Thomas Nemeth

Philosophy in Imperial Russia's Theological Academies

Thomas Nemeth

Philosophy in Imperial Russia's Theological Academies

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-100215-6
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-100286-6
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-100325-2

Library of Congress Control Number: 2023932878

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck

www.degruyter.com

Contents

Introduction

As a scholarly topic, the study of the quiescence of the Russian Orthodox Church, both politically and, most importantly for our purposes here, intellectually during the years of late Imperial Russia is still very much in its infancy. Whereas research into the ideas and personalities involved in Russian revolutionary movements abound, largely owing to the historical impact of the events of 1917 and their aftermath, there are relatively few monographs concerning the philosophical trajectories emanating from representatives of Orthodoxy even in the Russian language, let alone in the West. The reason for this, understandably, is not hard to ascertain and fathom. Unlike the supposedly revolutionary theories of the 1825 Decembrists and the "Men of the Sixties," representatives of and within Orthodoxy had little direct political impact unless, of course, we take their very passivity as a bolstering of the given state of affairs, which in fact is what they did and sought to do. As Richard Pipes noticed some decades ago now, the basic feature of Orthodox Christianity – indeed, of most eschatological religions with the exception of certain Protestant forms of Christianity – is resignation in confrontation with earthly misfortunes. One *could*, of course, trace such an attitude back to the Biblical sayings of Jesus of Nazareth. But since not all forms of Christianity have historically opted for open political passivity, it alone cannot completely account for the *Russian* Church's attitude. We should also add, perhaps most importantly, that the Russian Church did not appeal to Jesus's avowed political quiescence to justify its own attitude. No, the Russian Church to an uncommon degree in Christianity abandoned its institutional distinction within society without resistance and allowed itself already with Peter the Great to become a branch of the state apparatus, a role it has seemingly forever since *de facto* if not *de jure* warmly embraced including to the present day. Having abandoned their status as an autonomous estate equal to or above the state, the Russian Orthodox clergy neither as a group nor certainly on the individual level could count on the Church's institutions to serve as a bulwark against any attempt to encroach on its perceived prerogatives, most noteworthy of which was the safeguarding of what it considered to be eternal and immutable truths. To a large extent, then, as an appendage of the state it saw its continuance and expansion as dependent on the endurance and vitality of the state. Thus, it served for much of its modern existence not merely as in passive compliance with the state's wishes, but as actively endorsing and promoting government policies. The Russian state during the late Imperial era, for its part, was happy to let the Church tend to the safeguarding of ethereal timeless and inviolable truths, seeing these as buttressing the established social and political order, which itself was such a truth.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111002866-001

Another factor, however, influencing the relative neglect of scholarship on institutionalized Orthodox thought was that thought's *intended* unoriginality. Why would scholars, whether in Russia or in the West, investigate theological deliberations and speculations that purposely offered nothing new, that in effect offered an apology for the existing state of affairs. To an extraordinary degree, Russian Orthodox theologians and philosophers of religion safely ensconced in their own separate educational establishments saw their purpose to be a defense of traditional Church teachings, particularly as set against a perceived corrupting influence of modernism and Western Christianity. Unlike in much of Europe where philosophically-minded clerics reared in the Latin language could conceivably look upon a body of works in that tongue going back more than a millennium, Russian theologians, many even at the highest levels, remained largely ignorant of the Greek language, which was that of their revered intellectual ancestors. Even the most fundamental of all Christian texts, the Bible, did not receive a complete Russian translation until well into the nineteenth century.[1] Given this fact, Russian religious philosophers could not reference many historical treatises when writing their own scholarly works yet had to be circumspect when handling Latin-language texts out of fear of "contagion," of having their own theological viewpoint infected by Western treatments. When possible, they referred to the writings of the Eastern Church Fathers, which only reinforced their estrangement from the West. The result was the historical insularity of their community. The Orthodox Church's reliance on Old Church Slavonic, a language developed in Bulgaria, for its religious services, rather than Latin as in the West, also contributed to its isolation from much of Europe. As Gustav Shpet wrote, "We were baptized in Greek, but the language given to us was Bulgarian. What could the language of a nation devoid of cultural traditions, literature, and history bring along with itself?"[2]

Another factor in the development of the Russian Orthodox religio-philosophical outlook was its emerging (cultural) nationalism. The autocephaly of the Russian Orthodox Church entailed a separation not just from Western Christianity, but even from other national Orthodox churches. Given the sheer expanse of the Russian Orthodox lands with their low population density compared to Western Europe, there was no compelling reason for the Church to reach out beyond its borders, which in any case would have been difficult. The effect of this was to encourage an insular sense of nationhood within the Church. For all of these rea-

1 This late date can be compared unfavorably to the appearance of translations into German, French, and English in the sixteenth century. The first book printed in Hungary was a translation of the Bible in the middle of that century, and a Dutch translation became available around the same time.

2 Shpet (2008), 55.

sons the Orthodox Church in Russia saw itself as the *Russian* Orthodox Church. This cultural nationalism is reflected also in the neglect by those we shall examine in the pages ahead of other philosophically-minded Orthodox theologians from outside Imperial Russia.[3] Whereas those who taught philosophy at the theological academies certainly thought of themselves as Orthodox Christians, they appear never to have given more than a tacit acknowledgment to their co-religionists in a number of Eastern-European lands, such as Bulgaria, Romania, Serbia, and, most importantly, Greece.[4] Thus, they never drew inspiration or guidance in their own intellectual quests from beyond the political borders of their own country.

One of the most notable features of Imperial Russian religious philosophy within the academies was the constant attempt by its representatives to set it apart from Western philosophical systems. We find within the academies an incessant distancing of their philosophies from modern Western thought spanning from Descartes to Kant. Whereas many figures within these religious establishments were undoubtedly influenced by their readings of Western thought, this influence could hardly be acknowledged explicitly. We find no acknowledged Cartesians or Kantians within the academies. All philosophical writings emanating there as a rule had to be harshly critical of Western ideas even while implicitly absorbing many of them. All of this surely was only to be expected given the mission of the Imperial Russian schools. More surprising, however, is the sheer silence throughout by these religious philosophers on medieval scholasticism. With their gaze fixed, as it were, on modern thought, they had scarcely a word to say about the immense philosophical corpus left by Thomas Aquinas or that by such figures as Duns Scotus and William of Ockham. Why this was so is less obvious. They certainly could have aimed their barbs against the implicit rationalism of the Western medievalists, but they, to a man, remained silent. Yes, the Russians finally did address the traditional rational proofs for God's existence in the nineteenth century, but they did so uniformly without direct reference to the respective

3 The nationalism of Imperial Russia's Orthodox theologians was surely not a form of political nationalism, but a religious nationalism seen as a subset of cultural nationalism. They saw *their* understanding of Orthodoxy to be an essential feature or component of Russian culture and sought to defend and promote it whenever necessary and possible. Certainly, ethnic Ukrainians were culturally Russian in the eyes of these theologians, but whether other ethnic groups in the Asiatic expanses of Imperial Russia could belong to the cultural Russian nation was not an issue they addressed in their theoretical writings even though they sent missionaries to those lands seeking conversions.
4 A qualified exception here is Vladimir Solov'ëv, who maintained warm relations with clergy in Orthodox Serbia – and Catholic Croatia. The qualification is necessary here, since he was not a professor at a theological academy.

arguments' original formulation. There was no textual exegesis as such on scholasticism, arguably again for fear of some intellectual contagion. Whereas we can find commentaries on Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, e. g., in the works of Gogockij, Jurkevich, Archbishop Nikanor, and Bogdashevskij, we find nothing similar on Thomas Aquinas or, for that matter, any other medieval philosopher of Western Christianity. Moreover, prior to the establishment of the academies, the Russian Orthodox clergy displayed no interest at all in the theoretical grounding of their faith and doctrines comparable to what we find in the West.

The overt hostility of the philosophical tracts emanating from Imperial Russia's academies against Western philosophy was aimed at the pernicious "subjectivism," as they saw it, of modern Western philosophy.[5] Thus, since medieval philosophy had little trace of this evil, there was no particular need to address it. However, we cannot help but observe that just as in Western Europe philosophy professors in Russia's academies had to contend with the emergence of psychology as a distinct branch of knowledge, a discipline that by its very definition dealt with the human individual. This posed a challenge. How could one avoid subjectivism with its attendant relativism while engaging in research on the individual mentality? Few, if any, of those engaged in psychological queries pursued their investigations to explicitly psychologistic conclusions even though some did hold even logic to be an empirical science.

