

# I. Статті

## Києво-Могилянська академія

---

*Alfons Brüning*

### ON JESUIT SCHOOLS, SCHOLASTICISM AND THE KIEVAN ACADEMY – SOME REMARKS ON THE HISTORICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL BACKGROUND OF ITS FOUNDING

*The essay tries to examine critically the various interpretations of founding of the Kievan Academy in 1631/32, and to contribute to a more realistic estimation of the historical background. Classical terms in the discussion, as that about the leanings from Jesuit schools in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, or the often repeated Kievan scholasticism have to be put into question for several reasons. However, too little attention has been devoted so far to the religious motivation of the founder, Peter Mohyla, and his environment. In fact a purely religious motivation, even more on an Orthodox background, made it rather difficult to adopt Western models without hesitation and deliberate reflections. That was not only the case for Mohyla's opponents, but for his own views as well. If, nevertheless, those Western patterns were adopted, and the Kievan College modeled after the schools of the Western confessions, this step was mainly due to the cultural and social situation of the Polish Lithuanian Commonwealth – on a noble society, and a culture of dispute and arguing which was in many ways connected with the political system of this state.*

At the end of the year 1646, already at the dawn of a life so much engaged for the benefit of the Orthodox church, the famous Kyivan metropolitan Peter Mohyla took a realistic view on his performances and credits. Apparently, his look must have been sceptical. There was only one thing he considered a real merit – in his last will he named «my only pledge» the Kyivan College<sup>1</sup>, then the first institution of higher learning in the Orthodox world, founded during the years 1631–32. Succeeding in his endeavours to establish higher learning in the Orthodox

---

<sup>1</sup> «unicum pignus meum» (Памятники, изданные Временной комиссией для разбора древних актов [далі – Памятники].– Т. 2.– К., 1843.– С. 153, № 12).

centre Kyiv also signified a political victory over his opponents, those clerics, monks and in part Cossacks, who referred to any kind of higher education with distrust and the fear for heresy.

Contemporaries and later generations did not share the modesty of the metropolitan's statement, for, indeed, by that time the Orthodox church in Kyiv generally presented itself in a much better shape than it was able to do one or two decades before. Although a «conservative» opposition, critical to his innovations, was far from surrendering, Mohyla's scepticism seemed hardly to be justified. What is true, however, is that, in the long run, the founding of an institution of higher learning was to form a most significant part of Mohyla's legacy. It persisted almost two centuries afterwards, setting the standards for religious education in the whole Russian empire up to the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Still a hundred years later, students of this institution, which had meanwhile reached the state of an Academy in Kyiv, gratefully remembered the name of the founder once a year on a special feast day<sup>2</sup>.

There were yet supporters as well as critics, who passed their attitudes to modern historiography on the topic. Still a century later, historians in Russia, Ukraine, Poland, and in the West started to estimate the value of the founding for the Eastern Slavic world. With the beginning of modern history writing, it was not surprising, after all, that from that time onwards judgements about this institution very much differed one from another.

Russian Orthodox historiography of the 19<sup>th</sup> century wrote about the Kyivan Academy with almost univocal praise. There seemed to be reasons enough to underline what the Kyivan metropolitan did to defend Orthodoxy against its enemies on the part of heretics and schismatics of all kind, be they Protestants, Roman Catholics or Uniates<sup>3</sup>. Things yet became different, when the national adherences of the time started to enter the scene, and began to predominate also over religious factors. For example, the pride of some Polish historians of an alleged Polish cultural mission at the border of Europe led them to demonstrate, that even the Orthodox Kyivan Academy had been in fact little more than a devout imitation of Polish cultural patterns in pedagogy and science<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Cf.: *Голубев С. Т.* Память митрополита Петра Могилы в Киевской академии 31 декабря 1754 г. (к истории русского проповедничества за вторую половину XVIII ст.).— К., 1910.

<sup>3</sup> The tenor is in principle the same in the works by Stefan T. Golubev, Fedor I. Titov, Nikolay Petrov and others. To have here two of the early examples: *Макарий (Булгаков)*. История Киевской академии.— СПб., 1843.— С. 11; *Пекарский П.* Представители киевской учености в половине XVII-го столетия. Историко-литературные очерки // Отечественные записки.— 1862.— Т. 140 (февраль, отд. 1).— С. 573—594.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Jablonowski A.* Akademia Kijowsko-Mohilańska. Zarys historyczny na tle rozwoju ogólnego cywilizacji zachodniej na Rusi.— Kraków, 1899/1900.— S. 125—130. Controversy about Jablonowski's view soon arose, cf.: *Тумов Ф. И.* Урок с Запада. По поводу сочинения «Akademia Kijowsko-Mohilanska. Zarys historyczny» // Труды Киевской духовной академии [далі — Труды КДА].— 1902.— № 3.— С. 450—479. Jablonowski's answer: W sprawie «Akademii Kijowsko-Mohilańskiej» // Kwartalnik Historyczny.— 1902.— Т. 16.— S. 549—586.

On the opposite, outstanding figures of Ukrainian historiography, like Mykhailo Hrushevskyyi or Ivan Franko, even tended to share this view, although they did so on a different ideological ground. For these representatives of the so-called *narodna shkola* in Ukrainian history writing, the national culture of the Ukrainians of the 17<sup>th</sup> century was to be found not in the elite circles of the Kyivan hierarchy and the nobility, but among the Cossacks, the lower clergy and the simple folks — in other words, among Mohyla's opponents. So they regarded Mohyla's founding, modestly speaking, with distance<sup>5</sup>.

Later on, although still in patriotic terms of the Ukrainian diaspora in Europe and overseas, there were more positive attitudes towards Mohyla's founding, but more and more discussion went on about where the core of the metropolitan's motivation could be found — in Orthodox religion, or in his sympathies for the Ruthenian, later Ukrainian people? For Arkadiy Zhukovskyyi, who wrote his biography of Peter Mohyla first in Paris in the 1960's, the latter was, regardless of his Rumanian provenience, a true fosterer of Ukrainian culture. Religious motives stayed in the background, for the Orthodox church itself was mainly seen as the bearer of national culture<sup>6</sup>. A few years later, a thorough study of the early years of the Kyivan College by the Canadian Aleksander Sydorenko dealt more openly with Mohyla's religious motives, but regarded them as an integral element of Ukrainian national culture of the 17<sup>th</sup> century — a view, however, which had soon found its critics among other representatives of Ukrainian historical science overseas<sup>7</sup>.

Soviet scholarship, of course, proved to be hardly interested in religious motivations for themselves, but tried to estimate what could be named «the cultural outcome» of the innovations of Mohyla's time. In particular, the Kyivan College was, in this perspective, a main contribution of the Ukrainians to shift up the cultural level of East Slavic people in general, i. e. of all Ukrainians, Belorussians and Russians together. Obviously, such a view well corresponded with the predominant ideological directive, that tried hard to underline the cultural unity and united cultural progress of the named three East Slavic people<sup>8</sup>. In

---

<sup>5</sup> Грушевський М. Історія України-Руси.— Т. 2.— К., 1905.— С. 99; Його ж. Історія української літератури.— Т. 6.— К., 1996 (репринт).— С. 235–242. Quite more categorical is the judgement by: Франко І. Історія української літератури // Його ж. Зібрання творів у 50-ти тт.— К., 1976.— Т. 40.— С. 311 і далі, who considers the educational reform of no value at all for an advancement of Ukrainian culture of that time.

