



KYIV-MOHYLA
HUMANITIES JOURNAL

KYIV-MOHYLA SCHOLARLY PEER-REVIEWED JOURNALS

Key Dates in the History of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy

Author: Maksym Iaremenko

Source: Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal 2 (2015): 31–41

Published by: National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy

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

Key Dates in the History of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy

Maksym Iaremenko

National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy,
Department of History

Abstract

The researchers of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries defined its periodization and the important dates in its history. Their ideas are still relevant today as each system of periodization represents interpretations of certain events and phenomena of the Academy. In this article, two key dates of Kyiv-Mohyla history, 1701 and 1817, are redefined. The first date is analysed, accenting the change of the legal status of the Kyiv Collegium and its transformation into the Academy. In the second case, historians' ideas of defining the nature of the Kyiv-Mohyla curriculum differ, either in the interpretation of 1817 as the end of the history of the old Academy or as only one of the stages of its past. Perhaps in establishing important chronological boundaries, both groups of scholars are mistaken in their interpretations of the larger context of the question.

Key Words: Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, periodization, secular and theological education, reforms in education, university, early modern Ukraine.



The research of the scholars (alumni and professors) of the Kyiv Theological Academy (KTA) of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries remains relevant today not only as complex documentary and interpretive material of the Academy's past, but also for its conceptualization of the institution's periodization and key dates. This periodization exists to this day and has not been revised. In the article, I will analyse two periods of the Academy's history that according to existing research designated the gaining by the "Latin schools" of a new legal status (1701), and its end or the beginning of cardinal reforms (1817).

1701 became a key date in Kyiv-Mohyla history in Makarii Bulgakov's book, one of the first dedicated to its history. The reason for the importance of this date was a Charter granted to the Academy by the tsar. According to Bulgakov, Peter I granted the Collegium the status of Academy, which meant the beginning of a new, and the longest stage of the institution, known as the "Kyiv-Mohyla-Zaborovsky Academy."¹ Like his predecessor, Viktor Askochenskyi, the author of a subsequent Kyiv-Mohyla history, believed that the new stage of the "school's" formation

1 Makarii Bulgakov, *Istoriia Kievskoi akadiemii* [*The History of Kyiv Academy*] (Saint-Petersburg, 1843), 13, 45, 86, 103–04.

began in 1701. He claims: “At this time, a new epoch of the Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium began, and having the status of an Academy, it proved its high status year in year out.”²

Although the representatives of the next generations of researchers in the following decades regarded the above-mentioned books of the two pioneer authors of Academy historiography as outdated, they did not propose new periodization schemes, moreover, some of the scholars accepted the proposed “watershed” date.³ Thus writing his sketch on the 300-anniversary of the Academy, Archpriest Fedir Titov applied the crystallised scheme, according to which, “in 1701 the Kyiv Brotherhood School, later the Collegium, eventually received the status and rights of an Academy.”⁴ The importance of this date was grounded in the following manner: “It’s meaning [the Charter [*hramota*] of 1701. — Maksym Iaremenko] is extremely important as, on the one hand, the academic rights and privileges it received through a Charter on January 11, 1694, were defined more clearly and specifically in juridical terms, and on the other hand, the Kyiv Brotherhood School was overtly designated as an Academy.” Important to Titov was that the status of academy was granted not in an ordinary act, but as a monarchic document granted directly to the institution.⁵

Thus during the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, key researchers of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy past authoritatively established the idea that 1701 was a crucial moment in its history, which signified the beginning of its new legal status — not as a Collegium, but as an Academy. This is not strange because the key works on Kyiv “Latin schools” were written by the alumni and/or lecturers of the Kyiv Theological Academy [*Kyivska Dukhovna Akademia*], which originated from the Kyiv Brotherhood School, founded in 1615. Thus the accent on the role of monarchs in the history of the institution seems logical, and the historians were concerned not only with a functional matter in their works — the need for a periodization to enable a convenient presentation of material. Interestingly, in contemporary Ukrainian historiography the importance of 1701 for the history of Academy was established due to the other accent: the key role in the history of the institution played by Hetman Ivan Mazepa. In particular, he is granted the most important role in the emergence of the tsar’s Charter of 1701.

The views of some of the researches of the KDA circle were accepted not only by them, but were disseminated “outside,” particularly in scholarly works which were not dedicated to the “Mohyla Athens.”⁶ Consequently, the grounds for the periodization served the gaining of a new

2 Viktor Askochenskii, *Kiev s drevneishym ego uchilishchem Akadiemiiu* [Kyiv with Its Most Ancient Academy], 2 vol. (Kyiv, 1856), 261–62.

