KYIV-MOHYLA
HUMANITIES JOURNAL
KYIV-MOHYLA SCHOLARLY PEER-REVIEWED JOURNAL

DOI: 10.18523/2313-4895.12.2025.16-29

Svitlana Kuzmina
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3723-018X
dr.svitlana.kuzmina@gmail.com
Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University

Svitlana Avdieieva
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6177-4753
avdeeva@snu.edu.ua
Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University

PROFESSORS OF THE KYIV THEOLOGICAL ACADEMY ON EDUCATIONAL REFORM: DREAMS AND THE REALITY OF AUTHORITARIAN MODERNIZATION

Abstract
This article reconstructs the views of professors from the Kyiv Theological Academy on educational reform within the broader context of the Russian Empire during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The study aims to identify the value foundations of the educational reform models proposed by professors from the Kyiv Theological Academy and to analyze their historical and ideological determinants. The article demonstrates that, on the one hand, the professors based their projects on the fundamental principles and values of modernity, while, on the other hand, they were unanimous in opposing total bureaucratic control over educational institutions and the restriction of academic freedoms. This paradox, that the state must create and develop the educational system as a tool for its own self-preservation and development, while at the same time restricting its control over it, was addressed by the professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy through the concept of religious education or the Christianization of the school based on conservative values. It is emphasized that this conflict of values was conditioned by dependence on the official ideological doctrine, which contained internal contradictions characteristic of all projects of authoritarian modernization. The conclusion notes that, despite a certain degree of archaism, the ideas of the professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy may be useful in seeking a balance between conservative and liberal values for building an adaptive and inclusive educational system in Ukraine that takes into account national traditions and contemporary challenges.

Keywords: the Kyiv Theological Academy, educational reforms, authoritarian modernization, Petro Linytskyi, Sylvestr Hohotskyi, Pamfil Yurkevich, Mykola Makkaveiskyi.

Current educational reforms in Ukraine lack broad public support. Critics argue that the gradual implementation of radical changes results only in superficial modifications to educational institutions, without improving the quality of learning outcomes. These shortcomings are often attributed to insufficient economic support for reforms, weak managerial decisions, or the incompetence of those executing the changes. However, as experts emphasize, one of the key prerequisites for successful school reform is a broad national consensus on the values that should underlie such reform (Busemeyer et al., 2018; Busemeyer et al., 2020; Coombs & Merritt, 1977; Rosenberg et al., 2021; Sahlberg, 2021, pp. 13–24). Clearly, this kind of consensus can be formed not only through expert discussions, public debates, and political negotiations but also through the painstaking work of cultural reflection in the research of historians, philosophers, cultural theorists, and educators.

In this context, the need to analyze Ukraine's historical experience of educational reform, which already spans more than a century and a half, becomes particularly relevant. Legislative and regulatory acts, institutional documentation, memoirs, and other historical sources undoubtedly allow for a general reconstruction of the transformations in education. At the same time, it is impossible to overlook the importance of reconstructing the philosophical and pedagogical discourse when addressing the value-based and ideological foundations of such transformations. While the ideological justification for educational reforms during the Soviet period in Ukraine is primarily to be found in the resolutions of the governing bodies of the Communist Party, the history of school reforms in the pre-revolutionary era (from the second half of the 19th century to the early 20th century) offers a far richer and more nuanced body of material. As is well known, these reforms were discussed by representatives of various social and professional groups, including, notably, the professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy (1819–1924).

Overall, the academic community of this institution demonstrated a genuine concern not only for educational reform in general but also for specific issues related to it, including the structure of parish schools, religious education, the teaching of philosophy in gymnasiums, and the content and organization of the educational process in theological seminaries and academies. Professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy typically shared their ideas and proposals through various publications as well as manuscript documents prepared for committees and commissions tasked with developing the next stage of educational reform. To date, however, aside from a few studies devoted to the participation of Kyiv's theological-academic community in the movement for university autonomy in the early twentieth century (Tkachuk, 2007, pp. 149–165), and the analysis of Kyiv Theological Academy professors' approaches to shaping educational policy (Kuzmina, 2009, pp. 67–70), this legacy, which constitutes a substantial body of texts, remains largely underexplored. This study aims to identify the value foundations underlying the models of educational reform proposed by professors from Kyiv Theological Academy and to analyze their historical and ideological determinants.

In discussing the methodological design of such a study, it is essential to emphasize the importance of preserving a holistic view of historical processes and acknowledge the widely accepted scholarly consensus that the construction and reform of educational systems, beginning with the Enlightenment, have constituted an integral part of modernization. These processes were a response to the growing economic, social, and cultural demands of both the state and society (Goorha, 2010). At the same time, when examining Russia's educational modernity (Eklof & Lisovskaya, 2020, pp. 185–192), it is

crucial to adopt an appropriate analytical lens, one that navigates between the monolithic and hegemonic notion of a universal, homogenizing Eurocentric modernization (Holquist, 1997, 2002), and the view of "multiple modernities" (Eisenstadt, 2002). As Ben Eklof and Elena Lisovskaya rightly observe, it is precisely the term "multiple modernities" that allows us to see the peculiarities of each individual modern project informing social transformations within specific civilizational, cultural, and national contexts, carried out by diverse social actors and animated by a distinct cultural program (Eklof & Lisovskaya, 2020, p. 185). This raises the question: what worldview and value principles did the professors of the Kyiv theological-academic community lay at the foundation of their educational reform agenda?