Such, then, is the principal motivating factor behind the following pages, namely, to help fill in a distinct gap in the history of Russian philosophy and in that way to help understand Russia itself, its people and its culture. Make no mistake, the reader should not expect and will not find in the following pages philosophical arguments to compare with Kant's transcendental deduction of the categories or Husserl's inquiries into inner time-consciousness. But he/she will find much that will lead the thoughtful person to reflect upon and to help realize that certain issues remain interesting and vital across national cultures. Nevertheless, the investigations that follow illuminate a widespread type of mental outlook that persists to this day and, thus, can help us understand the emergence of a character trait that lay dormant under an official ideology that proclaimed the universality of human interests and goals.

We shall proceed chronologically in the pages that follow with the caveat that we are dealing with four different religious higher-educational institutions dubbed

5 The present study focuses, unquestionably, on the Imperial Russian context. However, it was not only the Russian Orthodox Church that reacted in horror to the subjectivism of modern philosophy. The Catholic Church, for example, had placed Hume's works on its *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* in 1761 and Kant's first *Critique* entered the list in July 1827. Even the devout Catholic Descartes had his books so honored in 1663.

theological academies, one each in St. Petersburg, Moscow, Kyiv, and Kazan. These four academies were governed by charters, which stipulated the common set of rules they were expected to follow. As the reader will also notice, there were four charters over the course of the existence of the academies up to the revolutionary events in 1917. Rather than examining each academy separately over the course of their roughly century-long existence, we shall see how each fared under the various charters. Thus, the narrative that follows will be divided into four parts. Of course, since we are dealing with the thoughts and works of human individuals whose profession was for the most part the teaching of philosophy as that discipline was understood at the time, their careers may have extended over more than the span of a single charter. This is particularly the case with the second charter, which was in effect for only fifteen years. Many professors, then as today, had teaching careers lasting much longer than that. Another caveat in our story is that in order to avoid extending it beyond manageable bounds, we shall limit our discussion to the works that appeared in print while the respective individual was associated with one of the four academies. This is important in that some figures still published philosophical tracts after leaving, for whatever reason, a teaching position at one of the academies. A prominent example is Pamfil Jurkevich, who taught at the Kyiv Academy in the 1850s, but then accepted the professorship in philosophy at the secular Moscow University, when instruction in philosophy was again permitted under Tsar Alexander II after it had been forbidden with the exception of psychology and elementary logic in 1850. Thus, we shall leave aside his numerically meager but important writings composed during the decade following his departure from Kyiv.

We begin naturally with the pre-history, so to speak, of the theological academies, with the time when the lands comprising Imperial Russia lacked not just institutions of higher education but had barely any fully formed educational establishments at all. Such was a confusing time in western Russia with vying political and religious allegiances. A number of centuries earlier the land of the Rus' officially adopted Christianity from Constantinople, not Rome as did their Slavic folk in neighboring Poland. A fact that, from the Western viewpoint, was to have over the centuries the most disquieting effects. The ambassadors of Kyivan Rus' surely were astonished by the apparent wealth of tenth-century Byzantium with its magnificent churches and Constantinople's enormous fortifications, but what they did not see was a civilization well into its decline and isolation in every noteworthy respect. Rus' inherited a form of Christianity, but not a spirit of inquiry, which was already largely absent in Byzantium.

As we shall see, whereas in the West the Roman Church confronted the rise of the empirical sciences and thereby the role of reason in affirming religious tenets and in resolving metaphysical disputes, similar conflicts were largely absent from

the Orthodox Church in Rus' and later Imperial Russia. At no time did the Church in those lands look to rational inquiry and criticism in order to understand the theological tracts that were available to them. The Russian Church produced not a single priest who through his writings challenged the rational mind to understand that Church's theological tenets. Instead, it largely opted for an appeal to tradition and to a mystical intuitivism, an alleged direct insight into what it took to be religious truths at the expense of logic and deliberation. Already in 1840, Arkhimandrit Gavriil (1795–1868), who taught at Kazan University, wrote, "All that does not agree with the true reason of Sacred Scripture is essentially false, a delusion, and without any mercy must be rejected."[6] We can hardly be surprised, then, that education beyond immediate practical needs was not merely disparaged, but even too often seen as a step leading to heresy. Another consequence that we see even today most vividly is Russia's sense of isolation from the West culturally and Western civilization intellectually and in values. When confronting the rationalism of Western Christian philosophy, Russia's Orthodox thinkers, almost uniformly, chose to re-affirm ever more strongly their retreat from reason into a personal and even social intuitivism that simply skirted rational elaboration and analysis. They saw themselves, the preeminent Slavic nation, as having insight into truths that other political nations or ethnic groups – it is not clear which – being blinded by their false faith, whether Christian or not, could neither see nor grasp. Gavriil expressed in the sixth volume of his *History of Philosophy* that each nation has its own special character and with it its own philosophy.[7] The relativistic consequences of such a position are all too obvious to need elaboration.

The original motivation behind the undertaking of the present study was not merely to write a long neglected history of philosophical thought in the Imperial Russian theological academies, but also to see whether the late nineteenth-century German debate on psychologism impacted or even had any resemblance to a similar controversy in the Russian philosophical scene. The importance of this inquiry is not only to determine the intellectual relationship between Germany and Russia in the nineteenth century, but also whether the latter with its insular conception of philosophy also maintained a preference for psychologism. The following pages will show that ultimately psychologism by no means exercised a hegemonic control over philosophy in the academies despite its forceful advocacy by some. In this lies the hope – however slim – that the heirs of Russian thought will finally emerge from their self-imposed philosophical isolation in asking such a xenopho-

6 Gavriil (1840), 22.

7 Gavriil (1840), 3.

bic question as Russia's place in history and instead share in the pursuit of answers to the same queries as their colleagues in America and western Europe.

Most, if not all, scholarly studies of Russian thought, regardless of how broadly or narrowly they are conceived, have to contend with how to render Russian names. Various systems have been employed over the decades. Although the range of choices has decreased, no single one has yet won universal acceptance among all the peoples employing the Latin alphabet in writing. Moreover, since different transliterations have been used in the past, the scholar is virtually forced to be somewhat familiar with all of them. An obvious example of this is the rendering of Solov'ëv, as used in this present work, but which has also been rendered as Soloviev, Solov'ev, and Solovyov. Since a number of the names and terms mentioned here have also appeared in the author's previous studies, rendering them differently now could only lead to further confusion and bewilderment. Some readers, surely, would prefer a different spelling, but hopefully they will recognize the names and terms found in these pages and not misidentify the individuals and concepts intended.

Acknowledgments

A study such as this could not be possible without the resources of numerous libraries. I am as always deeply appreciative of the remarkable collection housed in the New York Public Library, access to which is open to all regardless of one's home residence. I would also like to acknowledge the assistance in my research of New York University and, in particular, its Jordan Center for the Advanced Study of Russia, at which I was a visiting scholar for two years. As for individuals, I would like to thank my wife Anne for her understanding each and every day while I secluded myself in my study researching and writing the work before you. I particularly appreciate the many observations and suggestions made on this work in manuscript form by the blind reviewers. If these lines should pass before their gaze, please be assured that even though I, of course, cannot acknowledge them by name, I am deeply thankful for their efforts and assistance. I especially would like to express my gratitude to all those at the publishing house of Walter De Gruyter who helped make possible the appearance of this work, in particular Christoph Schirmer, whose thoroughness and promptness are, to say the least, exemplary, and Max Weber along with the entire production team, whose exactitude and courtesy are much appreciated. Lastly, the vast bulk of Chapter 2 previously appeared under this author's name as "Philosophy in the Early St. Petersburg Theological Academy: toward the roots of classical Russian Idealism." *Studies in East European Thought* 73(2021): 495–515. Permission to reprint is graciously acknowledged.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111002866-002