3 For example, see: Stepan Golubev, *Kievskaiia Akadiemiia v kontse XVII i nachale XVIII stolietii. Rech, proizniesionnaia na torzhestvennom akte Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akadiemii 26 sientiabria 1901 goda* [Kyiv Academy in the End of the 17th — the Beginning of the 18th Centuries. The Speech Delivered at the Ceremonial Act of Kyiv Theological Academy of 26 September 1901] (Kyiv, 1901), 1, 11.

4 Fiodor Titov, *Imperatorskaia Kievskaiia dukhovnaia akadiemiia v ieie trekhvekovoii zhyzni i deiatelnosti (1615–1915 gg.)*. *Istoricheskaia zapiska* [The Imperial Kyiv Theological Academy during Its Three-Century History, 1615–1915: The Historical Note] (Kyiv, 1915), 7.

5 Titov, *Imperatorskaia Kievskaiia dukhovnaia akadiemiia*, 111–12.

6 For example, see: Vladimir Ikonnikov, *Kiev v 1654–1855 gg. Istoricheskii ocherk* [Kyiv of 1654–1855: A Historical Sketch] (Kyiv, 1904), 14; Aleksander Jabłonowski, *Akademia Kijowsko-Mohilańska. Zarys*

legal status, granted by the tsar's Charter of September 26, 1701, by so called "Latin schools." Such a statement seems far from being dubious. In particular, the usage of the name of "Academy" in the document could have been the consequence of the transposition of entire phrases on the requests of the Academic corporation and the Kyivan Metropolitan (in documents of that time it was common practice to use entire blocks of an incoming text in the responding document). But did the content of the Charter attest to a genuine new status of the institution?

To answer this question, points of the tsar's Charter of 1701 should be reviewed. Thus the Charter, the appearance of which caused perhaps the biggest conflict between students and residents of Kyiv's Podil district in school history, merely confirmed the points of a previous tsar's Charter in 1694, as attested to by numerous statements of researchers. The 1694 Charter permitted the study of philosophy and theology not only for local residents but for "pious foreigners," (i.e. orthodox newcomers outside of the Hetmanate and Muscovy); the tsar's remuneration was granted to the Rector and Prefect; petite bourgeoisie, soldiers, and Cossacks were decreed not to "offend and oppress" professors and students.⁷ Confirming validation of the mentioned points, the document of 1701 more clearly defined the hierarchy of subordination of the Rector and Prefect — granting them the right to punish transgressions against students. If they did not cope with their responsibilities, students could appeal to the Bishop of Kyiv, to whose episcopacy the institution belonged. If justice could not be found there, the Kyiv *voivode* (Russian administrator and commander of the Moscovy troops) accepted complaints. Despite the granting of the designation of "Academy" as a substitute for "school," the academic status itself was not elaborated in the Charter.⁸

Accenting 1701 as an important year, researchers of the Mohyla past asserted that the highest status of the institution, excepting its status of "Academy," was also marked by the permission to teach theology and having autonomy. To prove the incorrectness of the first argument, it is worth mentioning that the presence of theology in the Kyiv curriculum not later than 1689, does not constitute a final argument for the status of an Academy, as higher level Collegiums also had such a course.

The second argument, about the independence of the academic corporation, hardly seems persuasive. On the contrary, the Charter of 1701 clearly defined the hierarchy of the Academic administration. Moreover, the document embraced only one aspect of academic life: the relationship between students and professors, and between students and "the outside world," i.e. the juridical subordination of students to teachers, not to the city council or the secular chancery. Commonly-known facts of the functioning of the "Kyiv Athens" are evidence of the illusion of the institution's autonomy in others spheres: professors were appointed only with the Metropolitan's permission. In the 18th century, the Metropolitan could even revise the content of courses and inner academic rules, and instructions could not change without his permission, etc. Even historians who point to the 1701 Charter's important role in the transformation of schools into academies, maintain that at the time of its granting even the

historyczny na tle rozwoju ogólnego cywilizacji zachodniej na Rusi (Kraków, 1899–1900), 206–07.

7 *Pamiatniki, izdannyye Vremennoiu komissiiie dlia razbora drevnikh aktov* [Evidence Published by the Temporary Commission for the Analysis of Ancient Acts], 2nd ed., vol. 2 (Kyiv, 1897), 488–92.

