

Terra Academica

Gary Marker

Staffing Peter's Church: Organizational Politics and the Journeys of Kyivan Clergy in the Early Eighteenth Century¹

After 1686 the movement of large numbers of Kyivan clergy into the upper ranks of the Muscovite church became an ongoing phenomenon, reaching a crescendo during the reign of Peter the Great who employed several of them as his leading ideologists and panegyrists. This article discusses the politics and concerns on the ground in Moscow and in Kyiv, surrounding the transmigration eastward, between 1690 and about 1710. It focuses on risks and advantages to clergy and secular authorities, Moscow and the hetmanate, that this migration east illuminated.

Anyone who studies the era of Peter the Great recognizes that large numbers of Kyivan-trained monks came east, at the tsar's behest, to serve in the upper echelons of the Orthodox Church. Dimitrii Tuptalo, Stefan Iavorskii, Feofan Prokopovich, and Gavriil Buzhinskii² served variously as his chief publicists, panegyrists, and ideologues, providing the philosophical and theological underpinnings of the Petrine reforms. They were the tsar's preachers, empowered – and required – to convey Scripture and the proper understanding of the faith and of secular authority from the pulpits of the capital's cathedrals. Other, more anonymous, figures dominated the eparchies as bishops, archbishops, and metropolitans.³ Projecting forward to the proclamation of Empire,

¹ I wish to thank the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation and the American Council of Learned Societies for providing support for this research

² A note on transliteration. I have employed a mixture of Russian and Ukrainian Library of Congress system of transliteration throughout this paper. Individuals, such as *lasyns'kyi* and *Odors'kyi*, and place names, such as *Kyiv* and *Baturyn*, associated with Ukraine are rendered in Ukrainian transliteration; those connected to Russia are in Russian transliteration. Individuals, such as *Prokopovich*, *Iavorskii*, and *Buzhinskii*, who were of Ukrainian origin and were educated in *Kyiv* but whose service careers are linked more to *Moscow/St. Petersburg* than to the *hetmanate* are rendered in Russian transliteration.

³ For a complete listing of those who were still serving in the 1720s see: *Списки архиереев иерархии всероссийской и архиерейских кафедр со времени учреждения*

Dukhovnyi Reglament, and the establishment of the Holy Synod during the early 1720s, we see the efflorescence of their collective position. Despite Iavorskii's fall from favor, Ukrainian hierarchs such as Filofei Leshchinskii, Varnava Volatkovskii, Antonii Stakhovskii, Kirill Shumlianskii, Epifanii Tikhorskii, and several others literally took over the reigns of the new empire's dioceses and oversaw the broadcasting of its most important public pronouncements. Although many are barely known to posterity and were apparently little published in their own time, they presided over what was arguably the most effective agency of domestic administration in the realm, the only one that reached down into the parishes and local villages. They were leading actors in the Russian imperial project.

All of these characteristics of the clerical transmigration are beyond dispute. They constitute a commonplace within Petrine scholarship, and they are surely familiar to readers of this journal. But beneath this uncontested surface lie a range of complicated problems of identity, networks, everyday life, patronage, and loyalty, some of which remain lightly explored. These problems go to the heart of what empire meant on the ground at its outset when "Malorossiiia" constituted the largest, most populous, and most sensitive non-Russian imperial space. They connect to the highly topical debates among contemporary historians over ethnic, national, and confessional affinities, in this case those that defined the pluralistic expanse of the early-modern east Slavic world. How, for example, did the Ukrainian background of these hierarchs manifest itself in the performance of their duties, their personal identities, and their political outlooks? Having moved east did they remain Kyivans in any fundamental way, other than through their intellectual dexterity and facility with Latin? Did they conduct themselves and their affairs differently *because* they came from Kyiv? Were they a collection of individuals, or did they constitute a discreet cohort, linked to each other in some way (in spite of, perhaps, their personal disagreements) and manifesting an identifiably Kyivan outlook that distinguished them from the *Velikorusskie* hierarchs and *sani* along side of whom they served? Did they maintain any discernible personal, familial, and institutional ties to the hetmanate, or did they cut themselves loose after the events of 1708-09?

These are big questions, and they are not new. Distinguished scholars have addressed them repeatedly, and some devoted entire careers to them.⁴ The start-

Святейшего Правительствующего Синода (1721–1895). СПб., 1896. С. 3 – 6. Jan Pampler calculated that 61.4 percent of the bishops in the Russian church during the reign of Peter the Great were non-Great Russian, with the vast majority of these being Ukrainian, see: Pampler J. *The Russian Orthodox Episcopate, 1721 – 1917: A Prosopography* // *Journal of Social History*. 2000, vol. 34, no. 1. P. 5 – 8.