Chapter 1
The Early Kyiv and Moscow Theological Academies

Any investigator of the history of higher education in general, whether secular or clerical, and not just of philosophy, in the lands that comprised "Imperial Russia" cannot but be startled, perhaps even perplexed, at first sight at how late such education arrived there. In the lands of western Europe, numerous universities had already existed for centuries before Russia established a single one. The University of Bologna in Italy dates from the late eleventh century. The University of Oxford was founded shortly afterward, and the University of Cambridge dates from the following century. The University of Paris was officially chartered in 1200. In central Europe, Prague's Charles University, modeled on that in Paris, was founded in the late 1340s with four faculties, and Jagiellonian University in Krakow was established in 1364. Even the British colonies in North America saw the establishment of Harvard College in 1636 and that of the College of William and Mary in 1693. In contrast, Imperial Russia established in Moscow its first university only in 1755. This is not to say, of course, that there were no institutions of higher education at all prior to that date in Russia. There were, but their curricula were quite narrow and as such far from what we today conceive as typical of a university. Whether the course of study in Imperial Russian schools provided instruction at a level comparable to that offered in western Europe is difficult to determine with confidence. One possible measure would be to look to the general attitudes expressed at the time and at the cultural and scientific accomplishments, broadly speaking, both of the society in which the various schools were located as well as, but principally, of the instructors and their graduates. Another conceivable objective measure would lie in comparing the classroom texts in terms of their level of difficulty and comprehensiveness. Such a measure, however, could be deceptive in that two quite distinct schools may employ the same text but not utilize it to the same extent or to the same degree of depth.[1] As our concern here is with philosophy as a scholarly discipline, viz., its teaching, propagation, and original development, within Imperial Russia's clerical or theological schools, let us look first at

1 The global ranking of universities is today rather commonplace taking into account such factors as the size of the respective libraries, international reputations, the number of international awards received by faculty members, and citations of writings by a school's staff in established scientific/scholarly journals. Unfortunately, none of these criteria is suitable in judging eighteenth-century universities.

https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111002866-003

how the country's nascent educational institutions evolved into the theological academies found in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Imperial Russia.

1.1 The Late Seventeenth Century

Imperial Russia traced its origin back to Kyivan Rus', which existed from the ninth century to the Mongol conquest in the mid-1200s. Accepting Christianity from Byzantium rather than Rome in the year 988, Rus' looked first to Eastern Christendom for religious and intellectual models. Unfortunately, as Gustav Shpet, remarked, the appeal of Kyivan Rus' to Byzantium was at a time when the once glorious Eastern Roman Empire and its civilization were already in marked moral and intellectual decline.[2] Nevertheless, Kyiv, which in the decades following its adoption of Eastern Orthodoxy was a large and vibrant cultural and trading center, should have had, in theory, access to the intellectual treasures of Greek antiquity and, though admittedly to a decidedly lesser extent, of medieval Islam.

Of course, having rich stores of philosophical and scientific works available to a person – or a nation – does not mean availing oneself of them. Kyivan Rus' demonstrated no particular interest in Greek philosophy or even in more recent theological subtleties, political theories, or scientific developments. To be sure, Rus' had as yet no developed educational system populated with competent individuals who could utilize what they could have possessed. But this simply begs the question: Why did the embrace of Eastern Christendom by Rus' not induce the establishment of such a system and prompt individuals to avail themselves of the newly available resources? What we do find is a smattering of translations of maxims from the Church Fathers, lives of saints, and basic edifying texts. Whatever dissemination did occur of ancient philosophy, it did not stimulate philosophical inquiry, let alone creativity. We find no interest in a theoretical grounding of their Orthodox Christian faith comparable to that found at the time in western Europe.[3] There,

2 Shpet (2008), 55. Whereas Shpet was correct from his perspective in the early twentieth century, the ambassadors of Rus' certainly would have been impressed by the apparent wealth of Byzantium as compared to the lack thereof of Rome. The conversion of Rus' to Orthodox Christianity instead of to Roman Catholicism, in the worlds of Richard Pipes, "was perhaps the single most critical factor influencing that country's destiny." By doing so, "Russia separated itself from the mainstream of Christian civilization which, as it happened, flowed westward." Pipes (1979), 223.

3 Many foreign travelers to Russia noted this general apathy and even hostility to intellectual inquiry. Johann-Georg Korb, a member of the Austrian embassy at the end of the seventeenth century, remarked, "In their schools positively the only labour of the schoolmasters is to teach the children how to write and shape their letters. … They despise liberal arts as useless torments of youth,

the so-called recovery of Aristotle in the Middle Ages led in short order to the huge corpus of Thomas Aquinas, but we find nothing at all similar to that in Kyivan Rus' or even the early Russian Empire.

Although this broadly painted, negative portrayal of the intellectual atmosphere in medieval Kyivan Rus' is correct, it fails to convey a full picture of the state of affairs. To be sure, "Athenian wisdom" was taken during these centuries in Rus' as a form of Western rationality, fundamentally incompatible with the people's religious faith. Yet, based on mentions in their own writings there were some who had a degree of familiarity with philosophical works from antiquity. The mid-seventeenth-century poet-monk Symeon of Polotsk (1629–1680) promoted an acquaintance with Greek works and referred to Aristotle. His intellectual debt to the latter was primarily through his ethics, which Symeon saw to be of the highest importance, writing: "Nature gives us life; philosophy teaches the good of life. … Just as medicine heals a disease, philosophy corrects the soul's disposition to evil."[4] However, a century earlier Andrej Kurbskij (1528–1583), a one-time friend of Ivan the Terrible and later a political opponent in self-imposed exile, recognizing the ignorance of the Orthodox community, urged his co-religionists to study the patristic tradition, which he saw as a continuation of a tradition that stemmed from the Greek philosophers. "Of the latter," remarked the noted twentieth-century Orthodox scholar Georges Florovsky, "he [Kurbskij] mainly read Aristotle (*Physics* and *Ethics*), probably under the influence of St. John of Damascus and Cicero, from whom he derived a Stoic conception of natural law."[5] We should bear in mind, though, that these manifestations of Kurbskij's intellectual interests originated from after his emigration from Ivan's Russia to neighboring Lithuania, where access to Western literature was much greater than in his homeland. To be sure, some information about philosophical ideas from antiquity, both Greek and Roman, was in the hands of a small handful of individuals in Rus'.[6] Whether they made use of it in any concrete fashion is another matter.[7]

---

they prohibit philosophy, and they have often publicly outraged astronomy with the approbrious name of magic." Korb (2013), 196.

4 Simeon (1953), 70, 71.

5 Florovsky (1979), 40. Florovsky notes that Kurbskij drew up an ambitious plan to translate the Church Fathers of the fourth century, but the translations were to be done based on Latin, not Greek, texts. The project never reached completion.

6 Shakmatov wrote that Plato was known almost from the very beginning of written documentation in Rus' with sayings attributed to him or excerpts from his works. Shakmatov (1930), 55.

7 In an essay immediately following that of Shakmatov in the same collection, the noted Ukrainian scholar Dmitrij Chizhevskij asked us to cautiously bear in mind what Shakmatov had unearthed: "Even a cursory glance at the material will convince us that we are by no means dealing with independent philosophizing, affiliated with Plato or emanating from him … but only information re-

The expanding and concomitantly contracting borders of central and east European political states at this time brought into contact peoples who had previously been culturally and religiously isolated from one another. The incorporation of lands into the burgeoning Lithuanian state in the second half of the sixteenth century and the first half of the following century brought Orthodox believers into direct contact with Western European culture, religions, and institutions, where Latin typically was the *lingua franca.* Whereas the Thomistic-Aristotelian tradition of educated religious discourse dominated in the West, particularly in Poland, a more symbolic and figurative understanding of Christianity dominated in the Eastern, Orthodox lands. In order to protect and defend their faith – and concomitantly their trade and pecuniary interests – the Orthodox believers within the expanding states formed "brotherhoods," consisting of laymen and clergy. Although the origin of these brotherhoods is unclear, they appear to have had their roots in the Middle Ages with the purpose of maintaining and supplying churches with the necessities for religious services.[8] These brotherhoods provided youth with the means and at least a modicum of education in Orthodox doctrine.