Rejecting the axiom, established as early as the sixteenth century, that educational reform must discard tradition and create radically new institutions better suited to emerging needs, the Kyiv academics began by addressing questions concerning the causes and patterns of the school's emergence as a social institution, and subsequently, the functions that schools have performed and continue to perform within the state.

Petro Linytskyi offers a somewhat romantic view of the school's evolution. The school, he argues, emerges as a cultural phenomenon that meets the needs of a gifted individual for the free expression of their spiritual capacities and their striving toward higher-order activities. It is no coincidence that in Ancient Greece, this institution was associated with leisure, not as a temporary respite from labor, but as a way of life devoted to the realization of the ideal of the human being. Similarly, in the Middle Ages, scholars and monks viewed the school and scholarly pursuits as a means of fulfilling their moral duty, attaining higher spiritual perfection, and saving the soul. And only when the development of society and the economy requires educated individuals and, as a result, the state begins to take care of education, does the majority choose schooling, guided not by a free spiritual aspiration but by the need to gain certain benefits (Linitskii, 1892, pp. 405–407). However, other Kyiv academics link the emergence of the school in human history to the specific characteristics of culture and the state. As Sylvestr Hohotskyi and Pamfil Yurkevych observe, in ancient China, where officials were recruited from among scholars well-versed in classical texts through a system of examinations regardless of their social origin, the care for educational institutions was elevated to a matter of state concern. By contrast, in other countries, schools emerged as a result of private initiative and did not directly influence the functioning of the state apparatus. In India, under the caste system, education was the responsibility of the Brahmins. In the classical world, the school arose to cultivate conscious citizens, both as defenders of the homeland and as participants in public life (Gogotskii, 1854, issue 10, pp. 1–33; issue 11, pp. 80–127; issue 12, pp. 191–192; Yurkevych, n.d.-b, ark. 3). Thus, the citizen, freed from the demands of daily physical labor, devoted himself to pursuits of "artibus liberalibus," activities deemed worthy of the true human being. This led to the emergence of a distinctive type of ancient school, oriented primarily toward aesthetic pursuits, such as play, leisure, and entertainment, aimed at the harmonious development of both the soul and the body (Gogotskii, 1874, pp. 7–8). Distinct in both spirit and way of life, Jewish culture developed its school according to a different principle, namely the principle of faith. As Mykola Makkaveiskyi notes, the need for systematic, specialized education arose as a result of the spiritual crisis experienced during the Babylonian captivity. Gradually, with the establishment of a new spiritual orientation for Jews and a new ideal of righteousness, which demanded detailed knowledge and skilled interpretation of the Law, thus requiring a

well-trained memory and sharp intellect, a class of bearers of this knowledge began to form. The school then became the central driving force of Jewish education (Makkaveiskii, 1903b, pp. 64–66).

Yurkevych regarded the school of his time not as the product of any single national culture, but as the outcome of world history, an expression of humanity's recognition of its calling to serve God. Its highest expressions became the Hellenic idea of harmony between inner and outer beauty, the Roman idea of law, and the Judaic idea of faith. Accordingly, three elements now lie at the foundation of the school. From Rome, it has inherited the idea of will, authority, and discipline, embodied in the administration, the headmaster, and the inspector. From Greece, it has inherited the idea of humanity and the necessity of harmonious development of the individual's higher faculties, entrusted to the teacher. From Israel, represented by the figure of the priest, it has received the idea of the heart and the fear of God, of humility, prayer, and the awareness of divine assistance (Yurkevych, n.d.-b, ark. 2). At the same time, in Yurkevych's view, having perceived the general structure of the school as a social institution, each nation seeks to fill it with its own meanings. The people themselves regard the school, and their right to influence it, as a fundamental condition for preserving their identity. For example, the philosopher notes that one of the main causes of the revolutionary events of 1830 in France, as well as Belgium's secession from the Netherlands, was the attempt by royal authorities to alter the confessional affiliation of schools and thereby restrict the freedom of religious education (Yurkevich, n.d.-c, ark. 1.99). Supporting this opinion, Makkaveiskyi points to the example of fraternal schools that emerged in the sixteenth-century Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as an instrument of resistance by Orthodox brotherhoods against Catholic expansion and as a defense of their sacred right to their own language and faith (Makkaveiskii, 1902, pp. 8–9). And if language and faith determine the unique characteristics of a people, then the school, in which they are mastered, may be seen as a distinctive embodiment of the national soul, an institution not only of instruction but also of moral and cultural education.

At the same time, the professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy caution against viewing educational institutions as "a special and novel form of the general spirit, a spontaneous phenomenon, a unique and new foundation of moral development and humanization."[1] The school, Yurkevich asserts, is an artificial institution, one whose life is breathed into it by the family, society, the state, and the Church (Yurkevich, 1869, pp. 212–213). "If," he observes, "the general consciousness holds a weak or false sense of honor; if the law and justice are treated with disregard; if the general direction of life is immoral, then the school can do nothing in such circumstances" (Yurkevich, n.d.-a, ark. 48). Makkaveiskyi likewise refutes the widespread belief in the self-sufficiency of the school and rejects the accusation that it corrupts the younger generation. Alongside the influence of schooling, the thinker notes, there unfolds the complex formative work of that vast mechanism known as surrounding life. It is life itself that provides the young soul with an endless array of impressions, the vividness and intensity of which often surpass those of classroom instruction (Makkaveiskii, 1903a, pp. 395–432). Consequently, the Kyiv academics unanimously affirm: it is not the school that shapes society, but society that shapes the school. Therefore, if society is unwell, its school cannot be healthy either.