⁴ In addition to those discussed in the text the most influential figures in this particular field have included F. I. Titov, F. A. Ternovskii, S. T. Golubev, I. Chistovich, N. Ohloblin, Zenon Kohut, and Giovanna Brogi-Bercoff. See in particular: Титов Ф. *К вопросу о значении Киевской академии для православия и русской народности XVII–XVIII вв.* // *Труды Киевской духовной академии* [hereafter – ТКДА]. 1903, № 11. С. 375 – 407. See also the very informative introductory chapter of the recent book: Яременко М. *Київське чернецт-*

ing point for any such discussion, of course, remains K. V. Kharlampovich's magisterial *Malorossiiskoe vliianie na velikoruskuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn'*⁵. Kharlampovich provided massive detail on virtually every aspect of the Ukrainian Church's institutional and intellectual influx into Great Russia, but he cautiously eschewed broad interpretations and big theories. More recently Serhii Plokyh has boldly taken up the big questions by inquiring into ethnic identities, what he terms "the origin of the Slavic nations."⁶ Nations as he plots them emerged as intertextual constructions, residing almost entirely in discursive space, and articulated within key texts written by leading authors at liminal moments. His discussion of the early eighteenth century dwells on the cohort in question whose outlook, he concludes, changed when they moved into Peter's retinue into something more Russian, thereby suggesting a decisive break from their own pasts. This shift emerges most succinctly in Plokyh's assessment of Prokopovich's world view, in particular his Kyiv period vs. his St. Petersburg career. Decades earlier James Cracraft had argued that Prokopovich's outlook underwent no discernible change over time, a conclusion which Plokyh rejects.⁷ For Plokyh, the Petrine Prokopovich veered sharply away from his Kyivan pronouncements and, virtually on his own, articulated a new conception of a Russian 'fatherland.'

Kharlampovich and Plokyh are hardly alone, though, and this small essay offers only a modest contribution to that literature by looking microscopically at the actual recruitment of Kyivan clergy, the tsar's interests and the activities of important figures in the Metropolia, the Caves Monastery, and the Mohyla Academy, including Varlaam Iasyn's'kyi, Ioasaf Krokov's'kyi, and Gideon Odors'kyi. The scholarship (especially the works focused on the Russian state) typically narrates these recruitments as little more than chance: Peter I happened to attend a memorial service in Kyiv or Moscow officiated by a talented young Ukrainian monk and then heard an eloquent sermon or elegy orated by the young *propovednik*. Impressed by the rhetorical skill of the *inok*, Peter invited him to accompany the tsarist party or to take up a position in the Muscovite church.⁸ This bit of lore constitutes a clerical complement to the familiar

⁵ XVIII ст. К., 2007. С. 9 – 21. Virtually every general history of Ukraine, Ukrainian-Russian relations, or Slavic Orthodoxy has dwelled on it as well.

⁶ Харлампович К. В. *Малороссийское влияние на великорусскую церковную жизнь*. Казань, 1914. Гл. V – VIII.

⁷ Plokyh S. *The Origins of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus*. Cambridge, 2006. P. 270 – 283.

⁸ My own view of Prokopovich's evolution is closer to Plokyh's than to Cracraft's, with a few variations. I would divide his career into three parts rather than two, with one demarcation coming in 1708 and another coming with the move in 1717. Although he emerged as the imperial ideologue *non pareil* in 1721, I also see him as remaining sensitive to Ukrainian concerns throughout his career, returning to them repeatedly as subtexts in his work. Finally, I would suggest that Prokopovich was not alone in employing *otechestvo*, and even *Pater patriae*, in the contemporary East Slavic discourses.

⁹ For a particularly ironic view of this trope see: Кагарлицкий Ю. В. *Риторические стратегии в русской проповеди переходного периода, 1700–1775* / Дисс... канд. филол.

tales of *velikoe posol'stvo*, itself one of the most enduring elements of Petrine hagiography: the sharp eyed talent scout and impatient reformer. Always on the lookout for men of talent, he hired them wherever he found them – Holland, Germany, Italy, Kyiv, and by the hundreds, plucking them from their previous existence and installing them in positions of authority back home.

While not entirely fanciful – Peter did indeed attend Iavorskii's grave-side oration for the military commander A. S. Shein, in 1700, as well as Prokopovich's welcoming address in Kyiv in the summer of 1706⁹ – it nevertheless amounts to a caricature. The realities surrounding the migration of Kyivan monks east were more involved, more political, and more contested than this version implies, and they relied on actors other than just the tsar. Educated monks had been making the trek eastward into the Muscovite church for generations, and their numbers had increased steadily, beginning with the establishment of the Moscow patriarchate in 1589, expanding in the wake of the treaty of Pereislavl, and then growing larger still during the last two decades of the seventeenth century. Once the Kyivan metropolia was placed under the authority of the Muscovite church in 1686 in the wake of the "eternal peace" between Russia and Poland, the movement of clergy back and forth between the hetmanate and the Russian capital became a regular phenomenon.