At least one of, if not, the oldest brotherhood, that in Lviv arose already in the fifteenth century. However, with its weak organizational structure and little financial resources, it played but a small role in historical terms during these early years. The Union of Lublin in 1569 creating the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth accelerated the creation and involvement of Orthodox brotherhoods in the field of education as a bulwark against Jesuit encroachments from Poland. In 1615 shortly after the founding of the Kyiv Epiphany Brotherhood a school was created and quickly established itself placing it in a leading position vis-à-vis the other schools. Drawing its instructors from Lviv and elsewhere, the school provided a general education that included grammar and history as well as, reportedly, philosophy![9] The initial attraction of the brotherhood schools began to dim in the early decades of the seventeenth century owing to scarcity of resources and competition with Jesuit

ported by chance, on the basis of one or another theological question or scattered among other historical data." Chizhevskij (1930), 71. After summarizing Shakmatov's information and evaluating comparisons between Plato's writings and the treatments of it in antiquity, Chizhevskij concluded that Shpet's judgment of the "ignorance" of philosophical education in ancient Rus' was overly harsh. Nevertheless, "one can perhaps remark that the comparisons show that in ancient Rus' there was only a very superficial, inaccurate and unclear acquaintance with Plato, that Plato's positions were often tendentiously distorted in order to exalt Plato through an alleged proximity of his positions to those of Christianity, or vice versa, in order to refute them, emphasizing the moments of Platonism that are unacceptable to Christianity." Chizhevskij (1930), 80.

8 Subtelny (2009), 97. Florovsky places their origin in "probably" the 1580s as parochial organizations that went on to become "corporations of the defense of the faith." Florovsky (1979), 56.

9 Sukhova (2013a), 8.

institutions. Those who sought a higher caliber of teaching opted for the latter despite the threat of "infection" from western Catholicism.

In the late 1620s, Petro Mohyla (1597–1647) was appointed archimandrite of the Kyivan Cave Monastery. Although himself educated at the Lviv Brotherhood School and possibly in France and the Netherlands, Mohyla remained firmly within the Orthodox Christian camp. Shortly after securing his new position and recognizing the ignorance of the youth and even of the clergy, he decided to establish a school near the monastery. Whether intended or not, it clearly stood in competition with the Kyiv Brotherhood School. When Mohyla's school opened in 1631 with more than one hundred pupils, it was met with rumors and suspicions of promoting pro-Uniate doctrines. To dispel the charges, Mohyla agreed to merge his school with the Kyiv Brotherhood School.[10] Nevertheless, the resulting Kyivan Mohyla College or Collegium[11] was organized around the principles of the Jesuit colleges, which would remain the model for more than a century afterward. Apart from catechism and Slavic grammar, the basic disciplines were taught in Latin.[12] Although one might think the school would place an emphasis on the Greek language, the teaching of it and of the Slavonic language soon decreased. Some classes were even taught in Polish. Aristotelian philosophy and Thomist theology were introduced in 1689 with the former divided into three parts: logic, physics, and metaphysics. Aristotle's writings themselves penetrated into Rus' in Latin and Polish translations.[13] The Kyivan Mohyla professors consistently over the next half century identified themselves exclusively with Aristotle, whereas western European logic courses at the time appealed to a variety of other thinkers in addition to Aristotle.[14] Nevertheless – and this cannot be stressed enough – neither originality nor critical thinking was either the stated goal or tolerated in classroom instruction. We should add, though, that critical thinking was also not the goal at the time in Western educational institutions, where, as in Russia, philosophy was taught using manuals as texts, which students were expected to learn much as they would hard facts in history or natural science.

---

10 Charipova (2006), 46–49. Charipova writes that the two surviving manuscript courses of philosophy from 1639–1640 serve as evidence that "at least an incomplete philosophical curriculum was already taught at the time." Charipova (2006), 52.

11 The title of "Academy" came later. In 1635, the king of Poland confirmed the school but not yet as an academy. Ševčenko (1985), 14. The first surviving written instance of the Kyivan school being called an "Academy" dates from 1701. Sukhova (2013a), 15.

12 "Latin was revered as the most important language, which is why it flourished from the first years of the school." Bulgakov (1843), 75.

13 Ovchinnikova (2012), 33.

14 Simchich (2016), 15.

Learning for its own sake was certainly not welcomed in much of seventeenth-century Russia regardless of its source. Instruction in languages and even of the grammar of one's own tongue had a purely utilitarian goal. The Church needed those who could compose liturgical literature, and the state needed clerks with a mastery of foreign languages to deal with trade and diplomacy. However, apart from these basic needs many members of the clergy regarded an aspiration for knowledge as amounting to a betrayal of religious faith. The cultivation of the mind, they held, was at the expense of the soul. The desire for knowledge was to know the mind of God and as such represented an example of the sin of pride, a sin that the Orthodox Church charged the Roman Church of having committed. An additional fear on the part of a powerful segment of the former was that the use of the Latin language and Latin-language literature would destabilize the commitment of Orthodox believers to their faith. Such a fear surely lurked behind the tension between a "Latin party" and a "Greek party" that would in time play out in Moscow.

As a result of the Russo-Polish War (1654–1667) the city of Polotsk in present-day Belarus fell into Russian hands. Tsar Aleksej (1629–1676) visited there in 1656 and was introduced to Symeon of Polotsk, who presented to him several panegyrics. Impressed with Symeon's ideas, the Tsar invited the monk, a graduate of the Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium and of a Jesuit school in Vilnius, to Moscow in 1664. Symeon organized an unfortunately short-lived school in the Zaikonospasskij monastery and was appointed tutor to the Tsarevich Aleksej and after his death to Tsarevich Fedor in addition to other children of the royal family.[15]

Tsar Fedor III (1661–1682) in 1679 requested Symeon to write a charter for what became the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy, the ancestor of the Moscow Theological Academy. Unfortunately, Symeon's death the following year halted these plans for the time being. Symeon's student Sil'vestr Medvedev obtained permission from the new regent Sophia, who was among those tutored by Symeon to renew the school started by Symeon in the Zaikonospasskij monastery in 1682. To be sure, the clash between the Greek and the Latin parties, the latter being those who favored teaching in Latin against those who placed an emphasis on Greek, had not abated and the plan to open the school stalled.[16] The patriarch of Moscow Joachim, thinking that the new school would surely be modeled on the one in Kyiv and in-

15 Korzo (2011), 137. Symeon was reproached for harboring a secret Catholicism but was saved by having Aleksej's favor.

16 Medvedev's story is quite tragic, even bizarre. Harmlessly enough it would seem, he took the "Latin" position regarding a purely theological point concerning the Holy Spirit. But after losing his job, rumors began swirling that he wished to kill the patriarch. He was alleged to be part of a political conspiracy, jailed, tortured, and, after two years in prison, executed.

fused with the spirit of Catholicism, revised the charter so that prospective teachers would have to prove their adherence to Orthodoxy. In addition, Joachim requested of his counterparts in Constantinople and Jerusalem to find teachers for the new school that he proposed to establish. It would be purely Orthodox with an emphasis on Greek and Slavonic, not Latin. Sophia, seeking not to challenge the patriarch, acquiesced.

The Leichoudes (Likhud) brothers, Ioannikios (1633–1717) and Sophronios (1652–1730), arrived in 1685. Although Greek monks, they were educated in Rome and the University of Padua. Their instructions for the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy were to strengthen the Hellenic trend at the expense of a Polish-Latin one. The school opened in 1687, albeit without a charter. [17] In its first decade the school stressed the study of Greek, but curriculum changes would eventually make Latin the predominant language of instruction.[18] The brothers, to no surprise given their educational background, taught in the same scholastic spirit as in Italy. Their instructions in logic and science were drawn from Aristotle mediated through medieval philosophy and more recent advances in natural science, though their understanding of the latter was still framed in qualitative rather than quantitative terms.[19]

The Leichoudes brothers benefited from the patronage of Patriarch Joachim, but they began to lose support with his death in 1690. Beset with enemies in Moscow, the brothers also encountered an attack by the patriarch of Constantinople, who, in a letter in 1693, remonstrated them for teaching not just in Greek, but also in Latin, thereby "introducing Latin iniquities into simple minds."[20] To whatever extent they taught and inspired their students with philosophy, it could not have been significant. The brothers were dismissed from their positions the following year and the school declined rapidly thereafter.[21] The immediate successors to

17 To date the Moscow school from 1687 is not undisputed. The completion of a building to house the school on the grounds of the Zaikonosplasskij monastery occurred in 1687, but the school was officially recognized by Patriarch Joachim already at the end of 1685. Panibratcev (1997a), 14.