8 *Pamiatniki*, 492–97.

inauguration of a newly-elected Rector could not be possible without a Hetman's permission.⁹ The Ukrainian situation of the time featured a several-staged system of subordination. Apart from the Metropolitan, *voivoda*, Governor-General or Hetman, the Academy was accountable to the Synod, and at times the fate of its professors was decided by the monarch's will.

The two last arguments, which allow researchers to establish a new stage of Mohyla history beginning in 1701, do not correspond to the sense embedded in them. Thus, approaching the periodization of Mohyla history, it is hardly reasonable to establish a certain date as a watershed (other than perhaps keeping in mind a concrete aspect of its history), rather it is better to think of the importance of the "schools" at the end of the 17th — the beginning of the 18th centuries, when they become the Hetmanate's sole centres of learning. At that time the curriculum was enriched, numbers of students grew, professors' authority in church life grew, and not only in Ukraine, the campus was enlarged, and the holdings of the Brotherhood Monastery, on whose support the Collegium existed, were brought to order. The support of Hetman Mazepa played a great role in these changes, but at the same time it is not reasonable to ascribe all Mohyla achievements to him.

If we consider the timeline of the university/academic status of Kyiv "schools," it would be relevant to search for its chronological framework not in the Russian state of the 18th century, which did not have a university tradition in previous times. The juridical underpinning for the preliminary date of the university tradition in the Hetmanate is provided by one of the points of the 1658 Hadiach Agreement, ratified by the Sejm of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1659, which involves the beginning of the Academy in Kyiv, "ktora takiemi praerogatiwami y wolnosciamy ma gaudere, iako Akademia Krakowska."¹⁰ The following turbulent decades for Kyiv and the final transfer of the city to Moscow did not allow to track how the new juridical status was realized in practice. But specific facts, for example, the independent introduction of theology to the curriculum without the permission of the Russian Church and the secular authorities in 1689, allow to presume that Mohyla professors considered the question of university status, meaning autonomy of the corporation, solved.

Hugo Kollontai (1750–1812) described more interesting evidence on the Kyiv "schools." The co-creator and an active figure of the Education Committee [Komisja Edukacji Narodowej], a reformer and Rector of the Krakiv Academy states that four main schools (*szkoły główne*, later he called them *universitates*) existed in Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth — in Krakiv, Vilensk, Zamoisk, and the Kyiv Academy, although the last "fell out" in 1686.¹¹ These reflections of the knowledgeable contemporary are also interesting in that they additionally attest to the university status of Kyiv "Latin schools" in the 17th century, before the gaining of the tsar's charters.

1817 is the second date of Mohyla history that requires detailed analysis. At that time the "Latin schools" were closed, and within two years Ukraine's sole and one of three (later — four)

9 Golubev, *Kiievskaia Akadiemiia*, 14.

10 *Hadiatska uniiia 1658 roku* [*The Treaty of Hadiach, 1658*], ed. P. Sohan and V. Brekhunenko (Kyiv, 2008), 16.

11 Hugo Kollontaj, *Stan oświecenia w Polsce w ostatnich latach panowania Augusta III (1750–1764)* (Wrocław, 1953), 54, 130.

institutions of its kind in the Russian Empire — the Kyiv Theological Academy (KTA), began its existence. Proposing his periodization of the history of the Academy, Makarii Bulgakov, a graduate of the KTA, did not regard 1817 as the end of the “Mohyla Athens.” In his opinion, the period of the Kyiv-Mohyla-Zaborovsky Academy (1701–1819) was followed by the next stage — the Kyiv Theological Academy (from 1819).¹² This suggested scheme of periodization was accepted by the next generations of historians and professors of the KTA. Interestingly, the acceptance of the continuity of the KTA from 1615 by a broader audience did not come at once. The celebration of its 50th anniversary in 1869 is representative of demonstrating how the institution perceived its own history. In his memoirs, Lev Matsiievych, one of the Academy’s alumni, qualified this anniversary as a turning point in the “historical consciousness of the KTA itself” allegedly in contrast to the “Mohyla Athens.” But as the evidence suggests, guests mentioned in their welcoming speeches not a 50th anniversary but a 250th anniversary.¹³ Even before the 1915 anniversary it was seen as necessary to celebrate the Academy’s 300th anniversary and one academic project involved the publication of documents relating to its 300 history.¹⁴