Our story begins shortly after the eternal peace, around the year 1690, a watershed moment for all parties. Within Moscow itself the long-simmering issue of rulership had just been resolved in Peter's favor. The Moscow Patriarch, Ioakim, died in 1690 and was replaced by Adrian, an energetic figure devoted to strengthening the patriarchal court and regularizing its control over the bishoprics. Of course, the church's primary concern was the proliferating Old Belief and the multitude of smaller sectarian manifestations that were erupting throughout the patriarchate. But another important element in the effort to formalize structures of authority within the church derived from the physical and geographic expansion of the patriarchate's domain to include not just the left bank of the Dnipro, but also a kind of spiritual sovereignty over Orthodox populations that lay outside the borders of Muscovy.

The Orthodox clergy who served within the hetmanate understood and mostly accepted the fact that they were serving for the foreseeable future firmly within Moscow's orbit, but the concrete implications of that status had not yet been worked out. They, too, were seeing a change in leadership with the death in 1690 of the metropolitan Gedeon Chetvertyns'kyi and the elevation of the archimandrite of the Caves Monastery, Varlaam Iasyns'kyi. The same sense of new beginnings held true in secular affairs, where the relatively new Het-

наук. М., 1999. С. 8. A more traditional version is in: Соловьев С. М. *История России с древнейших времен*. Т. 15. СПб., 1911. С. 1361 – 1365.

⁹ These accounts exist in many works. See, for example: Поторжинский М. А. *История русской церковной проповеди в биографиях и образцах пастырей-проповедников с IX – XIX вв.* К., 1891. С. 330. See also: Соловьев С. М. *История России с древнейших времен*. С. 1149 – 1157.

man, Ivan Mazepa, and his large retinue (including, significantly, Tuptalo) had recently returned to Baturyn from an important and extended visit to Moscow, during which they witnessed first hand the unseating of Sofia Alekseevna. The available sources, such as the official correspondence of those present, the *Diariusz* of Dimitrii Rostovskii and the *Letopis'* of Samoilo Velychko, provide only a vague sense of what actually transpired during the highly charged weeks of this sometimes perilous visit.¹⁰ At the very least, though, it afforded an opportunity for Mazepa and his clergy to assess “real existing” relations of authority (the concrete implications of the Russian *poddanstvo* to which they had been swearing allegiance since the Treaty of Pereislavl), and to develop possible avenues of immediate collaboration.¹¹ They had many contacts in Moscow, and it appears that they made the most of their time to, among other things, strengthen Mazepa's political position vis-à-vis his rivals among the starshyna and to secure support for his looming battle against the Crimean Tatars.¹²

However much Kyiv's clerical elite saw this moment as a new beginning, it was still a particularly opaque and fraught one. At this point no one could have imagined the soon-to-begin Great Northern War or the tumultuous consequences that this two-decades-long conflagration would have on Ukrainian land. Instead the focus was on the here and now, which for the clergy included three abiding issues: 1) maintaining the metropolia, and with as much autonomy as it had enjoyed previously; 2) securing its authority over Orthodox populations residing on Polish-controlled territory (Ukrainian Galicia) and protecting their rights of worship against the perceived incursions of Polish Catholics and Uniate clergy; 3) renewing the stauropigial status of the Caves Monastery, its lands, and its properties. Each of these issues required the ongoing involvement of Ukrainian churchmen, their Muscovite counterparts, the hetman, and the tsar. All of these agents could resort to law, treaties, precedent, and tradition to make separate claims, both complementary and competing, of legitimate au-

¹⁰ Velychko, for example, devotes only a couple of pages to these events. Величко С. *Летопись событий в Юго-Западной России в XVII-м веке*. Т. 3. К., 1855. С. 82 – 84. Tuptalo's *Diariusz* devotes about the same. See: *Дневные записки святого Димитрия митрополита ростовского, с собственноручно писанной им книги, к Киевопечерскому книгохранилищу принадлежащей, списанные // Древняя российская вивлиофика*. 1971, т. 17. С. 30 – 31. Mazepa himself, perhaps worried about security and a lack of confidentiality, sent relatively few letters while in Moscow. See: *Доба гетьмана Івана Мазепи в документах / Упоряд.: С. О. Павленко*. К., 2007. С. 136 – 140. For a recent and carefully reasoned characterization of the visit see: Таирова-Яковлева Т. *Мазена*. М., 2007. С. 78 – 85.

¹¹ The ritual reenactment of *poddanstvo* had taken place earlier, in the autumn of 1687, when Andrei Lyzlov and Vasilii Toporov traveled to Kyiv and Baturyn as the tsars' emissary to administer the formal oaths and witness the agreements. See: Российский государственный архив древних актов [hereafter – РГАДА]. Ф. 229, оп. 5, д. 338 («Дело о поездке ротмистра московских рот Андрея Ивановича Лызлова и подъячего посольского приказа Василия Торопова с грамотами и жалованием к гетману Мазепе, митрополиту Гедеону и архимандриту Киево-Печерской лавры Варламу Ясинскому в города Батурин и Киев»).