<sup>6</sup> Жуковський А. Петро Могила і питання єдності церков.— Вид. 2-е.— К., 1992.— С. 13 і далі.

<sup>7</sup> Sydorenko A. The Kievan Academy in the 17th Century.— Ottawa, 1977. See also the critical remarks on the «national perspective» of the study by Frank E. Sysyn. Peter Mohyla and the Kiev Academy in Recent Western Works: Divergent Views on Seventeenth-Century Ukrainian Culture // Harvard Ukrainian Studies.— 1986.— Vol. 10.— P. 156–187, here esp. pp. 158–160.

<sup>8</sup> Cf.: Хижняк З. І. Києво-Могилянська академія.— К., 1988; see also the review by

the years after 1991, this perspective preserved much of its substance, but was being purified of the Soviet implications, that wanted to have the Ukrainians, Belorussians and Russians together under the roof of the Soviet state. What remained, is the Ukrainian national perspective, enriched now in some cases by the theoretical requirements of an Ukrainian «statehood» (*derzhavnist*), as they were formulated in the political theories of the emigrant political philosopher Viacheslav Lypynskyi in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Consequently, the foundation of the Kyivan College was now regarded as one of Mohyla's main contributions to the erection of an independent Ukrainian state<sup>9</sup>, or, at least, to the formation of a Ukrainian national elite<sup>10</sup>.

Elsewhere, in church historiography of Orthodox and Western theologians, more of the religious aspects had been taken into account. That was the case already in the 1930's, when the Russian Orthodox theologian Georgiy Florovskiy published his overview of the «Ways of Russian Theology» in Paris. Different from his predecessors in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, father Florovskiy took a slavophile and non-imperial perspective on these ways, and came to the conclusion, that Mohyla's reforms signified at first an alienation of Orthodox theology by Western patterns, spoiling the original traditions of Eastern spirituality<sup>11</sup>. What Florovskiy criticized in particular was the adoption of scholastic models of thinking and arguing in the Kyivan College, which, in his view, pressed Orthodox religiosity in a shape inappropriate to its substance<sup>12</sup>. Western theology, Catholic in particular, agreed upon his analysis, albeit did not share his conclusions. The very adoption of Western, scholastic models in the curriculum of the Kyivan College was indeed taken for granted by church historians as well as slavists. Moreover, according to these studies, the scholasticism in Kyiv had its origin in the teaching at the

---

Тишкин Г. О. in: Український історичний журнал.— 1990.— № 9.— С. 147. On the other hand, the work was received quite critically in Western scholarship, see e.g. the review by *Hans Rothe* in: *Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*.— 1991.— Bd. 39.— S. 600 і далі.

<sup>9</sup> Нічик В. М. Петро Могила в духовній історії України.— К., 1997; *Хижняк З. І.* Освіта, її роль в релігійних, культурних та політичних діяннях Петра Могили // *Петро Могила: богослов, церковний і культурний діяч*.— К.: Дніпро, 1997.— С. 127–137.

<sup>10</sup> *Алексієвцев Л. М.* Києво-Могилянська академія у суспільному житті України (XVII–XVIII ст.).— Тернопіль: Лілея, 1997.

<sup>11</sup> *Флоровський Георгій, о.* Пути русского богословия.— Париж, 1937.— С. 50 и далее. Florovskiy uses the term of a «pseudomorphosis» of Orthodoxy through Mohyla's inadequate reforms, an expression he had taken before from the framework of the German philosopher of culture *Oswald Spengler*, cf.: *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*.— vol. 2.— Munich, 1922.— S. 225 ff. (Here the term is applied for the changes introduced by Tsar Peter I).

<sup>12</sup> To be sure, he named these models a «Tridentine scholastics»: «Таким образом усваивались и перенимались не только отдельные схоластические мнения или взгляды, но и самая психология и душевный строй. Конечно, это была не «средневековая схоластика», но — возрожденная схоластика контрреформационной эпохи, [...] — Тридентская схоластика, богословское Барокко [...]» (*Флоровский Георгий, о.* Цит. соч.— С. 51).

Jesuit schools of the time, and the Kyivan pedagogy was closely modelled in accordance with the Jesuit «*Ratio studiorum*» released in 1599<sup>13</sup>.

So this «Jesuit scholasticism» is obviously at the core of the problem. Yet, what does that exactly mean? Much of the perspectives proposed so far depended on the understanding of the term, and it can apparently be specified in quite different manners. We have just heard about father Florovskiy's thinking about the «scholasticism of the 17<sup>th</sup> century». The Ukrainian emigrant scholar Ivan Mirchuk, on the contrary, interpreted Mohyla's reforms as a related integration of the merits of medieval scholastic into Ukrainian culture<sup>14</sup>. Others spoke about something allegedly new: Soviet scholarship wanted to see in the Kyivan scholasticism a philosophical innovation, a step forward towards humanistic, «progressive» approaches<sup>15</sup>. Finally, there is the somewhat open-hearted access of the Ukrainian-American byzantinist Ihor Shevchenko, stating on occasion: «No wonder that Mohyla's college borrowed much from the Jesuit system – the enemy was to be fought with the enemy's weapons»<sup>16</sup>. But didn't this mean in fact to surrender, to give oneself into the hands of the opponents and let them rule the game?<sup>17</sup>

After all, as even our comparatively short overview is able to demonstrate, there are numerous questions left to be answered, and confusion overweighs. Both Russian Orthodox historians and Ukrainian patriots, each depending on his theoretical background rather than on the well known facts, are on occasion able to praise the achievements of the Kyivan college, or to condemn the reforms completely. A thorough explanation of what is meant by scholasticism, let alone «Jesuit scholasticism», is painfully missing. The very fact of an adoption of Western school patterns may be of no doubt, but once again opinions widely

---

<sup>13</sup> See: *Planck P.*, Art. «Mogila, Petr» in: *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*.– Freiburg, 1998 (3 ed.).– Vol. 7.– Col. 372; *Sydorenko A.* The Kievan Academy.– P. 35, 85 f.; *Trotzke I.*, Art. «Mogila(s), Petrus» in: *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*.– Freiburg, 1962 (2 ed.).– Vol. 7.– Col. 518 f; *Ammann A. M.* Abriß der ostslavischen Kirchengeschichte.– Wien, 1950.– S. 349 ff.; *Martel A.* La langue polonaise dans les pays ruthènes.– Lille, 1938.– P. 279 f.

<sup>14</sup> *Mirchuk I.* Geschichte der Ukrainischen Kultur.– München, 1957.– S. 40 ff.

<sup>15</sup> *Нічук В. М.* До питання про схоластичність філософських курсів у Києво-Могилянській академії // Від Вишньовського до Сковороди. З історії філософської думки XVI–XVIII ст.– К., 1972.– С. 54–74. See also *Хижняк З. І.* Києво-Могилянська академія.– С. 93 і далі.

