

Nikolaos Chrissidis

**Greek Teachers, Jesuit Curriculum, Russian Students:
The Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy of Moscow
in Historiographical Perspective¹**

In 1685, two Greek hieromonks, the brothers Ioannikios and Sophronios Leichoudes, established in Moscow a school of middle and higher education which is known in the historiography as the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy. It was the first formally organized educational institution in Russia and was modeled after contemporary Jesuit colleges. Ioannikios and Sophronios were not members of the Society of Jesus; rather, all evidence suggests they grew up and remained confessionally Greek Orthodox. However, like many others of their compatriots in the seventeenth century, the two brothers had acquired their education in schools of post-Renaissance Italy under a curriculum which was a precise copy of the Jesuit one. In turn, when the Leichoudes took it upon themselves to create a school in Russia, they emulated the structural characteristics, pedagogical methods and program of studies of Jesuit prototypes. As a result, they imparted to their Muscovite students the rhetorical and philosophical training offered by teachers of the Society of Jesus in their extensive network of schools throughout the world. To be sure, the Leichoudes adapted the Academy's curriculum to fit the demands of the Russian Orthodox cultural environment. This adaptation, however, did not substantially alter the essential aspects of Leichoudian teaching. As a result of the pedagogical activities of the two brothers, Russian institutional education commenced along Jesuit lines.²

¹ I thank the anonymous reviewer for substantive comments and Maksym Iaremenko for bibliographical suggestions.

² The best treatment of Greek-Russian relations, despite its obvious anti-Greek bias, still remains Каптерев Н. Ф. *Характер отношений России к православному востоку в XVI и XVII столетиях*. Сергиев Посад, 1914. Изд. второе. Among others,

The Old Paradigm: Grecophiles vs. Latinophiles

Scholars of Russian history have long portrayed the Greek clergymen who came to Muscovy in the seventeenth century as purveyors of a Byzantine Greek culture which was ossified, conservative, traditionalist and even reactionary. Such Greek clergymen could only have aided and contributed to the formation of a “grecophile” streak of culture in Muscovy, one that was diametrically opposed to a “latinophile” one springing from the Ukraine and Belorussia. In viewing the Greeks in this light, historians have failed to consider the evolution of Greek Orthodoxy in the two centuries after the fall of Byzantium.³ Thus, they

see also: Ševcenko I. *Byzantium and the Eastern Slavs after 1453* // Harvard Ukrainian Studies. 1978. Vol. 2, No 1. P. 5–25; Nitsche P. “Nicht an die Griechen glaube ich, sondern an Christus.” *Russen und Griechen im Selbstverständnis des Moskauer Staates an der Schwelle zur Neuzeit*. Düsseldorf, 1991; Муравьев А. Н. *Сношения России с Востоком по делам церковным*. СПб., 1858–1860. Ч. 1–2 (for the first half of the seventeenth century); Kraft E. *Moskaus griechisches Jahrhundert. Russisch-griechische Beziehungen und meta-byzantinischer Einfluss 1619–1694*. Stuttgart, 1995; von Scheliha W. *Russland und die orthodoxe Universalkirche in der Patriarchatsperiode 1589–1721*. Wiesbaden, 2004. For an understanding of Greek-Russian relations, indispensable are the works of Boris L. Fonkich and Vera G. Chentsova: see, for example: Фонкич Б. Л. *Греческо-русские культурные связи XV–XVII вв. (Греческие рукописи в России)*. М., 1977 and; idem, *Греко-славянские школы в Москве в XVII веке*. М., 2009; Ченцова В. Г. *Икона Иверской Богоматери. Очерки истории отношений Греческой церкви с Россией в середине XVII в. по документам РГАДА*. М., 2010.

³ Almost all pre-revolutionary and Soviet historians ignore the consequences of the Western schooling of the Greeks, even though they are clearly aware of it. For the case of the Leichoudes, see e. g.: Смирнов С. К. *История Московской славяно-греко-латинской академии*. М., 1855; Каптерев Н. Ф. *Характер отношений*; cf. also: Платонов С. Ф. *Москва и Запад в XVI–XVII веках*. Л., 1925 (English translation: *Moscow and the West* / Ed. and trans. by Joseph L. Wiczynski. Hattiesburg, Miss., 1972), who also speaks of a reaction by Muscovite higher clergy (aided by Greek clergymen) to the “latinism” of the court and especially the Ukrainian and Belorussian migrant monks; Богданов А. П. *К полемике конца 60-х – начала 80-х годов XVII в. об организации высшего учебного заведения в России. Источниковедческие заметки // Исследования по источниковедению истории СССР XIII–XVIII вв. Сборник статей / Под ред. В. И. Буганова*. М., 1986. С. 177–209 (Bogdanov speaks of “мудрборцы” [roughly, “enemies of wisdom, education”] with regard to, among others, the Leichoudes brothers). Russian literary scholars and Western historians have been more careful: see e. g.: Сафонова Л. И. *Поэтическое творчество Евфимия Чудовского* // *Slavia*. 1987.

have underestimated, or even outright overlooked, the fact that most theologians and high prelates of the Churches of Constantinople and Jerusalem at that time were Western-educated, usually graduates of Italian universities and most often that of Padua, the university city of Venice.⁴ To a greater or lesser degree, they were all influenced by the intellectual and theological currents of post-Renaissance Western Europe. This influence expressed itself in the educational enterprises as well as in the theological and philosophical output of the Greek Orthodox East in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Although the study of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Greek culture is fragmentary, the existing scholarship provides substantial insights into the impact of Western Renaissance and post-Renaissance literary, philosophical and theological currents on the educated Greek elite of the time (who were in their overwhelming majority clergymen). Such literature suggests that for all intents and purposes, most Greek clergy can hardly be seen as *a priori* constituting a traditional and conservative force in the cultural framework of seventeenth-century Russia. Instead, they can be better understood as representatives of a Western-educated Greek intelligent-

Roč. 56, seš. 3. S. 243–252 [but cf. her “Восточнославянские академии XVI–XVIII вв. в контексте европейской академической традиции” (Славяноведение. 1995, № 3. С. 46–61), in which she still employs the binary model grecophile-latinophile, although she avoids any characterizations of the Leichoudes themselves in this regard; cf. also her “Литературная культура России: Раннее новое время” (М., 2006), where the Leichoudes are bundled with the grecophiles although they are characterized as representatives of Western education (с. 104–112)]. Kraft carefully notes that viewing the Leichoudes as carriers of Greek cultural influence in Russia is problematic, given that they were Western-educated. He thus sees them as carriers of a culture that was not exclusively Greek. Still, he does not specify what this not-exclusively Greek culture encompassed beyond professed adherence to Orthodoxy and citations of Greek patristic authorities (see: Kraft E. *Moskaus griechisches Jahrhundert*. S. 179–180; see also my review of Kraft: *Moskaus griechisches Jahrhundert* // *Kritika. Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 2. 2001, No. 2 (Spring). P. 427–433.