[1] Obviously, when speaking in this way about the school, Yurkevich refers to the Hegelian understanding of the forms of evolution of the "objective spirit" (Sittlichkeit) that refers to the realm of social institutions and ethical life, where individuals participate in shared customs and practices, including family, civil society, and the state.

However, as Yurkevich observes, though the school may be a small being, it causes the world to tremble. The question of control over education has shaken states, for it is evident: whoever dictates the terms of education today holds power over the future. Still, the state must mature to the realization that it is strengthened not so much by its army or capital as by its system of education. Once this level of development is reached, the need for mass education becomes self-evident (Yurkevich, 1869, pp. 6, 207). Without school, Linytskyi asserts that the modern state cannot fulfill its purpose. Indeed, how could it possibly ensure external and internal security, material well-being, a benevolent atmosphere, and psychological comfort without the contributions of the military, doctors, law enforcement officers, legal professionals, entrepreneurs, merchants, civil servants, and, ultimately, the clergy? Meanwhile, all of them are educated by the school, which itself requires qualified teachers and administrators. Thus, the education system holds, without exaggeration, fundamental and all-encompassing significance for the state (Linitskii, 1892, pp. 407–408). In order for a particular form of government to function effectively, Yurkevich specifies, two conditions must be met. On the one hand, all citizens must share a "common spirit" of respect for statehood, a capacity and willingness to reconcile private interests with the common good, perceiving it as their own goal. This requires the expansion of general education. On the other hand, the state cannot fulfill its specific functions without specially trained individuals, which necessitates the development of a system of specialized education (Yurkevich, 1869, pp. 206–207; 1866, ark. 47). Naturally, the advancement of public and political life generates the need to expand the school network, which in turn raises the question of the extent and means of state control over the school.

Yurkevich, in particular, draws attention to the ever-present danger that state protection, support, and oversight of education may grow into complete and total control over the school. From there, the scholar warns, one may expect a disregard for the interests and needs of individual development, and ultimately, the transformation of the school into a breeding ground for ranks, and of education into mere preparation for securing lucrative positions. To prevent this, since the strength and vitality of statehood depend less on the number of specialists than on the moral spirit of its citizens, it is necessary, on the one hand, for society and families to nurture the aspiration to raise children for higher purposes, rather than for the uniform of a bureaucrat; and on the other, for the state to exercise conscious self-restraint and grant the pedagogical community the freedom to express its qualified opinions and carry out its work (Yurkevich, n.d.-a, ark. 47.102). "As soon as," the philosopher asserts, "schools cease to care for the higher moral spirit, a predictable transformation begins, whereby the university degenerates into a polytechnic institute, the gymnasium into a vocational school, and the primary school into a school of mere literacy" (Yurkevich, 1870a, p. 4).

Linytskyi likewise argues that the desire of state authorities to impose total control and to achieve rapid, large-scale results becomes a source of formalism in education. In such circumstances, both supervisors and practitioners strive to be as efficient and meticulous as possible, aiming to ensure a flawless educational process. However, in doing so, the thinker emphasizes that they inflict the greatest harm upon education. A teacher reduced to the role of bureaucrat, focused solely on following instructions, is capable only of producing another "executor" like himself, not an educated individual, not a creative actor inspired by higher convictions and genuine dedication to public and civic service. The school cannot tolerate formalism

and total control. In reforming it, one must not be guided by the pursuit of immediate outcomes at the expense of the distant future. One must remember that everything truly great and fruitful matures very slowly and gradually, from small and often imperceptible beginnings. According to Linytskyi, a school should be given a clearly defined task, but how that task is to be fulfilled should be left for the school itself to decide. Naturally, in the interest of national unity, a common educational space must be maintained; however, priority should be given to unity of spirit, not of form. The thinker is convinced that this can be achieved only by integrating instruction with moral education. More important than any policy measures are the engagement of talented individuals in science and schooling, for talent is by nature accompanied by commitment and love for one's work. Moreover, it is essential to create conditions in which teachers can invest their soul and intellect into their work, that is, to allow them freedom in choosing teaching methods and tools, and to ensure that they are not forced to expend their energy on supplementary jobs due to insufficient material support. There must also be room for freedom within the structure of school-based education. Pupils, the scholar notes, have the right to make mistakes, for personal development occurs only through the testing of intellectual, moral, and physical capacities, where shortcomings, missteps, and bursts of enthusiasm are inevitable. A "hyper-formalized" school, however, teaches students not to recognize such flaws, nor to reflect on how to correct or prevent them, but rather to conceal them, to falsify, and to present a polished façade. Overall, Linytskyi emphasizes that formalism in the school system must be countered by the aspiration toward intellectual and moral excellence in the human being (Linitskii, 1892, pp. 408–422).

Makkaveiskyi articulated his views on the principles of educational reform in the early 1900s, during yet another wave of school reform and the intense polemics surrounding it. Significantly, the Kyiv professor focused less on the content of the reform itself than on the fact that neither its proponents nor its critics had a clear and coherent concept of how the state ought to relate to the school, or what it should expect from it. "Today," Makkaveiskyi (1901) declared, "our school pedagogy stands, so to speak, at a crossroads. It has not yet found those firm foundations that would compel it, with deep conviction, to commit irrevocably to a single path. *We are wandering...*" (p. 609). What, then, should guide the determination of the directions and methods for the development of education? The demand for specialists? The principle of school unity? The improvement of learning conditions? The requirements for radical renewal? None of these, the thinker argues. School is the product of a long process of cultural development. It is impossible to destroy it completely and build something fundamentally new in its place. In fact, it is a cast of social consciousness and even a certain reflection of national archetypes. Therefore, only what already exists can be changed, and such changes must be guided by practical and vital considerations. Moreover, priority must be given to the needs of the child and the necessity of their holistic development, taking into account the "ABC of psychology," which speaks to the diversity of inclinations and talents, as well as the principles of "sound pedagogy," with its emphasis on the natural appropriateness of education and upbringing (Makkaveiskii, 1901, pp. 587–588). These considerations, in turn, dictate the need to grant schools the freedom to cultivate the particular strengths they possess. Only when uniformity and coercion are eliminated, society will be able to realize its broader prospects. These include a wide range of educational approaches aligned with the inclinations and natural abilities of children, implemented through diverse types of schools. It also enables