<sup>16</sup> *Shevchenko I.* The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla // *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*.– 1984.– Vol. 8.– P. 15. Recent Ukrainian historiography in part tended to share and continue Shevchenko's pragmatism, when it hints at the advantages of their colleges, and the «internationalism» and the quality of their education. The copy of these successful models then helped the Orthodox church to participate in what might be called an «all-European intellectual movement», to be met as well in the institutions of the Protestants. See *Яковенко Н. М.* Нарис історії середньовічної та ранньомодерної України.– 2-е вид.– К., 2005.– С. 295–298.

<sup>17</sup> It was, once again, Georgiy Florovskiy, who hit this point. As he points out, the argument according to which the Kievan reforms were reforms of the form, not of (the Orthodox) substance, is not valuable. «Yet that ignores that form shapes substance» (*Флоровский Георгий, о. Пути русского богословия*.– С. 53).

differ, to what degree this took place, and, secondly, how this mere phenomenon should be interpreted.

A pathway back to the roots — *ad fontes*, if one wants to have it like this — is recommended to regain orientation. Moreover, to attribute to Peter Mohyla and his collaborators too much of interest in national questions of later centuries would be not only anachronistic, but a violation of Ockham's razor. We have testimony, in the words of the founder himself, about what he thought about the value of education, and it proves to be a fruitful work to compare right them with those of the alleged enemies, Orthodox hardliners, and Catholics and Jesuits in particular. To open considerations with the most simple data: Peter Mohyla was a churchman, and there was hardly ever any question about his true devotion and piety (unlike, as might be argued, about several other hierarchs in the baroque era). Secondly, Mohyla was a nobleman of most illustrious origin, tracing back the line of his ancestors, the Moldavian house of the Movila princes, even to the families of Byzantine Emperors. His ancestors and relatives already before his own activities had a good reputation as fosterers and defenders of Orthodoxy<sup>18</sup>. So it is likely to assume, that it must have been a specific mixture of religiosity in its Orthodox shape on the one hand, and some kind of *noblesse oblige*, on the other, that guided his actions.

If an Orthodox Christian of the early 17<sup>th</sup> century expressed his opinion on education and higher learning, this was always a twofold thing, regardless of the provenience and social status of the author. Well known are the disrespectful words of the Ruthenian Mount Athos monk, Ivan Vyshenskyi. He clearly declared his audience, that it would be better for one's soul to know only the *Псалтур* and the *Октоїх* (the book of chants of the Eastern liturgy), and the New Testament, to gain eternal life, rather than to know Aristotle and Platon and all the pagan philosophers, be regarded as a wise man in this life, but go straight to hell after death<sup>19</sup>. Vyshenskyi frequently repeated, that he never had become familiar with Latin, and all the philosophical tricks taught at the new colleges.

To found an academy on the base of such opinions seems to be quite contradictory. The more astonishing it must be, if one detects similar sentences in the early writings of Peter Mohyla as well. They read like this: «If I knew all languages, which exist in the world, but would not have mercy, what could that help me before God, who judges in accordance to my works? [...] So if you want to learn something becoming and wise, be ignorant and without wide reading in anything». This

<sup>18</sup> For more data in this regard see: *Bruening A.* «Voevodych zemli moldavskoi...» — Peter Mohyla's Youth and Political Heritage // Соціум. Альманах соціальної історії.— Вип. 4.— К., 2004.— С. 19–25.

<sup>19</sup> Cf.: *Голубев С. Т.* Киевский митрополит Петр Могила и его сподвижники.— К., 1883.— Т. 1.— С. 417; Приложения.— № 18.

passage can be found in the so-called «*Книга души, нарицаемое золото*» which Mohyla composed during his early years as archimandrite of the Cave's Monastery, short after 1627. Significantly enough, Mohyla wrote his text most probably on the base of a translation of the «*De Imitatione Christi*» by Thomas a Kempis from the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. He took yet the text merely as a draft for own reasonings, and on spots even changed the argumentation, where he considered it necessary<sup>20</sup>. Perhaps Mohyla was preparing a printed edition of this work by 1628, but later resigned. The little book is the only one example from Mohyla's early writings to illustrate the strong influence of the ascetic traditions of early Christendom in his thinking. Much of a negation of the world's social and material temptations is repeated in them, with a vote for the inner, spiritual life of the Christian, the monk in particular. Elsewhere, he even denies any material possession on behalf of a true Christian way of living, and thereby continues the legacy of East Slavic monasticism, that was earlier represented by Nil Sorskiy and the *нестяжатели* of 16<sup>th</sup> century Muscovy<sup>21</sup>.

But how can these views, so much dominated by the idea of a flight from the secular world, later lead to initiatives in favor of higher education? Is the latter not to be regarded as a vain and spoiling thing at all, as the monk Vyshenskiy, and others of Mohyla's opponents held it? The contradiction can only be dissolved by a closer look on the Christian traditional attitude towards reason and science in general. Within this Christian tradition since the times of Late Antiquity there had always been a constitutive distinguishing between what was called «inner» knowledge or wisdom, and «outer sciences». It was the adoption of the whole corpus of ancient, mostly pagan philosophy which became possible on the ground of this difference. This in fact was a risky thing. Couldn't it mean a danger for the human soul to familiarize with pagan arts and sciences, as they were represented in the scheme of the *artes liberales*? Was belief not tempted by knowledge, and the will to understand – and to doubt, if necessary? After long debates, the above-mentioned distinction opened the way for an integration of ancient philosophical learning in Christian thinking. Symptomatically this allowance to deal with pagan philosophy right for the benefit of a better

<sup>20</sup> Cf.: Перетц В. Н. «Книга души, нарицаемое золото». Неизданное сочинение митрополита Петра Могилы // *Его же. Исследования и материалы по истории старинной украинской литературы XVI–XVII вв.* – М., 1964. – С. 117–136 (цит. с. 123). Interesting enough, that the text by Perets had been found among a collection of writings of Ivan Vyshenskiy (Ibid. – С. 120). On the background of the work cf.: Charipova L. Peter Mohyla's Translation of *The Imitation of Christ* // *Historical Journal.* – 2003. – Vol. 46. – P. 237–261.

<sup>21</sup> Cf.: Рассуждение Петра Могилы о высоком достоинстве иноческой жизни // Архив Юго-Западной России [дали – Архив ЮЗР]. – Ч. 1, т. 7. – К., 1887. This ascetic element in Mohyla's views has often been neglected so far. For more see: Климов В. Аскетико-мистична проблематика в творах П. Могилы // *Петро Могила: богослов, церковний і культурний діяч.* – С. 82–90.

understanding of the truth of Christian faith had been formulated in the works of St. John of Damascus in the 7<sup>th</sup> century. «Let us then examine also the teachings of outer sciences as well», he advises his readers. «Maybe, we will find also within them something appropriate, and becoming for one's soul. [...] For it is even up to the Queen to be served by some servants»<sup>22</sup>. Nevertheless, a wise man, or, in other terms, a real philosopher was quite more experienced in spiritual things, in prayers and meditation, rather than a learned man with extensive readings. This attitude, in short terms, was the Byzantine legacy to Old Russia, but it has also left its traces in what was called later Western scholastics. When in the 11<sup>th</sup> century Anselm of Canterbury formulated his philosophical program on the base of a «faith on the search for insight» (*fides quaerens intellectum*), others, as the monk and cardinal Petrus Damiani in his «*De Sancta Simplicitate*» still felt urged to answer, that pure philosophy should be regarded as an invention of the devil himself, and the laws of logics did not have force before God<sup>23</sup>.