⁴ On the Greek students of the university of Padua, see primarily: Podskalsky G. *Griechische Theologie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft (1453–1821). Die Orthodoxie im Spannungsfeld der nachreformatorischen Konfessionen des Westens*. Munich, 1988. S. 49–58 (with very good bibliography); also consult the revised Greek version of the book: *He hellenike theologia epi Tourkokratias 1453–1821. He Orthodoxia ste sphaira epirrhoes ton dytikon domgaton meta te metarrythmise* / Trans. by Georgios D. Metallenos. Athens, 2008. See also: Fabris G. *Professori e scolari greci all’ universita di Padova* // *Archivio Veneto*. 2nd ser. 1942. No 30. P. 121–165; Tsourkas C. *Gli scolari greci di Padova nel rinnovamento culturale dell’ Oriente ortodosso*. Padua, 1958.

sia. As such, they formed a venue through which Western culture found its way into Muscovy.⁵

Still, it was not only the Greek clergy who carried a Western cultural baggage into Muscovy. Closer to home, the Ukraine and Belorussia, as parts of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, were already experiencing the impact of Western Renaissance and post-Renaissance culture as early as the late sixteenth century. After the Union of Brest (1596), the Orthodox hierarchy of the Polish-Lithuanian State accepted the pope's primacy. However, the mass of believers remained loyal to Orthodoxy. The period between the 1590s and the 1630s was characterized by polemic and persecution. Facing the inroads of Catholicism and Protestantism, Orthodox clergymen of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, with the support of the brotherhoods and the Cossack and urban elite, set up schools in the form of Jesuit colleges with a baroque curriculum in Orthodox guise.⁶ The Kiev Mohylian Academy is the

⁵ Gerhard Podskalsky's work on Orthodox theology in the post-Byzantine period is invaluable, though his opinions are frequently debatable: see his *Griechische Theologie* and also *Die Rolle der griechischen Kirche und Theologie innerhalb der Gesamtorthodoxie in der Zeit der Türkenherrschaft (1453–1821)* // *Die Kultur Griechenlands in Mittelalter und Neuzeit. Bericht über das Kolloquium der Südosteuropa-Kommission 28.-31. Oktober 1992* / Eds. Reinhard Lauer and Peter Schreiner. Göttingen, 1996. S. 222–241 (for corrections and additions to the previous title). See also: Maloney G. A. *A History of Orthodox Theology since 1453*. Belmont, Mass., 1976; Runciman S. *The Great Church in Captivity*. Cambridge, England, 1968; Henderson G. P. *The Revival of Greek Thought, 1620–1830*. Albany, 1970; Giannaras Ch. *Orthodoxia kai Dyse ste Neotere Hellada*. Athens, 1992. Giannaras's is a polemical account bemoaning what he sees as the destructive influences of Western scholasticism on Orthodox theology and ecclesiology.

⁶ Грушевський М. *Історія України-Руси*. New York, 1954–1958 (10 vols., reprint). Т. 6. С. 444–564; Т. 7. С. 402–425; Sysyn F. E. *Between Poland and the Ukraine: The Dilemma of Adam Kysil*. Cambridge, Mass., 1985; Frick D. A. *Meletij Smotryc'kyj*. Cambridge, Mass., 1995. On the brotherhoods, see: Ісаєвич Я. Д. *Братства та їх роль в розвитку української культури XVI–XVIII ст.* К., 1966; and its revised English version: *Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early Modern Ukraine*. Edmonton and Toronto, 2006; also, idem, *Greek Culture in the Ukraine: 1550–1650* // *Modern Greek Studies Yearbook*. 1990, No 6. P. 97–122 (for the involvement of Greek merchants and clergymen in the educational activities of the Orthodox brotherhoods in the Ukraine). On the brotherhood schools, see: Харлампович К. *Западнорусские православные школы XVI и начала XVII века*. Казань, 1898; Медынский Е. Н. *Братские школы Украины и Белоруссии в XVI и XVII вв. и их роль в воссоединении Украины с Россией*. М., 1954.

prime example of such endeavors. Established by Petro Mohyla in 1632, the Kievan school was modeled after contemporary Jesuit colleges and offered its students classes in grammar, poetics, rhetoric and (less regularly) in Aristotelian philosophy.⁷ Even before the Treaty of Pereiaslav (1654), when the left bank Ukraine (*Гетьманщина*) passed to Muscovite control, several Ukrainian and Belorussian graduates of the Kievan Academy had found their way into Russia in search of printing presses and employment. Their migration intensified after the incorporation of the *Гетьманщина* into the Russian State. The Muscovites were clearly in need of their skills in languages and learning, for both Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich and Patriarch Nikon welcomed and harbored them.

Scholarly interest in the religious and cultural developments of the second half of the Russian seventeenth century flourished in a barrage of monographs in the period between 1850–1917. In addition to the schism of the Old Belief, historians produced studies of the activities of Ukrainian and Belorussian emigrant churchmen in Russia, of the reinvigorated Greek-Russian relations as well as of the activity of the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy. In retrospect, two factors appear to have primarily conditioned the overarching interpretative framework of such scholarship. One was the image of Peter the Great's reign (1689–1725) as a major break with old Muscovy. Nineteenth-century debates concerning the relation between Russia and Europe and the place of Russian culture in the larger European one constituted the second factor. The outcome was that contemporary rigid national and cultural distinctions contributed to partisan and anachronistic interpretations of the complex religious and cultural processes of early modern Russia.

For historians of the pre-revolutionary period, Peter's reign was a turning point from the old, traditionalist, conservative Muscovite culture to a modern, westernized, progressive one instituted by his reforms. Thus, when these scholars looked at the pre-Petrine past, they mostly saw a Byzantine Russia about to be swept away by the victorious Western

⁷ Грушевський М. *Історія України-Руси*. Т. 8, ч. 2. С. 83–101; Голубев С. Т. *Киевский митрополит Петр Могила и его сподвижники*. К., 1883–1898. Т. 1–2; Ševčenko I. *The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla* // Harvard Ukrainian Studies. 1984. Vol. 8, No 1–2. P. 9–44, as well as the other articles included in the same volume; Sydorenko A. *The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century*. Ottawa, 1977. For a historiographical overview, see: Brüning A. *On Jesuit Schools, Scholasticism and the Kievan Academy – Some Remarks on the Historical and Ideological Background of Its Founding* // Київська Академія. 2007. Вип. 4. С. 5–19.

ways forced onto it by the tsar-reformer. Similarly, historians projected the nineteenth-century Russian debates between “Westernizers” and “Slavophiles” into earlier periods by detecting a struggle between “latinizers” and “grecophiles,” progressives and conservatives respectively, on the eve of Peter the Great’s reign. In such a scheme, rigid confessional and cultural distinctions of the modern period left their stamp on the historiography of earlier periods. The result was that although pre-revolutionary scholars made great advances in charting the development of Russian culture in the seventeenth century, their accounts were colored by the imposition of anachronistic nineteenth-century conceptual categories on their sources. Thus, anything Russian or Greek before Peter the Great became automatically synonymous with conservative Orthodoxy and, sometimes, obscurantism. A Greek clergyman could be representative only of a largely imaginary Byzantine culture, even when educated in the colleges and universities of post-Renaissance Italy. Likewise, anyone coming from the Ukraine or Belorussia was *ipso facto* colored (or even corrupted) by Latin culture and hence confessionally suspect (and possibly a Uniate), but still comparatively progressive when juxtaposed to Greek and Russian representatives of Byzantinism. By applying such anachronistic and inflexible distinctive identities onto early modern culture, scholars obscured more than they sought to illuminate.

