

Barbara Skinner  
(Indiana State University)

## NEW PERSPECTIVES ON ORTHODOX CLERICAL EDUCATION IN RIGHT BANK UKRAINE, 1825–1855

The development of Orthodox seminaries and religious schools in Right Bank Ukraine after the partitions of Poland occurred in tandem with the demise of the Uniate Church in this region. The eradication of the Uniates and the rise of a dominant Orthodox Church in the Russian Empire's western provinces was a long and fraught process, but a critical aspect of that process involved the recreation and nurturing of Orthodox religious education in a region where Orthodox religious schooling had withered away in lieu of Uniate schools by the mid-eighteenth century within the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. After the Polish partitions, when more than one million Right Bank Ukrainians came under Russian Orthodox jurisdiction in a massive conversion campaign from 1794–1796, the newly installed Orthodox hierarchy here basically had to begin from scratch to rebuild an Orthodox educational network. Most of the effort centered on formal religious education in seminaries – in Right Bank Ukraine, one for each of the newly reinstated Orthodox dioceses of Volhynia and Podilia.

Later, the reforms in religious education under Tsar Alexander I yielded the additional creation of ecclesiastical *uezdnye* and *prikhodskie uchilishcha* to buttress clerical education before seminary, as well as standardized charters for the curriculum and administration of the schools and seminaries under the jurisdiction of the Holy Synod's new Commission for Ecclesiastical Schools (Коммиссия духовных училищ)<sup>1</sup>. The growth of these Orthodox educational institutions in Volhynia and Podilia was impressive, each diocese educating hundreds of students by the time Nicholas I came to the throne<sup>2</sup>. While at first they depended on instructors trained at the Kyiv Academy, by the early 1800s, the Right Bank seminaries were teaching advanced courses and training their

<sup>1</sup> The *ukaz* instituting the Коммиссия Духовных Училищ, as well as the curriculum, administration, and financing of Orthodox ecclesiastical schools at the parish, district, and seminary levels was issued on June 26, 1808 (ПСЗ, серия I, т. 30, № 23, 122). The new charters for the schools were instituted in 1814, though not applied in Ukraine until 1817.

<sup>2</sup> For the expansion of *uchilishcha* and the numbers of students in the Volynskaia diocese, see: Теодорович Н. И. Волынская духовная семинария. – Почаев, 1901. – С. 48–65.

own instructors<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand, these seminaries and schools suffered from poor facilities and limited funding – indeed similar to the fate of religious education throughout Russia, but nevertheless a painful shortcoming in the lands where Orthodoxy had to strengthen itself against a Uniate past and a still impressive Roman Catholic presence. For example, after the Volynskaia seminary's buildings in Ostroh suffered major damage in a fire in 1821, the lack of funding for repairs meant that the seminary existed for several years in extremely uncomfortable and unhealthy damp and leaky conditions as the buildings continued to deteriorate; the fire particularly damaged the library, leaving the seminary with even fewer books than its already previously meager holdings. After the seminary moved to Annopol' in 1825, its classes were held in dirty and unheated stables, and the students bunked two to a bed in filthy, crowded rented housing with dirt floors. With water unfit to drink in Annopol', the students' health was at risk. Clean water was at least ten versts away; moreover, there was no hospital within thirty versts<sup>2</sup>.

Conditions for a number of Orthodox schools improved after the Polish uprising of 1830–1831, when the subsequent suppression of nearly two-thirds of the Roman Catholic monasteries in the Russian Empire's western provinces created an opportunity for the Orthodox Church to appropriate some prime facilities for their religious schools<sup>3</sup>. Thus, in 1832, Volynskii Bishop Amvrosii (Morev) obtained permission to use a Bernardine cloister in Zhytomyr for the local and district uchilishcha, and Podol'skii Bishop Kirill (Bogoslovskii-Platonov) secured the use of a closed Dominican facility for local and district schools in the town of Letychiv with enough space for a dormitory for students<sup>4</sup>. While fewer well-built Basilian monasteries were closed before 1839 (the most important of which became Orthodox monasteries, such as those in Pochaiv and Derman), their resources did not go to waste for the Orthodox educational establishments. The Volynskaia Seminary benefitted from the closing of four Basilian monasteries by receiving in 1836 “a significant quan-

<sup>1</sup> For a list of instructors up to 1817 in the Podol'skaia seminary (first located in Sharhorod, then Kamenets-Podol'sk) indicating the dependence on graduates of the Kyiv Academy as well as increasing integration of top students from the Shargorod seminary, see: Синицкий Д. Исторические сведения о Подольской духовной семинарии. – Каменец-Подольский, 1866 – С. 21–27.