the resolution of the problem of the nationalization of education, for society will be able to clarify its own national characteristics in the realm of upbringing, provided it has the freedom to express its preferences and aspirations through the school system (Makkaveiskii, 1901, p. 588). Of course, Makkaveiskyi affirms that such a policy requires caution, time, and patience in awaiting results, just as any policy in the field of education does.

Thus, as we can see, on the one hand, the professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy grounded their educational reform project in the fundamental characteristics and values of modernity. In their vision, education should be mass, national, and public in nature, with the state supporting and overseeing the school system. On the other hand, the Kyiv academics were unanimously opposed to total bureaucratic control over educational institutions, as that administrative overreach and the deprivation of teachers' creative freedom led to the school's loss of its capacity not only to instruct, but to cultivate citizens who are consciously and faithfully committed to serving the state.

This clear and inherent paradox, according to which the state must create and develop the educational system as an instrument of its own preservation and progress while at the same time exercising self-restraint in controlling it, was addressed by the professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy through the concept of religious education.

To understand how the state can exert influence over education, Yurkevich proposes examining the nature of the state itself. He emphasizes that the entirety of human history has demonstrated the fallacy of Aristotle's definition of the state as a "self-satisfied," self-sufficient entity. In reality, the state endures only so long as it constitutes a "living and inspired union," an object not of servitude imposed by force or utilitarian calculation, but of the free service of its citizens (Yurkevich, n.d.-a, ark. 47). Is there any motivation more powerful than religious devotion to such service? For this reason, thrones have always been placed beside altars, and rituals honoring supreme authority have carried religious significance everywhere. Consequently, the state has consistently cared for both religious upbringing and education (Yurkevich, n.d.-c, ark. 1). Thus, the state has a vested interest in providing its citizens with religious education. Then, the philosopher asks, which religious doctrine should be introduced in the school, since there is natural religion and revealed religion, there is general Christianity and the religion of specific denominations. Rousseau, for example, advocated for an educational system based on an artificially synthesized cult acceptable to all religions, while German pedagogues promoted a general Christian doctrine stripped of any denominational specificity. On the one hand, Yurkevich does not reject the possibility of employing all three doctrines in education, as each corresponds to a different level of schooling: confessional religion, as the embodiment of Christianity in specific forms of national life, belongs to elementary or primary education; general Christianity, as the foundation of modern culture, suits the classical Christian gymnasium; and the "religion of pure reason", as the philosophy of religion, is appropriate for the university (Yurkevich, n.d.-c, ark. 1). On the other hand, he notes, one must not forget why thinkers such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Adolph Diesterweg, Karl Schmidt, and others excluded Christian confessions from the school setting. Rousseauism was driven by the idea of uniting all nations into a single humanity, while the Germans were struggling for national unity despite the diversity of their Christian denominations. Under the conditions of statehood and the historical circumstances of its formation, similar to those of Russia, the thinker observes that German schooling would

have defended confessional religious education[2] (Yurkevich, 1870b, p. 112). Overall, it becomes clear that it is policy that introduces religion-free schooling, and this, in fact, leads to the undivided domination of the state-bureaucratic apparatus within it.

Meanwhile, Yurkevich believes that it is a specific Church that should preach within the school, as the bearer of the spirit of the creative power of the nation that founded the state, and as the guarantor of the sacred right of parents to raise their children in their own faith. Beyond political considerations, there are also pedagogical reasons for this. First and foremost, only faith can serve as a reliable psychological foundation for morality. However, it is doubtful that natural religion could become a genuine formative force or a source of personal spiritual development. Reading about God in the book of nature is a difficult and perilous task. The abstract schemes of the "religion of pure reason" are accessible only to outstanding minds, but not to a child, whose "pure reason is zero." In contrast, Christianity stands much closer to ordinary human understanding (Yurkevich, n.d.-c, ark. 1). It makes the person free and independent in their moral self-determination, the bearer of higher values. However, no matter how much the abstract Christian doctrine is adapted to suit a child's perception, it will remain too abstract, impoverished, detached from reality, and lacking personal example, clarity, and vitality. Only within the environment of a specific Christian church will the child encounter not merely dogma to be memorized, but real life governed by truth and grace uniquely perceived. It is here, in harmony with parents and family, that the child will feel and internalize this truth with their heart. Thus, if the state wants the school to be an institution of upbringing, it must ensure the presence of the Church in schools, the faith historically professed by the people. Since, for the Russian people, Yurkevich emphasizes, Orthodoxy is the source of unity, peace, and strength, it should become the foundation of the Russian school (Yurkevich, 1870b, p. 112).

