



KYIV-MOHYLA
HUMANITIES JOURNAL

KYIV-MOHYLA SCHOLARLY PEER-REVIEWED JOURNALS

Kyiv Academic Philosophers of the 19th Century: Dialog with Kant about Education

Author(s): Svitlana Kuzmina, Svitlana Avdieieva

Source: Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal 11 (2024): 19–45

Published by: National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy

<http://kmhj.ukma.edu.ua/>

Kyiv Academic Philosophers of the 19th century: Dialogue with Kant about Education

Svitlana Kuzmina, Svitlana Avdieieva

Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University

Abstract

This article attempts to present the dialogue between 19th-century Kyiv academic philosophers and Kant regarding the issues related to the “pedagogical paradox” formulated in his Lectures on Pedagogy.

The main finding is the specific contributions made by Kyiv academics to Kant’s reasoning about education. Such a peculiarity was defined by the educational paradigm based on the requirements of the Charters of the Russian theological academies, which mandated that all philosophical doctrines be considered from the perspective of Orthodox Christian dogma. This approach led to the recognition of the child’s full right to humanity, thereby reinforcing Kant’s postulate on the universal significance of education. Simultaneously, it expanded the possibilities for overcoming the contradiction of the pedagogical paradox, allowing Kyiv academic philosophers to pose a fundamental question about how to create a space of freedom in education.

By acknowledging the capacity for moral freedom as inherent in the child’s nature, the strategic logic of pedagogical interaction in the reasoning of Kyiv academics shifted from Kant’s “active expectation” – where the child intellectually matures to understand moral ideas – to a logic of “interactive support,” where educators assist the child in realizing their personhood through accessible forms of moral activity. Consequently, within the context of these discussions, the theme of pedagogical creativity emerged prominently in the Kyiv philosophical and pedagogical discourse of the 19th century, underscoring the impossibility of standard solutions in a field where freedom and necessity are constantly negotiated.

Key Words: Kyiv academic philosophy, history of philosophy, philosophy of education, Kant’s anthropology, Pamfil Yurkevych, Markellin Olesnytskyi, Kyiv Theological Academy, St. Vladimir’s University.



Introduction

The 300th anniversary of Immanuel Kant has proved to be a powerful stimulus for conducting new research into the legacy of the great philosopher, as well as for reflecting on his influence on culture at both the global and national levels. Kant’s works continue to be actively translated, read, researched, discussed, and cited.¹ The interest in the German classic thinker remains high, with influential academic centers

1 Gisela Schlüter, “Einleitung,” in *Kants Schriften in Übersetzungen*, ed. Gisela Schlüter, Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte Sonderheft 15 (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2020), 11–30.

publishing or preparing new academic editions of his works for the anniversary,² and universities creating impressive-scale online projects, such as the Manchester University portal “Kant in the classroom.”³

Research societies and student audiences actively study not only Kant’s canonical works but also the lectures of the eminent professor, which essentially consist of publications of notes and summaries made by students of the University of Königsberg. In particular, over the past two decades, the popularity of Kant’s *Lectures on Pedagogy* has significantly increased. They have been translated into sixteen languages in addition to the existing more than thirty foreign-language translations.⁴ There is evidence that Kant’s pedagogical ideas continue to be relevant for educators around the whole world.

In the meantime, in modern Ukraine, signs of research interest in Kant’s pedagogical legacy are difficult to find. *Lectures on Pedagogy* by the famous professor have not yet been translated into Ukrainian, and publications offering philosophical analysis of his pedagogical doctrine remain sporadic.⁵

However, this does not mean that for Ukrainian philosophical culture, Kant’s pedagogy is an entirely *terra incognita*. From a historical perspective, such a situation is impossible, at least because Kant’s philosophy constituted one of the fundamental principles of a powerful academic tradition that emerged in the 19th century at the Kyiv Theological Academy and St. Vladimir’s University. As indicated in studies⁶, there

-
- 2 Immanuel Kant, “Anthropology, History, and Education,” in *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant*, ed. by Robert B. Loudon, Günter Zöllner (Cambridge: University Press, 2007).
 - 3 Steve Naragon, “Internet Resources for Translating Kant,” in *Kants Schriften in Übersetzungen*, ed. Gisela Schlüter, Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte Sonderheft 15 (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2020), 305–21.
 - 4 Jochen Laub and Thomas Mikhail, “Kant’s Lectures on Pedagogy on World Tour,” *Global Education Review* 10 (1-2) (2023): 157–71.
 - 5 Victor Kozlovskiy, “Pedahohika u svitli moralnoi antropohii Kanta” [“Pedagogy in the Light of Kant’s Moral Anthropology”], *Filosofiya osvity* 1 (2015): 183–96.
 - 6 Maryna Tkachuk, “Yak vyvchaly istoriu filosofii v Kyivskii dukhovnii akademii 19 – pochatku 20 stolittia” [“How the History of Philosophy was Studied at the Kyiv Theological Academy in the 19th and early 20th Century”], *Magisterium: istoriko-filosofski studii* 9 (2002): 35–51; Maryna Tkachuk, “Yak vyvchaly istoriiu filosofii v Universyteti Sv. Volodymyra” [“How the History of Philosophy was Studied at the St. Vladimir University”], *Magisterium: istoriko-filosofski studii* 13 (2004): 65–74; Maryna Tkachuk, “Filosofia v Kyivskii dukhovnii akademii: osvithnii aspekt” [“Philosophy in the Kyiv Theological Academy: educational aspect”], in *Filosofska osvita v Ukraini: istoriia i suchasnist* [Philosophical Education in Ukraine: History and Present], edited by Maryna Tkachuk (Kyiv: Ahrar Media Hrup, 2011), 66–94; Maryna Tkachuk, “Universytet Sv. Volodymyra v istorii vitchyzniansoi filosofskoi osvity” [“St. Volodymyr’s University in the History of Ukrainian Philosophical Education”], in *Filosofska osvita v Ukraini: istoriia i suchasnist* [Philosophical Education in Ukraine: History and Present], edited by Maryna Tkachuk (Kyiv: Ahrar Media Hrup, 2011), 126–56.

were primarily institutional prerequisites for this. Specifically, the requirement in regulatory documents to thoroughly study the history of philosophy with a special focus on Platonism and German idealism, in which Kant was considered the most influential figure. Therefore, it is quite natural that in the Kyiv academia, Kantian issues were the subject of constant study by both professors and students. As evidenced by publications of recent decades, the range of interest among Kyiv academics in Kant's philosophy was wide, from epistemology and moral teachings to social philosophy and philosophy of religion.⁷ However, the question regarding Kant's influence on the philosophical-pedagogical discourse in the academic environment of 19th century Kyiv still remains unanswered.

Meanwhile, the experience of reading Kant's pedagogical concept by Kyiv academicians could be a contributing factor to the awareness of the originality of a way of thinking which was, without doubt, formed within the limits of Russian imperial culture but, at the same time, reflected local intellectual and spiritual focuses different from those of the metropolis. This local originality might be particularly interesting from the point of view of the necessity to find ways to include the intellectual heritage of the colonial period into contemporary Ukraine identity construction.

The purpose of this paper is to clarify the idea-shaping importance of, and to explore what pedagogical meanings can be attributed to Kant's *Lectures on Pedagogy* and his philosophical system as a whole in the philosophy of education within Kyiv academic tradition of the 19th century. Additionally, this study aims to address the following question: how were the basic ideas and categories of Kant's *Lectures on Pedagogy*, as well as educational issues connected with his anthropology and moral philosophy, perceived and reinterpreted in Kyiv academic tradition of the 19th century? The research data in this investigation is derived from Kyiv academic philosophers' publications and manuscripts on pedagogical issues and the history of education.

7 Maryna Tkachuk, "Kantoznavchi studii u Kyivskii akademichnii filosofii 19 – pochatku 20 stolittia" ["Kant Studies in Kyiv Academic Philosophy of 19th and early 20th centuries"], *Collegium* 11 (2001): 103–19; Maryna Tkachuk, "Handwritten Candidate Works of Kyiv Theological Academy Students as Sources for Studying the Academy's Philosophical Heritage," *Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal* 6 (2019): 29–30; Maryna Tkachuk, "Filosofska problematyka v rukopysnykh kandydatskykh tvorakh studentiv Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii (1819–1924)" ["Philosophical Issues in Handwritten Candidate Works of Kyiv Theological Academy Students (1819–1924)"], *Sententiae* 38, no. 2 (2019): 23, 25–9; Victor Kozlovskiy, "Interpretatsiia Petrom Linytskym kantivskoi idei pro intelihibelnu ta empirychnu pryrodu liudyny" ["Peter Linitsky's Interpretation of Kant's Idea about Intelligible and Empirical Human Nature"], *Naukovi zapysky NaUKMA. Filosofiya ta relihiieznavstvo* 76 (2008): 43–8; Victor Kozlovskiy, "Kantivski 'paralohizmy chystoho rozumu' v intelektualnii atmosferi Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii 19 – pochatku 20 stolit' ["Kant's 'Paralogisms of Pure Reason' in the Intellectual Atmosphere of Kyiv Theological Academy of 19th and early 20th centuries," *Filosofska dumka* 6 (2008): 59–83; Thomas Nemeth, *Kant in Imperial Russia* (New York: Jordan Center for the Advanced Study of Russia, 2017).

The design of the study is framed by the key ideas of a cultural approach, which involves the application of hermeneutic procedures combined with tools of comparative analysis. On this methodological basis, the historical-philosophical narrative is constructed through interpretations and comparisons within the context of the cultural-historical peculiarities of both sides of the philosophical dialogue.