<sup>2</sup> РГИА. – Ф. 802. – Оп. 1. – Д. 5205 (1829). – Л. 3об, 4 об; Теодорович Н. И. Волинская духовная семинария. – С. 26–29.

<sup>3</sup> Of 319 Roman Catholic men's monasteries in the Russian Empire in 1825, only 113 remained open in 1833. Further closings continued in 1842, and then another major repression after the 1863 uprising left only 41 Roman Catholic monasteries remaining in Russia, with eight in the Catholic Lutsk-Zhytomyr diocese and only three in the Kamenets diocese in Right Bank Ukraine. See: Radwan M. Zakony męskie na ziemiach zabranych w XIX wieku. – Lublin, 2004. – S. 27; Gach P. P. Struktury i działalność duszpasterska zakonów męskich na ziemiach dawnej Rzeczypospolitej Śląska w latach 1773–1914. – Lublin, 1999. – S. 86–87.

<sup>4</sup> РГАДА. – Ф. 802. – Оп. 1. – Д. 6792. – Л. 16, 18; л. 23 (approved by the Ober-Prokurator of Synod Meshcherskii, 1 Oct 1832).

tity of books” from the monasteries’ collections, including from the closed Lutsk and Belastok monasteries <sup>1</sup>.

We should also note that in 1829, the Greek-Uniate Ecclesiastical College introduced new charters for Uniate ecclesiastical schools and seminaries, with administrative and curricular norms that almost exactly mirrored those adopted by Orthodox schools under the Commission for Ecclesiastical Schools. This meant that the Uniates adopted the same textbooks used in Orthodox schools, which involved shifting the language of instruction from Polish to Russian. Once Uniate seminaries and schools began to adopt the textbooks and curriculum of the Orthodox Church, it becomes difficult to speak of separate Uniate and Orthodox schooling. Ultimately, in 1835 all Uniate religious schools came under the administration of the Commission for Ecclesiastical Schools <sup>2</sup>. The elimination of separate Uniate schooling system was one of the essential steps in the great “reunification” (*vossoedinenie*) to Orthodoxy of the Uniate Church in 1839, when all Uniate seminaries and ecclesiastical schools formally became part of the Orthodox educational network in Russia’s western provinces.

While the material conditions, curriculum, teaching staff, and student body of the Orthodox religious schools in this period have been well covered by published works, this article turns to three archival documents that reveal lesser studied aspects of Orthodox religious training in the early nineteenth century. The first two sources come from the 1830s when concern about the Polish uprising was fresh and when preparations for the 1839 *vossoedinenie* of the Uniates into the Russian Orthodox Church were underway, and the third document comes from 1839–1840 immediately following the *vossoedinenie*. In the wake of the Polish uprising, the Russian imperial government aimed to strengthen Orthodoxy in the Ukrainian and Belarusian provinces as a means to counterbalance the Polish influence there. In 1832, the special committee formed to oversee the situation in the western provinces (*Комитет по делам возвращенных от Польши губернии*, created in 1831) issued resolutions on strengthening Russian elements (*обрусение*) in these provinces, including bolstering the Orthodox Church presence and influence <sup>3</sup>. In this atmosphere, Orthodox religious training was seen as critical for political as well as religious reasons.

The first document for consideration here detours from the formal experience of the seminary to look at practical training in proper Eastern-rite services

<sup>1</sup> РГАДА. – Ф. 802. – Оп. 1. – Д. 9196, л. – Л. 1.

<sup>2</sup> For official discussion from 1828 on applying Orthodox school charters to the Uniate schools and on using Russian textbooks and catechisms, see: РГИА. – Ф. 796. – Оп. 205. – Д. 172. – Л. 5об-7. For the imperial *ukaz*, О бытии Греко-униатским духовным училищам в ведении Комиссии духовных училищ (19 XII 1835), see: ПСЗ, серия II. – Т. 10, № 8692.