Both voices are to be found in Old Russia as well. For example, the biography of St. Stefan of Perm from the 15<sup>th</sup> century describes the saint as someone always striving to come to the truth until its very ending, having studied, for that purpose, the «outer sciences» as well. A century later, Josif Volockiy's *Просветитель* distances himself resolutely from all kinds of Hellenistic philosophy and idolatry, recommending to be a fool in «worldly sciences», but a wise man *in Christo*<sup>24</sup>.

The consequences of such attitudes on the field of pedagogy did not, of course, consist of a complete rejection of all kinds of learning. But learning itself was divided in accordance with the named distinction. Some patterns of knowledge concerned the inner spiritual life, and these are the ones, that, among others, Ivan Vyshenskyi had in mind. What remained necessary, even inevitable for the salvation of men's soul, was a fundamental knowledge of the teachings of the church (as accumulated already in the Creed of Nicea and Constantinople in 325 and 381 respectively), the main prayers and elements of the liturgy. All this was the subject of catechetical lessons, and to transmit this knowledge to the simple believer on behalf of his eternal life was consequently regarded as a *work of mercy*. To be sure, at least since the 15<sup>th</sup> century a developed network of schools at parishes and monasteries was devoted to these tasks in the Ruthenian lands, and in Muscovy as well<sup>25</sup>. There,

<sup>22</sup> Quotation is taken from: *Goerd W. Russische Philosophie.*— Freiburg — München, 1984.— S. 322.

<sup>23</sup> Cf.: *Heinzelmann R. Anselm von Canterbury // Klassiker der Theologie / Ed. H. Fries, G. Kretschmar.*— München, 1981.— Vol. 1.— P. 166–169. Furthermore, see: *Vaucher A. Kirche und Bildung — Veränderungen und Spannungen (t. 3, kap. 4) // Die Geschichte des Christentums.*— Freiburg, 1995.— Vol. 5.— P. 469–477).

<sup>24</sup> Both examples are taken from: *Goerd W. Russische Philosophie.*— P. 320, 325.

<sup>25</sup> See: *Oljanchn D. Aus dem Kultur- und Geistesleben der Ukraine. II: Schule und Bildung // Kyrios — 1937.*— Vol. 2.— S. 38–69, 143–157, esp. S. 43–47.

only a few decades after Josif Volockiy's harsh judgement, the *Stoglav* synod of 1551 had repeatedly underscored the importance of intensive teaching of the believers and the priests on behalf of a pious and moral life<sup>26</sup>. Even the newly founded brotherhood schools in the Ruthenian lands at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century preserved that main character of charity «to teach the uneducated». They were usually erected alongside with hospitals, and determined particularly to teach the Orthodox children «so that they, who drink on other institutions from the water of foreign languages and science, do not loose their faith [...]»<sup>27</sup>.

Certainly, this latter sentence already includes a nuance of defence of the Orthodox faith against other alternatives, as it is usually even more prescribed to Peter Mohyla's efforts in the following years. For the time being, however, there is no reason to assume that he stood apart from this older tradition – right the contrary. In his *Православне сповідання віри*, released after the church council of 1640, once again the teaching of the uneducated is expressively mentioned as a work of mercy<sup>28</sup>, and still in 1646, Mohyla's foreword to the new edition of the Sacramentary book (*Требник*) depicts the priest primarily as a teacher<sup>29</sup>.

This prevalence of faith and piety over pure literacy and knowledge did not necessarily oppose the Orthodox to their Western counterparts, let alone the Jesuits, and their schools. Scholasticism in the West also preserved much of the cautiousness and scepticism towards reason and science, that had once been expressed by Damiani (by the way, a very educated man himself). In the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the famous cardinal Stanisław Hozjusz, a leading personality in the renewal of the Polish Catholic church after the Council of Trent, and patron of the Jesuits in his homeland, on occasion also gave prevalence to a simple piety over extensive scholarship: «It's your faith, says Christ, that makes you blessed, not your literacy. To know nothing means to know about all ...»<sup>30</sup>. Still the pedagogical charta of the Jesuits, the «*Ratio studiorum*», which reached its final shape not earlier than 1599, explained as a main task, that the students «for the glory of God reached the best possible progress in the art of living, the fine arts and in (Christian) teaching». In any case, «everything has consciously to be ordered in that way, that piety

<sup>26</sup> See e.g. chapter 26 in: Стоглав / Под ред. Д. Е. Кожанчикова. – СПб., 1863.

<sup>27</sup> See the appellation of the Lviv brotherhood in 1608 in: Архив ЮЗР. – Ч. 1, т. 12. – К., 1904. – С. 526–529 (цит. с. 526). See also statutes of the Vilnius brotherhood in: Голубев С. Т. Петр Могила. – Т. 1. – Приложение № 36. – С. 235–259.

<sup>28</sup> Православне сповідання віри, ч. 1, № 91. Cf.: La Confession Orthodoxe de Pierre Moghila, Métropolitte de Kiev (1633–1646). Texte Latin inédit, publié avec introduction et notes critiques / Sous la direction de A. Malvy, M. Viller. – Roma, 1927. – P. 53 (*Orientalia Christiana*; Vol. X).

<sup>29</sup> *Тимов Хв.* Матеріали для історії книжної справи на Україні. – К., 1924. – № 51. – С. 367–373.

<sup>30</sup> *Hosius S.* Confessio catholicae fidei Christianae. – Vienna, 1559. – Fol. XV ff. Hozjusz refers to Tertullian in this passage (the quotation is taken here from the text in the anthology: *Slavische Geisteswelt* / Ed. S. Hafner, G. Wyrzens. – Baden-Baden, 1953. – S. 54 f.

takes the first place among all the studies». In the Jesuit colleges, students were obliged to visit the mass regularly several times a week, and every day was structured by times for prayers<sup>31</sup>. Moreover, other confessions, as the Calvinists or the Polish Brethren, acted principally the same way on their colleges in Poland-Lithuania, and throughout Europe. Apart from some specific forms of internal organization, the model even of the Jesuit colleges was far from being unique in late 16<sup>th</sup> century Europe. Different influences, as they could have been found in the Paris university, or the famous Gymnasium founded by Jakob Sturm in Strasbourg, were readily copied not only by the Jesuit order (whose pedagogical concept was in fact rather eclectic in this respect), but also, for example, in the Zamość academy after 1590<sup>32</sup>. The educational ideal of the time was formulated as «learned piety» (*pietas litterata*), combining humanistic inspired learning and courses of fine arts (*artes liberales*) with the solid base of the true faith<sup>33</sup>. It was this type of schooling that later on formed the model for Mohyla's innovation on the Orthodox part.