¹² Таирова-Яковлева Т. *Мазена*. С. 86 – 88.

thority, a phenomenon that western medievalists refer to as 'layered sovereignty'. Sorting out the specific terms of these intertwined relationships is not easy, and it requires its own separate study. But the documentation makes it clear that these interactions were fluid, *negotiated and reciprocal*, both between east and west and between clergy and laity. Moscow had inherited the formal authority from Warsaw and Constantinople to sanction all important decisions and appointments, and in return it had the authority and physical ability to intercede with Poland on behalf of Orthodox co-religionists, as the Ukrainian hierarchs repeatedly requested throughout the 1690s.¹³

The fate of the metropolia is a prime example. Left without a metropolitan for many years it had petitioned repeatedly during the 1680s, both to Moscow and to other patriarchates, to have its status as a metropolia acknowledged. This they formally achieved in 1686 in a lengthy epistle from Patriarch Ioakim announcing the investiture of Gedeon, the former Prince Chetvertins'kyi. But at what price did this confirmation come? Ioakim cited the apostles in emphasizing the unity of the church, and he bewailed the fact that the Kyivan eparchy had for so long been "widowed" (i.e., without a figure on the metropolitan's throne), a circumstance that had been ruled impermissible by the Fourth Synod of the Eastern Church. He explained the caesura, rather disingenuously, as a product of the metropolia having existed for so long under a Polish state. Now with its metropolitan restored (and, by implication, under an Orthodox ruler) the Kyivan church and its believers were widowed no more. Its metropolitan, he suggested at one point, would be *primus inter pares* in rank relative to the other Russian ("Rossiiskie") metropolitans.¹⁴

In due course during the ensuing years Peter and the Patriarchs reaffirmed the Kyivan metropolia as well as the stauropegial standing of the lavra.¹⁵ But Io-

¹³ There is an extensive body of documentation and scholarship describing this pursuit of intervention. See, for example, the many petitions from Iasyns'kyi to Patriarchs Ioakim and Adrian requesting that they act as intermediaries with Peter so that he might come to the assistance of the Ukrainian church. See, for example, the petition from Iasyns'kyi to the co-tsars Peter and Ivan from February 25, 1691 requesting physical protection for those parts of the diocese still in Polish hands. The petition calls for "the protective intercession of the tsars" ("царский свой покров") against the use of force against Orthodox congregations. See: Институт Рукопису Национальної бібліотеки України ім. В. І. Вернадського [hereafter – ИР НБУВ]. Ф. 160, спр. 442. Арк. 13 – 14.

¹⁴ The complete epistle («Список благословенной грамоти, Преосвященному митрополиту Киевскому князю Гедгону Четвертенскому данной») can be found in: Величко С. *Летопись событий в Юго-Западной России в XVII-м веке*. Т. 4. К., 1864. С. 603 – 612. The language of *primus inter pares* is slightly ambiguous. «Под нашею мерностью ему сушу, всем Российским архиереям председательствовать, яко Киевская митрополия в России ныне устроится первая» (р. 610). But later in the same paragraph he refers to Chetvertyns'kyi as having a rank «Единочинства же ради с Российскими митрополиты».

¹⁵ There exists a very large body of literature and documentation on this subject. The primary materials were published in: *Архив Юго-Западной России, издаваемый Временной комиссией для разбора древних актов, высочайше утвержденной при Киевском*

akim's charter of reinvestiture was replete with carefully-constructed ambivalences and ambiguities, such that no one in Kyiv who read the document could be sure just how the future relationship might evolve. One thing, however, was absolutely clear: a public embrace of the Moscow patriarchate was essential to all future negotiations and supplications. Whether out of conviction or pragmatism, Kyiv's Orthodox hierarchs verbally and in print expressed anew the views famously articulated a generation earlier by Innokentyi Gyzel and Lazar Baranovych avowing their commitment in the unity of the east Slavic church under the aegis of Moscow.¹⁶ Pluralities of ethnicity and political traditions aside, when the hierarchs expressed themselves as clergy they valorized Orthodox brotherhood above all.