The contemporary Kyiv Theological Academy and Seminary of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, which claims its continuity from the Imperial Theological Academy, on the eve of the recent great anniversary of the “Kyiv Athens,” announced the 400th anniversary of the “Kyiv Theological Schools.”¹⁵ Telling its own history, the Kyiv Orthodox Theological Academy of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (Kyiv Patriarchate) finds its origins in the Kyiv Brotherhood School, and the author of the official historical sketch on the Academy’s official web-site indicates: “Before the rise of the Kyiv Academy in the 17th century the history of Ukrainian theological education did not have such an institution.”¹⁶ As can be seen, one of the reasons to claim continuity from 1615 for both the institution of the 19th — beginning of the 20th centuries

12 Bulgakov, *Istoriia*, 13.

13 “Pismo v Sovet Kievskoi dukhovnoi akadiemii pochietnoho ieia chlenu L. S. Matseievicha,” [“The Letter to the Council of Kyiv Theological Academy by L. S. Matseievich, Honorary Member,”] *TKDA* 7–8 (1911): 507–08. The inaugural greetings are published in: *Piatidiesiatiletanii iubilei Kievskoi dukhovnoi akadiemii. 28-go sentiabria 1869 goda* [The Fifty Hundred Anniversary of Kyiv Theological Academy, 28 September 1869] (Kyiv, 1869). For instance, in the greetings of the Saint Petersburg and Kyiv Universities, it was stated that the KTA “is one of the most ancient Russian institutions,” “heir of the most ancient institution in Russia.” *Piatidiesiatiletanii iubilei*, 234–35.

14 See more in: Kostiantyn Krainii, *Istoryky Kyievo-Pecherskoi Lavry XIX — pochatku XX stolit* [The Historians of Kyiv-Pecherska Lavra of the 19th — Beginning of the 20th Centuries] (Kyiv: Pulsary, 2000), 102–03; Vasiliï Ulianovskii, “Istoricheskaia zapiska k 300-letiu KDA i ieie avtor Fedor Titov,” [“Historical Note on the Academy’s 300th Anniversary and its Author, Fedor Titov,”] in *Imperatorskaia Kievskaa dukhovnaia akadiemii v ieie trekhvekovoi zhyzni i deiatelnosti (1615–1915 gg.)*. *Istoricheskaia zapiska*, ed. Fedor Titov (Kyiv: Hopak, 2003), xii–xvii.

15 See, for example, the vision of the history at: http://kdais.kiev.ua/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=10&Itemid=10&lang=uk, accessed March, 16, 2015.

16 Iryna Prelavska, *Kyivska Akademiia: istoriia i sychasnist* [Kyiv Academy: The History and Contemporaneity], accessed March 3, 2015, <http://www.kda.org.ua/about/history.html>.

and for the contemporary specialized schools in theological education is the emphasis on the theological nature of the Mohyla “Latin schools.” Yet neither this postulate, nor the establishment of 1817 as a historical watershed of either two different academies or a single one were not and do not remain commonly accepted. Examples to show this are related below.

In his booklets entitled *The Illustrated History of Ukraine* [*Iliustrovana Istoriiia Ukrainy*] (Kyiv; Lviv, 1913) and *From the History of Religious Thought in Ukraine* [*Z istorii relihiinoi dumky na Ukraini*] (Lviv, 1925), Mykhailo Hrushevsky (whose father studied at the KTA from 1855 to 1859) suggested a gradual process of the transformation of the Kyiv Academy into specifically “theological schools,” and dated its completion as the end of Catherine II’s reign, not 1817.¹⁷ The precise watershed and even the opposition of the history of the “Mohyla Athens” to the KTA designated the change of attitude towards the Church, as a “bulwark of autocracy and obscurantism” brought into the Russian Empire and later its remnants by the first quarter of the 20th century. Thus in Shcherotsky’s Kyiv guide-book of the second half of 1917 the end of the “Latin schools” and the beginning of the theological institution is marked clearly. In 1817 the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy “was abolished — and only in two years, when rules for ‘theological schools’ were established, instead of an institution offering a general education and accessible to all strata, a ‘theological school’ was opened in Kyiv, whose paltry existence continues to this day.”¹⁸

Shcherotsky opposed not only the two academies to each other, but explained to the users of the guide-book why these institutions differ: “The new Academy claims to continue the traditions of the old Academy although it does not have the right to do so as its spirit is the alien to the old Academy, in which scholars did not narrow themselves to theological scholastics but served real interests.” Also, the researcher assessed the heritage of the two educational centres differently.¹⁹