The principal similarities should certainly not be exaggerated. The differences between the confessions, however, laid not so much in the structure of the schools, or even the relationship between rationalism, science and religiosity. More diverse were indeed the fundamentals, on which Christian religion of each type was taught and practised. Still only with great caution were these fundamentals of Christian faith made subject for scientific reflections, but right they were not the same in Calvinistic, Lutheran or Catholic institutions. By the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century each of the Western confessions had its determined corpus of constitutive writings, which were to form the dogmatic base of teaching as well. They were added to the traditional texts named above, the Creed, the prayers etc. In case of the Protestant denominations, integral texts might have been e.g. the Augsburg Confession of the Lutherans, Luther's catechisms and other writings, Calvins «*Institutio Christianae fidei*» or the Heidelberg Catechism and others. In Catholic schools, writings that came up after the Council of Trent, as the Roman catechism or the Tridentine *professio fidei*, had a comparable place. Additionally, in the Jesuit schools, elements of the spiritual exercises of the order's founder Ignatius of Loyola were to form a part of the religious upbringing of

<sup>31</sup> Cf.: Kessler S. Ch. Die Studienordnung der Jesuiten. Geschichte und Pädagogik der «Ratio studiorum» // Stimmen der Zeit.— 1999. — Vol. 217.— S. 243–255; Bowen J. A History of Western Education.— Vol. 2.— London—Routledge, 2003.— P. 420–432.

<sup>32</sup> Bowen J. A History of Western Education.— P. 430–432. On the Zamość academy see: Lempicki S. Działalność Jana Zamoyskiego na polu szkolnictwa // Tęgoz. Mecenat Wielkiego Kanclerza.— Warszawa, 1980.— S. 270 i dalej.

<sup>33</sup> On the *pietas litterata* see: Bowen J. A History of Western Education.— P. 395–399. For the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth see also: Żołądź D. Ideały edukacyjne doby staropolskiej. Stanowe modele i potrzeby edukacyjne szesnastego i siedemnastego wieku.— Warszawa—Poznań, 1990.— S. 171–173.

children, apart from the theoretical courses. Thus, already the basics of Christian teaching had acquired a confessional character. The trend of stressing the confessional differences became obvious already at the turn of the 16<sup>th</sup> century<sup>34</sup>. Within an epoch, that historiography has come to name the «confessional era», each of the confessional churches, in concurrence with the others referred to clearly defined dogmatic and ecclesiological scripts and teachings. Education meant at first to spread confessional religion among the believers, and to develop and strengthen their convictions, making out of them not only disciplined adherents of one specific way to believe and live, but also convinced witnesses to the truth of that way in society<sup>35</sup>.

Scholastic writings still were somewhat at the core of theological science, and were used to some degree on all confessional parts. Since the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the formerly widespread sentences of Petrus Lombardus gradually ceased their place to the *Summa* of St. Thomas of Aquin. The Jesuit order initially was even reluctant to integrate it into its teaching program, but agreed, after all, to give it a place in the system of their «*Ratio*». Theology by itself formed only the final part of a *curriculum*, and was taught as a regular subject only exceptionally, and not on each of the schools. On the contrary, the main role in the educational program was now taken by rhetorics, the art of arguing and convincing, obviously a decisive ability in confessional concurrence – and in politics<sup>36</sup>.

In sum, the particular significance of scholastic traditions in the «confessional era» – or, in other terms, the baroque now arising – was less that of concise theological systems, but rather that of the *method of discussions*. The conversational system of *quaestio, expositio, conclusio* proved to be of constitutional usefulness in the numerous religious debates of the time, especially when the very purpose of the public debates was less to convince the opponents, but to win over them in the eyes of the public by a more brilliant way of arguing.

Orthodox education apparently continued to form an exception in this landscape, even after the foundation of the Kyivan College. It is striking, in any case, that at least Orthodox theologians constantly refused to take part in public debates, at least during Mohyla's lifetime. Even the Kyivan contributions to the literary polemics – as might be stated as a mere impression – have been not quite numerous, taking into account the numbers of literal attacks and replies of controversian

---

<sup>34</sup> For corresponding observances in Polish historiography see already: *Brückner A.* Dzieje kultury Polski. – Vol. 2. – Kraków, 1933. – S. 478 i dalej.

<sup>35</sup> See, as a key text for the concept of confessionalization: *Reinhard W.* Zwang zur Konfessionalisierung? Prolegomena zu einer Theorie des konfessionellen Zeitalters // *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung.* – 1986. – Bd. 10. – S. 257–277; on the role of education here esp. p. 265.

<sup>36</sup> See: *Laplanche F.* Die intellektuelle Bewegung und die Kirchen (t. 3, kap. 4) // *Die Geschichte des Christentums.* – Freiburg, 1992. – Vol. 8. – S. 1114–1125.

theology in the West<sup>37</sup>. The famous «*Lithos, albo kamien...*», composed by Mohyla and his collaborators in 1644<sup>38</sup> is rather an exception, that confirms the rule. Most of the products of the Kyivan printing press are not of a direct polemical character. That might be, of course, due to a temporary modesty of the younger generation of theologians in Kyiv, where higher learning had just begun to develop. The main reason, however, apparently lies elsewhere. It was their specific approach to matters of faith, which forbade them to go out and «prove» the truth of the Orthodox religion. Once again, a passage from Mohyla's own writings is able to tell the essential. In his personal notes he refers an episode, when the Walachian prince Mikhaïl enters the town «Belgorod» (presumably the Transsylvanian Alba Iulia, taken by prince Mikhaïl the Brave in 1599), and gains moral victory over the local Catholics «not by words alone». Instead, it is a miracle, that proves the value of the right, Orthodox faith, and the Walachian prince consciously leads the initial debate to that way of testing, while the Catholics were already prepared for demonstrations from Holy Scripture and theological literature. «In debates there arises only endless anger. Apart from those arguments, however, we can easily demonstrate it [the righteousness of our faith — A.B.] with God's help»<sup>39</sup>.

The mysteries of the faith could not be understood even through the most elaborate theological or philosophical terms. The latter might yet sometimes help to *explain* them. Correspondingly, in Mohyla's *Православне сповідання віри* an obvious scholastic term as *transsubstantiatio* is merely used to illustrate, to give some imagination how bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord — for this none can truly understand but God himself<sup>40</sup>. To be sure, some of the main works of classical scholastic literature were represented in the library of the Kyivan College — those already named, Petrus Lombardus and St. Thomas, among them, and they were obviously in use — quoted, criticized, condemned, or corrected as they were in all the schools of the different confessions of that time. A greater part of the libraries fund, however, was devoted to the art of preaching, and to rhetorics. One finds there the works of the famous Jesuit Piotr Skarga, together with

<sup>37</sup> This might be true in spite of Ihor Shevchenko's statistics, that sees Orthodox polemical literature increase during the first half of the 17th century — cf.: *Shevchenko I. Religious Polemical Literature in the Ukrainian and Belarus Lands // id. Ukraine Between East and West: Essays on Cultural History to the Early Eighteenth Century.*— Edmonton, 1996.— P. 296 f. Indeed, only a minor part of the polemical works by orthodox authors had been written and printed in Kyiv, as can be learned already through a look on the collection of Titov: *Тимов Хв. Матеріали для історії книжної справи на Україні.*— К., 1924.