<sup>3</sup> *Корсунский И. Н.* Воссоединение униатов и Филарет, митрополит Московский // Прибавление к изданию творений святых отцов в русском переводе. Ч. 44. – М., 1889. – С. 11–12.

for Uniate priests, as one of the steps leading to vossoedinenie, and therefore as part of the training of future Orthodox priests. After the Polish uprising, when the Russian government underscored the “dangers” of Polish influence in the region, the Uniate Church hierarchy under Iosif Semashko’s leadership was able to more effectively push for reforms to bring the church’s rite and practices into accordance with those of the Orthodox Church, with the ultimate goal of converting the Uniates to Orthodoxy. From the time of the mass conversion of Uniates in Ukraine in 1794–1796, the Orthodox hierarchy of the revived Orthodox Volynskaia and Podol’skaia dioceses struggled to get former Uniate priests who became Orthodox to conduct services using the proper Eastern rite<sup>1</sup>. To alleviate some of these same problems in the mass vossoedinenie of the 1830s, Uniate leader Iosif Semashko directed from 1834 an all-out effort to cleanse the Uniate rite from all of the Latin-rite accretions that had developed as standard Uniate practice over time. The hierarchy argued that the Uniates should return to the original rite of 1595, as the pope had originally dictated, and yet, the secret goal was to externally prepare for conversion to Orthodoxy. This involved both physically altering Uniate churches, most substantially to add iconostases and to move the altar away from the wall of the church, as well as requiring priests to use the Moscow service book instead of Uniate service book for their liturgical duties<sup>2</sup>. The ultimate goal was to transform Uniate priests in Belarus and western Ukraine into good Orthodox priests for the post-1839 dioceses. Both the material and liturgical changes were difficult for Uniate priests. Nevertheless, while the Uniate hierarchy secured financial assistance to help the poorest churches with the physical transformation, the parish priests were basically on their own to adopt the Moscow Sluzhebnik, provided free of charge to the parishes from the Uniate hierarchy.

The source under consideration here elaborates on the Uniate campaign to urge its priests to meet Eastern-rite standards in their liturgical duties as a prerequisite for becoming Orthodox priests by 1839. Certainly, from 1834, no Uniate priest was ordained without passing an examination on his knowledge of the Eastern-rite liturgy according to the Moscow Sluzhebnik, but those who were already priests also had to begin to perform their services according to the Russian Orthodox Sluzhebnik. These older priests’ education had poorly prepared them in reading Church Slavonic, so many of them could not effectively perform from a new Slavonic text. Therefore, the Uniate bishops began in 1834 to examine all of their parish priests to ensure that they could use the Moskovskii Sluzhebnik and could celebrate the liturgy according to proper

<sup>1</sup> For more on the 1794–1796 conversions, see: *Skinner B.* The Western Front of the Eastern Church: Uniate and Orthodox Conflict in Eighteenth-Century Poland, Ukraine, Belarus, and Russia. – DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 2009. – Ch. 8.

<sup>2</sup> For a description of the efforts involved, see: Записки Иосифа, митрополита Литовско-го. – СПб., 1883. – Т. 1. – С. 79–100.

Orthodox Eastern rite. Those with the most difficulties were summoned to the diocesan cathedral for training<sup>1</sup>.

For the Uniate priests in Volhynia, this meant traveling to the Uniate Litovskaia diocesan cathedral in the town of Zhyrovitsy (in the Belarusian Slonim district) for several weeks or so<sup>2</sup>. In 1834, Uniate district deans (*dziekany* or *благочинные*) reported to the diocesan consistory on how well the parish priests under them were adopting the *Moskovskii Sluzhebnik* and identified those parish priests who resisted or who were slow to adapt and did not perform the rites properly. Those priests were then sent to Zhyrovitsy – some under police escort – for remedial training for several weeks, followed by an examination and a decision on whether they could continue in their position of parish priest. The process went on for several years. For example, the batch of 66 priests from the Litovskaia diocese who spent time in Zhyrovitsy from September through December 1835 included thirteen from Volhynia. According to the records, all priests summoned to the Zhyrovitsy cathedral completed lessons and examinations in theology, liturgical singing, Slavonic and Church Slavonic, and the rite of the basic liturgy. From the reports filed about their progress, many struggled with these subjects and received poor evaluations, particularly in theology and Slavonic/Church Slavonic. In the columns marked “Каких успехов?” for these subjects, ten of these thirteen had “малых успехов” in theology, and ten of thirteen had “малых” or “посредственных успехов” in Slavonic/Church Slavonic; moderate success dominated in liturgical singing, though, again, ten of thirteen had “малых” or “посредственных успехов” in this category as well. Only one of the thirteen priests (from the Volodymyr deanery) received excellent marks. In marks on performing the liturgy (“как служить обедню”), however, all thirteen received at least an average mark (“посредственно”), which probably held more weight in satisfying the requirements<sup>3</sup>.