During the next decades the separation of the two institutions became a common practice. Proof of this is information found in a 1930 guide-book prepared for the 10th anniversary of VUAN (The All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences) by several members under the general editorship of Fedor Ernst. In this book, 1817 is marked as the final end of the “Mohyla schools,” and 1819 as the beginning of the new school — the KTA: “In such a way, the reactionary tsarist government of Arakchieiev times destroyed the old Ukrainian educational institution and turned it into a narrow-caste professional-religious school.”²⁰

Until Perestroika and the proclamation of Ukraine’s Independence, when theological schools of higher learning were opened “reviving” the idea of the continuity of the history of the “theological schools” of the 17th century,²¹ the dominant idea was that the Old Mohyla

17 Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, *Iliustrovana istoriia Ukrainy* [*The Illustrated History of Ukraine*] (Kyiv, 1990), 3, 286, 427–28; Mykhailo Hrushevskyi, *Z istorii relihiinoi dumky na Ukraini* [*From the History of the Theological Thought in Ukraine*] (Kyiv: Osvita, 1992), 101, 119.

18 Konstantin Shcherotskii, *Kiev. Putivoditel* [*Kyiv: The Guidebook*] (Kyiv, 1917), 146.

19 Shcherotskii, *Kiev*, 164–65.

20 F. Ernst, ed., *Kyiv. Providnyk* [*Kyiv: The Guidebook*] (Kyiv: Derzhrest “K. D.,” 2-ha Drukarnia, 1930), 580–81.

21 The “theological” character of the Academy is accented not only by Ukrainian authors. See, for example, the naming of the Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium as a “theological institution” and the incorrect

Academy was a secular institution of general education that closed in 1817.²² Although some contemporary researchers on the early modern history of Ukrainian education do not have any doubts as to the difference between the two academies (the secular Mohyla institution and a specifically theological one from 1819), they accent the gradual loss of “secular elements” of the institution already at the end of the 18th century, and its closing in 1817 — as the last date in the history of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy.²³

To sum up, according to one of the hypotheses, 1817 represents the end of old Mohyla history; according to another, it is only one of markers of its centuries-old history. The basis for the different interpretations is served by the determination of the character of the institution: secular, for followers of the first hypothesis, and theological, for adherents of the second postulate.

It is probably not worth doubting the expediency of determining 1817 in the chronological dateline of the Academy for the convenience of its periodization, regardless of considering the date as a final point or transitional one. But it is not about formal periodization, which, like any other chronological “sectioning,” makes the study of certain phenomenon much easier. The events of 1817 need a broader perspective, considering the character of this educational institution from the 17th to the beginning of the 19th centuries.

As can be seen, the question of the “secularity” of the Mohyla Academy is a false one, as in that time and in that place the modern division of secular and theological education was not yet present. It is only in the second half of the 18th century that one can cautiously speak about a gradual evolution of Kyiv “Latin schools” into a specialized theological institution. In the Russian Empire educational attempts at change and reforms were centralized, and the academic corporation was not asked about its future. Despite the naming of the “Kyiv Athens” a “theological academy” in official documents of the last quarter of the 18th century,²⁴ official intrusion into the academic curriculum (establishment of the new academic curriculum in 1798, which designated the main aim of the so-called academies, the Kyiv Academy among them, as the preparation of clergy),²⁵ the Mohyla schools did not turn into a closed hierarchical school

attribution to the Jesuits, whose institutions were predominantly attended by the *schlakhta*, of control of “theological education in the Polish Crown.” Lidiia Sazonova, “Vostochnoslovianskie akademiï XVI–XVIII vv. v kontekste ievropeiskoi akademiïcheskoi traditsyi,” [“Eastern European Academies of the 16th–18th Centuries in the Context of European Academic Tradition,”] *Slovianoviedienie* 3 (1995): 45–61.

- 22 See, for example, the statement that the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy “did not belong to the category of theological schools.” Zoia Khyzhniak and Valerii Mankivskyi, *Istoriia Kyievo-Mohylianskoï akademii* [*The History of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy*] (Kyiv: Vydavnychi dim “KM Academia,” 2003), 170.
- 23 Lesia Aleksiievets, *Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia v suspilnomu zhytti Ukrainy i zarubizhnykh krain (XVII–XVIII st.)* [*Kyiv-Mohyla Academy in the Social Life of Ukraine and Abroad in the 17th–18th Centuries*] (Ternopil: Zbruch, 1999), 60.
- 24 See, for example, one of the Emperor’s charters of 1786: *Akty i dokumenty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Kievskoi Akademiï. Otdielenie II (1721–1795 gg.)* [*Acts and Documents Related to the History of Kyiv Academy. Section 2, 1721–1795*]. vol. 5, ed. N. I. Petrov (Kyiv, 1908), 139.
- 25 Titov, *Imperatorskaia Kievskaiia dukhovnaia akademiia*, 267–71.