Having clarified the issues of autonomy, and having restored the metropolia, the question now arose whether, or how, this fealty would have new materially beneficial consequences. On the Ukrainian side the key figures were Iasyn's'kyi and his then assistant, Iavorskii. If their strategy was straightforward the tactics used to pursue it were less obvious. On the one hand, they recognized that their interests required establishing a strong and enduring presence within the Patriarchate. Whether in the form of regular emissaries seeking political intercession, material resources, or semi-autonomous authority, the way forward ran through Moscow. In spite of the doctrinal conflicts that had swirled around the Patriarchate over the second half of the seventeenth century (Grecophile vs. Latinizer, the Eucharist controversy, et al.), and despite the fact that clergy from western Rus' were deeply implicated in all of them, the fact remained that Kyiv offered a supply of well-trained clergy, well-read, knowledgeable in the languages and doctrines of European Christianity writ large. Its exalted stature and influence notwithstanding, the Muscovite Patriarchate was in short supply of these capabilities, and with the emergence of Peter I in the 1690s, that point of view gained increasing acceptance in the capital. It is in this context that the transfer of personnel from the Mohyla Academy to Moscow arose.

The paper trail regarding this movement begins in April 1699 – i.e., shortly before Iavorskii's arrival in Moscow – with a letter from Patriarch Adrian to Iasyn's'kyi requesting that the latter arrange for students and instructors from the Mohyla Academy be relocated to Moscow, primarily to teach in the Greco-Latin-Slavonic Academy there.¹⁷ Between 1701 and 1704 the number of educated monks sent eastward increased markedly. Iavorskii's role in this process was definitive, as he was determined to bring the Moscow Academy's curriculum into

Военном, Подольском и Волыньском генерал-губернаторе. Ч. 1, т. 5: *Акты, относящиеся к делу о подчинении Киевской Митрополии Московскому Патриархату*. (1620–1694 гг.). К., 1873. Several of these have been republished recently in: *Доба гетьмана Івана Мазепи*. С. 460 – 494. See also: Чистович И. *Очерк истории западно-русской церкви*. СПб., 1884. С. 148 – 150 и далее.

¹⁶ Ploky S. *The Origins of the Slavic Nations*. P. 266 – 270.

¹⁷ ІР НБУВ. Ф. 160, спр. 442. Арк. 5.

line with Kyiv's as quickly as possible so as to produce cadres of Muscovite-trained clergy with the same standard of learning as their Kyivan counterparts. Iavorskii had been Iasyns'kyi's primary intermediary with Moscow throughout most of the 1690s¹⁸, and he was familiar with its leading figures well before he moved there permanently. It was during one such trip (sent by the metropolitan to secure the opening of a diocese in Pereiaslavl) that he met the tsar and gained appointment as bishop of Riazan'. Having won Peter's confidence, and installed as the de facto *In loco tenens* of the patriarchal seat after the death of Adrian, he moved aggressively to strengthen the Kyivan constituency within the *Patriarshii dvor* and at the Moscow Academy.¹⁹ The evidence suggests that Iavorskii maintained active contact with Kyivan clerics for the rest of his life, and more than once he asked Peter to free him from his responsibilities so that he could return home. Peter, of course, refused, as Iavorskii knew he would.

Over these first few years as many as a dozen seminarians from the Mohyla Academy were recruited to Moscow. The correspondence with Iasyns'kyi, begun almost as soon as the former took office, shows that he knew whom he wanted. Iavorskii knew many of the instructors personally, and he had the added advantage of leaving behind his brother, Fedor, to whom he entrusted many of the details of the actual journey.²⁰ The list quickly found its way to the tsar who, on September 26, 1701, wrote a formal instruction regarding the needs of the Moscow Academy, in which he orders that the following clergy be sent from Kyiv: Ieromonakh Rafail Krasnol'skii, Iosif Turoboiskii, Lariion Iaroshevitskii, Afanasii Sokolovskii, Grigorii Goshkevich, and Antonii Streshvskii.²¹ When Sokolovskii died in the following year Iavorskii supplied Peter with the names of two additional instructors to replace him.²² Subsequent communications added other names to the list including Lopatynskii and other future Petrine ideologues. Over the next two decades they would be followed by scores of others, some coming as young men directly from the Kyivan Academy, others, such as the homiletists Ivan Maksimovich and Feodosii Ianovskii, from monastic positions.

One might imagine that the clerical authorities in Kyiv, Baturyn, and Chernihiv would have been pleased to see their ranks in Moscow swell under

¹⁸ Ibidem. Арк. 13 зв. The earliest such reference that I could find dates to February 1691 in which Iasyns'kyi refers to Iavorskii, then an instructor in Kyiv, as his "trustworthy emissary" ("посланного своего честного") to the tsar.

¹⁹ Although he remained as the Riazan' hierarch, Iavorskii remained in Moscow most of the time, residing at the so-called «рязанское старое подворье», a building which subsequently became headquarters of the Moscow consistory. See: Снегирев И. М. *Рязанское старое подворье, что ныне дом Московской духовной консистории в Москве // Русские достопамятности*. Вып. 3. М., 1862. С. 7.

²⁰ IP НБУВ. Ф. 194, спр. 120. С. 66 – 67. See in particular a letter dated July 2, 1703 that refers to his brother's role. Mazepa also oversaw these details, and he assigned a certain Captain Annenkov to arrange their provisioning.