18 Michelson (2020), 96.

19 "The Leichoudes' Aristotle was not simply the original Aristotle (*pace* Leichoudian assurances to this effect) or the Aristotle of the Byzantines; rather it was a Jesuit Aristotelianism, Thomist in its basic interpretative approach but also eclectic in that it incorporated elements from other philosophical systems." Chrissidis (2016), 76.

20 Quoted in Pavlov (2017), 16.

21 The brothers first taught Italian to a group of people in accordance with a decree from Tsar Peter, but they continued to be charged with heretical views and exiled to a monastery in Kostroma. Later, in 1706, they were summoned by the bishop of Novgorod, who requested that they establish a school like that in Moscow. In that year they also completed an anti-Protestant treatise *Luther's Heresies*. They also occupied themselves, one might say, with translations from Latin

the Leichoudes, Nikolaj Semenov and Fedor Polikarpov, both of whom were students of the two brothers, taught neither philosophy nor theology. Their classes were given entirely in Greek.

The school changed rapidly under Peter I (the Great). He issued a decree in June 1701 to start teaching in Latin and invited instructors from the Kyiv Academy based on their scholarly rather than religious credentials. As "protector" of the Moscow School, Metropolitan Stefan Javorskij (1658–1722), who had himself previously taught, albeit briefly, at the Kyiv Academy, expanded the course of study and introduced the teaching of German, French, medicine, and physics.[22] These changes were of course consistent with Peter's intent to Europeanize his country. The invitation extended to the Kyiv Academy for instructors was prompted by pragmatic considerations and not meant as a slight to other institutions. Only those from Kyiv were thought to have the requisite academic background including knowledge of Latin to fill the vacancies in Moscow. The newly-arrived instructors brought along their Kyiv texts imbued with the spirit of scholasticism. The study of Greek fell into disfavor until 1738, when it was again introduced, along with Hebrew, but the Academy's authorities displayed little interest in it. Only at the end of the century (1798) was a study of Greek and Hebrew made mandatory. Until then, even theology was taught in Latin.

---

and Italian. The following year Sophronios went to Moscow on an assignment from the bishop to retrieve fonts from a printer in Moscow. He, however, stayed on to teach Greek. Ioannikios remained in Novgorod, running the school along with former students. It along with all the other newly created lower-level schools was closed in 1708. He returned to Moscow to help his brother teaching.

22 Pavlov (2017), 17. Pavlov writes that Peter the Great invited teachers from the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy to Moscow; Sukhova writes that it was Stefan Javorskij who called teachers from Kyiv. See Sukhova (2013b), 31–32. Shpet, settling the dispute even before it arose, wrote that Peter's decree was based on a suggestion from Javorskij. Shpet (2008), 88. On Javorskij's meteoric rise to administrative power in Peter's Russia, see Collis (2012), 211–214. Javorskij studied for five years in Polish Jesuit schools but re-converted to Orthodoxy on his return to Kyiv in 1689. He was appointed professor of philosophy at the Kyiv Collegium two years later. His lectures there on "natural philosophy" included astrological interpretations of Biblical depictions. Collis writes that Javorskij's sermons also displayed a "distinctly mystical and astrological bent." They "drew extensively on the mystical and emblematic writings of a number of prominent seventeenth-century Jesuits." Collis (2012), 215. Prior to approximately 1690, Javorskij displayed no firm commitment to any particular career. "In this period of his life, Javorskij appears before us as a completely secular man, close to the secular interests of the higher aristocratic circles of the Ukrainian social elite. … One can even say that in Javorskij's literary works of the time there was no hint of his categorical desire to dedicate himself to the Church and even less to a monastic life style." Chechin (2005), 81. In any case, he decided to be a monk in late 1689-early 1690.

1.2 Philosophical Instruction in Kyiv and Moscow

Before turning to a sketch of the philosophical and intellectual environment in Russia's nascent Kyiv and Moscow theological academies in the eighteenth century, let us first look at their economic condition. Until Peter I (the Great), the Russian Orthodox Church enjoyed a considerable degree of autonomy from the state. The implementation of the reforms Peter had in mind required a considerable amount of money, and he resented that the clergy not only avoided taxation but also played only a small, insignificant role in furthering state interests.[23] The age-old custom among those with means to bequeath a portion of their wealth to the Church in their will further irritated Peter.

The Tsar's perception of the Church's wealth, whether real or imagined, was not reflected in the financial condition – and therefore stability – of the theological academies and seminaries. The academies, standing as they were at the summit of the education system, were held in higher esteem by both the Church and the secular authorities and thus were assured of preferred financial treatment compared to the seminaries. However, that was not saying much. Subsidies for compensating the teaching staff and for the basic needs of the students came only irregularly. For example, monies for the upkeep and repair of the buildings of the Moscow Academy would remain a constant and insoluble issue throughout the eighteenth century. Moreover, teachers' salaries were quite low even when they were paid. Food and firewood were often given instead of cash. The situation was even much worse in the Kyiv Academy, where many of the instructors were monks who received compensation in the form of the bare necessities, such as housing, food, firewood, and candles. Despite the seemingly constant requests by the teachers for payment of their salaries, these came generally only on holydays, such as Christmas and Easter. Given these conditions, we can hardly be surprised that many students, who, unless they came from a prosperous family, had to literally beg in town, work in the fields, or say prayers in exchange for money.[24] There was, not surprisingly, a significant turnover of instructors who found they could make a better living in other ways, including even teaching in secular schools when their superiors approved. In 1736, the Moscow Academy had only seven teachers. Admission to the theological schools was not, in principle, restricted to sons of clergy. Children from a bourgeois background, as well as the service nobility, and even peasants could attend. Javorskij, for example, came from a poor noble family. However, given the manner in which clerical vacancies were filled, those from a secular

23 Pipes (1979), 240.

24 Charipova (2006), 56.

background were at a decided disadvantage. Moreover, throughout much of the century there was determined resistance on the part of the academic authorities to this class-blind admission policy. The Moscow Academy, for example, did become a closed institution later in the eighteenth century allowing only those from the clerical estate to enroll officially.[25]

Philosophy became a required course of study at the Kyiv Mohyla Collegium in 1632, the first in the Russian Empire. The depth of these courses can only be imagined. Fortunately, lecture material dating from a number of years later in that century and into the next has survived. Students at the Collegium studied philosophy for two years, the general topic being divided as mentioned above into logic, physics, and metaphysics. Starting in the 1730s, the study of ethics was systematically introduced into the curriculum. Training in "dialectic," the first of the two parts into which logic was divided, concerned the three alleged activities of the understanding: the use of concepts, judgments, and inferences.[26] This was the focus of study for one to two months at the start as a statement of principles. Then, the subject matter of the course turned to the other topics discussed in Aristotle's *Organon* including his thoughts on interpretation.[27] Also among the first topics to be discussed was the problem of universals and issues associated with it. The aim was to teach the fundamentals of Aristotelian logic in its medieval interpretation along with some of the later additions made during that period. Javorskij, for example, who taught logic from 1691–1693 specifically stated that the material he was presenting was drawn from Aristotle as viewed through medieval eyes and as preached by Jesuits.[28] This is not to say that each instructor of logic merely presented the material using the same text. By no means was this the case. Based on the evidence in the form of surviving archival sets of notes, most instructors composed – and were expected to do so – their own lectures, differing to various degrees in detail from each other while remaining within an accepted Aristotelian framework.[29] These differences, stemming, most likely, from differences in the Jesuit teaching of logic elsewhere in Europe, has led recent investigators to conclude

25 Generally regarded as the first step in this process was Peter's decree through the Holy Synod – effectively the ministry of religious affairs – in November 1721 that the sons of clergymen should study in the religious schools.

26 Bulgakov (1843), 67.

27 Simchich (2016), 17–18; Simchich (2009), 77.

28 "Javorskij's scholarship was purely scholastic. … He knew the classics well, but he was much more attracted to medieval and modern Jesuit scholasticism, from which he borrowed his preaching style with its rhetorical effects, historical anecdotes and fantastic references to natural history." Pypin (1902), 194.