for the priesthood. Children of the Cossack command continued to study there, for example, Illia Tymkivskiy, son of the commander of the Pereiaslav regiment, later an adviser of the regional court, attended the school in the 1780s.²⁶ The list of Mohyla students of 1779 includes “some ‘students’ from noble families, i.e. the Tumanskys, Mazarakievs, Ralovychs, Shlikevichs, Lahods, Maksymovychs, Raznatovskys, Tarnovskys, Katerynychs, Charnyshs, among others. The mentioned Vasylii Chernysh is a future leader of the nobility in Poltava region.”²⁷ The secular contingent of the Academy is attested to by annual student statistics.

For example, in 1779–1780 they were the majority: 435 students (51%) of 853.²⁸ Even at the beginning of the 19th century, with the secular Main General School [*Holovne Narodne Uchylshche*], a competitive institution existing from 1789, there were many secular students at the Academy.²⁹ For example, in 1801, 207 (17.6%) students of 1177 originated from secular families; and in 1808, 183 (12.7%) of 1438.³⁰ Generally speaking, the “Mohyla Athens” was undergoing a transformation process (was being transformed!) into a specialized school. But it was a process, and the theological institution emerged only in 1819.

Choosing between the two interpretations of the meaning of 1817 in the Academy’s history, it is necessary to state that it became the final point in two different epochs of Kyiv education — early modern and modern. The modern school is characterized by a disciplined division existing to this day between elementary, secondary, and post-secondary levels of education, with corresponding curricula, age divisions, etc. Also worth mentioning is that the new age brought to the former Hetmanate a distinct division of institutions into secular and theological.

Thus it is hardly reasonable to search for elementary, secondary, and post-secondary levels in the education system of previous times (except for in the case of the functionality of such a distinction, accenting its instrumental).³¹ The Mohyla “Latin schools” are a good example of the superflousness of such distinctions as they provided knowledge at different levels, and studies could be ended at a chosen level (exceptions being children of the clergy, beginning with the second half of the 18th century). In 1738, Archbishop Rafail (Zaborovskiy) claimed: “students as

26 “Zapiski Ili Fiodorovicha Timkovskogo,” [“The Notes of Ili Fiodorovicha Timkovskogo,”] *Russkii arkhiv* 1 (1874): 1413.

27 “Spisok ‘studentov i uchenikov’ Kievskoi akadiemii, 1779 goda,” [“The List of ‘Students and Pupils’ of Kyiv Academy, 1779,”] *Kievskaiia starina* 1 (1902): 10.

28 *Tsentralnyi derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy* [The Central State Archive of Ukraine]. Kyiv. F. 127, op. 1020, spr. 4950.

29 Nikolai Ryzhkov, “Otkrytiie v Kieve glavnogo narodnogo uchilishcha v 1789 g.,” [“The Beginning of the Main Folk School in Kyiv in 1789,”] *Kievskaiia starina* 7 (1893): 136–38.

30 Fiodor Titov, *Kievskaiia Akadiemiia v epokhu peform (1796–1819)* [Kyiv Academy during the Epoch of the Reforms, 1796–1819], vol. 2 (Kyiv, 1912), 84.

31 The paradoxical division of education into lower and higher is applied even to the Ukrainian Middle Ages. Accordingly, a chapter of prominent researcher Serhii Vysotskyi on the Kyiv writing school of the 11th–12th centuries speaks for itself: “Beginning and Higher Education in Kyivan Rus of 11th–12th Centuries.” See: Serhii Vysotskyi, *Kyivska pysemna shkola X–XII st. (Do istorii ukrainskoi pysemnosti)* [The Kyiv Graphic School of the 10th–12th Centuries: On the History of Ukrainian Script] (Lviv; Kyiv; New-York: Vydavnytstvo M. P. Kots, 1998), 117–23.

free people can study as much as they want, and after graduation, according to tradition, choose the employment that they want.”³² The faulty characterization of the old Academy as a “secular” or “theological” school violates the truth and limits the character of this institution and thus the understanding of Ukrainian education of the early modern period overall.