In all likelihood, given the evaluations of “малых успехов” or “посредственных успехов” from this training, these priests’ abilities in the Orthodox rite according to the Moscow service book likely remained shaky when they returned to their parishes and after their parishes technically became Orthodox by 1839. This report provides important and rare evidence on the extent to which the Uniate church tried to train priests in the Orthodox rite before

<sup>1</sup> The documents outlining the process are in: РГАДА. – Ф. 797. – Оп. 6. – Д. 22901. First, the Uniate College wanted all priests to come to the cathedral for testing, and, if necessary, training (Л. 58); then, more expediently, all the monastery abbots and district deans (*blagochinnye*) went to the cathedral for examination, and then they were responsible for teaching or sending to the cathedral the priests who needed training (Л. 119–119 об).

<sup>2</sup> With the abolition of the Uniate Lutsk diocese in 1828, the Uniate deaneries in Volhynia were incorporated into the Litovskaia eparchy. From 1833, Iosif Semashko presided as the Litovskii bishop, so Volhynian Uniate priests came directly under his control.

<sup>3</sup> Lithuanian State Historical Archives (LVIA). – Ф. 605. – Оп. 1. – Д. 2008. – Л. 88–91 (из архива Виленской православной духовной консистории).



vossoedinenie, particularly on the individual experiences in this effort and on the marginal level of success of such training for many priests. It attests to the limited capabilities of future Orthodox priests in the former Uniate parishes and points to the long struggle of the Orthodox church in subsequent decades to bring all parishes into standard Russian Orthodox practice.

Next, two documents from the archive of the Commission for Ecclesiastical Schools (Комиссия духовных училищ) provide insight into pedagogical issues in the seminaries and religious schools. The first document, an 1832 report on the Volynskaia seminary, underscores efforts to train the clergy in correct use of the Russian language; the goal was to have priests who could pass on good Russian skills to the communities they served, thereby more closely binding this region to Russia. Language and the loyalties implied by the use of language were constant issues for the Russian government in the Ukrainian provinces.

Once Orthodox schooling was reinstated in the Right Bank under Russian jurisdiction, the Polish language was targeted for elimination among Orthodox students. Although Polish had been the language of instruction for schooling throughout the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth, the new Orthodox seminaries that opened in the late 1790s in the Right Bank began to teach in Russian (of course, the students learned Latin for philosophy and theology, but now they learned through translations into and from Russian rather than Polish), relegating Polish to the status of an optional modern European language for study, along with French and German. Until the Polish uprising, these Polish courses were considered useful for Orthodox parish priests in the western provinces, since they needed Polish to speak to landowners and for some correspondence with the consistories. After the Polish uprising of 1830–1831, however, the Orthodox hierarchy formulated the argument that the priests no longer needed to study Polish, and an effort led by the Commission for Ecclesiastical Schools finally shut down all Polish language courses in Orthodox seminaries in the western provinces by 1840<sup>1</sup>. Before that goal was achieved, Polish remained one of the subjects in which the students of the Volynskaia seminary performed the best<sup>2</sup>.

The Ukrainian language also came under attack, as the 1832 report reveals. Basically, students who did not have a good mastery of Russian, the language of instruction, continued to use their own Ukrainian language in their coursework or at least to pepper their Russian with Ukrainian words, spelling, and grammar. Volynskii Archbishop Innokentii (Sel'no-Krinnov), who replaced Bishop Amvrosii (Morev) in February 1832, worked on promoting proper

<sup>1</sup> Compliance was generally slow; however, the Volynskaia and Podol'skaia seminaries were among the first to comply. The Kyiv seminary taught Polish until June of 1840 (incidentally, so did the Minsk seminary). See: РГИА. – Ф. 802. – Оп. 2. – Д. 931. – Л. 306, 5–6.

<sup>2</sup> According to the bishop's report on the Volynskaia seminary in 1832, the best foreign language abilities of the students were in Greek and Polish (РГИА. – Ф. 802. – Д. 6827. – Л. 506.)

Russian usage by seminarians during his short stint at the helm of the Volynskaia eparchy through December 1833. His 1832 report on the Volynskaia seminary bemoaned the continued prevalence of the local Ukrainian language in the courses and coursework. He wrote that while the seminarians' compositions in all subjects were not bad, with a few weak exceptions, improvement in this sphere should be a goal, and particularly that the professors of theology, philosophy and rhetoric to spend more time on composition and to provide sound critique for each exercise. He noted that part of the problem was the use of Ukrainianisms – specifically “Volynisms” – in the students' writing:

...ученики как говорят, так и сочиняют на вольнском наречии, весьма отличном от чистаго российского штиля; и потому учащему прележит здесь двоякий труд – и образовать учеников в правильном сочинении, и истреблять в сочинениях их вольнизмы. Даже исправление одного только правописания в их упражнениях составляет немалый труд для учащего, ибо ученики по здешнему наречию сплош пишут вместо литеры «ы» букву «и» и вместо «и» «ы»<sup>1</sup>.

