2004, pp. XXIX–XXXIX. (In Ukrainian)

Received: June 13, 2018

Accepted: November 30, 2018

Статья поступила в редакцию 13 июня 2018 г.

Рекомендована в печать 30 ноября 2018 г.