<sup>38</sup> Published in: Архив ЮЗР.— Ч. 1, т. 9.— К., 1886.

<sup>39</sup> «В словопрѣныхъ трудъ безъ конца есть, нь кромѣ словопрѣнія въскорѣ се, Богу поспѣшествующубъ мы показати можемъ» (Архив ЮЗР.— Ч. 1, т. 7.— С. 81).

<sup>40</sup> Православне сповідання віри, ч. 1, № 99, 106. Cf.: *La Confession Orthodoxe.*— P. 56, 62.

classical texts by Cicero and others<sup>41</sup>. Obviously, rhetorics soon began to flourish in the academy. A panegyric addressed to Mohyla in connection with his founding compares the art of speech with the water of the Nil river, without which nothing can grow, but which is also able to destroy all life by the force of a flood. «Now this water rightly floods the wide lands of Rus...»<sup>42</sup>. Similar enthusiasm was apparently devoted to Poetics, with its imparting of all the forms of poetry, comedy, tragedy, elegy, satire etc. Early printings in Kyiv after the colleges founding sufficiently demonstrate this influence. «Judging from the popularity of Poetics, the Kyivan student was less a scholar and more an aspiring bard»<sup>43</sup>. On the other hand, courses of philosophy, or even theology, by that time were apparently still a matter of desire, and were taught regularly only after the 1680's<sup>44</sup>.

So, for several reasons, there was something ornamental in the early program of the school – a characteristic, that has more to do with the nobleman Mohyla, rather than with the bishop. Principally, Mohyla's motives in founding the Kyivan college still contained much of the feeling of responsibility and mercy, that was mentioned above. His somewhat ceremonial declaration from June 15<sup>th</sup>, 1631, speaks mainly about the danger for human souls, which arises from the ignorance of the clergy and the lack of education among the youth. «I, Peter Mohyla, by the grace of God archimandrite of the Kyivan Cave's monastery [...] have decided to found schools, so that the youth shall be educated in all piety, in good behaviour and fine arts»<sup>45</sup>. The sound of this declaration, as well as many other official texts written by him, shows much of the grandiosity of a nobleman – even more, if one reads the following passages, where the archimandrite promises to keep the institution financed mainly out of his own burse. Since the time of the illustrious magnate Kostiantyn Ostrozskyi, there had been perhaps no other protector of the church with a similar potential. Mohyla here fulfils the duty, that was laid upon him already by the legacy of his ancestors, the Moldavian princes – to be occupied with the wealth and flourishing of church and faith. In the same year, he reminds his younger brother Moise, by that time the reigning Moldavian prince (hospodar), of the named

<sup>41</sup> Unfortunately, much of the libraries funds have been lost in several fires over the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. There is yet some evidence that e.g. St. Thomas of Aquin's «*Summa theologiae*» was represented, cf.: La Confession orthodoxe. – P. XIV f.; *Sydorenko A.* The Kievan Academy. – P. 130. For further details on the college's library see: *Charipova L. V.* Latin books and the Eastern Orthodox clerical elite in Kiev, 1632–1780. – Manchester: M. University Press, 2006.

<sup>42</sup> Eucharisterion, або вячність. – К., 1632. Cf.: *Грушевський М.* Історія української літератури. – Т. 6. – С. 214 і далі.

<sup>43</sup> *Sydorenko A.* The Kievan Academy. – P. 115; see also: *Martel R.* La langue polonaise. – P. 280 f.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibidem.* – P. 217; *Sydorenko A.* The Kievan Academy. – P. 125.

<sup>45</sup> Памятники. – Т. 2. – К., 1843. – С. 93, № 7; *Голубев С. Т.* Петр Могила. – Т. 1. – С. 433 и далее.

obligations<sup>46</sup>. As we shall see, it was also this noble origin, which had the main part in Mohyla's motives to introduce higher learning as well, regardless of the harsh opposition of monks and cossacks, who often couldn't see in this nothing else but a threatening for their salvation<sup>47</sup>.

The Polish-Lithuanian nobility of that time had a clear idea of the value of good manners and education. These virtues were constitutive ornaments of the noble estate. The ability to speak in sophisticated terms, with an advanced language, perhaps on occasion interspersed with Latin sequences, was regarded as a characteristic sign of the true noble, an ornament of similar significance as clothes and the coat of arms. The noble society, even more with its political system on the local dietines and diets all over the kingdom, easily recognized the plebeian, who «spoke like a peasant»<sup>48</sup>. Consequently, Silvestr Kosiv, one of Mohyla's main collaborators of that time, argued in favour of Latin and Polish lessons in Kyiv, because all this was necessary for the Ruthenian nobleman on the dietines, diets, before courts and tribunals. Otherwise, understanding no single word of the themes discussed, «he has no judge, no advocate, neither reason nor translator: he only sits and opens his eyes, staring on this and that like a crow». Latin, therefore, is what the nobles need for public affairs<sup>49</sup>. Later, in the already mentioned polemical work «*Lithos, albo kamien...*» (Lithos, or stone...), edited in 1644, it is apparently Mohyla himself, who points out, that statements on religious questions could hardly be held in Greek or Church Slavonic (the languages that Mohyla's opponents had preferred), if these questions were asked in Latin or in a Polish with Latin interruptions (as that was the usual habit of the contemporary nobleman). Answers should be given in the language of the question. Moreover, there existed little amounts of theological books in Slavonic, and no *political* books at all. The literature written in Greek had to be collected with great costs and difficulties in remote countries, while Latin works were easily available. «Members of the Rus are frequently accused, that they do not study and thus stay fools, no politicians, and that they are not able to explain what they believe in...» – this describes in exact terms the societal problem, the new Kyivan college had to face<sup>50</sup>.

<sup>46</sup> Bogdan D. P. Les Enseignements de Pierre Movila a son frère Moise Movila // Cyrilomethodianum.– 1971.– Т. 1.– Р. 23.

<sup>47</sup> For their arguments see: Голубев С. Т. Киево-Могилянская коллегия при жизни ее фундатора, киевского митрополита Петра Могилы // Труды КДА.– 1890.– № 12.– С. 541; Грушевський М. Історія України-Руси.– Т. 7.– С. 421.

<sup>48</sup> Tazbir J. Kultura szlachecka w Polsce. Rozkwit. Upadek. Relikty.– Warszawa, 1997.– S. 26 i dalej.

<sup>49</sup> Silvestr Kosiv. Exegesis // Архив ЮЗР.– Ч. 1, т. 8.– К., 1914.– С. 443.