Innokentii, a native Russian from the region of Perm who had served until then only in Russian dioceses, could not tolerate the Ukrainian language. He viewed the dominant characteristics of Ukrainian as irritating distortions of the Russian language, as bad habits that could be erased and replaced by proper Russian. In this same report he advocated steps to be taken to abolish the use of Ukrainian in the seminaries in the name of unifying this region more closely to Russia:

...для истребления в семинарии и училищах разности, существующей между наречиями вольнским и велико-российским и состоящей наипаче в неправильных и даже совершенно превратных ударениях над словами, в произношении и писании буквы «ы» вместо литеры «и» и наоборот, и в употреблении многих польских слов, необходимо нужно, чтоб учащие в семинарии и даже училищах все были родом из великороссиян, а не из малороссиян, и особенно не из родившихся в губерниях, возвращенных от Польши. Ибо действительно, ничем скорее и удобнее, по намерениям Государя Императора, нельзя достигнуть единства в духе здешних жителей с Великою Россиею, как постоянным искоренением в учениках, а чрез них в их семействах, и вообще чрез духовенство в самых жителях здешнего польско-славянско-русского наречия, и водворением, на место сей смеси в языке, чистого велико-российскаго наречия...<sup>2</sup>

Obviously, Innokentii embraced the Russian imperial perspective that this region constituted a part of ancient Rus' that was returned to Russia, and that

<sup>1</sup> РГИА. – Ф. 802. – Д. 6827 (О состоянии Вольнской семинарии, 1832). – Л. 6–6 об.

<sup>2</sup> Ibidem. – Л. 6 об–7, emphasis mine. In this section of the report Innokentii is actually quoting his own correspondence several months earlier (from 28 August 1832) to the leading cleric in the Holy Synod, Metropolitan Serafim of Novgorod, on this issue.

therefore it needed to shed its Polonisms and return also to the cultural world of Russia. He argued that Russifying the language comprised the easiest and least dangerous path to Russification:

Упомянутого единства в духе, конечно, можно, между прочим, достигать и истреблением местных обычаев. Но сия мера может быть проводима в действие только мало-по-малу, и требует весьма долгого времени, ибо народные обычаи, укоренившиеся веками, вдруг начать истреблять, особенно в буйной Польше – опасно. Напротив того искоренение здешнего наречия не сопряжено ни с опасностью, ни с трудностями какими-либо. Легкость такого искоренения испытал я сам на служащих при мне здешних урожденцах. Непрестанно искоряя в разговоре их как нерусские слова так и неправильное произношение самых русских слов, в течение шести только месяцев, достиг того, что они почти уже совершенно правильно говорят по-русски. Почему я подтвердил Семинарскому Правлению, дабы учащие как в семинарии, так и училищах при преподавании лекций и в обращении с учениками всемерно старались искоренять упомянутую разность, существующую между волынским и великороссийским наречиями <sup>1</sup>.

To achieve the goal of Russifying the Orthodox seminarians' language, Archbishop Innokentii initiated two active policies, as outlined in his 1832 report. First, he requested that all Russian textbooks from the Commission for Ecclesiastical Schools, starting with primers, be printed with accent marks above the words for correct Russian pronunciation.

Сии ударения не стоили бы Коммиссии больших издержек, а приняли бы большую пользу для образования в словесности духовного юношества малороссийского и особенно здешнего краев. Ибо ученики, с самого поступления в приходское училище и до окончания курса семинарских наук безпрестанно видя ударения над словами в российских учебных книгах, неприметным образом и в разговоре отстали бы от неправильных и совершенно превратных ударений над речениями, а чрез учеников сия перемена могла бы распространяться и между самыми жителями <sup>2</sup>.

Secondly, he strived to hire more instructors and administrators from central Russia to teach at the seminary and its subordinate uchildishcha ("ибо и в Малороссии неправильно делают ударения над словами") <sup>3</sup>. It is worth noting that this was also a policy also pursued by Archbishop Podol'skii Bratslavskii Kirill for his seminary and schools; in 1832 Kirill stated in his annual report "...для водворения и утверждения российского духа и наречия на будущее время постановить непременно правилом, чтобы наставников в семинарию и смотрителей и инспекторов в училища определять

<sup>1</sup> Ibidem. – Л. 7–7 об.

<sup>2</sup> Ibidem. – Л. 7 об. – 8.