29 Simchich writes that there are approximately 80 such specimens that have been taken to be student notes. Simchich (2009), 34.

that there was more originality in those courses than was really the case.[30] The instructors at the Kyiv Academy, where there was a high turnover, attended various Jesuit-led institutions in Europe.[31]

The next topic of concern after logic, extending for approximately ten months, was physics, which formed the largest component of the two-year philosophy course. Again, the lectures were structured in accordance with Aristotle's treatment of the same as found, not surprisingly in his *Physics*, *On the Heavens*, *On Generation and Corruption*, *Meteorology*, and *On the Soul*. Of particular interest were issues associated with matter, form, and privation (for example whether matter can exist without form). This discussion was drawn largely from the first book of the *Physics*. The second book of Aristotle's *Physics* formed the basis of the lectures dealing with the Greek philosopher's definition of nature, asking, for example, whether nature itself is an active or passive principle. After this, the course typically turned to an analysis of cause – what is it and what are the types of causes. Among other topics addressed were the essence of motion, whether an infinite could exist and whether an infinite division is possible. However odd it may appear to us today, metaphysics was the briefest part of the two-year philosophy course lasting as it did less than one month. Judging from the surviving manuscript-notes, the topics addressed were again drawn from Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, for example, the difference between being and essence, substance and accident.[32]

The regular and systematic teaching of ethics in Kyiv actually began relatively late – only in 1737. Naturally, this is not to say that it was not touched upon earlier than this in other courses, and we should note that Feofan Prokopovich, a major figure whom we shall discuss shortly in more detail, was the first to teach ethics at the Kyiv Academy, which he did in the 1706 – 1708 academic sequence and that Stefan Kalinovs'kij (1700 – 1753) also taught an idiosyncratic ethics course in 1729 – 1731.[33] Ethics in the early eighteenth century was not a required component

30 For example, one historian writes, "The professors of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy in the eighteenth century tried to take into account the experience of their predecessors … seeing the anti-scholastic orientation of their utterances, the often dualistic nature of their philosophical views. Thus, the democratic tradition of teaching generated in the listeners' minds a steady desire for independent thinking, from time to time a push to a different mind-set, to a critical attitude toward Orthodoxy, and even to a departure from faith." Shkurinov (1992), 45. There is little basis for this author's claims. In fact, the opposite is evidenced not just by the surviving notes but also by the number of prominent clerics that emerged from the Kyiv Academy.

31 Simchich (2009), 76, 89.

32 Simchich (2016), 20 – 22.

33 Simchich, possibly in contradiction with his later statement, wrote that ethics "was taught systematically only after 1729 starting with Stefan Kalinovs'kij." See Simchich (2009), 48. To be sure 1737 was later than 1729, so it is possible there is no contradiction here. Kachuba writes that

of the philosophy course. Consequently most professors simply ignored it or did not see the need to introduce it. Others managed to devote some attention to the topic if there was free time after the presentation of dialectic, logic, and natural philosophy. Consistent with what we just saw, the ethics that was taught not only contained many Aristotelian elements – a concentration on virtues and vices, but to be sure also of the moral good and of happiness and bliss – but was also structured along Aristotelian lines. Whereas Kalinovs'kij taught ethics in the spirit of scholastic Aristotelianism while trying to cover as much as possible all topics mentioned in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Prokopovich held that ethics is the study of customs. The purpose of ethics as a subject matter in school was to teach the rules of good behavior.[34] Since ethics was taught by various individuals and, unlike the course in logic, varied considerably over the years, the time spent on the subject could vary from one to three months.

The dispute between the Latin and the Greek "parties" continued to play out in Moscow in the early eighteenth century with the forceful addition of another "party," a Protestant-oriented theological direction. Nonetheless, the general picture concerning the teaching of philosophy was much the same in these early years in Moscow as in Kyiv. Sophronios Leichoudes in 1690–1691 taught a course in philosophy, which, as in Kyiv, consisted of logic and natural philosophy. And as in Kyiv the presentation of logic contained problems connected with the theory of argumentation, i.e., the rules of dialectical disputation and the skillful framing of questions and answers. A second section on the treatment of logic was specifically entitled "Preliminary Questions Concerning the Entirety of Aristotle's Logic," which included a discussion of the significance of logic and its divisions. The third section was entitled "Explanations and Questions on Porphyry's *Introduction*," which was a standard logic textbook in medieval Europe. This section ended with a look at Aristotle's *Categories* and the first chapters of the first book of his *Analytica.*[35]

In his course on "natural philosophy" presented in 1691 the other brother, Ioannikios, spoke of problems associated with matter and motion, causality, space and time, finitude and infinity, continuity and discontinuity drawing his information from both physics and chemistry. Make no mistake, though, these presentations were not abstract, narrowly focused treatments of the subject matter

based on archival material ethics was taught to some extent by Kalinovs'kij in 1730, Eronim Mitkevich in 1734, and Syl'vestr Kuljabka in 1739. See Kashuba (2006), 100. Cracraft writes, "Prokopovich appears to have been the first and for a century almost the only professor of philosophy at Kiev to teach the subject." Cracraft (1978), 56.

34 Semikras (2019), 37.

35 Panibratcev (1997b), 9.

as we find them in university classrooms today. Ioannikios made it clear at the start that whereas his lectures were in accordance with the doctrines of Aristotle they were being presented with the help of the Holy Spirit so as to be fully in accordance with Orthodox Christianity.[36]

1.3 Lopatinskij's Defense of "Two Truths"

Peter the Great's 1701 decree shifted the center of Russia's education system, such as it was, from Kyiv to Moscow even though the school in the former continued for a time to supply Moscow with personnel for both the academy there as well as for the Church's administrative units.[37] All of the instructors at the Moscow Academy were graduates of Kyiv, but one of the earliest, who stands out, in particular, for special attention was Fedor (Feofilakt) L. Lopatinskij (~1680–1741). After studying at the Kyiv Collegium, he reportedly went for additional study to Poland, Italy, and Germany. He possibly returned to teach at his alma mater in Kyiv, but his stay there in any case had to have been rather brief. In 1702, he appeared in Moscow and began lecturing in philosophy in 1704 as well as theology in later years. He also served as rector for a time.[38]

Lopatinskij structured his philosophy course along the traditional lines of the time to include "dialectic" or logic, natural philosophy (i. e., physics), metaphysics, psychology, and mathematics. He banished ethics to a third year of philosophical studies, which, as mentioned, was previously only a two-year sequence at the academies. Lopatinskij's course reflected his training in scholastic Aristotelianism and followed it in terms of both style and content.[39] His division of philosophy into theoretical and practical may not be surprising, but his inclusion of logic in the latter certainly is unusual to the contemporary reader. The reason given for this is that logic provides information about the structure of our mental activity, which in-

36 Smirnov (1855), 61.

37 Sukhova (2013a), 25.

38 Panibratcev (1997b), 14. The very first years of the new century before Lopatinskij's arrival were dismal for the effectiveness of philosophical instruction. The rector of the Academy from 1703–1704, Iosif Turobojskij, another graduate of Kyiv and who taught philosophy there, probably did not teach philosophy in Moscow. In fact, remaining in Kyiv he visited Moscow only for short stays. His presence in Moscow was on an invitation from Peter as part of the 1701 decree.