²¹ IP НБУВ. Ф. 2, спр. 2309. С. 5 – 6.

²² Там само. С. 7 – 8.

Iavorskii's welcoming aegis. Perhaps they were. But the record suggests that they were troubled, and in some sense even opposed to the move. Some instructors were too important, we learn, others, such as Turoboiskii, were deemed unprepared. Although already teaching Rhetoric, Turoboiskii had not completed the advanced courses, and his mentors insisted that he had to continue his studies through *bogoslovie*.²³ These pleas probably reflected self interest more than concern over Turoboiskii's training, since in short order he was entrusted to produce definitive and closely-argued tracts for Peter. The Kyivan hierarchy raised material objections as well. Who would bear the financial burden for their journeys? Who would guarantee their sustenance and provide letters authorizing their billeting in monasteries and private homes along the way? Iasyn's'kyi expressed reluctance to let the students depart at all, and at one point Mazepa had to write to him essentially confirming the tsar's decree, as if to say that in this matter there would be no personal intervention from the hetman. The Metropolitan then wrote to Iavorskii in May 1701 confirming the arrangement, but making one last plea (in vain) for the young scholars to remain in Kyiv.²⁴ Ioasaf Krokovs'kyi, then the rector of the Academy, raised a similar objection.

A far more disturbing issue further clouded this transfer, one involving the behavior and atmosphere among the students at the Mohyla Academy and their uneasy relations with the local townsfolk. Throughout the 1690s endless disputes and protests had arisen in which local shopkeepers accused the students of hooliganism and the students, in turn, accused local citizens of ill treatment. During the second half of the decade this bad blood generated episodes of physical violence in which groups of younger seminarians roamed the streets on Saturdays getting into fights (one commentator referred to these chronic episodes as "*dies irae*"). While we might not be particularly surprised by such outbursts from young adolescents with time on their hands, local authorities at the time found the situation alarming, and their investigations reached all the way to Moscow.

Although the precise size of the Academy's student population is not known, their ranks surely ranged at least into the several hundred and possibly more than a thousand.²⁵ These numbers afforded the seminarians a significant presence in the city, whose permanent population at the time probably fell

²³ Голубев С. *Киевская академия в конце XVII и начале XVIII столетия*. К., 1901. С. 98; РГАДА. Ф. 229, оп. 5, д. 83. Л. 468 – 471.

²⁴ ИР НБУВ. Ф. 2, спр. 3470. Арк. 2 – 6.

²⁵ One can find various figures in the scholarship, none of which have firm documentation to support them. Just Juel's estimate of 2,000 students is the most widely cited figure, but Juel had little direct contact with the Academy, and one suspects that his figure reflects his impression of their visibility within Kyiv rather than any hard information. On fact one of his traveling companions put the number even higher, at 6,000! For the most complete effort to assess these numbers see: Русанов В. *Быт студентов старой Киевской академии (1909)* // ИР НБУВ. Ф. 304, спр. 2066. С. 68 – 71.

somewhere below 20,000, most of which was clustered within Podil and Pechersk.²⁶ In large measure it was a town composed of traders – many of whom were non-Ukrainian and non-Orthodox (Jews, Poles, Greeks, etc.) – clergy, students, and soldiers. When the students ranged in groups onto the streets outside of the Academy they became highly visible. A disorderly student body quickly taxed the manpower of the municipal authorities, and Kyiv's town magistrates raised frequent complaints about this problem. According to some accounts, the disturbances were reminiscent of a much older problem, involving other students within Kyiv, including those still studying at other monastic schools and those from the Jesuit College before its closure in the 1640s. Jesuit students had been reputed to be particularly unruly, with claims of desecration of Orthodox and Jewish sacred places.²⁷ Sometimes Ukrainian and Russian students squared off against each other as well, as did students coming from Ukrainian lands to the west of the hetmanate (“poliaki”). By the late 1680s these inter-confessional and inter-ethnic infractions had diminished, but with the revival of violence in the 1690s these students from outside the hetmanate sometimes joined with the local ones, creating a town vs. gown problem of epic proportions. One particularly notorious incident in 1694 left several people wounded and one townsman dead.²⁸

Many of these roaming students came from humble backgrounds, the so-called “*bursaki*” who lived in student dormitories within the Academy. It was these residential students who were deemed most unruly, roaming the area around Kreshchatyk in groups of twenty or thirty, engaging in theft, drunkenness, brawling, and missing Sunday services. The situation had become such a scandal that Iasyn's'kyi expelled a number of the worst offenders, and in near desperation turned to Patriarch Adrian for assistance, which the latter provided in the form of a stern epistle “Na bezchinota studentov na kotorykh net suda i raspravy.”²⁹ “Large numbers of students assemble at night,” he declared, “they wander around the townsmen's quarters, steal their firewood, their provisions, and all manner of things.” Even then the situation did not improve, and in January 1700 a student riot took place, lasting for days until suppressed by the voevoda, the Moscow boiar, Petr Khovanskii.³⁰ Peter I ordered a military official in Kyiv, Dmitrii Polotskii, to conduct a separate investigation, and report back. His report drew a vivid picture of bloody street violence.³¹ Peter then issued a

²⁶ Hamm M. F. *Kiev, A Portrait of a City, 1800-1917*. Princeton, 1993. P. 10.