<sup>3</sup> Ibidem. – Л. 7 об.



воспитанников не из Киевской, а чистых россиян из Санкт-Петербургской и Московской Академии”<sup>1</sup>.

On both counts, Volynskii Archbishop Innokentii made some progress. Correspondence from the Commission for Ecclesiastical Schools in September 1833 approved the publication at the Pochaiv Lavra press of the Russian primer with the brief sacred history (in one book) with accent marks on the words “для употребления в тамошних низших училищах, в виде опыта к исправлению неправильного в тех местах произношения.”<sup>2</sup> Archbishop Innokentii was also able to hire several Russians to fill positions of personnel at the seminary whom he claimed were ineffective and needed replacing in his 1832 report. A new professor of philosophy, who trained at the Yaroslavl’ seminary and the St. Petersburg Spiritual Academy, and a new instructor of mathematics and the Hebrew language, who trained at the Kaluga seminary and the Moscow Spiritual Academy, came to the Volynskaia seminary in 1833 under Innokentii’s tenure. One year later, in 1834, a new seminary inspector and teacher of church history and German with training from the Riazan seminary and the St. Petersburg Spiritual Academy joined the faculty of the Volynskaia seminary. By 1834, then, five members of the total eight faculty (including the rector and the professor of rhetoric) were Russian; the other three members consisted of one from the Kievskaia guberniia and two from the Volynskaia guberniia. Most debilitating to Innokentii’s goals on this issue, however, was the apparent inability to attract Russians to teach at the parish and district schools; in 1835, the faculty of the lower schools were almost all from the Volynskaia guberniia<sup>3</sup>. Without instruction by native Russians at the lower levels, the students lacked a firm foundation in Russian when they continued with seminary studies.

Although Innokentii’s dreams of “eradicating” the Ukrainian language in the Volynskaia ecclesiastical schools fell far short in reality, his 1832 report demonstrates the determination of the Russian Orthodox bishops to use the religious schools and the local clergy as a means to Russify the local population, as well as the importance of language in this endeavor. It is a relatively early document that demonstrates the Russian tendency to denigrate the ethno-linguistic characteristics of Ukrainians even before the rise of Ukrainian secular nationalism. Indeed, it provides a rather unsettling insight into the depth of Russian discomfort with the distinctive linguistic characteristics of non-Russian Eastern Slavs.

<sup>1</sup> РГИА. – Ф. 802. – Оп. 1. – Д. 6810. – Л. 8 об.

<sup>2</sup> Ibidem. – Д. 6827. – Л. 92–92 об. (5 IX 1833).

<sup>3</sup> Ibidem. – Д. 8450 («Ведомость об учителях и учениках Волынской семинарии, 1834–1835»): on the seminary faculty: Л. 1 об. – 10; on the staff of the *uezdnye* and *prikhodskie uchi-lishcha*: Л. 15 об-33. For Innokentii’s complaints about faculty at the seminary in his 1832 report: Д. 6827. – Л. 12 об. – 13.

Finally, the third document selected for this article provides a contrast to the Russifying policies within the training of the future Orthodox clergy in Right Bank Ukraine. Instead, it illustrates impressive pedagogical considerations in the training of confessional norms. After a long rejection of works influenced by Roman Catholic theological thought, the Russian Orthodox Church leadership in the late 1830s returned to the classical Catholic-influenced exposition of the faith by Kyiv Metropolitan Peter Mohyla as an essential text for seminarians. Namely, in 1839, as the *vozsoedinenie* of the Uniates was complete, the Commission for Ecclesiastical Schools asked all Russian Orthodox seminaries to integrate into their curriculum Peter Mohyla's Orthodox Confession of Faith (*Pravoslavnoie ispovedanie very*)<sup>1</sup>. Originally written in 1640, this work had fallen out of favor with the incorporation and long-term predominance of Theofan Prokopovych's Protestant-influenced theology system within seminary courses of study in the eighteenth century<sup>2</sup>. The *Dukhovnyi Reglament* of 1721, moreover, criticized Mohyla's major work as too complex for most priests<sup>3</sup>. It had not been translated from the original Latin into Slavonic until 1696; although that Slavonic version was then periodically published over the 18th century, it was used only as a supplemental text in Russian Orthodox seminaries<sup>4</sup>. The first modern Russian translation was published in 1769 at the Moscow University, but in the 1830s, this work gained new life. The Holy Synod published editions of it in 1830, 1831, 1836, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1843, and so on – in all, 16 editions before the second half of the 19th century<sup>5</sup>. The revival of this text by Orthodox officials and their insistence that seminaries incorporate the work is of itself interesting. This demonstrates some kind of recognition that, regardless of its more “Roman” elements that had been criticized in the eighteenth century, Mohyla's grand summation of the Orthodox faith was a work worthy of study in the seminaries throughout the Russian Empire.