39 "We will not slavishly adhere to the ancients, although we respect all philosophers, in particular Aristotle. Accordingly, we do not swear allegiance to anyone. We are all friends, but truth is dearer. The philosopher is obliged to rationally state his opinion and not rely on authority." Lopatinskij (1997), 213.

cludes the human will. Our minds are by nature prone to delusion and oscillate regularly between truth and falsehood. The task of logic is to get the mind oriented to affirming the truth. It is comparable to a tool that allows us to distinguish truth from falsehood. But the point of knowledge is to motivate us to act. Thus, practical philosophy had, in his eyes, a priority over theoretical philosophy.[40]

As we might expect from those writing at this time, their works were by no means strictly secular. Indeed, Lopatinskij held to a doctrine of "two truths," a position widely attributed to Averroës, although whether Lopatinskij was aware to any extent of the pedigree of his belief is unknown. In any case, he held that there is one truth given to us from Scripture and Revelation and another acquired through reflection. Theologians are concerned with the former; scientists, in a broad sense, with the latter. In this, Lopatinskij hoped to stake out for himself a measured independence from religious dogma. But he cleverly avoided transgressing the scientific sphere when discussing religious dogmas. We need not try to determine how closely he adhered to or departed from strict Thomism, but Lopatinskij certainly was aware of such later medieval philosophers as Duns Scotus and William of Ockham. We should bear in mind that Lopatinskij's writings were not intended to be original works that contributed to world philosophy. His intent was merely to teach established thought. Although today we look on rationalism and empiricism as contending expressions of modern European philosophy, we should not forget that the representatives of both philosophical directions were not academics and their writings played only a marginal role in the academic world in their own time. Rather than being surprised by Lopatinskij's admission of seemingly old-fashioned Aristotelianism, we should be struck by his frank mention and therefore awareness, although perhaps only cursory, of Descartes. Yet what is surprising is that although Lopatinskij acknowledged Descartes' position in the forefront of the "newest" philosophical directions, his overt concern is not with Descartes' subjectivist stand, but with the Frenchman's natural philosophy. Lopatinskij saw Descartes as an advocate of Democritus' atomism with the proviso that Descartes differed on whether atoms are divisible. Unfortunately, Lopatinskij's notes end here after writing that he would return later to the issue of whether Descartes succeeded in amending the Greek's conception of matter.[41]

Lopatinskij served for a comparatively lengthy period as rector of the Moscow Academy persevering through crises including the high turnover in instructors and acute deficiencies in the number of staff. He cooperated over many years with So-

40 Lopatinskij (1997), 209. He structured his argument along scholastic lines with theses and contrary theses.

41 Lopatinskij (1997), 213.

phronios Leichoudes in preparing a Slavic translation of the Bible. Like Javorskij, Lopatinskij generally supported the reforms of Peter and delivered patriotic sermons in connection with hostilities against Sweden, then a major European power. However, a gulf began to widen between those who could and those who could not abide what they considered to be secular interference in ecclesiastic matters. Peter indulged to the end Javorskij's criticisms out of consideration of the latter's rigorous defense of Peter's military exploits.[42] Javorskij additionally voiced support for the content of Peter's reforms, just not for the manner in which they were being carried out. However, neither Javorskij nor Lopatinskij chose to remain silent over the pro-Protestant inclinations of Peter and his leading ideologist Prokopovich. At the time of his death in 1722 Javorskij left behind an anti-Protestant tract *Kamen' very* [*The Rock of Faith*], aimed chiefly at Prokopovich and which attempted to rebut Protestantism's objections to Orthodoxy and Catholicism by appealing to Scripture, tradition and the resolutions of Church councils. Lopatinskij took it upon himself to edit and publish this work in 1728.[43] Whereas Javorskij never fully encountered the wrath of Peter and his associates, a gradual estrangement between the two resulted from the former's protest against state intervention in the Church's fiscal affairs and his speech in 1712 in praise of the Tsarevich Aleksej Petrovich, who was not, to say the least, on the best of terms with his father. As a result of that speech Javorskij was forbidden to preach.

Lopatinskij's own anti-Protestant outlook did not sit well with the German court circles after Peter's death. He was arrested in May 1735, though released after interrogation on condition of house confinement and forbidden to conduct religious services. He was arrested a second time in December 1738, accused of malicious, obscene, and impudent reasoning and criticism, and kept in a gloomy dungeon in the Vyborg castle north of St. Petersburg for three years. Upon his release, he returned to St. Petersburg, where he lived in the archbishop's residence until his death six months later.[44]

---

42 Florovsky (1979), 121. This is not to say that all was well between Javorskij and Tsar Peter. A gradual estrangement between the two started already in 1712 when the former denounced among other things Peter's divorce and marriage to his mistress, showing support for the Tsarevich Aleksej.

43 Gary Hamburg accurately summarizes, "In form, the book owed much to the Scholastic tradition of theological inquiry; in content, its greatest debt went to post-Tridentine Western thinkers who spelled out Christian teaching on issues of dogma, and defended those dogmas against the 'heretical' beliefs of Protestant theologians." Hamburg (2016), 261.

44 Lopatinskij's successor in the role of teaching philosophy at the Moscow Academy was Stefan Pribylovich (?-?). A Pole by birth, Pribylovich taught for four years, after which he lived in a Kyiv monastery. There, in 1716 the monks accused him of heresy. Instructed to go to St. Petersburg to translate or correct some ecclesiastic works, he was again charged with heresy.

1.4 Peter the Great's Ideologist

The most influential and thus most important figure from the first estate in Petrine Russia was undoubtedly Feofan Prokopovich (1681–1736), a Ukrainian raised by his uncle, who was a rector of the Kyiv Collegium, where the young Feofan studied until 1698.[45] He then went for additional study to Poland and subsequently Rome, returning to Kyiv in 1702 after a pause in Protestant Germany that remains controversial today. We mentioned above that Prokopovich taught a somewhat innovative course in ethics already in the first decade of the eighteenth century. He also taught a course in rhetoric and hermeneutics, for which a manuscript entitled "De arte rhetorica" has survived and which relies fundamentally on Aristotle, particularly his *On Interpretation.*[46] Prokopovich's writing style, understandably, was heavily indebted to scholasticism even when he departed from scholastic doctrine and, in particular, Aristotle to whom he frequently referred regardless of the topic and whose views he virtually always summarized before engaging in any discussion.

In 1708, Prokopovich taught a course on natural philosophy and in 1712–1716 theology. Not all of the notes for these courses have survived intact, but based on what has we can come to an overall picture of his teaching and overall philosophical conception.[47] In the years 1705–1706, Prokopovich taught philosophy, which at the time uniformly started with dialectics. Not unlike earlier and later professorial manuals or notes preserved at the Kyiv and Moscow Academies, Prokopovich's texts cover such basic topics as the rules of elementary logic, the division of concepts and judgments, rules of debate, the types of argument, and how to conduct an argument. There is little controversial or interesting in this.[48] However, we can tentatively conclude that he, in effect, dismissed what today we call "psycholo-

45 The first name "Feofan" was his chosen monastic name in honor of his uncle Feofan. The family name "Prokopovich" was his mother's maiden name as well as that of his uncle. The real name of the young "Feofan" appears to have been Elysei Tsereis'kyi. See Ivanov (2020a), 60. Much has been written over the years about Prokopovich, undoubtedly, owing not just to his theological positions, but to his political allegiance with Tsar Peter and the reformist official circles. For this reason, we need not linger long on him apart from his position in the history of Russian non-secular philosophy.

46 For the Latin text, see Prokopovich (1961), 228–333.

47 Cracraft has urged a bit of caution here, writing "Prokopovich's supposed philosophy lectures, on the other hand, have only been printed in translated extracts without indication of the state or provenance of the manuscript sources." Cracraft (1981), 189.

48 In their introductory essay to the Ukrainian translation of Prokopovich's philosophical works, the editors remark regarding this logic, "In its structure and problems, it resembles the logic of Melanchthon, a famous Protestant scholar and theologian." Kirik and Nichuk (1979), 61.

gism." The formal object of logic, he affirms, is "the operations of the mind directed toward the correct approach in a dispute."[49] The utility of logic is to help the human mind, so that it can reason without falling into error.

Of more interest than his dry exposition of logic is Prokopovich's physics. More than most professionally-trained philosophers even today, Prokopovich hailed the study of physics. Philosophy and physics complement each other, and he found it unsurprising that historically the two disciplines were not viewed as separate. Most historically eminent philosophers engaged in investigations that belong to what we now ascribe to the discipline of physics. Indeed, "the ancients respected physics more than any other part of philosophy, and only those were called philosophers who found happiness in the careful observation of nature."[50] As an Orthodox clergyman, he stressed the link between physical investigation and his religious beliefs and found no conflict lurking between them. Not only must physics be considered of use to moral philosophy, but "only with the help of physical observations can one know God, who judges people by merit."[51] Prokopovich, certainly, did not want to depart from Scripture, but the divine revelation given in antiquity was to those with a low level of scientific knowledge compared to today. Such revelation needs constant improvement and, when necessary, correction from science. Since God created the laws of nature as well as gave the Scriptures, there can be neither conflict nor contradiction between the two. Neither is to be accepted at the expense of the other. A perceived conflict means that the Scriptural text is to be interpreted allegorically. We can find a concrete example of this approach in Prokopovich's treatment of the heliocentric model of the solar system, which, as we know, was controversial in early modern Europe and proscribed in Kyiv and also at the Moscow Academy, where Javorskij taught.[52] Prokopovich in the mentioned course briefly described the models of Ptolemy, Copernicus, and Brahe. He voiced distinct reservations about the Copernican system for its apparent conflict with Scripture and expressed tepid approval of Tycho's.[53] "Most modern philosophers have adopted this system, precisely because it is the easiest to solve many complex questions of astronomy and in turn does not contradict Scrip-

49 Prokopovich (1980), 50.

50 Prokopovich (1980), 116.

51 Prokopovich (1980), 117.

52 Ivanov (2020b), 50. In 1704, Javorskij came out against Copernicus, who preached, according to the former, that "the heavenly wheels do not lie, stand, or come to a stop" as he falsely claims. Quoted in Morozov (1971), 42.