The absence of structure and gradation in education is a characteristic feature of European education of the early modern period. Steps towards the creation of the strict schemes and divisions into secular and the theological institution generally began at the 18th century, somewhere earlier, somewhere later. A fact worth mentioning is that the processes connected with the modernization of education took place with state involvement.³³ In the Russian Empire, reforms that lead to the organization of secular and theological types of elementary, secondary, and post-secondary education were carried out at the end of the 18th century and finalized during the next century. Thus 1817 should be considered as a watershed in Mohyla history that reflects the change of the character of Academy, not from “secular” to “theological,” but to again stress, from an early modern institution to one characteristic of the new epoch.

To sum up, the definition of the history of watersheds in Mohyla history is connected with important phenomena reflecting the complex problems of its past, some of which are yet to be researched.

Bibliography

- Akty i dokumenty, otnosiashchiiesia k istorii Kievskoi Akadiemii. Otdielenie II (1721–1795 gg.)* [*Acts and Documents Related to the History of the Kyiv Academy: Section II, 1721–1795*]. Vol. 1. Edited by N. I. Petrov. Kyiv, 1904.
- Akty i dokumenty, otnosiashchiiesia k istorii Kievskoi Akadiemii. Otdielenie II (1721–1795 gg.)* [*Acts and Documents Related to the History of the Kyiv Academy. Section 2, 1721–1795*]. Vol. 5. Edited by N. I. Petrov. Kyiv, 1908.
- Aleksiievets, Lesia. *Kyievo-Mohylianska akademiia v suspilnomu zhytti Ukrainy i zarubizhnykh krain (XVII–XVIII st.)* [*The Kyiv-Mohyla Academy in the Social Life of Ukraine and Abroad in the 17th–18th Centuries*]. Ternopil: Zbruch, 1999.
- Askochenskii, Viktor. *Kiev s drevneishym ego uchilishchem Akadiemiieiu* [*Kyiv with Its Most Ancient Academy*]. 2 vols. Kyiv, 1856.
- Bulgakov, Makarii. *Istoriia Kievskoi akadiemii* [*The History of the Kyiv Academy*]. Saint-Petersburg, 1843.
- Ernst, F., ed. *Kyiv. Providnyk* [*Kyiv: A Guidebook*]. Kyiv: Derzhrest “K. D.,” 2-ha Drukarnia, 1930.
- Ikonnikov, Vladimir. *Kiev v 1654–1855 gg. Istoricheskii ocherk* [*Kyiv of 1654–1855: A Historical Sketch*]. Kyiv, 1904.
- Hadiatska uniiia 1658 roku* [*The Treaty of Hadiach, 1658*]. Edited by P. Sohan and V. Brekhunenko. Kyiv, 2008.

32 Akty i dokumenty, I, 60.

33 Robert Allan Houston, *Literacy in Early Modern Europe: Culture and Education 1500–1800* (London: Longman, 1988), 10–12.