<sup>50</sup> One should bear in mind, that in the Polish language of the 17<sup>th</sup> century the terms «politician», and «political» (*polityczny*) could well have the meaning of «polite» in modern terms, and referred then directly to the due behaviour of a nobleman, with «courteous manners, social tact, avoidance of coarse habits». Cf.: Łozinski W. Zycie polskie w dawnych wiekach.– Krakow, 1969 (reprint).– S. 187. More deliberately on the point of the alleged Ruthenian

children, apart from the theoretical courses. Thus, already the basics of Christian teaching had acquired a confessional character. The trend of stressing the confessional differences became obvious already at the turn of the 16<sup>th</sup> century<sup>34</sup>. Within an epoch, that historiography has come to name the «confessional era», each of the confessional churches, in concurrence with the others referred to clearly defined dogmatic and ecclesiological scripts and teachings. Education meant at first to spread confessional religion among the believers, and to develop and strengthen their convictions, making out of them not only disciplined adherents of one specific way to believe and live, but also convinced witnesses to the truth of that way in society<sup>35</sup>.

Scholastic writings still were somewhat at the core of theological science, and were used to some degree on all confessional parts. Since the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, the formerly widespread sentences of Petrus Lombardus gradually ceased their place to the *Summa* of St. Thomas of Aquin. The Jesuit order initially was even reluctant to integrate it into its teaching program, but agreed, after all, to give it a place in the system of their «*Ratio*». Theology by itself formed only the final part of a *curriculum*, and was taught as a regular subject only exceptionally, and not on each of the schools. On the contrary, the main role in the educational program was now taken by rhetorics, the art of arguing and convincing, obviously a decisive ability in confessional concurrence – and in politics<sup>36</sup>.

In sum, the particular significance of scholastic traditions in the «confessional era» – or, in other terms, the baroque now arising – was less that of concise theological systems, but rather that of the *method of discussions*. The conversational system of *quaestio, expositio, conclusio* proved to be of constitutional usefulness in the numerous religious debates of the time, especially when the very purpose of the public debates was less to convince the opponents, but to win over them in the eyes of the public by a more brilliant way of arguing.

Orthodox education apparently continued to form an exception in this landscape, even after the foundation of the Kyivan College. It is striking, in any case, that at least Orthodox theologians constantly refused to take part in public debates, at least during Mohyla's lifetime. Even the Kyivan contributions to the literary polemics – as might be stated as a mere impression – have been not quite numerous, taking into account the numbers of literal attacks and replies of controversian

---

<sup>34</sup> For corresponding observances in Polish historiography see already: *Brückner A.* Dzieje kultury Polski.– Vol. 2.– Kraków, 1933.– S. 478 i dalej.

<sup>35</sup> See, as a key text for the concept of confessionalization: *Reinhard W.* Zwang zur Konfessionalisierung? Prolegomena zu einer Theorie des konfessionellen Zeitalters // *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung.*– 1986.– Bd. 10.– S. 257–277; on the role of education here esp. p. 265.

<sup>36</sup> See: *Laplanche F.* Die intellektuelle Bewegung und die Kirchen (t. 3, kap. 4) // *Die Geschichte des Christentums.*– Freiburg, 1992.– Vol. 8.– S. 1114–1125.

theology in the West<sup>37</sup>. The famous «*Lithos, albo kamien...*», composed by Mohyla and his collaborators in 1644<sup>38</sup> is rather an exception, that confirms the rule. Most of the products of the Kyivan printing press are not of a direct polemical character. That might be, of course, due to a temporary modesty of the younger generation of theologians in Kyiv, where higher learning had just begun to develop. The main reason, however, apparently lies elsewhere. It was their specific approach to matters of faith, which forbade them to go out and «prove» the truth of the Orthodox religion. Once again, a passage from Mohyla's own writings is able to tell the essential. In his personal notes he refers an episode, when the Walachian prince Mikhaïl enters the town «Belgorod» (presumably the Transsylvanian Alba Iulia, taken by prince Mikhaïl the Brave in 1599), and gains moral victory over the local Catholics «not by words alone». Instead, it is a miracle, that proves the value of the right, Orthodox faith, and the Walachian prince consciously leads the initial debate to that way of testing, while the Catholics were already prepared for demonstrations from Holy Scripture and theological literature. «In debates there arises only endless anger. Apart from those arguments, however, we can easily demonstrate it [the righteousness of our faith – *A.B.*] with God's help»<sup>39</sup>.

The mysteries of the faith could not be understood even through the most elaborate theological or philosophical terms. The latter might yet sometimes help to *explain* them. Correspondingly, in Mohyla's *Православне сповідання віри* an obvious scholastic term as *transsubstantiatio* is merely used to illustrate, to give some imagination how bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of the Lord – for this none can truly understand but God himself<sup>40</sup>. To be sure, some of the main works of classical scholastic literature were represented in the library of the Kyivan College – those already named, Petrus Lombardus and St. Thomas, among them, and they were obviously in use – quoted, criticized, condemned, or corrected as they were in all the schools of the different confessions of that time. A greater part of the libraries fund, however, was devoted to the art of preaching, and to rhetorics. One finds there the works of the famous Jesuit Piotr Skarga, together with

<sup>37</sup> This might be true in spite of Ihor Shevchenko's statistics, that sees Orthodox polemical literature increase during the first half of the 17th century – cf.: *Shevchenko I. Religious Polemical Literature in the Ukrainian and Belarus Lands // id. Ukraine Between East and West: Essays on Cultural History to the Early Eighteenth Century.* – Edmonton, 1996. – P. 296 f. Indeed, only a minor part of the polemical works by orthodox authors had been written and printed in Kyiv, as can be learned already through a look on the collection of Titov: *Титов Хв. Матеріали для історії книжної справи на Україні.* – К., 1924.

<sup>38</sup> Published in: Архив ЮЗР. – Ч. 1, т. 9. – К., 1886.

<sup>39</sup> «В словопрѣныхъ трудъ безъ конца есть, нѣ кромѣ словопрѣнія въскорѣ се, Богу поспѣшествуюшубъ мы показати можемъ» (Архив ЮЗР. – Ч. 1, т. 7. – С. 81).

<sup>40</sup> *Православне сповідання віри*, ч. 1, № 99, 106. Cf.: *La Confession Orthodoxe.* – P. 56, 62.

classical texts by Cicero and others<sup>41</sup>. Obviously, rhetorics soon began to flourish in the academy. A panegyric addressed to Mohyla in connection with his founding compares the art of speech with the water of the Nil river, without which nothing can grow, but which is also able to destroy all life by the force of a flood. «Now this water rightly floods the wide lands of Rus...»<sup>42</sup>. Similar enthusiasm was apparently devoted to Poetics, with its imparting of all the forms of poetry, comedy, tragedy, elegy, satire etc. Early printings in Kyiv after the colleges founding sufficiently demonstrate this influence. «Judging from the popularity of Poetics, the Kyivan student was less a scholar and more an aspiring bard»<sup>43</sup>. On the other hand, courses of philosophy, or even theology, by that time were apparently still a matter of desire, and were taught regularly only after the 1680's<sup>44</sup>.