“The Pedagogical Paradox” in Kant’s Philosophy

When discussing the central figure of the dialogue – Kant, a large body of modern research is devoted to his so-called “pedagogical paradox,” which consists of the following:

One of the biggest problems of education is how one can unite submission under lawful constraint with the capacity to use one’s freedom. For constraint is necessary. How do I cultivate freedom under constraint? I shall accustom my pupil to tolerate the constraint of his freedom, and I shall at the same time lead him to make good use of his freedom.⁸

The key contradiction that forms this paradox lies, on the one hand, in Kant’s complete disagreement with Rousseau’s recognition of the child’s nature as fundamentally good. The German philosopher asserts that human nature is radically corrupted by sin and that children have an inherent inclination towards evil, and that from birth they are in a “state of nature” or “state of savagery.”⁹ On the other hand, in Kant’s moral anthropology, the idea of a person as a free individual who acts by consciously choosing good is manifested. Therefore, it turns out to be paradoxical that Kant considers it possible to lead a person to an understanding of the ideas of reason and the capacity for freedom as a result of taming “wild impulses,” disciplining, and cultivating animal nature, that is, through coercion. However, among contemporary Kant scholars, there are researchers who argue that this contradiction is apparent because Kant developed moral philosophy and the philosophy of education within different theoretical paradigms: namely, a teleological notion of human nature and a transcendentalist framework. Nevertheless, the core ideas of Kant’s moral philosophy are also present in his pedagogy, and there is an intrinsic connection between them and Kant’s educational theory.¹⁰

8 Kant, “Anthropology, History, and Education,” 447.

9 Kozlovskiy, “Pedahohika u svitli moralnoi antropolohii Kanta,” 474–82.

10 Melissa McBay Merritt, “Kant on Enlightened Moral Pedagogy,” *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 49, no. 3 (September 2011): 227–53; Johannes Giesinger, “Kant’s Account of Moral Education,” *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 44, no. 7 (2012): 775–86; Yunus Bayrak, “Kant’s View on Education,” *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 174

Modern Kant scholars argue that the “pedagogical paradox” itself contains significant heuristic potential, which has been unlocked in philosophical and pedagogical issues of subsequent times and remains relevant in the philosophy of education today.¹¹ Indeed, from this concise and provocative formulation arise a number of fundamental questions:

What is the specificity of childhood as a unique period of life and a state of being for a person, and is a child a fully-fledged human being?

What is the essence of the idea of education?

– Is a child capable of moral activity, and therefore, of freedom?

– If a child is capable of moral activity, in what forms does it manifest?

The academic philosophers in Kyiv were among those who responded to Kant’s provocation, as the philosophical and pedagogical discourse of this community revolved around issues related to the “pedagogical paradox” of the professor from Königsberg.

The Issue of the Humanity of the Child

The making of academic philosophy in 19th-century Kyiv took place within the environment of a Church-Orthodox institution of higher education, the Kyiv Theological Academy. Therefore, it is quite natural that the key factor in shaping the concept of childhood for Kyiv thinkers was Orthodox Christian dogma. Kant’s anthropology is also based on Christian dogma, but not Orthodox—rather, Protestant. The difference in doctrines about humanity between these two denominations proved to be significant in answering the question of the humanity of the child. Thus, in Catholicism and Protestantism, human nature was considered radically damaged by original sin and the loss of the “graceful gift of righteousness,” which removed the antagonism between the sensual and spiritual principles of human nature. According to this view, reason is a spiritual force that leads a person to Salvation, while the body is a sensual force that leads to eternal damnation. Accordingly, in childhood, when sensual impulses and desires prevail, and the mind has not yet awakened, human nature is perhaps in its most miserable state. According to Kant, this is far from the ideal of humanity: “rather, it is a certain raw state in that the animal in this case has, so

(2015): 271–315; Joris Vlieghe, “In Dangerous Waters: On Language, Freedom and Education,” *Philosophy of Education* 71 (2015): 483–5.

11 Michael Uljens, “The Pedagogical Paradox and the Problem of Subjectivity and Intersubjectivity” (paper presented at Conference: Philosophy of Education Society in Australia (PESA), Claremont, Western Australia, November 30 – December 2, 2001). <https://pesa.org.au/images/papers/2001-papers/uljens-michael-subjectivity.pdf>; Lars Løvlie, “Does Paradox Count in Education?,” *Utbildning & Demokrati* 16, no. 3 (2007): 9–24; Paweł Zieliński, “The Relationships and Differences of the Kantian Philosophy and Pedagogy in Regard to Postmodern Pedagogic,” *Studia Edukacyjne* 48 (2018): 115–32.

to speak, not yet developed the humanity inside itself,” and if “it is allowed to have its own way and is in no way opposed in its youth, then it will retain a certain savagery throughout its life.”¹²

In the Orthodox worldview, where the dogma of the image of God in humans is primary, and the dogma of sin is secondary, such a view of childhood was unacceptable. Therefore, at the very first stage of the formation of the Kyiv academic tradition, ideas that were important for its reinterpretation and criticism were expressed. In particular, Professor Petro Avseniev asserted in his lectures on the “philosophy of the spirit” that in every state and modification in which the soul exists at a specific moment (including age, gender, temperament, talents, character, race, cultural affiliation, physical and mental health, etc.), its idea or essence is always revealed.¹³ Thus, childhood, even with undeveloped self-awareness, is not a “state of savagery” or a life without law. According to P. Avseniev, the spiritual needs inherent in the adult soul to seek truth, contemplate beauty, and act freely are also inherent in the child’s soul, but they manifest in specific qualities and forms. Ivan Skvortsov also emphasizes that the “beginning of freedom” and the “moral law” with all its components – love for good, truth, and beauty – are ontological attributes of human nature that neither educators nor the social environment can give or take away.¹⁴ Therefore, we must consider a child, like an adult, as a human being.

The academic philosophers of the next generation, who actually began lecturing on pedagogy in Kyiv, adhered to similar positions. Pamfil Yurkevych also considered the phenomenon of childhood as a philosophical and pedagogical problem. Speculating on “to what extent the characteristic features of true humanity are inherent in this age,”¹⁵ he sought to outline the general spiritual image of a child. Studying the history

12 Kant, “Anthropology, History, and Education,” 438.

13 Petr Avsenev, “Iz zapisok po psikhologii” [“From the Notes on Psychology”], in *Sbornik iz lektzii byvshikh professorov Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii arkhimandrita Innokentii, protoiereia I. M. Skvortsova, P. S. Avseneva (arkhimandrita Feofana) i Ia. K. Amfiteatrova, izdannyi akademieiu po sluchaiu piatidesiatiletnego iubileia (1819–1869) eia* [The Collection of Lectures by Archimandrite Innokentii, Archpriest Ivan Skvortsov, PetroAvseniev (Archimandrite Feofan) and Yakiv Amfiteatrov, the Former Professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy, Published by the Academy on the Occasion of its 50th Anniversary (1819–1869)], pagination III (Kyiv: Tipografia Gubernskogo upravleniia, 1869), 75.

14 Ioann Skvortsov, “Zapiski po npravstvennoy filosofii protoiereya Ioanna Skvortsova” [“Notes on Moral Philosophy by Archpriest Ioann Skvortsov”], in *Sbornik iz lektzii byvshikh professorov Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii arkhimandrita Innokentii, protoiereia I. M. Skvortsova, P. S. Avseneva (arkhimandrita Feofana) i Ia. K. Amfiteatrova, izdannyi akademieiu po sluchaiu piatidesiatiletnego iubileia (1819–1869) eia* [The Collection of Lectures by Archimandrite Innokentii, Archpriest Ivan Skvortsov, PetroAvseniev (Archimandrite Feofan) and Yakiv Amfiteatrov, the Former Professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy, Published by the Academy on the Occasion of its 50th Anniversary (1819–1869)], pagination II (Kyiv: Tipografia Gubernskogo upravleniia, 1869), 5.

15 Pamfil Yurkevich, “Plan i sily dlya pervonachalnoy shkoly” [“Plan and Resources for the Elementary School”], *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniya* 3 (1870): 3.

of pedagogical thought, the thinker concludes that every theory of education begins with the question of good and evil in the child's soul. In the debate on this matter with Rousseau, Yurkevych takes the side of Kant.¹⁶ At the same time, he disagrees with the German philosopher in believing that a child is governed by "wild sensuality" that must be strictly subdued. Life, claims the Kyiv professor, is governed by the spirit, and the tasks that a child solves at each stage of their age-related development are spiritual. Overall, he notes, there is always something present in the human soul that resembles the calculated function of "the work of supererogation of saints" according to the Catholic formula, or more precisely, the means and forces "so to speak, redundant for the purposes of sensual self-preservation."¹⁷

Appealing to this fact, Yurkevych, similarly to Kant in *Lectures on Pedagogy*,¹⁸ attempts to answer the question of why a human being, in order to become an adult, must undergo a longer process of development than an animal. Thus, a newborn does not possess the necessary instincts for rapid adaptation to the natural environment, as its main task is to internalize images and to live in the realm of thoughts rather than things. The fact that this internal work indeed takes place, and that it is truly spiritual, confirms the fact that children's interest lies only in realizing their own thoughts, whims, and fantasies, rather than in useful results. This very "restraint" of the newborn's strength, Yurkevych believes, is redundant for organic development but crucial for the formation of the spirit, as it restrains the child's willful impulses and directs their focus towards internal life, allowing their mind to mature and strengthen. Communication seems superfluous and incidental to the physical survival of the infant. However, according to Yurkevych, it is precisely communication, and nothing else, that contributes to spiritual development, as only through the mediation of the mother can an orderly, culturally and socially processed influence from the external world be provided to the "ideal being" – the human spirit.¹⁹

Only to the "superfluous forces," emphasizes the philosopher, can we attribute the fact that a child inevitably goes through a mythological stage of consciousness development with its inherent love for the common good. Even inanimate objects are perceived as spiritualized by the child, imbued with qualities that it finds within itself. The living needs of a loving heart, not yet cooled by experience, compel the child to see things not as they are, but as they might be if everything in the world felt complete

16 Edward Franklin Buchner, transl. and ed., *The Educational Theory of Immanuel Kant* (Philadelphia/London: J.B. Lippincott company, 1904), 25–8.