The fervor with which Kyiv Orthodox academics defend the idea of religious education may seem somewhat surprising, given that in the Russian Empire, the Orthodox Church was not separated from the state or the school system. Accordingly, subjects such as the Law of God, sacred history, and moral theology were compulsory in schools, depending on the level of education, and could be taught only by priests. However, it appears that in the 1870s, it was precisely this official status of religion in schools that prompted objections from Yurkevich. A school, he argued, that is divided into two separate "microscopic faculties, the theological and the historical-philological," cannot educate a "whole person," or be truly humane. In this system, the teacher and the priest are turned into officials of two separate departments. Moreover, the priest, when teaching the Law of God and other religious subjects, does not connect them in any way with secular disciplines, while the teacher, having no right to expound church doctrine, fails to show how God's will and human faith operate in the history of humankind and in personal life. As a result, great truths and historical events, instead of inspiring and educating, become trivialized, reduced to ordinary "study material" to be memorized. This arrangement, Yurkevich asserts, "seems deliberately aimed at producing parties that do not yet exist in our society, clericals who turn away from life and humanists who turn away from Christianity," or even at shaping a person with two separate consciousnesses, two worldviews, each kept in reserve, convenient to use depending on the circumstances (Yurkevich, 1870a, p. 9).

To prevent the danger of ideological division within society, Yurkevich develops a vision of

[2] Here, Yurkevich ignores the obvious fact of the religious diversity of the Russian Empire.

a fundamentally new type of school. In particular, he calls for transforming it into a center not so much of intellectual, but of comprehensive spiritual, moral, and creative development of the individual. He sees the essence of religious education not in catechization or rote learning of dogmatics, but in the stimulation of religious life, in the creation of a particular religious atmosphere in which understanding would emerge through contemplation, and faith would be preached "through music, singing, visual art, and all the powers of inspiration" (Yurkevich, n.d.-c, ark. 2). Just as music, the most subjective and profound of the arts, as the philosopher observes, first appeals to emotions and only then, through emotions, to ideas, so too religion should operate through a way of life, prayer, contemplation, and only thereafter through study and concepts. For this reason, the academic calendar should be aligned with the church calendar, including all its feasts and fasts. To some extent, Yurkevich attempts to implement, naturally taking into account contemporary realities and the specifics of Russian culture, the Platonic ideal of education. The school curriculum, in his view, should be built, so to speak, on four pillars: history, language, music, and physical culture (Yurkevich, n.d.-c, ark. 2–3). Of course, to implement this ideal model, it is necessary to introduce fundamental changes to the teacher training system. However, as a first step, Yurkevich proposes to finally equalize the rights of teachers and priests by allowing both, where needed, to teach religious subjects and to refer to Christian doctrine while teaching secular ones (Yurkevich, n.d.-c, ark. 1; 1870a, pp. 23–24). Christianity, the philosopher emphasizes, is neither a science nor a craft. As the doctrine of Salvation, it belongs to all people and is embodied in their creativity and service. Therefore, every Christian, and especially a teacher, has the right to express and demonstrate Christian ideas in history, literature, and the content of other school subjects. Only then can one hope that both forces, ecclesiastical and secular, will harmoniously unite. The teacher will educate while instructing, the priest will instruct while educating, and the "school of literacy" or "technical school" will become a "school of humanity."

The validity of Yurkevich's pessimistic forecast was confirmed in the early twentieth century by Makkaveiskyi. He reproached the Russian educational system for lacking an organic integrity of all pedagogical components, viewing this as a reflection of the deep division in Russian society between believers and atheists. Under these circumstances, the religious and moral influence is limited to the lessons taught by the instructor of religion, while secular subjects, both in the humanities and in the sciences, exist separately. If most teachers do not hold Christian beliefs, are only superficially familiar with, or entirely unaware of, church dogmatics and doctrine, then how, the thinker asks, can they possibly reveal the religious and moral significance of the educational content? Without faith, how can a natural scientist sincerely glorify the greatness and wisdom of God reflected in nature? How can a philologist find examples of beautiful literary language in the Bible and the patristic writings and present them to students? How can a historian discern signs of divine providence in the map of major world events, or a classical scholar perceive the "radiance of divine light" in antiquity? Without this foundation, all efforts aimed at "enhancing the religiosity of teaching" or "introducing piety" will be either fruitless or, more likely, harmful (Makkaveiskii, 1903a, pp. 408–411).

Makkaveiskyi expresses hope that the Russian school will emerge from its amorphous and chaotic state and acquire coherent and rational forms once it recognizes that the key ideas for its development are the Christianization and nationalization of education. Reflecting on the school reform of