- Hrushevskiy, Mykhailo. *Iliustrovana istoriia Ukrainy* [*The Illustrated History of Ukraine*]. Kyiv, 1990.
- Hrushevskiy, Mykhailo. *Z isrorii religiinoi dumky na Ukraini* [*From the History of Theological Thought in Ukraine*]. Kyiv: Osvita, 1992.
- Houston, Robert Allan. *Literacy in Early Modern Europe: Culture and Education 1500–1800*. London: Longman, 1988.
- Jabłonowski, Aleksander. *Akademia Kijowsko-Mohilańska. Zarys historyczny na tle rozwoju ogólnego cywilizacji zachodniej na Rusi*. Kraków, 1899–1900.
- Golubev, Stepan. *Kiievskaia Akadiemiiav kontse XVII i nachale XVIII stolietii. Rech, proizniesionnaia na torzhestvennom akte Kiievskoi Dukhovnoi Akadiemii 26 sentiabria 1901 goda* [*The Kyiv Academy at the End of the 17th — Beginning of the 18th Centuries. Speech Delivered at the Ceremonial Act of the Kyiv Theological Academy on September 26, 1901*]. Kyiv, 1901.
- Khyzhniak, Zoia and Valerii Mankivskiy. *Istoriia Kyievo-Mohylianskoii akademii* [*The History of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy*]. Kyiv: Vydavnychiy dim “KM Akademia,” 2003.
- Kołłataj, Hugo. *Stan oświecenia w Polsce w ostatnich latach panowania Augusta III (1750–1764)*. Opracował Jan Hulewicz. Wrocław: Zakład narodowy imienia Ossolinskich, 1953.
- Krainii, Kostiantyn. *Istoriiky Kyievo-Pecherskoii Lavry XIX — pochatku XX stolit* [*Historians of the Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra of the 19th — Beginning of the 20th Centuries*]. Kyiv: Pulsary, 2000.
- Pamiatniki, izdannyye Vremennoiu komissiiie dlia razbora drevnikh aktov* [*Evidence Published by the Temporary Commission for the Analysis of Ancient Acts*]. 2nd ed. Vol. 2. Kyiv, 1897.
- Piatidiesiatiletanii iubilei Kievskoi dukhovnoi akadiemii. 28-go sentiabria 1869 goda* [*The 50th Anniversary of the Kyiv Theological Academy, 28 September 1869*]. Kyiv, 1869.
- “Pismo v Sovet Kievskoi dukhovnoi akadiemii pochietnoho ieia chlena L. S. Matseievicha.” [“Letter to the Council of Kyiv Theological Academy by L. S. Matseievich, Honorary Member.”] *TKDA* 7–8 (1911): 507–40.
- Prelovska, Iryna. *Kyivska Akademiia: istoriia i sychasnist* [*Kyiv Academy: The History and Contemporaneity*]. Accessed March 3, 2015. <http://www.kda.org.ua/about/history.html>.
- Ryzhkov, Nikolai. “Otkrytiie v Kieve glavnogo narodnogo uchilishcha v 1789 g.” [“The Beginning of the Main General School in Kyiv in 1789.”] *Kievskaiia starina* 7 (1893): 136–38.
- Sazonova, Lidiia. “Vostochnoslovianskie akadiemii XVI–XVIII vv. v kontekste ievropeiskoi akadiemicheskoi traditsyi.” [“Eastern European Academies of the 16th–18th Centuries in the Context of European Academic Tradition.”] *Slovianoviedienie* 3 (1995): 45–61.
- Shcherotskii, Konstantin. *Kiev. Putivoditel* [*Kyiv: The Guidebook*]. Kyiv, 1917.
- “Spisok ‘studentov i uchenikov’ Kievskoi akadiemii, 1779 goda.” [“The List of ‘Students and Pupils’ of the Kyiv Academy, 1779.”] *Kievskaiia starina* 1 (1902): 8–13.
- Titov, Fiodor. *Imperatorskaia Kievskaiia dukhovnaia akadiemii v ieie trekhvekovoii zhyzni i deiatelnosti (1615–1915 gg.)*. *Istoricheskaiia zapiska* [*The Imperial Kyiv Theological Academy during Its Three-Century History, 1615–1915: Historical Note*]. Kyiv, 1915.
- Titov, Fiodor. *Kievskaiia Akadiemii v epokhu peform (1796–1819)* [*The Kyiv Academy during the Epoch of the Reforms, 1796–1819*]. Vol. 2. Kyiv, 1912.
- Tsentralny derzhavnyi istorychnyi arkhiv Ukrainy* [*The Central State Archive of Ukraine*]. Kyiv. F. 127, op. 1029, spr. 4950: Imenni vidomosti vchyteliv ta uchniv Kyivskoi dukhovnoi akademii, 1780.

Vysotskyi, Serhii. *Kyivska pysemna shkola X–XII st. (Do istorii ukrainskoi pysemnosti)* [*The Kyiv Graphic School of the 10th–12th Centuries: On the History of Ukrainian Script*]. Lviv; Kyiv; New-York: Vydavnytstvo M. P. Kots, 1998.

Ulianovskii, Vasilii. “Istoricheskaia zapiska k 300-letiiu KDA i ieie avtor Fedor Titov.” [“Historical Note on the Academy’s 300th Anniversary and its Author, Fedor Titov.”] In *Imperatorskaia Kievskaiia dukhovnaia akadiemiia v ieie trekhvekovoi zhyzni i deiatelnosti (1615–1915 gg.)*. *Istoricheskaia zapiska*, edited by Fedor Titov. Kyiv: Hopak, 2003.

“Zapiski Ili Fiodorovicha Timkovskogo.” [“The Notes of Ilia Fiodorovich Timkovski.”] *Russkii arkhiv* 1 (1874): 1377–1466.



Maksym Iaremenko is Associate Professor at the Department of History of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. His research interests include the history of the Orthodox Church and education in early modern Ukraine. Maksym Iaremenko is co-editor of the annual *Kyivska Akademia* [*Kyivan Academy*] journal; his last monograph is entitled “*Academiky” ta akademiia: sotsialna istoria osvity i osvichenosti v Ukraini XVIII st.* [*The “Academicians” and the Academy: A Social History of Education and Literacy in 18th-Century Ukraine*] (Kharkiv: Akta, 2014).