²⁷ Левицкий О. *Очерки народной жизни в Малороссии во второй половине XVII ст.* К., 1902. Гл. 57: Киевские студенты. С. 288 – 290.

²⁸ Левицкий О. *Очерки народной жизни в Малороссии*. С. 293 – 294.

²⁹ Левицкий О. *Очерки народной жизни в Малороссии*. С. 221 – 222; The original document is reproduced in: *Киевская старина*. 1885, № 9. С. 142.

³⁰ Левицкий О. *Очерки народной жизни в Малороссии*. С. 296 – 297.

³¹ *Киево-Могилянська Академія, кін. XVII – поч. XIX ст.: повсякденна історія: Збірник документів / Упоряд. О. Ф. Задорожна*. К., 2005. С. 29 – 30, № 8. My thanks to Maksym Iaremenko for making me aware of this book.

direct decree demanding that the voevoda quell the student violence, an intervention that lasted for several more years.³²

In itself there is nothing sensational or revealing about these episodes, nothing particularly Kyivan about seminarians getting into trouble on the streets. Boys will be boys, after all, and tales of badly behaved or drunken seminarians were commonplace throughout Christendom both before and after the events of the 1690s. With the subsequent proliferation of seminaries in the Russian Empire after 1737, the image of the ill-tempered and drunken *bursak-seminarist* became a familiar caricature in town after town well into the nineteenth century. Why, then, do these seemingly minor unpleasantries rise to a level of high drama? Let me offer three reasons here, although there are likely others. First, the Kyivan clerical hierarchy itself, both from within and outside the Academy, took them seriously. Repeatedly and over several years they engaged every possible source of authority to redress the problem. Until they turned to Moscow nothing much had worked, and the hierarchs plausibly feared escalations in the violence. They reasoned that what was needed locally were more rather than fewer instructors and advanced students in the Academy to watch over the younger ones. Taking away several of the most talented and more mature ones risked depriving the Academy of a layer of institutional discipline and social control. Without their presence, local military authorities—outsiders in every sense—might well become involved in Academy affairs and thereby weaken its ability to run its own affairs. This was unquestionably an abiding concern, and the desire to maintain local clerical autonomy in the face of multiple challenges is a common thread of anxiety running from the metropolia, through the lavra, and to the academy.

This leads to the second reason: even the most mundane conflicts can occasionally illuminate fundamental relationships and the dilemmas they engendered. In this case an issue that on the surface appears to be little more than a nuisance when compared, for example, with apprehensions about preserving the traditional rights and privileges of the Cossack *starshyna*, in reality exposed all the raw contradictions of the clergy's struggle to give practical shape to its relationship with Moscow. Without Moscow's assistance the problem of rowdy students seemed to defy every effort at remediation. Moscow's assistance, however, put the Academy's autonomy at some risk and it threatened to bring in the Great Russian voevoda and the troops of the local garrison that were under his direct command. In one letter to Iavorskii, Iasyn's'kyi was explicit about the need to defend the dignity and rights of the Academy, its faculty, and its students, in resolving the trouble between them and the townsfolk.³³ In a separate petition to Iasyn's'kyi the Academy's professors and students pleaded for support, worried that the bad relationship with townsmen

³² IP НБУВ. Ф. 2, спр. 21969. Арк. 1 – 8.

³³ Голубев С. Т. *Геден Одорский (бывший ректор Киевской академии в начале XVIII стол.)* // ТКДА. 1900, № 10. С. 569 – 570.

would leave the academy in a vulnerable situation.³⁴ Hence the ambivalence about sending some of the leading lights from the Academy's class of 1701. Iavorskii seems to have been instrumental in negotiating these various concerns more-or-less to everyone's satisfaction, for, in a letter from 1703 Iasyn's'kyi thanks him profusely, comparing his intervention with the tsar to Christ's intervention between God and humanity ("iakozhe i Khristos Gospod by khodotaistvuia mezhdou Bogom i chelovekom").³⁵