the early 1900s, which marked an abrupt shift from classical to vocational education, the scholar seeks ways to Christianize the school as it already exists. What force, then, can lead it onto a new path? The answer, he believes, is evident to all – the teacher. However, Makkaveiskyi does not succumb to general illusions, unlike, for example, Archpriest Ioann Solovyov, who merely urged teachers not to remain silent in class about the religious and moral dimension of their disciplines, but instead, to bring it to the forefront at every opportunity (Makkaveiskii, 1903a, p. 396). The utilitarian orientation and pragmatism have already taken deep root among the Russian intelligentsia, Makkaveiskyi notes, and therefore, creating an ideal religious atmosphere in the school, one that would be shared by all, is a task too difficult, if at all realistic (Makkaveiskii, 1901, pp. 601–602; 1903a, p. 409). According to the thinker, the primary responsibility for the Christianization of the school should fall to the Church. However, this should not be accomplished in an administrative or bureaucratic manner by bringing all educational institutions under its control, but rather by introducing into the school, in the person of the instructor of religious doctrine, an institution of pastoral care. On its part, the state, as an interested party, should support its authority (Makkaveiskii, 1903a, pp. 411–415). Makkaveiskyi associates the introduction of such an institution with significant changes. First and foremost, it is necessary to reform religious instruction by transforming the Law of God from an ordinary school subject into an instrument of spiritual formation, one that draws students to the primary sources of the Christian faith, namely the Holy Scriptures and the works of the Holy Fathers. Another necessary change that the institution of pastoral care should introduce into the school is the celebration of religious services in the school's house chapel, through which the instructor of religious doctrine would acquire a special status as a priest and gain the right to provide pastoral guidance to his pupils. This would not be a formal connection but a genuine prayerful bond, a unification of the school community with the Church in accordance with Orthodox dogma concerning its essence as a mystical organism. It would also serve as natural support for parents, who, for various reasons, may not always be able to penetrate certain hidden aspects of their children's spiritual lives. And, as the thinker reflects, not much is actually needed to achieve this: to establish house chapels in schools, to grant the instructor of religious doctrine equal rights with other educators, to pay him for his work as a pastor, to involve him in discussions on matters related to the school's educational mission, to relieve him of the burdensome bureaucratic oversight that accompanies the teaching of the Law of God, and, finally, to expand the pedagogical component in theological education (Makkaveiskii, 1903a, pp. 415–429; 1906, pp. 235–239). Yet all these measures will prove futile if the instructor of religious doctrine fails to support his formal status with personal effort, conscientious devotion to his work, both outward and inward culture, love for others, and especially for the child (Makkaveiskii, 1903a, pp. 430–431). Only when he exerts a genuine pastoral influence on pupils and colleagues will he become the central figure in the school's educational system and establish within it a truly Orthodox spiritual atmosphere. According to Makkaveiskyi, this will best express the national features of the Russian people's worldview and self-perception. At that point, teaching the native language, Russian literature, history, geography, law, fundamentals of philosophy, and the arts will acquire a special significance, and the application of "fatherland studies" as a unifying pedagogical principle will be realized throughout the entire curriculum at all educational levels, from the lowest to the

highest (Makkaveiskii, 1895, pp. 43–45). Then the school will exchange its indifferent mask of a "state institution" for the spiritual face of a "Russian Christian."

Summing up the concepts of religious education or the "Christianization of the school," it should be noted that, formally, they contradict the general intention of the project of educational modernity to reject tradition, particularly by freeing itself from religious control (Arenas, 2007; Kamens, 2012; Lave, 1988; Rapple, 1988; Smith, 1992). However, in terms of both the essence and the form of instruction, these concepts have nothing in common with the "medieval" school of rote learning; on the contrary, they are oriented not only toward cognitive but also toward holistic development of the individual.

Thus, the presented facts and generalizations make it possible to assert that the professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy genuinely shared the values and priorities upon which the modern educational project was based. To some extent, they even anticipated this project by demanding that the state exercise self-restraint in its control over schools. At the same time, it is important to underline the Kyiv academics' orientation toward conservative values. Their speculative constructions, on the one hand, implied the provision of freedom for pedagogical creativity and personal development, but on the other hand, remained within the orbit of the official imperial ideology, embedded in the so-called "Uvarov's triad." Its universal and capacious formula – "Orthodoxy, Autocracy, Nationality" – was also internally contradictory, aiming to establish a unified educational space in the state in accordance with the European model, while simultaneously preserving the existing political system and the integrity of the empire through the assimilation of colonized peoples (Bevziuk, 2024). In essence, the "Uvarov's triad" represented one of the unsuccessful variants of "authoritarian modernism" that is characterized by a regime leadership that propagates economic modernity while resisting democratic change by co-opting (and not just repressing) civil society while justifying authoritarian rule as culturally appropriate, with liberal democracy dismissed as a "Western" and not universally valid (Thompson, 2019).

It is evident that the reform projects developed in Kyiv were part of this trend, since their authors were obliged to adhere to the official ideology. Why, then, did these projects remain on paper and were never implemented? The reason lies in the gap between reality and the way the professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy understood the triad "Orthodoxy, Autocracy, Nationality." In particular, their concept of religious education or the Christianization of the school is based on the orthodox teaching of the apostles and the holy fathers regarding the Church as a mystical organism, whose head is Christ and whose believers are its members, each with their own ministry. Meanwhile, within the political structure of the Russian Empire, the Orthodox Church served as a state department, tasked with providing ideological support for the autocracy. Under such conditions, was it possible to build an educational policy on the principles of trust in the teacher and academic freedom? Moreover, the abstract concept of nationality from the "Uvarov's triad", which the professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy apparently sincerely and diligently adhered to, exaggerated the devotion to the Orthodox faith as supposedly the key trait of the Russian national character while in reality it ignored the real and significant cultural and religious differences even among the "fraternal" Ukrainians, Belarusians, and Russians, not to mention the many other ethnic groups within the Russian Empire.

Thus, the educational reform projects developed by the professors of the Kyiv Theological Academy were dreams that could not withstand the collision with the harsh

reality of authoritarian modernism. Nevertheless, it would be unwise for us to devalue the intellectual legacy of the Kyiv academics, as their achievements and delusions can help us today to understand how to reform education not by completely dismantling national traditions, but by developing and advancing them.

References

Arenas, A. (2007). The Intellectual Development of Modern Schooling: An Epistemological Analysis. *Universitas Humanística, 64*, 165–192. https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/791/79106408.pdf.

Bevziuk, Ye. (2021). S. Uvarov's Imperial Ideology as a Principle of Modernization of the Educational Environment. *Ukrainskyi Istorychnyi Zhurnal*, *3*, 126–136. https://doi.org/10.15407/uhj2021.03.126.