The historiography of the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy and of the Leichoudes constitutes a case in point. In the first and still valuable work covering the Academy’s operation between 1685–1814, Sergei Smirnov set a milestone and lay the interpretative foundation for virtually all subsequent studies of the Academy and of the Leichoudes as educators.⁸ Smirnov provided a comprehensive view of the Academy’s development until its reorganization into a purely theological seminary in 1814. He identified three separate and distinctive stages in the Academy’s evolution: a “Greek” one, lasting from 1685 to 1700, when the Leichoudes and their students taught in the Academy, mainly in Greek; a “Latin” one, between 1700–1775, during which Ukrainian scholars

⁸ Смирнов С. К. *История Московской славяно-греко-латинской академии.*

In his comprehensive study of intellectual life in Petrine Russia, Petr Pekarskii was the first to follow Smirnov’s lead. He thus saw the Leichoudes and their Academy as representatives of a Byzantinism which would and did resist Peter’s sweeping initiatives, see: Пекарский П. *Наука и литература в России при Петре Великом.* СПб., 1862. Т. 1. С. 2. 113.

dominated the teaching positions and Latin prevailed in the curriculum; and finally, a “Slavo-Greco-Latin” period between 1775–1814, in which all three respective languages were used in instruction. Smirnov based his periodization on what he considered to be the dominant linguistic tool in each phase, but went beyond that. Indeed, in what came to be a common interpretative device in all scholarship on the Leichoudes and the Academy, Smirnov uncritically extrapolated the cultural orientation of the Academy from the language of instruction.⁹ Accordingly, if Greek was the dominant language during the Leichoudes’s tenure in it, then the Academy imparted to its students a Greek culture (which in pre-revolutionary Russia was largely seen as being identical to the Byzantine one, although Smirnov himself is not very specific on this point). Smirnov was clearly aware of the precariousness of such an analytical criterion, for he undertook great efforts at proving that what was true for the language (i. e., its dominance in instruction) also applied to the very content of the education provided in it. He thus provided an extensive overview of the Leichoudian corpus of texts, both polemical and educational. He acknowledged that the Leichoudes also taught Latin in the Academy and summarized (briefly and not always correctly) the main Leichoudian textbooks, pointing out their scholastic character and their intellectual debt to Western authors.¹⁰ Still, he uncritically and simplistically restricted the Western elements of Leichoudian education to the external, formal traits of the curriculum, leaving the content somehow purely Greek. Thus, Smirnov remained firmly convinced that the Leichoudes were teaching Greek culture to their students, although he failed to define what this Greek culture comprised.

All other pre-revolutionary Russian studies faithfully followed Smirnov’s view of the Leichoudian Academy as a bastion of Greek culture, even as they offered valuable new insights into seventeenth-century Russian religion and culture. Several biographies of major players in the ecclesiastical and cultural developments of the time deserve mention here. Petr Smirnov’s and Grigorii Skvortsov’s biographies of Patriarchs Ioakim (1674–1690) and Adrian (1690–1700) are useful for an understanding of the activities of the last two patriarchs of early mod-

⁹ Смирнов С. К. *История Московской славяно-греко-латинской академии*. С. 15.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* С. 40–69.

ern Russia.¹¹ Both Ioakim and Adrian were patrons of the Leichoudes and their priorities partly conditioned the educational choices of the Leichoudes in the Muscovite Academy. Petr Smirnov offered a picture of Ioakim as an archconservative, “grecophile” Patriarch who found in the Leichoudes educated allies in his struggle against the “latinophile” tendencies of the royal court and of Ukrainian and Belorussian scholars (such as Simeon Polotskii and his Russian disciple Sil’vestr Medvedev). Grigorii Skvortsov, on the other hand, provided a much more nuanced portrait of Patriarch Adrian as a church leader who was not an opponent of all Western influences, but was unable to pursue sustained educational and religious programs in view of Peter the Great’s increasing inroads into church affairs. Still, as he was more interested in church-state relations, Skvortsov did not escape the trap of the grecophile-latinophile dichotomy in his discussion of Russian cultural life in the last decade of the seventeenth century. Likewise, V. Pevnitskii and I. Tatarskii studied the activities of Epifanii Slavineckii (?–1675) and Simeon Polotskii (1629–1680),¹² as representatives of two contrasting intellectual streaks, a grecophile and latinophile one.¹³ Grigorii Mirkovich used the same dichotomy in his detailed investigation of the disputes over the precise moment of transubstantiation in the Eucharist in the 1680s,¹⁴ as did Konstantin Kharlampovich who charted the inflow of Ukrainian and

¹¹ Смирнов П. С. *Иоаким, Патриарх Московский*. М., 1881; Скворцов Г. А. *Патриарх Адриан. Его жизнь и труды в связи с состоянием Русской Церкви в последнее десятилетие XVII в.* Казань, 1913.

¹² On Epifanii Slavineckii, see: Панченко А. М. *Епифаний Славинецкий // Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси*. СПб., 1992. Вып. 3 (XVII в.), ч. 1 (А–З) / Отв. ред. Д. С. Лихачев. С. 309–313; Bushkovitch P. *Religion and Society in Russia. The Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. Oxford, 1992. P. 152–160. On Simeon Polotskii, see *ibid.*, 163–175; and: Панченко А. М., библиогр., Буланин Д. М., Романова А. А. *Симеон Полоцкий // Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси*. СПб., 1998. Вып. 3 (XVII в.), ч. 3 (П–С) / Ред. Д. М. Буланин. С. 362–379; *Симеон Полоцкий и его книгоиздательская деятельность* / Изд. подгот. В. К. Былинин, В. П. Гребенюк и др. Под ред. А. Н. Робинсона. М., 1982.

¹³ Певницкий В. *Епифаний Славинецкий — один из главных деятелей русской духовной литературы в XVII в.* // Труды КДА. 1861. № 8. С. 405–438; № 10. С. 135–182; Татарский И. А. *Симеон Полоцкий (его жизнь и деятельность). Опыт исследования из истории просвещения и внутренней церковной жизни во вторую половину XVII века*. М., 1886.

¹⁴ Миркович Г. *О времени пресуществления св. Даров*. Вильно, 1886.

Belorussian churchmen into Russia in the latter half of the seventeenth and throughout the eighteenth centuries.¹⁵ Finally, Nikolai Kapterev examined Greek-Russian contacts of the early modern period in what remain fundamental studies on the subject and further contributed to the image of the Greeks as representatives of a largely imaginary Byzantine culture.¹⁶

In what constitutes the second milestone in the study of the Academy's first period of operation, Mikhail Smentsovskii's biography of the Leichoudees faithfully followed Smirnov's lead, even as it enormously advanced knowledge of the Leichoudees's activities in Russia.¹⁷ In this comprehensive study Smentsovskii charted virtually every detail of their life in Russia, unearthing in the process important new archival materials. He also devoted a significant part of his work to a discussion of the Academy's institutional framework and of Leichoudian textbooks. Still, he uncritically depended on Smirnov's account and thus tended to overlook the importance of the new evidence he had uncovered. His contribution, important as it was, did not provide a complete and in-depth discussion of Leichoudian instruction as represented in both Greek and Latin as well as the Slavic versions of Leichoudian works. Moreover, Smentsovskii — like Smirnov long before him, but also like all other scholars writing on the Leichoudees after Smirnov — relied primarily on the polemical Leichoudees for an interpretation of his subjects' contribution to Russian culture in the 1680s and 1690s. Simply put, when confronted with the Leichoudees, Smentsovskii saw them primarily as defenders of the Orthodox interpretation of the transubstantiation in the Eucharist, the vicious conflict which held center stage in the Russian Orthodox Church in the late 1680s. Accordingly, for Smentsovskii as for almost every other Russian pre-revolutionary historian, the Leichoudees

¹⁵ Харлампович К. *Малороссийское влияние на великорусскую церковную жизнь*. Казань, 1914. Т. I.