17 Pamfil Yurkevych, "Z nauky pro liudskyi dukh" ["From the Science of the Human Spirit"], in *Vybrane [Selected Works]* (Kyiv: Abrys, 1993), 209.

18 Kant, "Anthropology, History, and Education," 437–8.

19 Pamfil Yurkevich, *Sovershenstva i nedostatki dushevnoy zhizni v zavisimosti ot osobennostey telesnoy organizatsii [The Perfections and Imperfections of Mental Life Depending on the Characteristics of Bodily Organization]*, 1867, DA 335 L, no. 7, 5. Fond 301. Tserkovno arkheolohichniy muzei Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii [Church and Archaeological Museum of the Kyiv Theological Academy]. Manuscript Institute of the V. I. Vernadskyi National Library, Kyiv.

happiness. As a result of this profound need, the infant neither wants nor knows how to separate its individuality from the family community, and its morality consists of the customs of this community, while its knowledge is derived from the authority of elders.²⁰

In essence, childhood, for the philosopher, represents a prototype, a manifestation of the spiritual ideal, epitomized by Christian sanctity. Analogous to saints, children exhibit a proclivity towards ideal sentiments – “a wholly sincere compassion for a conceivable entity, rejoicing or grieving for it,” reflecting a concern for the entirety of existence rather than individual interests.²¹

In the cognition and activity of the child, Yurkevych also identifies signs of the presence of “superfluous,” unnecessary for an animal existence, spiritual forces. However, they manifest themselves not as directly as feelings. For example, he considers children’s mobility to be a manifestation of spirituality, as “a separate circle of thoughts and fantasies” does not hold their attention for long. Mobility, as emphasized by the Kyiv scholar, makes the child an unbiased “observer of the world,” similar to a scientist who adheres to the basic rule of science: “Whatever is worthy of being, is worthy of being known.” As a second sign of a child’s spirituality, Yurkevych considers variability, and at the same time, integrity – the ability to easily and quickly transition from one thought to another, from one feeling to another, from thought to desire, and from desire to action. In this quality, the thinker sees the possibility of accumulating diverse experience, as the child becomes acquainted with things and their own psychological states, without which the child would forever remain outside of education and culture.²² The third spiritual characteristic of a child is the elemental empiricism inherent in concrete thinking, when “reliance is placed on sensibility as a revelation of all that is true.”²³ The general qualities of the child’s interaction with the world lie in the dominance of images over thoughts, the dominance of the laws of association of ideas over the laws of reason, the authority of adults over the internal authority of ideas, shyness over conscience, imitation over self-activity, and the priority given to everything new over the familiar, the striking, and the vital over the true, and the aesthetic over the good.²⁴ Together, these qualities constitute the prototype of moral activity. The distinction between this prototype and the ethical ideal lies in the insufficient understanding of higher moral ideas, confined within the bounds of empiricism. Thus, by delineating the characteristics of childhood, Yurkevych seems to caution that a child, per se, cannot realize the potential of human spiritual nature. A child’s ideal feelings, if not supplemented and clarified by “theoretical thoughts about the world, its foundation, and purpose,” will remain

20 Yurkevych, “Z nauky pro liudskyi dukh,” 207.

21 Ibid., 210.

22 Pamfil Yurkevich, *Kurs obshchei pedagogiki s prilozheniyami* [Course of General Pedagogy with Appendices] (Moscow: Tipografiia Gracheva i K, 1869), 46–7.

23 Ibid., 48.

24 Ibid., 50–1.

unconscious and will not transform into a need to embody truth in actions or to manifest the theoretically true in the morally good.²⁵

All of this helps to understand how the philosopher viewed the coexistence of good and evil in childhood. In accordance with Orthodox dogma, he asserted that “good is an eternal principle of the spirit,” and, in this sense, a child is no exception. Evil, on the other hand, is rooted not in any part of human nature but is a “condition, position, fact,” moreover, a fact not pure when there is not yet actualization, only potentiality and propensity.²⁶ “This evil, this shadow,” Yurkevych believes, “appears when the light of reason disappears,” and moral ideas dim and vanish from consciousness.²⁷ Therefore, a child’s inclination toward evil can be explained as an inability to understand moral ideas and, consequently, to properly evaluate their desires and wishes, choosing between them as motives for action. Thus, the essence and task of education, according to Yurkevich, can be defined, as Kant did, as making a child disciplined, cultivated, prudent, civilized, and moral step by step.²⁸

However, this did not happen, as Yurkevych would thereby contradict his conviction that spiritual life is born “in the darkness and obscurity” of the depths of the heart, and the soul lives according to the moral law given by God, initially not even realizing it.²⁹ Thus, inclinations and aspirations toward moral activity are inherent qualities of the child, which sin and selfishness cannot fully dim.³⁰ As a result, there is always the possibility of educational influence on them. Yurkevych emphasizes that from birth, a child inherently loves goodness, desires goodness, and does goodness. There is only one obstacle: they do not know how to find, see, or develop goodness within themselves. Therefore, “as soon as we forget the idea of the natural human being” – meaning the Rousseauist postulate that the nature of the child is “radically good,” and if left unhindered, will naturally develop its morality – education that directs them towards goodness helps develop moral character, ceasing to be “something beyond or alongside nature and instead becoming a natural environment for children, like water for fish.”³¹

Markellin Olesnytskyi views the specialized understanding of childhood as a crucial condition for the development of philosophical-pedagogical science, as “if each

25 Yurkevych, “Z nauky pro liudskiy dukh,” 211.

26 Pamfil Yurkevich, *Chteniya o vospitanii s programmoi 1866 g.* [Readings on Education with a Program of 1866]. 1866. DA 354 L (Muz. 818v), no. 1, 89. Fond 301. Tserkovno arkheolohichnyi muzei Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii [Church and Archaeological Museum of the Kyiv Theological Academy]. Manuscript Institute of the V. I. Vernadskyi National Library, Kyiv.

27 Ibid.

28 Kant, “Anthropology, History, and Education,” 444.

29 Pamfil Yurkevich, “Sertse ta yoho znachennia u dukhovnomu zhytti liudyny, zghidno z uchenniam slova Bozhoho” [“The Heart and Its Significance in Human Spiritual Life According to the Teaching of the God’s Word], in *Vybrane [Selected Works]* (Kyiv: Abrys, 1993), 95.

30 Ibid., 111.

31 Pamfil Yurkevich, *Chteniya o vospitanii s programmoi 1866 g.*, 89.

age of a person has its psychophysical specificity, then the nature of childhood all the more so has its own characteristics compared to the nature of an adult.”³² The philosopher attempts to examine the development of a child within the paradigm of the unity of soul and body, which postulates the possibility of the genesis of a living organism or an individual due to the presence of the soul as a “vital force” or an internal cause – a tendency toward self-creation. At the same time, he emphasizes that an individual, to ensure their livelihood, requires interaction with the environment. This fully applies to humans, who, being dependent on the environment, evolve under the influence of physical and social factors.³³ However, as Olesnytskyi argues, their purpose is also to live and act freely, not by animal instinct, but by intelligently managing themselves to form a specific spiritual image or a strong mental type.³⁴

To reconcile this, the philosopher believes that “by development,” one should understand both the disclosure of what is inherent in the soul from the beginning and the changes under the influence of external factors. It is perhaps not coincidental that a person is born extremely helpless, with indeterminacy and plasticity in their inner being. “The soul in its primordial state,” the philosopher asserts, “should be conceived as a power for creating certain products, rather than as the products themselves.”³⁵ Nevertheless, one must also consider the fact that the souls of all people unfold and manifest themselves outwardly in roughly the same way. Therefore, it can be assumed that there are some *a priori* forms of their development. Everything that appears later, the philosopher insists, must have been fundamentally laid down from the beginning. Thus, “the primordial psychic force should be conceived as an as yet undeveloped reason, which... is primarily directed towards sensibility.”³⁶ However, outwardly, despite the fact that the development of the human personality is determined by spiritual factors, according to Olesnytskyi, the child, both physically and spiritually, represents “a complex of impulses and needs” that manifest themselves in a flow of emotions under the guise of various desires, whims, excitements, and mischiefs.³⁷

Certainly, it is crucial to discern in this confusion the intrinsic urge of the child to fulfill their human destiny.³⁸ How does this urge manifest itself? Olesnytskyi identifies a whole range of signs of a child’s humanity, among which are spiritual sensitivity, an extraordinary ability to discern the mood of adults, to understand the emotional tone of their relationships, as well as a powerful need for activity, and a drive to interact with the world, to see through the essence of things, and to transform

32 Markellin Olesnitskiy, *Kurs pedagogiki: rukovodstvo dlya zhenskikh institutov i gimnaziy s dvukhgodovym kursom pedagogiki* [Course of Pedagogy: Guide for Women’s Institutes and Gymnasiums with a Two-Year Course of Pedagogy], vol. 1 (Kyiv: Tipografia G. T. Korchak-Novitskogo, 1886), 19.