However, that is not all that this *delo* reveals. It also contains correspondence with twenty-two seminaries throughout all of Russia (from central Russian dioceses to some outlying Siberian and northern regions, and including

<sup>1</sup> *Ibidem*. – Ф. 802. – Оп. 2. – Д. 436. – Л. 1. («О порядке преподавания в семинариях чтения Православнаго Исповедания Петра Могилы», 1839–1841). See: *Титлинов В.* Духовная школа в России в XIX столетии. Т. 2. – Вильна, 1908. – С. 129; (mentions this addition to the curriculum with a decree from 1838 (not verified in this document) with no explanation of why this decision was made or any discussion of it.

<sup>2</sup> *Ševčenko I.* The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla // *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*. – 1984. – Vol. 8, no. 1–2. – P. 24; on the Protestant influences in the eighteenth-century Russian Orthodox Church, see: *Ivanov A. V.* Reforming Orthodoxy: Russian Bishops and Their Church 1721–1801. Ph.D. dissertation. – Yale University, 2012.

<sup>3</sup> ПЗС, серия I. – Т. 6, № 3718. – С. 321.

<sup>4</sup> *Знаменский П. В.* Духовные школы России до реформы 1808 года. – СПб., 2001; репринт издания: Казань, 1881. – С. 741–742.

<sup>5</sup> See Russian National Library catalogues.

the seminaries in the western provinces) that provide a rare glimpse into basic pedagogical concerns in the seminaries across the Empire. In general terms, the Commission for Ecclesiastical Schools stated that seminary students should read the *Pravoslavnoie Ispovedanie* “...непрерывно, с кратким объяснением и строгим отчетом, в виде повторения Катихизического учения, и в приготовлении можно было поверять с оным богословие догматическое и нравственное.”<sup>1</sup> Seminaries were instructed to introduce the work into their curriculum in September 1839 and to file a report on how they had taught the work and what methods they had used to assess the students’ mastery of this book’s contents. The Commission then wrote a detailed report on the differing approaches to teaching the text, including when each seminary taught it, how quickly they covered it and in conjunction with what subjects, using what methodology, what forms of reinforcing the students’ understanding, and what assessments. Based on this feedback, the Commission issued further instructions in 1840 on how all seminaries should integrate the book into the seminary curriculum<sup>2</sup>. All in all, this shows a very high level of consideration of pedagogy – above and beyond the usual stereotypes for seminaries in this era.

In their turn, the Volynskaia and Podol’skaia seminaries wrote quite detailed remarks on their experiences teaching Mohyla’s text, which they both completed early in the fall of 1839. The Podol’skaia seminary’s report was one of the most substantive, particularly in demonstrating the interconnections between this text and other theological courses in the seminary curriculum, as well its explication of the parts of the catechism the seminarians learned (by Moscow Metropolitan Filaret [Drozdov]), the decrees of church councils, the teachings of the church fathers, and principles of hermeneutics. In the words of this report:

а) ...[instructors should teach the *Pravoslavnoie Ispovedanie*] замечаниями и объяснениями, в иных местах краткими, а в других (наибольшей важности) довольно пространными, с указанием, к какой части богословского учения принадлежит трактуемый предмет, в каком порядке и объеме будет изложен в нашей системе... Таким образом, предварительно сообщается краткое понятие о правилах толкования, а через сие ученики мало помалу знакомятся с герминевтикою. К изъяснению присовокупляется иногда чтение о том же предмете из Катихизиса преосв. Филарета, а по понедельникам (после обеда) в случае остатка времени от повторения прочитывается по несколько статей из Правил Апостольских, соборных постановлений и учения Отцев Церкви.

б) Когда, в окончание класса, оканчивается чтение из автора (Православного Исповедания), то делается краткое обозрение всего сказанного,

<sup>1</sup> РГИА. – Ф. 802. – Оп. 2. – Д. 436. – Л. 1 (Июнь 1838).

<sup>2</sup> Ibidem. – Л. 39 об. – 44.

а потом заставляются кто-либо из учащихся повторить то же. При начале следующего класса таковое повторение делается с большею полнотою и отчетностью. Особенно требуется точное и верное изучение всех текстов, встретившихся и объясненных в предыдущий класс. Для сего приказано особливо их выписывать и хранить на будущее время, ибо сии же самые тексты имеют встретиться и в самой системе.