¹⁶ Каптерев Н. Ф. *Характер отношений; idem, Сношения Иерусалимских патриархов с русским правительством с половины XVI до конца XVIII столетия // Православный Палестинский Сборник*. СПб., 1895. Т. XV, вып. 1; *idem, Сношения Иерусалимского патриарха Досифея с русским правительством 1669–1707 гг.* М., 1891.

¹⁷ Сменцовский М. *Братья Лихуды. Опыт исследования из истории церковного просвещения и церковной жизни конца XVII и начала XVIII веков*. СПб., 1899. Also: *idem, Церковно-исторические материалы. (Дополнительные приложения к исследованию «Братья Лихуды»)*. СПб., 1899.

were among the leading figures of the “grecophile” camp in the Russian Church in its struggle against the “latinizing” tendencies of the court of Sophia Alekseevna and its associates among a number of Ukrainian, Belorussian and Russian clerics. To be fair, Smentsovskii was not the originator of such a focus on the polemical Leichoudes, for he borrowed it from other church historians of the late nineteenth century, such as Smirnov, Kapterev and Mirkovich. However, since his study of the Leichoudes acquired the status of authoritative biography of the two brothers, Smentsovskii’s opus became the standard point of interpretative reference for all subsequent scholarship on the Leichoudes. Nevertheless, the interpretation of the Leichoudes as “grecophiles” aside, Smentsovskii’s biography still remains unsurpassed.

Interest in the Academy waned after the Revolution even though Soviet historians made significant advances in researching the history of Russian education. Between 1917 and the 1980s, only a few studies (mostly in article form) focused upon the Leichoudian period of the Academy. By studying the records of the Patriarchal Treasury Chancellery (*Патриарший Казенный Приказ*), A. I. Rogov brought to light new archival evidence concerning the Academy’s student body.¹⁸ A. P. Bogdanov’s polemical study sought to describe and analyze what he considered to be a “cultural struggle” between conservative obscurantism (as represented by the Leichoudes and Patriarch Ioakim) and Western proto-rationalism (as personified in their opponents in the Eucharist conflict, primarily Sil’vestr Medvedev).¹⁹ In this way, Bogdanov utilized and built upon the already established grecophile-latinophile dichotomy and took it one step further by anachronistically presenting it as a conflict of the religious versus the secular. The works of Boris L. Fonkich constitute a case of their own. Fonkich’s paleographic studies of the Leichoudian manuscripts have single-handedly reinvigorated interest in the Leichoudes’s authorial output among both Greek and Russian scholars.²⁰ It is noteworthy that Fonkich has generally avoided making

¹⁸ Рогов А. И. *Новые данные о составе учеников Славяно-греко-латинской академии* // История СССР. 1959. № 3. С. 140–147.

¹⁹ Богданов А. П. *К полемике конца 60-х — начала 80-х годов XVII в. об организации высшего учебного заведения в России.*

²⁰ See for example: *Фонкич Б. Л. Новые материалы для биографии Лихудов* // Памятники культуры. Новые открытия. Ежегодник за 1987 г. М., 1988. С. 61–70; also published in Greek: *Nea stoicheia gia te zoe kai to ergo ton adelphon Leichoude*

substantive evaluative arguments on the Leichoudes's importance in the cultural life of seventeenth-century Russia.²¹ Not so his student, the philologist Dmitrii Yalamas, who provided the first ever analytical study of any Leichoudian textbooks. In his dissertation on the philological activity of the Leichoudes brothers, Yalamas investigated the Greek grammatical works of the Leichoudes and their sources.²² In doing so, he enhanced our knowledge of the linguistic views of the two brothers and in the process unearthed significant new materials on the student body of the Academy in its Leichoudian period. Yalamas's study, though valuable, is restricted to the grammatical textbooks of the two brothers and does not analyze the curriculum of the Academy as a whole. As a result, Yalamas, echoing Smirnov and Smentsovskii, ultimately remains convinced that the Leichoudian Academy was a bastion of Greek culture in Russia until its reorganization by Ukrainian teachers in the beginning of the eighteenth century. As is evident, Soviet scholarship adopted the "grecophile" image of the Leichoudes and their Academy and in some cases even enhanced it. The pre-revolutionary dichotomy was dying a slow death indeed.²³

// *Praktika tou E' Diethnous Panioniou Synedriou*. Tomos 1: *Istoria os to 1809*/Ed. Georgios N. Moschopoulos. Argostoli, 1989. P. 227–239.

²¹ The only exception appears to be his latest book on Greek schools in Russia in the seventeenth century. In it Fonkich briefly asserts that the Leichoudes's erudition was a fusion of Greek and Latin elements that went above and beyond the expectations of both grecophiles and latinophiles. Thus, while Fonkich accepts the grecophile-latinophile divide, he refrains from assigning the label grecophile to the Leichoudes, preferring to limit it to Evfimii Chudovskii and his circle, see: Фонкич Б. Л. *Греко-славянские школы в Москве в XVII веке*. С. 232–239, esp. 237.

²² Яламас Д. А. *Филологическая деятельность братьев Лихудов в России*. Диссерт. кандид. филол. наук. М., 1992 (Moscow State University).

²³ A note is in order here regarding the sparse scholarship in Modern Greek on the Leichoudes. Although it has added considerably to our knowledge of the Leichoudes's biographies, such scholarship has not contributed substantially to the discussion on the influence of their work in Russia, nor has it ventured into analysis of their textbooks.

New Approaches to Russian Culture in the Seventeenth Century

Scholarship of a different kind opened up new venues for the study of the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy by illuminating the activities of the Ukrainian and Belorussian scholars in Muscovy in the late seventeenth century. Literary historians traced the Western notions of language and style in the works of the most prominent of them, Simeon Polotskii and Epifanii Slavinetskii, and analyzed their impact on the native Muscovite literary output. Polotskii and Slavinetskii contributed substantially to the appearance of Baroque genres and literary tastes, especially didactic poetry, in the Russian court. As graduates of Kievan schools, both were conversant with the rhetoric and Aristotelian philosophy of the post-Reformation period. They served in the Russian court as translators, correctors and tutors to members of Moscow's ecclesiastical and secular elite. In this capacity, Polotskii and Slavinetskii functioned as conduits through which elements of Western philosophical and literary theories penetrated Russian elite culture.²⁴

Historians utilized these advances in our knowledge of seventeenth-century Russian literature for understanding developments in Russian elite culture. Paul Bushkovitch, in particular, charted Polotskii's and Slavinetskii's contributions to the formation of new attitudes to learning and faith on the part of the Russian court and church elite. He demonstrated that, by the second half of the seventeenth century, the Muscovite secular and ecclesiastical establishment placed more emphasis on the practical application of Orthodox teachings in life and concomitantly disfavored monastic spirituality and the miracle cults. "Practicing" the faith actively by moral and pious acts rather than "experiencing" it through simple participation in the ritual increasingly became the standard acceptable behavior for the true Orthodox Christian.²⁵ Application of the faith's teachings presupposed previous understanding of them, which in turn required active intellectual pursuit on the part

²⁴ Панченко А. М. *Русская стихотворная культура XVII в.* Л., 1973; Елеонская А. С. *Русская ораторская проза в литературном процессе XVII века.* М., 1990; Робинсон А. Н. *Борьба идей в русской литературе XVII века.* М., 1974; Демин А. С. *Русские пьесы 1670-х гг. и придворная культура // ТОДРЛ.* 1972. Т. 27. С. 273–283.