33 Ibid., 50–2.

34 Ibid., 59–61.

35 Ibid., 66.

36 Ibid., 67.

37 Ibid., 305.

38 Ibid., 55.

them.³⁹ However, he considers the integrity and unity of a child's life to be even more important than these aforementioned qualities. In the child, as in a bud, all forces are still merged into one harmonious whole, without opposing each other, and the body, soul, mind, and feelings remain in harmony, not clashing with each other. Internally, childhood lives by what German educators called *Gemüt*,⁴⁰ which denotes a state of blissful concentration in contemplating the "closed sanctuary of human spirit life."⁴¹ Indeed, while the child may seem extraordinarily receptive to external and new impressions, appearing wholly absorbed by them, important processes of developing creative forces are occurring in the depths of their subjective spirit.

Olesnytskyi reverently regards this primal virtue of the child as an ideal. "At the pinnacle of education," he emphasizes, "the child, in the unity and harmony of their psychic forces, corresponds entirely to the ultimate goal of education, which is to perfect all the human faculties and unite them into a single harmonious whole."⁴² The distinction lies only in the fact that the integrity of the child's personality is currently purely natural, immediate, and not permeated with self-awareness and freedom as specific principles of spiritual-moral life.⁴³ This is especially noticeable in the qualities of the child's conscience: sensitive, sincere, yet at the same time naive, inexperienced in distinguishing right from wrong, and good from bad.⁴⁴ Thus, it is not in vain that adults love children so much. What attracts them is not so much their touching helplessness, but the natural beauty of the soul, to which, as Olesnytskyi reminds us, Christ the Savior Himself drew attention.⁴⁵

However, just as the entire world is imperfect, so too is the nature of the child not without its shortcomings and flaws. Differentiating them into individual and general categories, the thinker agrees with Kant that there is a radical evil in human beings – original sin, which manifests itself in "wild caprice and rude obstinacy."⁴⁶ Therefore, the question of priority in education will always remain relevant: whether to make efforts to develop the positive side of the child's soul or to strengthen the child's will in the struggle against the dark forces of their being.

As we have seen, the "philosophy of childhood" of the 19th century Kyiv academics was shaped under the evident influence of Kant's *Lectures on Pedagogy*. Central to it was the issue of the humanity of the child's nature, the main feature of which is morality. Can a child be considered a moral being at all? How does spirituality manifest itself in them? Naturally, addressing these questions, both Yurkevych, and Olesnytskyi could not bypass the problem of original sin. They resolved this issue on the basis of the dogma of Orthodox Christianity. The concept of childhood developed by the Kyiv

39 Ibid., 57–8, 108, 209.

40 Ibid., 107.

41 Ibid., 105–6.

42 Ibid., 108.

43 Ibid.

44 Ibid., 326–7.

45 Ibid., 109.

46 Ibid., 109–10.

academic philosophers organically combined not only elements of a worldview-scientific synthesis but also religious-aesthetic contemplation, marked by admiration for the beauty and grace of childhood, in which the ideal of humanity was revealed to them. At the same time, what united the Kyiv academic philosophers with Kant was the belief that as a child develops, they require support and guidance, and the understanding of childhood must be inseparably linked to the idea of education.

Idea of Education

In the Kyiv academia of the 19th century, education was primarily understood as being inspired by higher ideals of serving the common good.

Olesnytskyi defines the idea of education as “the deliberate and systematic influence of mature individuals on younger and immature ones to help them become capable of independently achieving their purpose.”⁴⁷ According to Olesnytskyi, this idea arises from recognizing the contradiction that, while a child is capable of developing traits aligned with a certain ideal, their weakness and helplessness prevent them from doing so independently, thus requiring external assistance.⁴⁸ However, this contradiction cannot be resolved unless one relies on consistent ethical teaching, which clearly distinguishes between the idea and reality, the present state of the human being, and the moral ideal.⁴⁹ Therefore, the idea of education is a product of philosophical thought that seeks to comprehend the essence of the moral spirit of humanity and the conditions of its development, combining the “proper” and the “existent.” At the same time, pedagogical activity aimed at promoting the development of the child in accordance with the requirements of reason, and thus revealing their human essence, propels humanity along the path of cultural progress.⁵⁰

The connection between these reflections by Olesnytskyi and the considerations presented in Kant’s *Lectures on Pedagogy* is quite evident. Kyiv philosophers completely agree with the great importance of the principle that “children should be educated not only with regard to the present but rather for a better condition of the human species that might be possible in the future; that is, in a manner appropriate to the idea of humanity and its complete vocation,” as well as the belief that parents ought to educate their children “better, so that a future, better condition may thereby be brought forth.”⁵¹

Without a doubt, Kant’s formulations were appealing due to their humanism, emphasizing that the highest value for educators should be the child themselves as the embodiment of the future of humanity, with the needs of the family and the interests

47 Ibid., 54–5.

48 Ibid., 18.

49 Markellin Olesnitskiy, *Istoriya npravstvennosti i npravstvennykh ucheniy [History of Morality and Moral Doctrines]*, vol. 1 (Kyiv: Tipografia G. T. Korchak-Novitskogo, 1882), 26.

50 Olesnitskiy, *Kurs pedagogiki*, vol. 1, 23.

51 Kant, “Anthropology, History, and Education,” 442.

of the state following thereafter. Instead, Yurkevych, in dialogue with Kant, draws attention to the fact that the primary nourishing soil for the roots of this conviction is not the philosophy of humanism but Christianity. It is the evangelical doctrine of “the rebirth, the renewal of man in the entire family of humanity...” that, he emphasizes, “opens up to the educator, to what extent, why, and under what conditions they can hope for success in their endeavors.”⁵²

The idea of education, he asserts in the spirit of Platonism, has clear signs of “an objective actor who cares for the origin and formation of phenomena... reality.”⁵³ Nothing, other than the idea of education can explain why a child, being born into the world as a helpless being, is only capable of fulfilling its purpose – to develop moral, intellectual, and creative faculties – with the help of other people, in order to resemble God and attain eternal life.⁵⁴

The idea of education also emerges as a fact of universal human consciousness: that “through the educational influence of others, a person achieves their goal, and this deliberate influence is subject to principles and laws – this has always been recognized by nations.”⁵⁵ The idea of education, which unites generations of parents and children in a bond of love, allows us to grasp the complete image of humanity in harmony and fullness.⁵⁶ Within this idea are concentrated the highest values that constitute the essence of the moral worldview.⁵⁷

As we can see, Yurkevych associates with the idea of education something much higher than just cultural activity. “According to Christian beliefs,” he notes, “the upbringing of children is a service to all of humanity and humanity itself.”⁵⁸ By equating pedagogical service with priestly and royal avocations, aimed at promoting the spiritual progress of humanity and preserving and strengthening moral ideas,⁵⁹ the Kyiv thinker significantly raises the level of emotional tension in emphasizing the significance of the idea of education in comparison to Kant.

Freedom in Education

The issue of freedom in education arises as an organic consequence of Kant’s understanding of human nature. In *Lectures on Pedagogy*, he indicates: “Now, by

52 Yurkevich, *Kurs obshchei pedagogiki*, 41–2.

53 Pamfil Yurkevich, “Ideia” [“Idea”], in *Vybrane [Selected Works]* (Kyiv: Abrys, 1993), 5.

54 Yurkevich, *Kurs obshchei pedagogiki*, 49.

55 Yurkevich, *Metodyka [Methodology]*, 1872, DA 354 L (Muz. 818v), no. 4, 1. Fond 301. Tserkovno arkheolohichni muzei Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii [Church and Archaeological Museum of the Kyiv Theological Academy]. Manuscript Institute of the V. I. Vernadskyi National Library, Kyiv.

56 Yurkevich, “Ideia,” 7; Pamfil Yurkevich, *Chteniya o vospitanii [Readings on Education]* (Moscow: Izdatelstvo Chepelevskogo, 1865), 4.

57 Yurkevich, *Kurs obshchei pedagogiki*, V.

58 *Ibid.*, 5.

59 *Ibid.*, 41.

nature, the human being has such a powerful propensity towards freedom that, when he has grown accustomed to it for a while, he will sacrifice everything for it.”⁶⁰ At the same time, in seeking ways to resolve the pedagogical paradox, the German philosopher develops a strategy of pedagogical interaction that stems from his conceptions of the child and childhood and is akin to “active waiting” or “symptomatic treatment.” According to this logic, harmful manifestations of illness should be minimized to the greatest extent possible, while signs of recovery should be supported and strengthened. Following Kant’s directives, during this active waiting, while the child develops the capacity for moral freedom, i.e., during the period of upbringing, it is necessary to minimize dangerous actions and behavior, and instead cultivate the germs of prudence and higher rationality through care, discipline, training, education, and guidance.

For the community of philosophers-academicians in the 19th-century Kyiv, freedom was also an indisputable value. However, within their environment, there were those who generally agreed with Kant’s logic regarding overcoming the contradiction in the pedagogical paradox, and there were those who considered it from a specific perspective.

In this context, Olesnytskyi addresses the issue of harmonizing pedagogical interaction, drawing on Herbartianism, which proposes combining educational discipline and educational management.⁶¹ If discipline, by preserving and restraining, compels the pupil to obedience, then management, relying on authority and love for the educator, sets an example and gently, unobtrusively guides, fostering independent development. Overall, according to Olesnytskyi, discipline should be applied from the birth of the child and gradually limited depending on how obedience becomes voluntary, active, and conscientious. Management, starting later when signs of rational behavior emerge, should prevail towards the end of the educational period.