53 Obolevitch (2015) provides much general information on the reception of Galileo's conception of the solar system in Russia.

ture."[54] In this, we see Propokovich's melding of science with theology, of observation with the sacred text.

Prokopovich's position developed gradually toward an acceptance of the heliocentric model and with it of an allegorical interpretation of the Bible. In his theology course given in the second decade of the eighteenth century, he announced that he was willing to accept Copernican heliocentrism despite a literal reading of the Bible if scientific evidence supported the former. "If," he said, "the disciples of Copernicus as well as other scientists, who defend the movement of the earth, can bring valid physical and mathematical arguments to prove their opinion, then the texts of Sacred Scripture that speak of the movement of the sun cannot serve as obstacles. These texts should be understood not in a literal, but in an allegorical sense."[55] Prokopovich, in time, fully accepted heliocentrism as he himself was able to utilize a telescope in Russia. Make no mistake, though, already upon his return from abroad, Prokopovich firmly rejected scholasticism and sought to replace the Aristotelian Thomism in Kyiv's curriculum with essential elements drawn from Protestant authors.

Prokopovich's prominent position in Russian intellectual history has little to do with his "innovative" theological positions but much to do with his political thought and defense of Peter the Great's reforms including those of the Church. Since these relevant documents stem from after his call to St. Petersburg after leaving the Kyiv Academy in 1715, they are not germane to our topic here. Nevertheless, if their traditional attribution to Prokopovich is correct, they further enhance our understanding of his idiosyncratic Protestant-oriented Orthodoxy. Peter commissioned Prokopovich to compose the *Dukhovnyj reglament* [*Spiritual Regulation*], which was published and enacted in 1721. This document led to the creation of the Holy Synod, which in effect made the governance of the official Orthodox Church a governmental department with the tsar at its ultimate head.

Typically thought to be of more interest and importance, however, is the *Pravda voli Monarshej* [*The Right of the Monarch's Will*] of 1722, which sought to ground the monarch's absolute rule.[56] Set in opposition to what he viewed as Catholicism's Papocaesarism, Prokopovich defended Caesaropapism as sacred and absolute. Peter had previously that year decreed that the reigning monarch had the sole

54 Prokopovich (1980), 290.

55 Quoted in Pypin (1902), 201. Pypin observed, "Here for the first time Prokopovich recognized the position of science, which then was considered a great heresy (as we saw was Javorskij's opinion)."

56 To what extent Prokopovich single-handedly, if at all, wrote this tract has been questioned recently. See Cracraft (1981).

and absolute right to declare a successor, a stand that departed from Russian tradition. Prokopovich's text, thus, can be seen as an apology by drawing on Biblical sources and European political philosophy.[57] He understood the social contract between the tsar and the people as the transference of all power and the bestowal of unlimited rights from the latter to the former. The endowing of this authority is sanctioned by the Deity.[58] And after quoting Hugo Grotius's definition of sovereignty, Prokopovich added, "Thus, every Autocratic Sovereign need not keep to human law, since he is not to be judged for transgressing it. He must adhere to God's commandments, and for their transgression he will answer only to God. He cannot be judged by man."[59] In short, all political power in Prokopovich's scheme comes from God.

Through his service to Peter and advocacy of reform, Prokopovich's "star" rose quickly. Even before the death of Javorskij, who as president of the Holy Synod nominally was the highest figure in the Church, Prokopovich, as vice president, was the de facto head. With Javorskij's death, Peter delegated authority to Prokopovich, leaving the highest office nominally vacant. From his position he was able to exercise enormous influence. Later, during the comparatively brief tenure of Peter II (1727–1730) and with Javorskij's posthumous charges in his *Rock of Faith*, Prokopovich's position became increasingly tenuous. However, with Peter II's death and the elevation of Tsarina Anna, Prokopovich acquired virtually dictatorial power, filling the Synod with subordinates. His policy of subordinating the Russian Church to state interests continued past his death and, in fact, strengthened.

1.5 From a "Second Scholasticism" to Wolffianism

Whereas Peter Mohyla in seeking to staff his Collegium with competent teachers had little choice but to encourage the best and the brightest to study at Jesuit-run institutions in the near-abroad, the need to continue the practice became less acute with the gradual maturation of the Kyiv and Moscow Academies. This coupled with Prokopovich's infectious disdain for scholasticism and sympathy for Protestant attitudes toward physical science and Biblical-interpretation meant fewer and fewer students went to the predominantly Catholic countries of Europe for further study. Indeed, by the mid-eighteenth century the practice be-

57 The seminal examination of *Pravda voli* is Georgij Gurvich's work, written while still a law student at Jur'ev (Dorpat) University.

58 Gurvich (1915), 15

59 As cited in Bugrov (2020), 102.

came rather uncommon. Instead, study at universities in Protestant-dominated locales became favored.[60] Already under Prokopovich's influence, the professorial manuals began to introduce questions and concerns that Lutheran theologians, in particular, had been raising. Now, there was greater emphasis on questioning accepted tenets such as, for example, whether natural religion was sufficient for salvation. The study of philosophical ethics, which, as we saw, had been quite neglected, also drew more attention by mid-century.

There were, of course, those who fundamentally adhered to Aristotelianism. One of the last was Vasilij Kryzlanovskij (?-1760), who has come down to us by the name Vladimir Calligrapher, owing to his work in the Moscow Academy's calligraphy shop. Calligrapher was a converted Jew and a graduate of the Kyiv Academy. He taught theology there for a time starting in the mid-1750s. Although he often referred to Leibniz, his own position harkened back to an earlier era. Owing to criticism in one sermon of the Moscovite reliance on icons and prayers to the apostles rather than to Jesus, Calligrapher was accused of heresy (of Lutheran and Jewish "prattle") and transferred to the Yaroslavl Theological Seminary, where he too ran into conflict being charged with teaching Protestantism and Judaism. Nonetheless, his course and text at the Moscow Academy were virtually the last expressions of scholasticism there. Henceforth, the Wolffian system as presented by Friedrich Baumeister came to be taught.[61]

Although there were signs of dissatisfaction with scholastic Aristotelian philosophy in the first half of the eighteenth century, the speed with which its teaching was abandoned at both the Kyiv and Moscow Academies was amazing. We can see this evolving trend arguably most distinctly from the titles of the philosophy courses at the Kyiv Academy. In a course beginning in September 1743 the philosophy professor Mykhailo Kozaczynski specifically stated that his intent was to lead a course in Aristotelian philosophy using "the model of the peripatetic school."[62] His successor for the two-year philosophy sequence in 1745–1747 was Gideon Slo-

60 Ivanov (2020a), 48. We should not overlook, though, that the Catholic Church began questioning the value for itself of allowing Orthodox students to temporarily convert in order to attend Catholic schools only to find them reverting to Orthodoxy once back in their homeland. Protestant universities in Germany had no religious requirement, thereby obviating the charade the eastern Orthodox students had to play. Ivanov (2020a), 74.

61 "In general, the textbooks of Baumeister on logic, metaphysics, moral philosophy, and physics were known in Russia from the middle of the century." Pavlov (2017), 79. Indeed, a translation from the Latin of his *Institutiones metaphysicaes* was published in 1764. Another translation of his ethical thought appeared in the 1780s.

62 Simchich (2009), 223. Simchich, however, also states that Kozaczynski used as his textbook at this time one by the Capuchin friar Gervasius Brisacensis. He adds that although the work was written by a Franciscan it was not typical of someone who was in the mold of Duns Scotus.