²⁵ Bushkovitch P. *Religion and Society.* P. 100–127 and 152–175.

of the educated believer. Faith thus became an essentially private matter which involved, indeed necessitated, individual erudition if the elite was to fulfill their function as leaders of society and guardians of Orthodoxy. Cathy Potter investigated the official church's response to these developments in elite culture. By focusing on the patriarchates of Nikon (1652–1667) and Ioakim (1676–1690), she showed that their attempts to reorganize the church's administration were accompanied by concern over the spiritual renewal of Muscovite society. Further, Potter argued that these two aspects of the church's reformist program were linked together by what she branded the theory of enlightenment (*просвещение*). According to this theory, spiritual wisdom was bestowed by God upon the Patriarch and through him down to the church hierarchy which in turn transmitted it to the common believers. Enlightenment in this sense did not invalidate the activity of the human mind by positing the absoluteness of divine revelation. Rather, Potter maintained, "[it] involved the sanctification, or deification of the human mind and human learning. Divine grace elevated human wisdom, transforming it into spiritual wisdom. . . . At the same time, it elevated and legitimized human wisdom and learning as the material on which grace worked." Thus, the theory of enlightenment justified strict adherence to a hierarchical status within the church and bolstered its claims to a monopoly on learning.²⁶

Reconsidering the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy's First Period

Such advancements in the understanding of Russian culture in the early modern period call for a fresh and critical look at the impact of the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy and the Leichoudes brothers' educational activities on Russian culture in the late seventeenth century. By building on more nuanced literary and historical investigations of early modern Russian elite culture, I have endeavored to overcome artificial and anachronistic dichotomies between "grecophiles" and "latinizers" by providing the first detailed examination of the Muscovite Academy's curriculum. Thus, I have focused not on the polemical but rather on the educational opus of the Leichoudes brothers as represented in their curricular choices for the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy. By focusing on the

²⁶ Potter C. J. *The Russian Church and the Politics of Reform in the Second Half of the Seventeenth Century*. Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1993. Vol. 1. P. 4–5, quote P. 5.

Academy's program of studies, I have sought to uncover the content of instruction and to relate it to Russian intellectual life of the time. Only in this way, I believe, can one discern the contribution of the Leichoude brothers to Russian institutional education and to Russian elite culture at large.

First, understanding the Leichoude as scholars and teachers presupposes understanding their own educational history. The formal education Ioannikios and Sophronios received in the colleges and universities of post-Renaissance Italy helps us uncover the cultural impulses which exercised a formative influence on the intellectual make-up of the two brothers. Although Sophronios graduated from the University of Padua with a doctorate in philosophy, Padua's tradition of neo-Aristotelianism appears to have had negligible impact on the curricular choices of the Leichoude in Moscow. Instead, Ioannikios and Sophronios's tutelage under Gerasimos Vlachos and their study in the Cottunian College in Venice served as the decisive factors in their intellectual formation. Both Vlachos and the Cottunian College provided the two brothers with an education based on the institutional contours and curriculum of seventeenth-century Jesuit colleges. Ioannikios and Sophronios followed much the same example in the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy in the period 1685–1694.

Second, a detailed description and analysis of the curriculum, textbooks and other educational materials which the Leichoude used in instruction are of central importance. In setting up the Academy, Ioannikios and Sophronios patterned their curriculum after a typical Jesuit college. In the range of classes, subjects taught and pedagogical goals, the Leichoudian Academy faithfully adhered to the contours of an educational institution, the Jesuit college, which had taken Western Europe by storm, but which had also gained firm foothold in many other parts of the world thanks to the indefatigable activity of Jesuit missionaries. By the middle of the seventeenth century a Jesuit college was an institution of secondary and partly higher education, providing instruction in both the humanities (grammar, poetics, rhetoric) as well as in the university-level subjects of philosophy and theology. The Jesuit curriculum had thus broken down the medieval division between the trivium and the quadrivium, by providing for a program of studies which attempted to unify secondary schooling with elements of higher education. In this form, a college could serve both as propaedeutic to future university study and/or prepare candidates for Jesuit priesthood and missionary

activity. For those who wished to pursue neither of the above, it provided the necessary secondary education for successful careers in fields such as notary public, where basic literacy would not otherwise suffice. Accordingly, the student body was varied and comprised laymen as well as aspiring clergymen.²⁷ Not infrequently, Jesuit colleges evolved into fully fledged academies or universities. As such, they were granted a papal or royal decree which guaranteed them the right to confer academic degrees upon their students. In these cases, they often provided instruction in law (and later, in the eighteenth century, medicine) in addition to the other subjects enumerated above.²⁸

In the post-Tridentine period, Jesuit education adopted the form and adapted the content of Protestant schools (notably, those of the Brethern of the Common Life in the Netherlands) and put it to use for the defense of the Roman Catholic faith. Indeed, Jesuit educators shared with Protestant reformers several pedagogical and administrative models. The progression of the curriculum in standardized, distinct classes, the internal division of each class into hierarchical grades according to the achievement level of the students, as well as the adoption of competition (*aemulatio*) as a pedagogical device were all elements which the Jesuits borrowed from their opponents in the struggles of the Reformation period. More importantly, in their quest for the defense and propagation of the Roman Catholic faith, the Jesuits, like their opponents, concluded that adapted humanist knowledge could properly serve their

²⁷ On the term college as understood in Jesuit terminology, see: Ganss G. E., S. J. *Saint Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University*. Milwaukee, 1954. P. 31–32; Koch L., S. J. *Jesuiten-Lexikon. Die Gesellschaft Jesu einst und jetzt*. Paderborn, 1934 (s. v. "Kolleg"); Farrell A. P., S. J. *The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education. Development and Scope of the Ratio Studiorum*. Milwaukee, 1938; for an overview of scholarship on Jesuit education, see: Scaglione A. D. *The Liberal Arts and the Jesuit College System*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 1986.

²⁸ See: Hengst K. *Jesuiten an Universitäten und Jesuitenuniversitäten*. Paderborn, 1981 (esp. chap. 1 for a very helpful discussion of Jesuit distinctions between college and university); Brizzi G. P. *Les jésuites et l'école en Italie (XVe-XVIIIe siècles) // Les jésuites à la Renaissance. Système éducatif et production du savoir / Ed. Luce Girard*. Paris, 1995. P. 35–53 (for a discussion of the reaction of established Italian educational institutions to the creation of Jesuit colleges in Italian university towns); *Geschichte der Universität in Europa / Walter Rüegg*, ed. Munich, 1996. B. 2. S. 56–73, and esp. S. 68–70; Ganss G. E. *Saint Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University: A Study in the History of Catholic Education, Including Part Four of the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus*. Milwaukee, 1956. P. 33–34 (for St. Ignatius's understanding of the term university).

ends. They thus undertook to teach a mixed humanist/scholastic curriculum which sought to instill in their students a Christian humanism. The ultimate goal of such education was the formation of an educated citizen who would simultaneously be a loyal and devoted member of the Roman Church.²⁹