To add another layer of paradox, the Muscovite side had its own reservations, both material and political, about the arrangement. The steady stream of supplicants from the Kyivan metropolia had proven to be an irritant to Muscovite authorities. The ongoing requests for support, intervention, enforcement of land rights, and money to rebuild churches increased with each passing decade, a necessary consequence perhaps of the Eternal Peace, but an annoyance nevertheless. These came from numerous institutions – monasteries, churches, confraternities, cathedrals – and from locales throughout the metropolia. Iasyn's'kyi had sent several such delegations, including a very large one in 1793 headed by Gedeon Odors'kyi.³⁶ Although the Caves Monastery was the most prominent of cloister to send emissaries, it was far from alone.³⁷ For example, the Kyivo-Bratskii monastery requested financial assistance several times in the 1690s, primarily through direct supplications.³⁸ The Epiphany Monastery also sent numerous petitions and emissaries to the tsar regarding its rights to land. Interestingly, one of these petitions raised some concerns about a recent *universal* from Mazepa that, in the eyes of the monks, threatened to reduce their income from specific villages. They asked the tsar to reconfirm their original rights which, they asserted, had been spelled out by Aleksei Mikhailovich shortly after Pereislavl.³⁹ The Intercession Monastery did the same.⁴⁰

In a series of judgments between the early 1690s and the 1700s, Peter imposed restrictions on these journeys, even banning them outright for a brief period. For example, on October 3, 1697 Mazepa wrote to Adrian regarding the tsar's order not to permit an official from a monastery in Vilno (a part of the metropolia even though outside the hetmanate) to travel to Moscow.⁴¹ Similar impediments were placed before emissaries from other institutions, and, in an effort to curtail these *dukhovnye khodotaistva*, Peter sent a decree to the met-

³⁴ *Києво-Могилянська Академія, кін. XVII – поч. XIX ст.* С. 34 – 35.

³⁵ Голубев С. Т. *Геден Одорский*. С. 585.

³⁶ Голубев С. Т. *Геден Одорский*. С. 166; See also: Вишневецкий Д. *Киевская академия в первой половине XVIII столетия* // ТКДА. 1902, № 1. С. 18 – 19.

³⁷ On the relations between the lavra and the Romanov court see: Титов Ф. И. *Русский царствующий дом Романовых в отношениях его к Киево-Печерской лавре, 1613 – 1913*. К., 1913. С. 57 – 63; РГАДА. Ф. 167, оп. 6, д. 60. Л. 39, 56, 90 и др.

³⁸ ІР НБУВ. Ф. 194, спр. 120. Арк. 28, 118.

³⁹ ІР НБУВ. Ф. 194, спр. 160. Арк. 10 – 12.

⁴⁰ Титов Ф. И. *Русский царствующий дом Романовых*. С. 64.

⁴¹ ІР НБУВ. Ф. 160, спр. 442. Арк. 98.

ropolitan in 1701 ordering him not to allow monks to travel to Moscow with petitions.⁴²

The final reason to take these disorders seriously is the most obvious: the fear of wider social strife. The stratifications within the student body mirrored some of the deepest and most obvious divisions within the East Slavic world, both ethnic and confessional. In a territory that had only recently emerged from decades of violence the fear that divisions among students might spread to other populations and other locations was palpable. Here, the distinction between the *bursaki* in the lower courses, i.e., those learning Latin *de novo*, and the more senior seminarians proved particularly important. If the students in the lower grades embraced parochial loyalties and identities, the senior students often embodied a broader and less sectarian set of possibilities that saw confessional and ethnic boundaries as porous and reciprocal rather than absolute. The latter were most likely to travel to Catholic academies for advanced education, or to the Order of St. Basil in Rome, an institution established explicitly to embrace them. The temporary conversions to Greek-rite Catholicism that often facilitated this arrangement entailed a risk, of course, but one to which the local authorities were willing to turn a blind eye. The bonds of social peace across these communities and social boundaries remained fragile, and well educated Orthodox clergy were far better situated than, for example, the Cossack starshyna, to work across these communities.

Paradoxically, then, the very qualities of experience, learning, and relatively broad outlooks that made the Kyivans so attractive to Peter's state building were precisely those that made them essential to the project of social and inter-confessional fence mending back home. It was for this reason that Iasyns'kyi, and later Krokovs'kyi, negotiated so hard with Iavorskii, a negotiation which, the exodus notwithstanding, enabled them to keep most graduates of the Mohyla Academy firmly within the borders of the hetmanate and metropolia.

Гарі Маркер

**Кадри для церкви Петра I:
організаційна політика та подорожі
київського духовенства на початку XVIII ст.**

Після 1686 р. переміщення багатьох представників київського духовенства на вищі щаблі Московської Церкви стало постійним феноменом, що досягнув апогею за царювання Петра Великого, який використовував кількох із них у ролі власних ідеологів та панегіристів. Ця стаття обговорює політику і підтримку в Москві та Києві між 1690 та 1710 рр., що супроводжували згадані переміщення, фокусуючись на ризиках та вигодах для духовенства й світської влади Москви й Гетьманщини, на які проливає світло ця міграція.

⁴² Голубев С. Т. *Гедеон Одорский*. С. 581 – 582.