On the other hand, Yurkevych, convinced that the child is a moral being from birth, is confronted with the question: how to create a space where this being has the opportunity to realize its potential for freedom? Considering the pedagogical paradox, he seeks answers by calculating the correct balance between coercion and granting freedom in pedagogical interaction.

Notably, Yurkevych observes that educational influence always transforms into a general form of demand, as this form not only urges one to exert efforts but also entails making a free choice – either internally agreeing with or resisting the will of the educator.⁶² Pedagogical demands are divided, depending on the situation, into positive and negative, creative and restrictive. Positive and creative demands develop the student and shape good personality traits, while negative and restrictive ones eliminate negative behaviors.⁶³ In light of this, education simultaneously creates both a space of freedom and its moral boundaries through coercion to obey. Yurkevych understands

60 Kant, “Anthropology, History, and Education,” 438.

61 Olesnitskiy, *Kurs pedagogiki*, vol. 2, 301.

62 Yurkevich, *Kurs obshchei pedagogiki*, 89–90.

63 *Ibid.*, 87.

well that compulsion can traumatize a child, destroying the entire web of pedagogical relationships. However, he also recognizes the necessity of using authority with the pupil when their behavior becomes dangerous or immoral. At such moments, the child needs to be encouraged to focus on themselves, to realize the meaning of their actions, and, however painful it may be, to evaluate them, gaining valuable experience in distinguishing between good and evil not from external pressures but through inner reflection. Without this, the child will not become completely free and will not make conscious choices for good, no matter how wonderful the content of their activities may be. Therefore, restrictive measures in education are a necessary addition to the creative development of the individual.⁶⁴ Yurkevych notes that it is important for the child to feel their freedom, so educational demands should primarily encourage rather than restrain autonomy while leaving room for risk-taking, testing one's own strengths, and self-management.⁶⁵ Indeed, this raises the question of how to organically combine within the inner life of the child a sense of independence from the external world with the desire for self-improvement, freeing themselves from contradictions and the passions of their own being.

Contemplating how to reconcile positive and negative educational measures, Yurkevych concurs with Johann Herbart that the exertion of authority will be pedagogically effective under several specific conditions. The first is a "strong moral alliance," where the "best qualities of the student's personality are aligned with those of the educator," meaning they adhere to the same value system. The second condition is natural harmony – the "bright mood of the child's soul," the loss of which "narrows, restricts, and biases consciousness" and gives rise to a sense of psychological discomfort.⁶⁶ If, as Yurkevych emphasized, the educator has authority and is loved, if there is justice in the "inner republic of the child's soul" and a sense of genuine trust in the world, then the educational limitations and prohibitions will be interpreted by the child as beneficial, serving as incentives for their own improvement. Otherwise, all demands, instructions, and punishments will lose any pedagogical meaning, transforming into violence.

In the ideal scenario, the philosopher believes, negative educational measures should exclusively have a protective nature, indicating the limits of the child's empirical freedom, without which they will never develop perfect forms of life and activity.⁶⁷

64 Ibid.

65 Pamfil Yurkevich, *Programma pedagogiki dlya dukhovnykh seminarii* [Pedagogy Program for Theological Seminaries], 1867, DA 354 L (Muz. 818v), no. 1, 4. Fond 301. Tserkovno arkheolohichniy muzei Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii [Church and Archaeological Museum of the Kyiv Theological Academy]. Manuscript Institute of the V. I. Vernadskyi National Library, Kyiv.

66 Jogan Gerbart, "Obshchaya pedagogika, vyvedennaya iz tseli vospitaniya" ["General Pedagogy Derived from the Purpose of Education"], in *Izbrannye pedagogicheskie sochineniya*, vol. 1, ed. G. P. Veysberg (Moscow: Uchpedgiz, 1940), 162–6; Yurkevich, *Kurs obshchei pedagogiki*, 88–9.

67 Yurkevich, *Kurs obshchei pedagogiki*, 88–9.

However, no theory can instruct the educator on how to create an educational environment with as few prohibitions, threats, and punishments as possible. In general, according to Yurkevych's convictions, the moral mood of an individual is not shaped by formal relations of power and subordination, but by an atmosphere of love, friendship, serious attention, and genuine respect, the creation of which indeed defies any universal recommendations. It is the result of creativity, an expression of a brightly Christian worldview, and the art of moral self-improvement by the educator.⁶⁸

Indeed, Yurkevych finds a clue for exploring another way of creating a space for freedom in education in Beneke's postulate that the human psyche becomes aware of itself not through changing psychological states of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, but through interaction with the environment. From this, the German thinker concludes that in educational interaction, it is psychologically justified and expedient to focus the center of the child's personality primarily on activity. However, mere activity is insufficient for moral development. True moral education will occur when activity is guided not by selfish motives, but by a higher norm that is independent of psychological states. Such a norm for a child typically involves a certain order of actions and occupations. The child does not rush to entertainments that are not intended for them, patiently endures constraints, and, if difficulties arise, finds a way out that does not violate established rules.⁶⁹ It is only necessary that these actions correspond to the logic of moral development in humanity.

So, another way to resolve the pedagogical paradox is to consider, in pedagogical requirements, the forms of moral activity that are accessible to the child in proportion to their maturation.

According to Yurkevych, true morality arises from overcoming one's own willfulness, beginning with the earliest self-sacrifices for the sake of love for the good. Individuals achieve this by "internally assimilating the general will with its morally perfect content," thereby forming an important psychological disposition – "a tendency to view oneself as an outsider" and to evaluate oneself as others do, which constitutes the precondition for the main Christian virtue – love for one's neighbor as oneself.⁷⁰ The conviction held by the Kyiv academicians was that all the rudiments are laid in the soul of a child so that their development proceeds in this direction. However, there is still no answer to the question of how a child ascends to moral freedom. How does the child learn to consciously submit to the "general will" and serve the good?

68 Ibid., 110.

69 Pamfil Yurkevich, *Zametki po pedagogii [Pedagogy Notes]*, 1865, DA 354 L (Muz. 818v), no. 5, 8. Fond 301. Tserkovno arkheolohichni muzei Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii [Church and Archaeological Museum of the Kyiv Theological Academy]. Manuscript Institute of the V. I. Vernadskyi National Library, Kyiv.

70 Pamfil Yurkevich, *Programma pedagogiki dlya dukhovnykh seminarii [Pedagogy Program for Theological Seminaries]*, 1867, DA 354 L (Muz. 818v), no. 1, 7. Fond 301. Tserkovno arkheolohichni muzei Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii [Church and Archaeological Museum of the Kyiv Theological Academy]. Manuscript Institute of the V. I. Vernadskyi National Library, Kyiv.

Certainly, the Kyiv academic philosophers could not recognize the full capacity of a child for moral freedom. However, their views on the sources of spiritual and moral life, which are located not in reason but in the spiritual core of the personality, did not allow them to categorically deny the morality of the child. Instead, they provided grounds for assuming its existence in pre-rational forms.

The scientific and theoretical foundation for defining and explaining the essence of these forms was found by the Kyiv academics in the German philosophical tradition. Primarily, this involved criticism of Kant's ethical postulates, which did not recognize morally unconscious actions, even if they were in accordance with the moral law, as well as the notion of "goodness of temperament" based on certain natural traits of human beings. Friedrich Beneke, for instance, emphasized that Kant's analysis only described the reflective form of morality. Instead, as Friedrich Jacobi pointed out, "goodness always arises before its name and rules," meaning that it initially forms unconsciously in the so-called naive form. Regarding reflective morality, Jacobi argued that naive morality is the primary and immediate form from which the law is abstracted. Friedrich Beneke described naive morality as the ability to evaluate phenomena and things based on the level of good or evil attributed to them through feelings resulting from the interaction between the individual and the external world. Since feelings predominate in the child's soul, the naive form of morality arises much earlier than the awareness of the moral law.⁷¹ Therefore, a child can be a subject of moral action, capable of certain forms of moral activity.

Olesnytskyi attempts to elucidate the mechanisms of morality formation through a detailed examination of the psychological constructs of Kant and Beneke. He asserts that the unconscious impulses of a moral nature in childhood are essentially a "blind will," serving merely as the psychological foundation of morality. However, genuine morality evolves from the unconscious to the conscious, undergoing a transformation akin to a spiral progression of feelings, knowledge, and volitional actions. In the initial rotation of this spiral, commencing with instinctual needs and sensations, the child acquires knowledge about certain things as objects of their desires. In subsequent rotations, knowledge begets higher feelings, and these feelings stimulate action. From the moment of action influenced by feelings, the conscience awakens, Olesnytskyi emphasizes, and moral life begins. It stabilizes because a rational being perceives in the inclinations of their essence and their satisfaction a certain correctness, thus reaching an awareness of the natural moral law. At the same time, the moral environment confirms that the natural moral law is not something arbitrary but a reflection of the rational idea of the good, which corresponds to the structure of the world. This knowledge, tinged with higher emotions, ennobles, liberates, and elevates the "blind will" to the will of conscious, rational, free-moral agency.⁷² According to this

71 Friedrich Beneke, *Rukovodstvo k vospitaniyu i ucheniyu* [Guidance for Education and Instruction], vol. 1, transl. Nikolai Vessel (Saint Petersburg: Tipografia i litografia K. Sorvanova i Ko, 1871), 216–24.

72 See Olesnitskiy, "Iz sistemy npravstvennogo bogosloviya" ["From the System of Moral Theology"], *Trudy Kyivskoy dukhovnoy akademii* 1 (1889): 110–2.

understanding of the mechanism of moral formation, the philosopher asserts that the inner life of the child is rooted in the lower strata of human existence.⁷³ Yet, how does this reconcile with his demand that the child's moral character be formed not mechanically, under coercion, but only voluntarily?⁷⁴ Does this approach not require the "ability to exercise one's freedom." How is moral freedom possible for a child at all?