Comparing the Muscovite Academy with an average Jesuit college of the seventeenth century, one is struck by how closely the Leichoudes followed both the form and the content of the Jesuit college curriculum. The Leichoudes's was no mere grammar school, for the higher disciplines like philosophy were also taught in it. Nor was it a fully-fledged "academy" in the strict sense of the word. According to Western European standards, only such schools as could boast a papal or royal decree awarding them the privilege of degree conferral could properly title themselves "academies."³⁰ No such charter for the Leichoudian school appears to have survived, probably because none was ever issued. Even after its reorganization in 1701 by Tsar Peter's decree, the Muscovite school was not properly called an "academy" but rather "Latin" or "Slavo-Latin" school (*латинские, славяно-латинские школы*).³¹ I do not think that we should expect great consistency among the scribes of the patriarchal or tsarist administration in educational terminology. Russia did not have a history of institutional education which could be

²⁹ See: Scaglione A. D. *The Liberal Arts*. P. 51–52 and passim; Brizzi G. P. *Strategie educative e istituzioni scolastiche della Controriforma // Letteratura Italiana / Ed. Alberto Asor Rosa*. Vols 1–9. Turin, 1982–1991. Vol. 1. P. 899–920, esp. 907–914; Bauer B. *Jesuitische "ars rhetorica" im Zeitalter der Glaubenskämpfe*. Frankfurt and New York, 1986. S. 21–22 (with reference to the fundamental works of Paul Oskar Kristeller, who first spoke of "religious humanism"). For an examination of the pedagogical methods of the Renaissance and an argument that humanism replaced scholasticism because it (humanism) corresponded well with the rise of the absolutist State in the Counter-Reformation period, see: Grafton A., Jardine L. *From Humanism to the Humanities: Education and the Liberal Arts in Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Europe*. Cambridge, Mass., 1986. For a review of debates over Renaissance education, see: Black R. *Italian Renaissance Education: Changing Perspectives and Continuing Controversies // Journal of the History of Ideas*. 1991. Vol. 52, No 2. P. 315–334.

³⁰ *Geschichte der Universität*. S. 63–68. Rüegg notes that the boundaries between secondary and higher education were unclear in many cases and depended upon a lot of factors, including national and local variations. Thus, the term "academy" could be employed invariably for a college with some higher courses, or even a university.

³¹ See: Смирнов С. К. *История Московской славяно-греко-латинской академии*. С. 80–81.

referred to as need arose. Although Ukrainian and Belorussian scholars were clearly aware of how important such designations might be,³² the Russian government does not appear to have assigned particular importance to such titles, even though it may have reacted positively to the Kievans' requests.³³ Although the Leichoudes were no doubt aware of contemporary distinctions between a college or academy and a university in the Western European context, they appear not to have concerned themselves greatly with the actual title of the school.³⁴ It is of course impossible to know how the school might have evolved had the Leichoudes stayed the full course in it. But it does not pay to dwell upon what the Academy was called in contemporary documents: no matter what its title, it was the education that it provided which was important. It is more fruitful to consider what was actually taught in it and compare it with Western European models. In my opinion, the best way to conceive of the Academy is as a school of secondary and partly higher education. The quality of the Academy's education must have been high enough,

³² See, for example, their petitions for the Tsar's protection and for the confirmation of the right to teach philosophy and theology in the Kiev Mohylian Academy in the 1690s, in: Харлампович К. *Малороссийское влияние*. С. 405–409.

³³ According to Kharlampovich, even the 1701 edict of Peter, which reconfirmed tsarist protection for the Kievian Academy first granted in 1694, does not title the school an academy: Ibid. С. 411–412.

³⁴ The Leichoudes occasionally referred to their school as a "lykeion" (*lyceum*) in their textbooks (see e. g., the title page of Sophronios's logic and philosophy manual: Отдел Рукописей Российской Национальной Библиотеки. Ф. 906 [Собрание Греческих Рукописей], Греч. 152. С. 1. In addition, on at least one occasion (between 1690–94) the Academy was reported as "*греколатинская школа*" ("Greco-Latin school"), see: Российский Государственный Архив Древних Актов [РГАДА]. Ф. 159, оп. 2, ч. 1, д. 2991. Л. 257 (the document is a 1691 petition of Ioannikios to the tsars for an increase of his salary). A. Bogdanov (*К полемике конца 60-х – начала 80-х годов XVII в. об организации высшего учебного заведения в России*) in his polemical zeal against the obscurantist "grecophiles" has sought to minimize the quality of education provided by the Leichoudes. In doing so, he partly rehearses the polemical statements of the Leichoudes's archenemy, Sil'vestr Medvedev, and his supporters during the Eucharist conflict. Specifically, Bogdanov has pointed to the fact that in contemporary documents (the records of the Patriarchal Treasury Chancellery), the school is not called academy, but rather "Greek school," "ancient and modern Greek school" ("*елиногреческие школы*") or "Greco-Slavic school" ("*грекословенские школы*"). Based on this, he argues that the school was not a university and that it taught a Greek curriculum.

словенского книжного писания, an indication that it taught not vernacular Russian (though it must have done so by implication). Timofei's Typography school played a similar role for Greek at least until 1687, when most of its remaining students were transferred to the Academy.³⁷

If the division of classes is clear, the duration of studies in the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy is a slightly more complicated issue. In Jesuit schools grammar took up a period of between three and four years, followed by one year each for poetics and rhetoric. Philosophy (including logic) was taught for an additional two to three years and was succeeded by at least two years of theology.³⁸ In the Academy's case, there is unfortunately no clear evidence with regard to when and for how long one or the other subject was taught. Still, there are several sources which provide insights in this regard. Thus, in one of their petitions addressed to Tsars Ivan and Peter and to Tsarevna Sophia (dated 1687), Ioannikios and Sophronios assert that students (of the higher level, must be implied) have completed the study of Latin and Greek grammar, poetics and part of rhetoric, and that they already can speak in Greek (both vernacular and the "learned," scholarly version) and Latin.³⁹ Thus, even allowing for possible exaggeration on the part of the two teachers, it appears that by 1687, the more advanced students had embarked on the study of rhetoric. A note in the files of the Patriarchal Treasury Chancellery reports that on December 27, 1689, Sophronios and his students of "rhetoric, grammar and 'scholarly' Greek and Slavonic" delivered ora-

³⁷ On the Typography school, see: Фонкич Б. Л. *Греко-славянские школы в Москве в XVII веке*. С. 101–187.

³⁸ See the diagram in: Hengst K. *Jesuiten an Universitäten und Jesuitenuniversitäten*. S. 67; also: Scaglione A. D. *The Liberal Arts*. P. 87. It should be noted here that poetics and rhetoric were normally regarded as comprising a sort of unified rhetorical cycle. This unit sought to teach style and eloquence and covered some moral treatises (most often by Cicero) and some history authors, see: Scaglione A. D. *The Liberal Arts*. P. 85.

³⁹ РГАДА. Ф. 159, оп. 2, ч. 1, д. 2991. Л. 231: "ныне, Государи, уже третье лето исполняется, еже живем в сем благочестивейшем царствующем граде Москве... и работа наша великая явна есть всем чрез предупреждением учеников наших, которые выучили грамматику еллинскую и латинскую, поетику и часть риторики, язык же наш простой и еллинский, и латинский глаголюше исправно и добре...". In a previous petition in November 1686 (that is, when they were still teaching in the Bogoiavlenskii Monastery), the Leichoudes report that the higher class has finished grammar, but they do not specify in what language: *ibid.* Л. 333.

es appear to confirm Fedor Polikarpov's 1726 report that the Leichoudes did teach philosophy (physics) in the Academy. I should emphasize here that all of the above evidence refers specifically to the higher class of students and applies only to them. There is no reason to believe, however, that students at other levels followed or were projected to undergo a different curricular course.