Busemeyer, M. R., Garritzmann, J. L., & Neimanns, E. (2020). Qualitative Evidence: The Role of Public Opinion in Education Reforms in Western Europe. In H. W. Schumann & A. Merkel (Eds.), *A Loud but Noisy Signal? Public Opinion and Education Reform in Western Europe* (pp. 153–307). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108767505.007

Busemeyer, M. R., Lergetporer, P., & Woessmann, L. (2018). Public Opinion and the Political Economy of Educational Reforms: A Survey. *European Journal of Political Economy, 53*, 161–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2017.08.002.

Coombs, F. S., & Merritt, R. L. (1977). The Public's Role in Educational Policy-Making: An International View. *Education and Urban Society, 9* (2), 167–196. https://doi.org/10.1177/001312457700900204.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (Ed.). (2002). *Multiple Modernities* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315124872.

Eklof, B., & Lisovskaya, E. (2020). Russia's Involuted Paths Toward and Within Educational Modernity. *European Education, 52* (3), 185–192. https://doi.org/10.1080/10564934.2020.1834198.

Gogotskii, S. S. (1854). Ob istoricheskom razvitii vospitaniia u primechatelneishikh narodov drevnego mira. Rech, chitannaia na torzhestvennom sobranii Universiteta Sviatogo Vladimira 9 iunia 1853 g. [On the Historical Development of Education Among the Most Notable Peoples of the Ancient World. Speech Delivered at the Solemn Assembly of St. Vladimir University on June 9, 1853]. *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia*, *10*, 1–33; *11*, 80–127; *12*, 191–256 [in Russian].

Gogotskii, S. S. (1874). *O razlichii mezhdu vospitaniem i obrazovaniem v drevnie i novye vremena (Publichnaia lektsiia, chitannaia 27 ianvaria 1874 g. v polzu goloduiushchikh Samarskoi gubernii i nedostatochnykh studentov Universiteta)* [*On the Difference Between Education and Upbringing in Ancient and Modern Times (Public Lecture Delivered on January 27, 1874, in Aid of Starving People of Samara Province and Indigent Students of the University*)]. Univ. tip. [in Russian].

Goorha, P. (2010). Modernization Theory. In K. C. Lavelle, M. Benson, & C. Navari (Eds.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of International Studies*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.013.266.

Holquist, P. (1997). "Information is the Alpha and Omega of our Work": Bolshevik Surveillance in its pan European Context. *The Journal of Modern History*, *69* (3), 415–450. https://doi.org/10.1086/245534.

Holquist, P. (2002). *Making War, Forging Revolution: Russia's Continuum of Crisis, 1914–1921.* Harvard University Press. https://www.hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674009073.

Kamens, D. H. (2012). Modernity and Changing Patterns of Intolerance. In D. H. Kamens (Ed.), *Beyond the nation-state* (*Research in the Sociology of Education*, *18*, 121–156). Emerald Group Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-3539(2012)0000018009.

Kuzmina, S. L. (2009). Shkola i derzhavna osvitnia polityka: pohliad kyivskykh akademichnykh filosofiiv XIX – pochatku XX st. [School and State Educational Policy: The View of Kyiv Academic Philosophers of the 19th and early 20th Centuries]. *Naukovi Zapysky NaUKMA. Filosofiia ta Relihieznavstvo*, *89*, 67–70 [in Ukrainian].

Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in Practice: Mind, Mathematics, and Culture in Everyday life*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511609268.

Linitskii, P. I. (1892). *Posobie k izucheniiu voprosov filosofii (elementy filosofskogo mirosozertsaniia)* [*A Manual for the Study of the Issues of Philosophy (Elements of a Philosophical Worldview)*] (427 p.). Tip. Gub. pravl. [in Russian].

Makkaveiskii, N. K. (1895). Religiia i narodnost kak osnovy vospitaniia. Rech, proiznesennaia na torzhestvennom akte Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii 26 sentiabria 1895 g. [Religion and Nationality as Foundations of Upbringing. Speech Delivered at the Solemn Ceremony of the Kyiv Theological Academy on September 26, 1895]. *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii*, *11*, 428–472 [in Russian].

Makkaveiskii, N. K. (1901). Sovremennye pedagogicheskie bluzhdaniia (po povodu izdaniia S. A. Rachinskogo "*Absit Omen*", SPb., 1901) [Modern pedagogical wanderings (Regarding the Publication of S. A. Rachinsky's *Absit Omen*, St. Petersburg, 1901)] [Review of the book]. *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii*, *12*, 580–609 [in Russian].

Makkaveiskii, N. K. (1902). *Nasha osnovnaia zadacha i nashi glavnye sredstva. Rech, skazannaia v tserkvi Kievo-Bratskogo monastyria v den molitvennogo vospominaniia osnovatelei i blagotvoritelei Kievskoi akademii, i vsekh, v nei uchivshikh i uchivshikhsia* [*Our Main Task and our Primary Means. Speech Delivered at the Church of the Kyiv-Bratsky Monastery on the Day of Prayerful Remembrance of the Founders and Benefactors of the Kyiv Academy, and All Who Studied and Taught There*]. Tip. I. I. Gorbunova [in Russian].

Makkaveiskii, N. K. (1903a). K voprosu o religioznom vospitanii v nashei srednei obshcheobrazovatelnoi shkole [On the Issue of Religious Education in our Secondary General Education School]. *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii*, *3*, 395–432 [in Russian].