в) Чтобы доставить более пользы учащимся, предположено означенную книгу читать неспешно; за всем тем она непременно должна быть кончена к концу трети. А чтобы чрез таковое отнятие целой трети у курса наук богословских не стеснить чтения самой системы, предположено в эту же треть пройти введение в богословское учение, а затем трактаты о естественном богопознании, о недостаточности оногo и необходимости откровенного с присовокуплением трактата о Священном Писании как источнике веры христианской. Чтение сие так распределено, что первая и большая половина класса посвящается на преподавание Православнаго исповедания, а остальное время на преподавание означенных оснований христианства, за прочтением коих (если будет оставаться время) в сию же треть начнется преподавание герминевтики <sup>1</sup>.

The Volynskaia seminary faculty in particular wanted the students to read the appendices to Mohyla's text that contained excerpts of works he referenced, such as those by John of Damascus. Notably, rather than simple rote memorization of key points, the seminarians here were asked to repeat concepts in their own words (пересказыванием своими словами); upper division students had to write essays on concepts from Mohyla's text <sup>2</sup>.

The Commission's final instructions in 1840 prescribed a standardized method of teaching the Pravoslavnoie Ispovedanie based on a review of the approaches used in the twenty-two seminaries that provided reports. The proposed standardized method reflected much of the pedagogy used in the Right Bank Ukrainian seminaries: to read the work from the very start of the first year of seminary in the lower division as a repetition of the catechism and as an introduction to the course of religious study, to compare it with Metropolitan Filaret's catechism and to consult the Scriptural citations, to repeat the important points at the beginning of each class and to examine the students on each part of the confessional explication already covered. Moreover, "отчет состоять должен не в одном только чтении на память выученного текста книги, но в свободном изложении мыслей, без нарушения сущности предмета." The Commission also stipulated that later courses in dogmatic and moral theology in the higher divisions at the seminaries should refer to the relevant sections of the Pravoslavnoie Ispovedanie to renew the memory of the students on the importance of this

<sup>1</sup> РГИА. – Ф. 802. – Оп. 2. – Д. 436. – Л. 20 об–21 об.

<sup>2</sup> Ibidem. – Л. 13 об.

work<sup>1</sup>. Overall, this document demonstrates that despite all the difficulties in financing, staffing, and providing adequate conditions at Orthodox seminaries in the Russian Empire, seminary faculties nevertheless managed to give serious consideration to teaching methods and to strive toward effective student learning. It also reveals that the seminaries in Right Bank Ukraine were at the forefront of the accepted pedagogical methods.

In conclusion, while the first two documents presented here indicate exclusionary tendencies within the Russian Orthodox church (if we consider that the Zhyrovitsy Uniates were aiming toward the ultimate conversion to Orthodoxy) to promote only Russian practices and language, the final document provides the counterpoint of a more inclusive Russian Orthodox educational curriculum that reinstated the signature text of the Ukrainian churchman Peter Mohyla, *Pravoslavnoie Ispovedanie* – criticized for over a century for its Romanist constructs – as a seminal text for teaching Orthodox clergy. On the one hand, the Russian demands for ritual and linguistic conformity in the Orthodox church struggled to eliminate Ukrainian deviations and seemed to depict a clear “us v. them” perspective. On the other hand, at a time when the Empire was suppressing the Uniate Church and restricting the Roman Catholic Church, the Russian Orthodox leadership at long last recognized the usefulness of Mohyla’s more Catholic-influenced elaboration of the tenets of the Orthodox faith, revealing a more complex situation than is usually denoted for the era of Nicholas I. In other words, the situation in Orthodox seminaries in the 1830s largely skewed toward a pro-Russian agenda, and yet there was a pragmatism and professionalism about teaching the Orthodox faith that overlooked the previous criticism of Mohyla’s text and thoughtfully reintroduced it to the Orthodox curriculum. Together, these three documents provide snapshots into the lived experience of clerical education and the challenges faced by the clergymen and seminarians of the era. Each document contributes to our understanding of larger issues at stake in clerical training in the Right Bank at this time: the efficacy of Uniate conversion, the attempted Russification of the Orthodox population, and pedagogical methods to solidify an understanding of the foundations of the Orthodox faith.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibidem. – А. 39о6 – 44 for the final summary of the 22 reports and the instructions issued by the Commission in 1840; А. 52–52 о6. for the copy of the final instructions as sent to the Volynskaia seminary on 14 Oct. 1840; А. 71–72 for the copy sent to the Podol’skaia seminary.