Ioannikios and Sophronios remained the only teachers in the Academy in the period 1685–1694. Beyond their own textbooks, the two teachers made use of other educational materials as well. Dmitrii Yalamas has suggested that in their grammar and rhetoric courses, Ioannikios and Sophronios utilized a wide variety of handbooks and original works by ancient authors, in addition to their own manuals. He argues so by citing a 1687 delivery to the Academy of a substantial number of books (both by Renaissance authors and editions of ancient ones) and by pointing out that the Leichoudes appear to have started authoring their own manuals only after 1688–89.⁴⁴ I think that the argument is well-taken and should be extended to include logic and philosophy as well.⁴⁵

The combination of original texts (e. g., Cicero's orations, Aristotle's *Organon*) with handbooks or manuals (of rhetoric or logic, in our example) as complementary explanatory material was a well-entrenched pedagogical practice in Jesuit schools, whence Ioannikios and Sophronios adopted it. Such an emphasis on ancient authors in the original was, of course, a hallowed principle of humanist pedagogical theory and practice. Direct exposure of the student to literary or philosophical texts aimed at first-hand familiarity with both their style and their content. Teachers would subsequently utilize handbooks or textbooks to clarify

expressly included "scientific subjects" which in the opinion of the most recent student of Greek education during the period 1453–1821, meant philosophy and theology, see: Skarvele-Nikolopoulou A. *Ta mathemataria ton Hellenikon scholeion tes Tourkokratias*. Athens, 1989. P. 181. Dositheos was among the signatories to this *sigillion*.

⁴⁴ Яламас Д. А. *Филологическая деятельность братьев Лихудов в России*. С. 27–28; idem. *Два неопубликованных панегирика братьев Лихудов // Византийский Временник*. 1994. Т. 55 (80). С. 210–214, esp. 210–211. For the titles of the books delivered to the Leichoudes and their identification, see: Chrissidis N. *Creating the New Educated Elite*. Chapter 3, fn. 19.

⁴⁵ Still, the originality of Leichoudian works needs to be carefully assessed.

certain concepts, provide theoretical background or explain particular literary phenomena or philosophical concepts, as necessary.⁴⁶

As in Jesuit colleges, in the Leichoudian Academy this method of instruction was coupled with an abundance of practical exercises, aimed at the inculcation of theoretical precepts. Memorization, competitive exercises, declamations and disputations must have been an essential feature of a student's class time, in addition that is, to the homework which he was to prepare. Such homework included parsing (that is, transferring a text from "learned" into vernacular Greek and vice versa) and theme-writing (written work on a particular topic).⁴⁷ Moreover, orations in front of royal personages and especially in front of the patriarch were a regular occurrence in Academic life. In particular, on the occasion of Christmas and Easter, the Academy's students repeatedly exhibited their skills in oratory, delivering speeches on various religious themes or simply presenting their well-wishes to the Academy's patrons.⁴⁸

Whether Greek or Latin was the dominant language of instruction in the Academy (a feature on which many scholars have relied to extrapolate the Academy's cultural orientation) becomes immaterial without a careful consideration of the actual content of the curriculum. Greek culture in the seventeenth century was far from the static, Byzantine one which many scholars have taken it to be. Its most prominent representatives were educated in the West. As such they hardly were carriers of an

⁴⁶ See the comments: Scaglione A. D. *The Liberal Arts*. P. 97 (with regard to logic). Also for examples from France, see: Brockliss L. W. B. *French Higher Education in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. A Cultural History*. Oxford, 1987. P. 60. Brockliss suggests that the practice became less frequent in France as the seventeenth century progressed, because some Jesuit educators recognized that some ancient works were far too complex for introductory level courses: *ibid.* P. 126–127.

⁴⁷ See: Яламас Д. А. *Филологическая деятельность братьев Лихудов в России*. С. 110–111, 122, 124 for examples of parsing. Such homework was also a well-entrenched practice in Jesuit colleges (see: Scaglione A. D. *The Liberal Arts*. P. 85) and in the schools of the Greek East (see: Skarvele-Nikolopoulou A. *Ta mathemataria*. P. 285–302).

⁴⁸ Сменцовский М. *Братья Лихуды*. С. 79; Яламас Д. А. *Филологическая деятельность братьев Лихудов в России*. С. 24–25; *idem*. *Приветствия учеников Славяно-греко-латинской академии московскому патриарху Иоакиму* // *The Legacy of Saints Cyril and Methodius to Kiev and Moscow. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Millennium of the Conversion of Rus' to Christianity*, Thessaloniki, 26–28 November 1988 / Ed. Tachiaos A-E. N. Thessaloniki, 1992. P. 513–519 (for orations in front of the Patriarch).

undifferentiated Byzantine-Orthodox culture. Ioannikios and Sophronios Leichoudes were no exception to the rule and their Academy in Moscow testifies to that fact.

Jesuit colleges provided a complete program of studies starting with elementary instruction in languages (Latin and Greek) and proceeding through grammar, rhetoric and logic to natural philosophy and theology. The Leichoudes emulated the same order of classes but, due to their expulsion from the Academy in 1694, they did not have the opportunity to teach theology. An analysis of the rhetoric course as reflected in the textbooks and speeches the two brothers authored proves that Leichoudian rhetoric was influenced by Jesuit rhetorical theory in two ways: directly, through immediate borrowing from Jesuit handbooks (especially that of the Frenchman Gerard Pelletier, S. J.); and indirectly through the two brothers' imitation of the manuals written by Gerasimos Vlachos and (possibly) Phrangiskos Skouphos. The latter two authors had themselves based their rhetorics on the handbook of Cyprian Soares, S. J., the manual of choice in Jesuit colleges in the seventeenth century. Having assimilated the above influences into a coherent whole, the Leichoudes taught and practiced the Baroque rhetoric of the "grand style" as it had developed by the middle of the seventeenth century.⁴⁹

Philosophy was the last subject in which Ioannikios and Sophronios managed to offer lessons before their removal from Academic duties. As with rhetoric, the Academy's philosophy course (from logic through "general" to "special" physics) was squarely based on Jesuit prototypes. Sophronios's textbook on logic was modeled on the logical treatises of Gerasimos Vlachos and, ultimately, on those of Franciscus Toletus, S. J., which served as the authoritative manuals in the art of correct reasoning in Jesuit schools. Ioannikios's commentaries on Aristotle's physical writings and especially his instruction on cosmology similarly imparted the Jesuit understanding of the subject. Thus, in expounding on the intricacies of the universe, the Leichoudes offered their Muscovite audience one of the many versions of Jesuit cosmology. The two brothers did not blindly conform to Aristotle or the medieval Christian scholastics in their classes. Rather, they imparted to their students an understanding of the cosmos which sought to accommodate firmly entrenched philosophical principles and axiomatic religious beliefs to

⁴⁹ See: Chrissidis N. *The Jesuit Origins of Leichoudian Rhetoric: A Preliminary Appraisal* // Третьи Лихудовские Чтения (forthcoming).

recent scientific discoveries. Like its Jesuit archetypes, Leichoudian cosmology remained solidly within the framework of qualitative physics but allowed for at least some of the “novelties in the heavens” which the telescope had effected.⁵⁰