First and foremost, Olesnytskyi suggests trusting human nature because it "provides all the material for education and performs the greater part of the educational task." Therefore, the educator "is left only, so to speak, to observe the development of the child, to outline the direction for him, and, where necessary, to prompt."⁷⁵ It is also important not to forget that the source of moral life, according to the scholar, is found in the "heart" as the ontological depth of the human personality.⁷⁶ In his view, children are capable of higher manifestations of morality – good deeds "according to the dictates of the heart."⁷⁷ However, their entire psychological structure is also adapted to affirm the principles of the moral law, the bearer of which is the conscience, which signals how closely a person's actions align with the moral law that God has inscribed in their heart. The philosopher disagrees with sensualistic theories, which suggest that conscience is a certain spiritual norm created by each individual by generalizing their own life experience. He also does not share Kant's belief that conscience is the ideal self, the individual's awareness of their higher and rational essence, which "reacts" to lower, sensual impulses and desires. In conscience, Olesnytskyi emphasizes, we feel not only our human but also divine nature.⁷⁸ However, conscience is not the moral law itself. The content of the moral law is not "written" in the conscience, as some theologians claim. On the contrary, it is defined by religion, culture, and education.⁷⁹ Based on this, it can be argued that moral freedom begins when there is the possibility of making some, even the simplest, independent decisions and acting in accordance with them. Thus, the conditions for awakening the voice of conscience are formed, allowing the human being to become aware of its demands as incentives or prohibitions of specific actions, and to begin accumulating experience and shaping their personal motivational sphere. Obviously, this does not necessarily involve weaving chains of syllogisms; rather, it requires a free flow of ideas and the ability to freely combine them according to one's own choice, which is accessible to children.

If the logic of spiritual education is built on this concept of moral development, then at its first stage, special attention should be paid to creating an environment that fosters the manifestation of the child's moral nature, the realization of the deep impulses of their heart, the development of intellectual abilities, and the accumulation

73 Olesnitskiy, *Kurs pedagogiki*, vol. 1, 119–20.

74 Ibid., 59–60.

75 Ibid., 124.

76 Olesnitskiy, "Iz sistemy npravstvennogo bogosloviya," *Trudy Kyivskoy dukhovnoy akademii* 5 (1889): 26.

77 Ibid.

78 Ibid., 31–2.

79 Ibid., 34.

of experience in moral relationships. At this level, the awakened conscience takes on the images of specific individuals – the father and mother, and the form of moral activity becomes obedience to them, through which the child satisfies the natural desire to do as they should.⁸⁰ At the next stage, when the circle of communication expands beyond the family, conscience is strengthened through the organization of a certain way of life and education, the assimilation of general rules of behavior and moral law, and it becomes impersonal – a secret inner voice. Strict truthfulness, love of truth, and the alignment of practical actions with theoretical knowledge are the main principles of clarity, sharpness, and liveliness of conscience, says Olesnytskyi.⁸¹ And how this conscience develops depends on the spirit and direction of the educational institutions of society as embodiments of the moral ideas of a certain culture.

Yurkevych, in substantiating the logic of education, preferred the concept of Beneke, where the precondition for moral development is defined as the natural ability of a person to consider the states of their soul from a distance, as in a mirror, and at the same time feel the presence of a spiritual treasure within themselves – the ideal of the “general image of personality, instinctively preserved.” This image, Yurkevych emphasizes, serves as a measure of our moral state and is the naive morality of instincts, unconscious benevolence. It is evident when passions subside, especially after committing evil. It is then that the conscience awakens. Just as the first sensation of a newborn is pain, Yurkevych repeats the thought of the German thinker, so too, the first moral feeling is pain, shame, and self-condemnation. However, this sense of personality does not spontaneously evolve into morality; on the contrary, it can grow into egoism. Therefore, it needs to be focused on, explained, and strengthened with the help of a higher norm that is not dependent on sensory states. According to Beneke, this norm is represented by the will of parents, the proper order of life, and views on what is honest, useful, and sacred.⁸² Based on these ideas, P. Yurkevych seeks to identify forms of moral activity accessible to children.

The first of these, according to Yurkevych, is obedience. Of course, not every act of obeying an elder is a moral action. Initially, obedience serves a protective function, teaching restraint of certain desires and safeguarding against physical harm. Later on, it contributes to the gradual formation of the skill to internally align one’s intentions and actions with the rules established by parents, fostering a habit of self-observation and self-assessment.⁸³ It is evident that sometimes children obey simply out of fear of

80 Olesnitskiy, *Kurs pedagogiki*, vol. 2, 327.

81 Olesnitskiy, “Iz sistemy npravstvennogo bogosloviya,” *Trudy Kyivskoy dukhovnoy akademii* 5 (1889): 34.

82 Pamfil Yurkevich, *Zametki po pedagogii* [*Pedagogy Notes*], 1865, DA 354 L (Muz. 818v), no. 5, 8–9. Fond 301. Tserkovno arkheolohichniy muzei Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii [Church and Archaeological Museum of the Kyiv Theological Academy]. Manuscript Institute of the V. I. Vernadskyi National Library, Kyiv; Friedrich Beneke, *Rukovodstvo k vospitaniyu i ucheniyu* [Guidance for Education and Instruction], vol. 1 (Saint Petersburg: Tipografia i litografia K. Sorvanova i Ko, 1871), 297–301.

83 *Ibid.*, 8.

punishment. However, the philosopher asserts that if overcoming oneself, renouncing certain desires, and consciously obeying someone else's will are motivated by love, trust, and respect for the educators, then it is already genuine self-sacrifice and a moral act.⁸⁴ Its essence lies in the voluntary subordination to moral necessity: personal will to the general, human will to Divine's will, the prototype of which is the authoritative adult.

The next form of moral activity for children, according to Yurkevych, is adherence to disciplinary rules. Olesnytskyi viewed these rules as a means of external restraint and pacification of the child's chaotic impulses and needs, as well as the development of correct habits in them. Even if children were saints, Yurkevych notes, discipline would still be necessary because they are careless and inattentive. However, unlike his colleagues, Yurkevych proclaims discipline as a "great liberating force" that subordinates the ward not to the personal orders of the educator but to the general will and reason. Thus, the child's will "for the first time triumphs over immediate impulses in favor of reason, which outlines a plan of life and activity," and learns to obey the law.⁸⁵ If this becomes habitual, it will create the precondition for "pure," uncoerced moral activity – "free moral self-government," where the law is obeyed effortlessly, solely out of respect for it.⁸⁶

However, the Kyiv academics did not absolutize the importance of discipline in the moral development of the individual. Following the principles of Herbartianism, Yurkevych asserts that individuals live by their convictions, as the direction of will and feelings is primarily determined by thoughts.⁸⁷ If the sphere of thoughts delineates the boundaries of character, then the importance of comprehending and internalizing the patterns of truth, goodness, and beauty becomes clear, as it is a prerequisite for overcoming one's own subjectivism, triumphing over passions, and desiring to serve justice. Without clarifying consciousness with truth and moral ideas, Olesnytskyi emphasizes, instilling habits in a child toward a certain way of acting and living would be more like training an animal than educating a human.⁸⁸ Therefore, pedagogical discipline and management must be complemented, deepened, and perfected by schooling, without which human morality will not become a consciously held personal stance.

The Kyiv academics consider education to be an extremely effective factor in personality development. Primarily, by directing one's energies towards correct actions, education focuses on the realm of thoughts and higher feelings, prompting a tension of will, while suppressing and organizing lower feelings and desires.⁸⁹ Additionally, Yurkevych claims that education instills in the child the habit and ability to contemplate their own states impartially, thereby laying the psychological groundwork for self-discovery.⁹⁰ But, most importantly, acquired knowledge can not only train but also

84 Ibid.

85 Yurkevich, *Kurs obshchei pedagogiki*, 94–5.

86 Yurkevich, *Chteniya o vospitanii s programmoi 1866 g.*, 49.

87 Yurkevich, *Kurs obshchei pedagogiki*, 7, 34.

88 Olesnitskiy, *Kurs pedagogiki*, vol. 2, 5.

89 Yurkevich, *Kurs obshchei pedagogiki*, 233; Olesnitskiy, *Kurs pedagogiki*, vol. 2, 3.

90 Yurkevich, *Kurs obshchei pedagogiki*, 234.

spiritually transform the individual. Indeed, the realization of the powerful educational potential of learning depends on specific conditions. In this regard, Olesnytskyi recalls Herbart's observation that knowledge will only reach the depths of feelings and influence the will when self-directed thinking transforms it into certain convictions, while Yurkevych notes that true moral freedom of actions can only be ensured by Christian beliefs.⁹¹ Founded on the "invaluable criteria of perfection and eternity," such beliefs provide "the determination to do good and just deeds, not what pleases and gratifies people."⁹² However, the Kyiv philosophers interpret this phenomenon not only as a purely intellectual creation but also as a moral force that drives life and human activity, grounded in the philosophy of Platonism. According to Olesnytskyi, the ideal of education is primarily the accurate and complete cognition of benevolence, the revelation of which in its full heavenly radiance forever captivates humanity.⁹³ Yurkevych emphasizes the necessity of leading the child beyond the "world of sensory images" and guiding them towards the "higher realm of the good, the true, and the beautiful," where the birth of true benevolence is possible, rather than merely vague reflections of it.⁹⁴ Thus, for the Kyiv thinkers, the essence of education lies not in acquiring useful knowledge and information but in forming strong Christian convictions and being inspired by a love for all that is perfect.