So, for several reasons, there was something ornamental in the early program of the school – a characteristic, that has more to do with the nobleman Mohyla, rather than with the bishop. Principally, Mohyla's motives in founding the Kyivan college still contained much of the feeling of responsibility and mercy, that was mentioned above. His somewhat ceremonial declaration from June 15<sup>th</sup>, 1631, speaks mainly about the danger for human souls, which arises from the ignorance of the clergy and the lack of education among the youth. «I, Peter Mohyla, by the grace of God archimandrite of the Kyivan Cave's monastery [...] have decided to found schools, so that the youth shall be educated in all piety, in good behaviour and fine arts»<sup>45</sup>. The sound of this declaration, as well as many other official texts written by him, shows much of the grandiosity of a nobleman – even more, if one reads the following passages, where the archimandrite promises to keep the institution financed mainly out of his own burse. Since the time of the illustrious magnate Kostiantyn Ostrozskyi, there had been perhaps no other protector of the church with a similar potential. Mohyla here fulfils the duty, that was laid upon him already by the legacy of his ancestors, the Moldavian princes – to be occupied with the wealth and flourishing of church and faith. In the same year, he reminds his younger brother Moise, by that time the reigning Moldavian prince (hospodar), of the named

<sup>41</sup> Unfortunately, much of the libraries funds have been lost in several fires over the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. There is yet some evidence that e.g. St. Thomas of Aquin's «*Summa theologiae*» was represented, cf.: La Confession orthodoxe. – P. XIV f.; *Sydorenko A.* The Kievan Academy. – P. 130. For further details on the college's library see: *Charipova L. V.* Latin books and the Eastern Orthodox clerical elite in Kiev, 1632–1780. – Manchester: M. University Press, 2006.

<sup>42</sup> Eucharisterion, або вячність. – К., 1632. Cf.: *Грушевський М.* Історія української літератури. – Т. 6. – С. 214 і далі.

<sup>43</sup> *Sydorenko A.* The Kievan Academy. – P. 115; see also: *Martel R.* La langue polonaise. – P. 280 f.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibidem.* – P. 217; *Sydorenko A.* The Kievan Academy. – P. 125.

<sup>45</sup> Памятники. – Т. 2. – К., 1843. – С. 93, № 7; *Голубев С. Т.* Петр Могила. – Т. 1. – С. 433 и далее.

obligations<sup>46</sup>. As we shall see, it was also this noble origin, which had the main part in Mohyla's motives to introduce higher learning as well, regardless of the harsh opposition of monks and cossacks, who often couldn't see in this nothing else but a threatening for their salvation<sup>47</sup>.

The Polish-Lithuanian nobility of that time had a clear idea of the value of good manners and education. These virtues were constitutive ornaments of the noble estate. The ability to speak in sophisticated terms, with an advanced language, perhaps on occasion interspersed with Latin sequences, was regarded as a characteristic sign of the true noble, an ornament of similar significance as clothes and the coat of arms. The noble society, even more with its political system on the local dietines and diets all over the kingdom, easily recognized the plebeian, who «spoke like a peasant»<sup>48</sup>. Consequently, Silvestr Kosiv, one of Mohyla's main collaborators of that time, argued in favour of Latin and Polish lessons in Kyiv, because all this was necessary for the Ruthenian nobleman on the dietines, diets, before courts and tribunals. Otherwise, understanding no single word of the themes discussed, «he has no judge, no advocate, neither reason nor translator: he only sits and opens his eyes, staring on this and that like a crow». Latin, therefore, is what the nobles need for public affairs<sup>49</sup>. Later, in the already mentioned polemical work «*Lithos, albo kamien...*» (Lithos, or stone...), edited in 1644, it is apparently Mohyla himself, who points out, that statements on religious questions could hardly be held in Greek or Church Slavonic (the languages that Mohyla's opponents had preferred), if these questions were asked in Latin or in a Polish with Latin interruptions (as that was the usual habit of the contemporary nobleman). Answers should be given in the language of the question. Moreover, there existed little amounts of theological books in Slavonic, and no *political* books at all. The literature written in Greek had to be collected with great costs and difficulties in remote countries, while Latin works were easily available. «Members of the Rus are frequently accused, that they do not study and thus stay fools, no politicians, and that they are not able to explain what they believe in...» – this describes in exact terms the societal problem, the new Kyivan college had to face<sup>50</sup>.

<sup>46</sup> Bogdan D. P. Les Enseignements de Pierre Movila a son frère Moise Movila // Cyrillomethodianum. – 1971. – Т. 1. – P. 23.

<sup>47</sup> For their arguments see: Голубев С. Т. Киево-Могилянская коллегия при жизни ее фундатора, киевского митрополита Петра Могилы // Труды КДА. – 1890. – № 12. – С. 541; Грушевський М. Історія України-Руси. – Т. 7. – С. 421.

<sup>48</sup> Tazbir J. Kultura szlachecka w Polsce. Rozkwit. Upadek. Relikty. – Warszawa, 1997. – S. 26 i dalej.

<sup>49</sup> Silvestr Kosiv. Exegesis // Архив ЮЗР. – Ч. 1, т. 8. – К., 1914. – С. 443.

<sup>50</sup> One should bear in mind, that in the Polish language of the 17<sup>th</sup> century the terms «politician», and «political» (*polityczny*) could well have the meaning of «polite» in modern terms, and referred then directly to the due behaviour of a nobleman, with «courteous manners, social tact, avoidance of coarse habits». Cf.: Łozinski W. Zycie polskie w dawnych wiekach. – Kraków, 1969 (reprint). – S. 187. More deliberately on the point of the alleged Ruthenian

After all, as our sketch may have shown despite its shortness, we have a school fitting with the requirements of its time – a noble society in the «confessional era», and the baroque. To some degree, enemies were fought, and the enemies' weapons were used. Elsewhere, religion was practised, and was praised and celebrated. The Orthodox church praised and celebrated itself, after it had learned to do so, but in many respect did not give up its character, and those specifics, who made it different from the Western confession. Right the mixture, that arose, is difficult to interpret. Certainly it was the strong accent on religion and piety, after all, which brought about the similarities of the Kyivan College with Western models, but also led to obvious differences.

*Альфонс Брюнінг*

### ПРО ЄЗУЇТСЬКІ ШКОЛИ, СХОЛАСТИКУ ТА КИЇВСЬКУ АКАДЕМІЮ – КІЛЬКА ЗАУВАГ ЩОДО ІСТОРИЧНОГО ТА ІДЕОЛОГІЧНОГО ТЛА ЇЇ ЗАСНУВАННЯ

*У статті зроблено спробу критично розглянути різноманітні інтерпретації заснування Київської академії у 1631–1632 р. та знайти виваженіше пояснення його історичного підґрунтя. Класичні терміни в дискусії, як-от запозичення з єзуїтських шкіл у Речі Посполитій або часто повторювана «київська вченість» мають бути поставлені під питання з кількох причин. З іншого боку, замало уваги приділялося релігійним мотиваціям засновника Петра Могили та його оточення. Фактично суто релігійні спонуки, зокрема православного спрямування, утруднювали сприйняття західних моделей. Так було не лише через супротивників Могили, але й через його власні погляди. Якщо ж, незважаючи на це, були прийняті західні зразки, і Київський колеґіум був побудований за взірцем шкіл західних конфесій, то цей крок цілком узгоджувався з культурною та суспільною ситуацією Польсько-Литовської держави – шляхетського суспільства та його культури дискусії, що багатьма шляхами поєднувалися із політичною системою країни.*