In the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy, Jesuit education extended beyond mere adoption of institutional structures and pedagogical methods. It penetrated the heart of the Academy’s curriculum through the overwhelming influence it exercised on the textbooks and other educational materials the Leichoudes used. Ioannikios and Sophronios were by no means original or innovative scholars. If anything, their works testify to the derivative nature of their authorial output. This fact, however, should not cause us to dismiss the Academy’s curriculum as traditionalist or inconsequential. The Academy was projected to satisfy the demands of the state by supplying skilled administrators and to produce learned clergymen, able to staff the church hierarchy and to disseminate Christian teachings to the laity. Simultaneously, the first educational institution in Russia catered to the intellectual quests of members of the royal and patriarchal courts. A product of cooperation between church and state, its foundation was very much the result of the challenges and dilemmas presented to the Muscovite secular and ecclesiastical elite by a changing cultural environment. Jesuit education was, to one degree or another, the common lot of Western European aristocrats and nobles. When the reformist Peter “drove” his own courtiers toward the West, at least some of them were prepared to meet their Western counterparts eye to eye, thanks in large part to the education they had received in the Leichoudian Academy.

A few concluding remarks may be in order regarding potential comparisons of the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy with its counterpart in Kiev, the famed Kiev Mohyla Academy. Since the 19th century, there have been several scholarly contributions to the study of the Kievan Academy’s educational activities. In particular, pre-revolutionary schol-

⁵⁰ See: Chrissidis N. *A Jesuit Aristotle in Seventeenth-Century Russia: Cosmology and the Planetary System in the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy* // *Modernizing Muscovy: Reform and Social Change in Seventeenth-Century Russia* / Marshall Poe and Jarmo Kotilaine, eds. London and New York, 2004. P. 391–416, and in a slightly revised Russian version: Хриссидис Н. А. *Аристотель Иезуитов в России XVIII века: космология и планетная система в Славяно-греко-латинской Академии* // *Русский Сборник*. 2008. Вып. 5. С. 37–66.

ars focused on its early history, its significance for the religious and social history of the Ukraine, and also on the formal aspects of its curriculum. Much less attention was paid to the actual content of courses taught, with the exception of the works of some of its most famous representatives, such as Stefan Iavorskii or Feofan Prokopovich. Due in large part to the dearth of sources and, under Soviet rule, to the socio-political environment, until the 1960s there were very few attempts to actually study the content of its education, especially as regards the philosophical curriculum in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. More was done in this regard in the Ukraine in the 1960s and 1970s, primarily by historians of philosophy. Such studies have considerably multiplied since the early 1990s.⁵¹

A lot of what we know about the formal aspects of the Kievan Academy's pedagogical activity (division of classes, teaching and disciplinary methods, employment of dramatic performances and disputations, etc.) comes from nineteenth-century studies, primarily the works of M. Linchevskii and N. Petrov, and more recent scholarship has advanced little beyond them. Linchevskii had already discussed the Jesuit origins of the formal structure of the academy's curriculum and its pedagogical methods, primarily in comparison to other Jesuit schools based in the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth.⁵² Noting that Linchevskii was overwhelmingly basing his conclusions on eighteenth-century evidence (which was more abundant for the Kiev Mohylan Academy), Petrov sought to expand upon and correct some of Linchevskii's apparent anachronisms. Thus, Petrov provided a detailed analysis and comparison of both Jesuit (and Piarist) schools of contemporary Poland-Lithuania. In his conclusions, he pointed out that the Kievan Academy from its inception was based on the Jesuit model of middle and higher education. Still, Petrov focused primarily on the external characteristics of the Academy (division of classes, administration, disciplinary methods, student body, etc.) and was much less concerned with the actual

⁵¹ For a useful overview, see: Симчич М. *Philosophia rationalis у Києво-Могилянській академії. Компаративний аналіз могилянських курсів логіки кінця XVII – першої половини XVIII ст.* Вінниця, 2009. С. 9–32.

⁵² Линчевский М. *Педагогия древних братских школ и преимущественно древней Киевской Академии* // Труды КДА. 1870. № 7–9 (июль–сентябрь). С. 104–154; 437–500; 535–588.

content of its teaching beyond its main lines.⁵³ Recently, S. O. Seriakov has reconfirmed Petrov's conclusions utilizing more recent scholarship on Jesuit schools in Poland-Lithuania.⁵⁴ It would thus appear that the Jesuit influence was paramount in the organization of the school, at least in its formal and administrative contours.

Regarding the actual content of courses taught in the Kievan Academy, more studies are needed before safe pronouncements can be made. As M. Symchych has noted, the valuable work that has been done since at least the 1960s is in large part fragmentary and, under Soviet rule, tended to assign to philosophers of the Kievan Academy views that sometimes turned them into deists, pantheists or even proto-materialists *avant la lettre*. Still, in the opinion of the present author, it would seem that some tentative conclusions can be made. To begin with, all recent authors appear to agree that the Kievan Academy's philosophy courses betrayed little originality given the fact that their character was conditioned by their place in a school curriculum. To put it differently, Kievan teachers were not creating new philosophical answers, but rather teaching their students the main elements (sometimes to considerable depth) of already acceptable scholastic views present in textbooks by mainly Jesuit scholastic authors.⁵⁵ Second, much like the main contours of the structure of its classes and its pedagogical methods, the Kievan Academy appears to have adopted Jesuit approaches to the actual curriculum, as well. The extent of such adoption is more difficult to ascertain. As far as logic is concerned, for example, in a recent study Symchych has argued that Jesuit approaches to logic were dominant in the textbooks "authored" by teachers in the Kievan Academy in the late seventeenth century and throughout the first half of the eighteenth century.⁵⁶ In addition, V. Kotusenko has pointed out

⁵³ Петров Н. И. *Киевская Академия во второй половине XVII века*. К., 1895. С. 66–110, and his conclusions on 110–115.

⁵⁴ Серяков С. О. *Характерні риси єзуїтського шкільництва в освітній діяльності Києво-Могилянської академії в XVII столітті* // Наукові записки НАУКМА. 2000. Т. 18: Ювілейний випуск, присвячений 385-річчю КМА. С. 24–28.

⁵⁵ Ткачук М. *Філософські курси Києво-Могилянської академії в контексті європейського схоластичного дискурсу* // Релігійно-філософська думка в Києво-Могилянській академії: європейський контекст / Гол. редкол. В. С. Горський. К. 2002. С. 39–66.

⁵⁶ Симчич М. *Philosophia rationalis у Києво-Могилянській академії*.

the various ways in which philosophical eclecticism and dialogue with Thomism, largely within Jesuit philosophical parameters, characterized approaches to metaphysics and ethics in the Kievan Academy in the same time period.⁵⁷ It remains to be seen whether similar conclusions can be made for courses in natural philosophy, as well. To the extent that the above studies represent accurate depictions of the Kievan Academy's organization and curriculum in the seventeenth century, then it would seem that the two Academies, Muscovite and Kievan, from their foundation were based upon similar lines, that is, those of the Jesuit colleges and their curriculum. Which Jesuit curricular textbooks were used (and there were many) especially in the rhetorical and philosophical courses requires further investigation.

⁵⁷ Котусенко В. *Томізм і його реценція у філософії професорів Києво-Могилянської академії* // Релігійно-філософська думка в Києво-Могилянській академії: європейський контекст. С. 117–150.