Makkaveiskii, N. K. (1903b). *Vospitanie u drevnikh evreev. Istoriko-pedagogicheskii etyud* [*Education Among the Ancient Hebrews: A Historical-Pedagogical Study*]. Tip. I. I. Gorbunova [in Russian].

Makkaveiskii, N. K. (1906). Kafedra pedagogiki v dukhovnykh akademiiakh (K voprosu o pedagogicheskoi podgotovke k uchebno-vospitatelnomu delu v dukhovnoi shkole) [Department of pedagogy in theological academies (On the Issue of Pedagogical Training for Educational and Upbringing Work in Theological Schools)]. *Tserkovnyi Vestnik*, *8*, 235–239 [in Russian].

Rapple, B. A. (1988). Matthew Arnold's Views on Modernity and a State System of Middle-class Education in England: Some Continental Influences. *The Journal of General Education, 39* (4), 206–221. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ402814.

Rosenberg, J. M., Borchers, C., Dyer, E. B., Anderson, D., & Fischer, C. (2021). Understanding Public Sentiment about Educational Reforms: The Next Generation Science Standards on Twitter. *AERA Open, 7*. https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584211024261.

Sahlberg, P. (2021). *Finnish Lessons 3.0: What can the World Learn from Educational Change in Finland?* (3rd ed.). Teachers College Press.

Smith, G. A. (1992). *Education and the Environment: Learning to Live with Limits*. State University of New York Press. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED356554.

Thompson, M. R. (2019). *Authoritarian Modernism in East Asia*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-51167-6.

Tkachuk, M. L. (2007). Kyivska dukhovna akademiia v osvitianskomu avtonomizatsiinomu rusi pochatku XX stolittia [Kyiv Theological Academy in the Educational "Autonomization" Movement of the Early 20th Century]. *Kyivska Akademiia*, *4*, 149–165. https://ekmair.ukma.edu.ua/handle/123456789/7201 [in Ukrainian].

Yurkevich, P. D. (n.d.-a). *Chteniia o vospitanii s programmoi 1866 g.* [*Readings on Education with the Program of 1866*] [Manuscript]. Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteki Ukrainy im. V. I. Vernadskoho, DA 354 L (Muz. 818v), No. 1. (170 f.) [in Russian].

Yurkevich, P. D. (n.d.-b). *Metodyka* [*Methodology*] [Manuscript]. Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteki Ukrainy im. V. I. Vernadskoho, F. 30I, op. 354 L, spr. 4 (papka A). Ark. 1 zv. [in Ukrainian].

Yurkevich, P. D. (n.d.-c). *Religioznoe obuchenie* [*Religious education*] [Manuscript]. Instytut rukopysu Natsionalnoi biblioteki Ukrainy im. V. I. Vernadskoho, DA 354 L (Muz. 818v), No. 4, Papka S "S". (18 f.) [in Russian].

Yurkevich, P. D. (1869). *Kurs obshchei pedagogiki s prilozheniiami* [*Course of General Pedagogy with Appendices*]. Tip. Gracheva i K. [in Russian].

Yurkevich, P. D. (1870a). Plan i sily dlia pervonachalnoi shkoly [Plan and Resources for the Elementary School]. *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia*, *3*, 1–29 [in Russian].

Yurkevich, P. D. (1870b). Plan i sily dlia pervonachalnoi shkoly [Plan and Resources for the Elementary School]. *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia*, *4*, 95–123 [in Russian].

Анотація

У статті здійснено реконструкцію поглядів професорів Київської духовної академії (КДА) на реформу школи в контексті процесів реформування освіти в Російській імперії другої половини XIX – початку XX століття. Мета дослідження – виявити ціннісне підґрунтя моделей освітніх реформ, які пропонували професори КДА, і проаналізувати їхні історичні та ідейні детермінанти. У статті показано, що, з одного боку, в основу своїх проєктів вони закладали базові принципи і цінності модерну, а з іншого боку – були одностайно проти тотального бюрократичного контролю над освітніми інституціями, обмеження академічних свобод. Цей парадокс — держава має створювати і розбудовувати систему освіти як інструмент власного самозбереження і розвитку і, водночас, повинна самообмежитись у контролі над нею — професори КДА розв'язували за допомогою концепції релігійного навчання або християнізації школи на основі консервативних цінностей. Наголошено, що такий ціннісний конфлікт був зумовлений залежністю від офіційної ідеологічної доктрини, яка містила внутрішні суперечності, притаманні всім проєктам авторитарної модернізації. У висновку зазначено, що, незважаючи на певну архаїчність, ідеї професорів КДА можуть бути корисними у пошуку балансу консервативних і ліберальних цінностей для побудови в Україні адаптивної та інклюзивної освітньої системи, що враховує національні традиції та сучасні виклики.

Ключові слова: Київська духовна академія, освітні реформи, авторитарна модернізація, Петро Ліницький, Сильвестр Гогоцький, Памфіл Юркевич, Микола Маккавейський.

Svitlana Kuzmina, Dr. habil. in Philosophy, Professor of the Department of Economic Law and Socio-Political Disciplines in Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University. Author of *Philosophical and Pedagogical Concept of P. D. Yurkevich* (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, including publications on professors and graduates of the Kyiv Theological Academy and St. Volodymyr University during the 19th and early 20th centuries.

Svitlana Avdieieva, Senior Lecturer at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University. She has authored numerous articles on the philosophy and history of Islam, as well as on foreign language teaching methods and psycholinguistics. Her research interests include philosophy of religion, linguodidactics, psycholinguistics, and academic translation.