Therefore, it is not coincidental that special attention is paid to the pedagogical concept of the spirit of teaching in the academic tradition of Kyiv. Olesnytskyi interprets this concept quite abstractly as the moral mood, tone, manner, and technique of teaching. However, the philosopher acknowledges that the power of the spirit of teaching influences not only the intellect but also the moral aspect of the pupil's personality.⁹⁵ Other academics from Kyiv, while not denying the necessity of being able to teach correctly and systematically, and of awakening cognitive interest and higher feelings in children, emphasize that this is not enough. The most powerful educational forces, hidden within teaching, as Yurkevych supposes, can only be activated by the teacher through their art. Educational subjects develop in the pupil the ability to see the ideal side of life, beauty, and harmony, and to awaken a selfless love for truth when the teacher reveals in science not a means of gaining some advantage, but the radiance of the higher spiritual world. If teaching is characterized by an attitude towards everything exemplary, true, and beautiful as sacred, then there is no need to specifically study religion, because education as a whole becomes religious. The ideal of such education was embodied in the activities and life of Socrates, who demonstrated that the pursuit of truth, goodness, and perfection is, in essence, the pursuit of God and service to Him. Therefore, the art of infusing a religious spirit into education can only be mastered by the educator who has chosen the sacred and the Divine.⁹⁶ Then, like a

91 Ibid., 235.

92 Yurkevich, *Chteniya o vospitanii*, 219.

93 Olesnitskiy, *Kurs pedagogiki*, vol. 2, 5.

94 Yurkevich, *Kurs obshchei pedagogiki*, 157.

95 Olesnitskiy, *Kurs pedagogiki*, vol. 1, 118–23.

96 Yurkevich, *Kurs obshchei pedagogiki*, 236–7.

true artist, inspired by love for truth, goodness, and children, the educator creates conditions for the authentic and self-directed expression of the child's personality.⁹⁷

As we can see, for Yurkevych and other academic philosophers from Kyiv, the issue of fostering the capacity for moral freedom has only a religious solution. This is not surprising, as the sense and purpose of all moral efforts for Christians, as the scholar reminds us, are for Christ to be reflected within them.⁹⁸ Yurkevych distinguishes within the psychological basis of morality two aspects: feelings that arise from empirical experience of human relationships and faith as mystical contemplation. The task of education is to impart knowledge and strengthen moral feelings as the substance of spiritual life. However, in order for them to become a driving force, a motivating power is needed, which according to Yurkevych, can only be faith, which by its very nature, is a pure act of moral freedom.⁹⁹ Here, for the Kyiv philosophers, the circle closes, as it turns out that in the process of forming moral activity as a way of realizing moral freedom, a crucial step is the exercise of this freedom - accepting faith and forming one's own motivation based on it.

They consider this act decisive for the fate of a person as a being whose existence extends into eternity. Therefore, the Kyiv academics are convinced that educators have no right to pretend they do not notice this eschatological perspective but, rather, should embrace it. On the other hand, the inclusion of the religious factor requires acknowledging the fact that it is impossible to fully understand the logic of the spiritual growth of the individual, and thus to precisely construct the logic of pedagogical influence on them, as this growth occurs in the unpredictability of free and self-active arrangement, through the efforts of the individual to illuminate their own spiritual image.

Making Conclusions & Discussing Findings

The present study aimed to assess the importance of Kant's *Lectures on Pedagogy* for the philosophy of education in Kyiv academic tradition of the 19th century. Although very little was found in the literature on the question, enough evidence exists to show that the views of Kyiv academic philosophers in general were formed in dialogue with Kant as a key actor in German idealism. This influence was determined by both institutional factors and the personal preferences of Kyiv academics as a Christian-Orthodox intellectuals.

The most obvious finding to emerge from the analysis is that Kant's *Lectures on Pedagogy* had a foundational significance in the formation of the philosophy of education in the Kyiv academic community of the 19th century. The evidence from this study suggests that Kyiv professors of philosophy knew the text of Kant's lectures very well in its original form; after all, their first translation into Russian was published only

97 Ibid., 109, 244.

98 Yurkevich, *Chteniya o vospitanii s programmoi 1866 g.*, 9.

99 Yurkevich, *Zametki po pedagogii*, 9.

in 1896.¹⁰⁰ The findings of this research provide insights into how Kyiv academic thinkers formed their educational philosophy in an active rethinking of Kant's pedagogical concepts such as child nature and childhood, the idea of education, and the pedagogical paradox.

Another important finding is the specific features introduced by Kyiv academics to Kant's reasoning about education. To summarize, it was an approach based on the paradigm of philosophizing outlined by the Charters of the Russian theological academies, which required considering all philosophical doctrines from the standpoint of "true Christianity," i. e., Orthodox dogma.¹⁰¹ On the one hand, this added emotional intensity and ideological tension to the philosophical-pedagogical discourse. On the other hand, it yielded certain results. In particular, the recognition of the child's full right to humanity strengthened Kantian postulates regarding the universal significance of the idea of education. Moreover, the Orthodox approach expanded the horizons for overcoming the contradiction in the pedagogical paradox, allowing Kyiv academic philosophers to raise fundamental questions about the ways of creating space for freedom in education. In response to this question, they drew attention to the necessity of finding the right balance between positive and negative pedagogical demands.

As a result of recognizing the child's capacity for moral freedom as inherent in their nature, the strategic logic of pedagogical interaction among Kyiv academics shifted from Kant's concept of "active waiting," where the child intellectually matures to understand moral ideas, to a logic of "interactive support," where educators assist the child in realizing themselves as individuals through accessible forms of moral activity. Ultimately, within the outlined problematic, the theme of pedagogical creativity resonated distinctly in the Kyiv philosophical-pedagogical discourse of the 19th century due to the understanding of the impossibility of offering standard recipes for a sphere of activity where freedom and necessity are constantly at play.

Unfortunately, the limited scope of the article did not allow for a comprehensive analysis of other issues in the philosophy of education associated with Kant within the Kyiv academic tradition of the 19th century. It is our hope that this will become the subject of further research.

Bibliography

Avsenev, Pyotr. "Iz zapisok po psikhologii" ["From the Notes on Psychology"]. In *Sbornik iz lektsii byvshikh professorov Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii arkhimandrita Innokentii, protoiereia I. M. Skvortsova, P. S. Avseneva (arkhimandrita Feofana) i Ia. K. Amfiteatrova, izdannyi akademieiu po sluchaiu piatidesiatiletneho iubileia (1819–1869) eia* [The Collection of Lectures by Archimandrite Innokentii, Archpriest Ivan Skvortsov, Petro Avseniev (Archimandrite Feofan) and Yakiv Amfiteatrov, the Former Professors of the Kyiv

100 See Immanuel Kant, *O pedagogike* [On Pedagogy], transl. S. Lyubomudrov (Moscow: Pedagogicheskaya biblioteka, 1896).

101 Maryna Tkachuk, "Yak vyvchaly istoriu filosofii v Kyivskii dukhovnii akademii 19 – pochatku 20 stolittia" ["How the History of Philosophy was Studied at the Kyiv Theological Academy in the 19th and early 20th Century"], *Magisterium: istoryko-filosofski studii* 9 (2002): 35–51.

- Theological Academy, Published by the Academy on the Occasion of its 50th Anniversary (1819–1869)*]. Pagination III, 1–245. Kyiv: Tipografia Gubernskogo upravleniia, 1869.
- Bayrak, Yunus. “Kant’s View on Education.” *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Science* 174 (2015): 2713–15.
- Beneke, Friedrich. *Rukovodstvo k vospitaniyu i ucheniyu* [Guide for Education and Study]. Translated Nikolai Vessel. Vol. 1. Saint Petersburg: Tipografia i litografia K. Sorvanova i K^o, 1871.
- Buchner, Edward Franklin, transl. and ed. *The Educational Theory of Immanuel Kant*. Philadelphia/London: J. B. Lippincott company, 1908.
- Gerbart, Jogan. “Obshchaya pedagogika, vyvedennaya iz tseli vospitaniya” [“General Pedagogy Derived from the Purpose of Education”]. In *Izbrannye pedagogicheskie sochineniya*. Vol. 1, edited by G. P. Veysberg, 148–280. Moscow: Uchpedgiz, 1940.
- Giesinger, Johannes. “Kant’s Account of Moral Education.” *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 44, no. 7 (2012): 775–86.
- Kant, Immanuel. “Anthropology, History, and Education.” In *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant*, edited by Robert B. Loudon, Günter Zöllner, 437–85. Cambridge: University Press, 2007.
- — —. *O pedagogike* [On Pedagogy], translated S. Lyubomudrov. Moscow: Pedagogicheskaya biblioteka, 1896.
- Kozlovskiy, Victor. “Interpretatsiia Petrom Linytskym kantivskoi idei pro intelihibelnu ta empirychnu pryrodu liudyny” [“Peter Linitsky’s Interpretation of Kant’s Idea about Intelligible and Empirical Human Nature”]. *Naukovi zapysky NaUKMA. Filosofiya ta relihiieznavstvo* 76 (2008): 43–8.
- — —. “Kantivski ‘paralohizmy chystoho rozumu’ v intelektualnii atmosferi Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii 19 – pochatku 20 stolit’” [“Kant’s ‘Paralogisms of Pure Reason’ in the Intellectual Atmosphere of Kyiv Theological Academy of 19th and early 20th centuries”]. *Filosofska dumka* 6 (2008): 59–83.
- — —. “Pedahohika u svitli moralnoi antropolohii Kanta” [“Pedagogy in the Light of Kant’s Moral Anthropology”]. *Filosofiya osvity* 1 (2015): 183–96.
- Laub, Jochen, & Mikhail Thomas. “Kant’s Lectures on Pedagogy on World Tour.” *Global Education Review* 10 (1-2) (2023): 157–71.
- Løvlie, Lars. “Does Paradox Count in Education?” *Utbildning & Demokrati* 16, no. 3 (2007): 9–24.
- Merritt, Melissa McBay. “Kant on Enlightened Moral Pedagogy.” *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 49, no. 3 (September 2011): 227–53.
- Naragon, Steve. “Internet Resources for Translating Kant.” In *Kants Schriften in Übersetzungen*, ed. Gisela Schlüter (Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte Sonderheft 15), 305–21. Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2020.
- Nemeth, Thomas. *Kant in Imperial Russia*. New York: Jordan Center for the Advanced Study of Russia, 2017.
- Olesnitskiy, Markellin. *Istoriya npravstvennosti i npravstvennykh ucheniy* [History of Morality and Moral Doctrines]. 2 vol. Kyiv: Tipografia G. T. Korchak-Novitskogo, 1882–1886.
- — —. “Iz sistemy npravstvennogo bogosloviya” [“From the System of Moral Theology”]. *Trudy Kyiskoy dukhovnoy akademii* 1 (1889): 95–112.
- — —. “Iz sistemy npravstvennogo bogosloviya” [“From the System of Moral Theology”]. *Trudy Kyivskoy dukhovnoy akademii* 5 (1889): 21–59.
- — —. *Kurs pedagogiki: rukovodstvo dlya zhenskikh institutov i gimnaziya s dvukhgodovym kursom pedagogiki* [Course of Pedagogy: Guide for Women’s Institutes and Gymnasiums with a Two-Year Course of Pedagogy]. 2 vol. Kyiv: Tipografia G. T. Korchak-Novitskogo, 1886–1887.

- Schlüter, Gisela. "Einleitung." In *Kants Schriften in Übersetzungen*, ed. Gisela Schlüter (Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte Sonderheft 15), 11–30. Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2020.
- Skvortsov, Ioann. "Zapiski po npravstvennoy filosofii protoiereya Ioanna Skvortsova" ["Notes on Moral Philosophy by Archpriest Ioann Skvortsov"]. In *Sbornik iz lektzii byvshikh professorov Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii arkhimandrita Innokentii, protoiereia I. M. Skvortsova, P. S. Avseneva (arkhimandrita Feofana) i Ia. K. Amfiteatrova, izdannyi akademieiu po sluchaiu piatidesiatiletnego iubileia (1819–1869) eia* [*The Collection of Lectures by Archimandrite Innokentii, Archpriest Ivan Skvortsov, PetroAvseniev (Archimandrite Feofan) and Yakiv Amfiteatrov, the Former Professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy, Published by the Academy on the Occasion of its 50th Anniversary (1819–1869)*]. Pagination 2, 1–83. Kyiv: Tipografiia Gubernskogo upravleniia, 1869.
- Tkachuk, Maryna. "Filosofia v Kyivskii dukhovnii akademii: osvittii aspekt" ["Philosophy in the Kyiv Theological Academy: educational aspect"]. In *Filosofska osvita v Ukraini: istoriia i suchasnist* [*Philosophical Education in Ukraine: History and Present*], edited by Maryna Tkachuk, 66–94. Kyiv: Ahrar Media Hrup, 2011.
- — —. "Filosofska problematyka v rukopysnykh kandydatskykh tvorakh studentiv Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii (1819–1924)" ["Philosophical Issues in Handwritten Candidate Works of Kyiv Theological Academy Students (1819–1924)"]. *Sententiae* 38, no. 2 (2019): 19–36.
- — —. "Handwritten Candidate Works of Kyiv Theological Academy Students as Sources for Studying the Academy's Philosophical Heritage." *Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal* 6 (2019): 43–67. <https://doi.org/10.18523/kmhj189003.2019-6.43-67>.
- — —. "Kantoznavchi studii u Kyivskii akademichnii filosofii 19 – pochatku 20 stolittia" ["Kant Studies in Kyiv Academic Philosophy of 19th and early 20th centuries"]. *Collegium* 11 (2001): 103–19.
- — —. "Universytet Sv. Volodymyra v istorii vitchyznianoï filosofskoi osvity" ["St. Volodymyr's University in the History of Ukrainian Philosophical Education"]. In *Filosofska osvita v Ukraini: istoriia i suchasnist* [*Philosophical Education in Ukraine: History and Present*], edited by Maryna Tkachuk, 126–56. Kyiv: Ahrar Media Hrup, 2011.
- — —. "Yak vvychaly istoriu filosofii v Kyivskii dukhovnii akademii 19 – pochatku 20 stolittia" ["How the History of Philosophy was Studied at the Kyiv Theological Academy in the 19th and early 20th Century"]. *Magisterium: istoriko-filosofski studii* 9 (2002): 35–51.
- — —. "Yak vvychaly istoriiu filosofii v Universyteti Sv. Volodymyra" ["How the History of Philosophy was Studied at the St. Vladimir University"]. *Magisterium: istoriko-filosofski studii* 13 (2004): 65–74.
- Uljens, Michael. "The Pedagogical Paradox and the Problem of Subjectivity and Intersubjectivity." Paper presented at *Conference: Philosophy of Education Society in Australia (PESA)*, Claremont, Western Australia, November 30 – December 2, 2001. <https://pesa.org.au/images/papers/2001-papers/uljens-michael-subjectivity.pdf>.
- Vlieghe, Joris. "In Dangerous Waters: On Language, Freedom and Education." *Philosophy of Education* 71 (2015): 483–5.
- Yurkevych, Pamfil. *Chteniya o vospitanii* [*Readings on Education*]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Chepelevskogo, 1865.
- — —. *Chteniya o vospitanii s programmoi 1866 g.* [*Readings on Education with a Program of 1866*]. 1866. DA 354 L (Muz. 818v), no. 1. Fond 301. Tserkovno arkheolohichniy muzei Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii [Church and Archaeological Museum of the Kyiv Theological Academy]. Manuscript Institute of the V. I. Vernadskyi National Library, Kyiv.
- — —. "Ideia" ["Idea"]. In *Vybrane* [*Selected Works*], 3–72. Kyiv: Abrys, 1993.

- — —. *Kurs obshchei pedagogiki s prilozheniyami* [Course of General Pedagogy with Appendices]. Moscow: Tipografiia Gracheva i K, 1869.
- — —. *Metodyka* [Methodology]. 1872. DA 354 L (Muz. 818v), no. 4. Fond 301. Tserkovno arkheolohichniy muzei Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii [Church and Archaeological Museum of the Kyiv Theological Academy]. Manuscript Institute of the V. I. Vernadskyi National Library, Kyiv.
- — —. “Plan i sily dlya pervonachalnoy shkoly” [“Plan and Resources for the Elementary School”]. *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniya* 3 (1870): 1–29.
- — —. *Programma pedagogiki dlya dukhovnykh seminarii* [Pedagogy Program for Theological Seminaries]. 1867. DA 354 L (Muz. 818v), no. 1. Fond 301. Tserkovno arkheolohichniy muzei Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii [Church and Archaeological Museum of the Kyiv Theological Academy]. Manuscript Institute of the V. I. Vernadskyi National Library, Kyiv.
- — —. “Sertse ta yoho znachennia u dukhovnomu zhytti liudyny, zghidno z uchenniam slova Bozhoho” [“The Heart and Its Significance in Human Spiritual Life According to the Teaching of the God’s Word”]. In *Vybrane* [Selected Works], 73–114. Kyiv: Abrys, 1993.
- — —. *Sovershenstva i nedostatki dushevnoy zhizni v zavisimosti ot osobennostey telesnoy organizatsii* [The Perfections and Imperfections of Mental Life Depending on the Characteristics of Bodily Organization]. 1867. DA 335 L, no. 7. Fond 301. Tserkovno arkheolohichniy muzei Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii [Church and Archaeological Museum of the Kyiv Theological Academy]. Manuscript Institute of the V. I. Vernadskyi National Library, Kyiv.
- — —. “Z nauky pro liudskiy dukh” [“From the Science of the Human Spirit”]. In *Vybrane* [Selected Works], 115–221. Kyiv: Abrys, 1993.
- — —. *Zametki po pedagogii* [Pedagogy Notes]. 1865. DA 354 L (Muz. 818v), no. 5. Fond 301. Tserkovno arkheolohichniy muzei Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii [Church and Archaeological Museum of the Kyiv Theological Academy]. Manuscript Institute of the V. I. Vernadskyi National Library, Kyiv.
- Zieliński, Paweł. “The Relationships and Differences of the Kantian Philosophy and Pedagogy in Regard to Postmodern Pedagogic.” *Studia Edukacyjne* 48 (2018): 115–32.



Svitlana Kuzmina, Dr. habil., is the Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University. She is the author of *Philosophical and Pedagogical Concept of P. D. Yurkevych* (Kyiv, 2002) and *Philosophy of Education and Upbringing in the Kyiv Academic Tradition of the 19th and Early 20th Century* (Simferopol, 2010), as well as numerous articles on the history of philosophy and education, along with publications about professors and graduates of the Kyiv Spiritual Academy and St. Volodymyr University during the 19th and early 20th centuries.

Svitlana Avdieieva is the head teacher at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University. She has authored numerous articles on the philosophy and history of Islamism, as well as on foreign language teaching methods and psycholinguistics. Her academic interests encompass the philosophy of religions, linguodidactics, psycholinguistics, and academic translation.