

From: dwaugh@u.washington.edu

Author's Subject: new title: Religioznoe obrazovanie v Rossii i Evrope v XVII veke

Date Written: Fri, 25 May 2012 23:47:46 +0000

Date Posted: Sat, 25 May 2012 19:47:46 -0400

<http://h-net.msu.edu/cgi-bin/logbrowse.pl?trx=vx&list=h-earlyslavic&month=1205&week=d&msg=YDs5hbEBD4FtNZA7IspmiA&user=&pw=>>

With the volume of all the interesting publications appearing nowadays, essays in a collection such as this one which deserve our attention might easily pass us by. The book is:

Religioznoe obrazovanie v Rossii i Evrope v XVII veke. Pod red. E. Tokarevoi, M. Ingłota (SPb.: Izd-vo Russkoi khristianskoi gumitarnoi akademii, 2011; ISBN 978-5-88812-502-1). At the head of the title page: Institut vseobshchei istorii RAN, Grigorijskii universitet (Rim), Russkaia khristianskaia gumitarnaia akademiia. Facing title page in Italian. Several of the essays translated here from languages other than Russian.

This is proceedings from the third (held in 2010) of a series of international conferences devoted to the general subject of the title, the previous ones (which also have been published) held in Moscow in 2008 and Rome in 2009. One has to imagine that the cross-fertilization of the varied interests here is potentially very productive, even if to a considerable degree the individual essays seem largely confined to the niches of the authors' expertise.

I have skimmed quickly through the whole book; my notes here (not a review in the proper sense) will emphasize what is in the book for those who study education in the Orthodox lands.

M. V. Dmitriev writes about skeptical attitudes amongst Orthodox clerics regarding the value of "grammar, rhetoric and syllogism," emphasizing that such views were based on deeply held religious conviction (deriving especially from the writings of Dionisius the Areopagite). Much of the essay analyzes the views of the monk Artemii who fled Muscovy in the middle of the 16th century.

B. A. Fonkich's essay on Archimandrite Benedikt should make those of us who have not yet read it go back to Fonkich's book, *Greko-slavianskie shkoly v Moskve v XVII veke* (M., 2009), where it was first published in a slightly different version. As Fonkich establishes, Benedikt was not just another of the numerous Greek clerics who showed up in Moscow in the 17th century with their hands out. He was highly educated (even spent several years in Wittenberg, it seems), was particularly interested in establishing schools (this is an important aspect of his two visits to Moscow). Contra Kapterev's dismissal of B., argues Fonkich, we need to take B. seriously. Among other things (this is of particular interest to me at the moment), he sent to Moscow from Iasi a number of letters with news about the Ottoman Empire, the Orthodox Patriarchate in Istanbul, etc.

O. V. Kosheleva's historiographic review of 19th-century writings on schooling in Muscovy is a helpful reminder of the way in which ideological biases of "slavophiles" and "westernizers" help explain

whether or not they found any evidence of formal schools. She concludes with approval of the idea put forth by E. E. Golubinskii that we should not just be looking for evidence of institutionalized schools (of a type familiar to us) if we want to learn about education in pre-modern Russia.

For those like me who have not been keeping up with publication by D. N. Ramazanova on the Slaviano-Greko-Latin Academy, her essay reviewing challenges in its study will be a useful stimulus. To a fair degree here she seems to be summarizing what she has published in a number of articles; the particular focus of this essay is on the challenges of trying to re-construct the library of the academy, which has not been preserved as an intact collection. She suggests that to a considerable degree it was probably supplied by what the Likhud brothers brought to Moscow with them; one might still hope to search out the surviving books now scattered in various collections.

Ierodiakon Rodion (Larionov)'s essay on the early Moscow academy covers largely familiar ground about the transition from the school of the Likhuds, with the exception (which I find not particularly persuasive) that he argues a previously ignored decree by Peter from 1706 granting the institution judicial autonomy in effect raised it to the status of a university by European standards.

D.A. Karpuk provides a useful overview of the contributions of faculty (and graduates) of the St. Petersburg Ecclesiastical Academy to the study and teaching about the history of religious education in Russia.

A disappointment, in a sense, about some of the focus in the book is the uneven attention to curriculum. An exception here is K. V. Sutorius' essay on the teaching of theology at the Kievan Collegium, which recognizes that introduction of the course came late in its 17th-century history. Here we find the various curricula plans of different instructors and some description of course content.

P. Iu Neshitov's long analysis of Avvakum's views on what constituted proper spiritual education ("Obrazovanie dushi kak rezul'tat asketichskoi i sotsial'noi praktiki: primer protopopa Avvakuma") almost reads like a sermon. Given what Kosheleva wrote (citing Golubinskii) and Dmitriev's material cited above, it makes for very interesting reading in its emphasis on "non-school" education and education as it was conceived in a context where its goal was to prepare one for salvation.

I am not entirely sure what the point is in M. A. Iusim's essay "Bokkalini o Bodene, svobode sovesti, Ital'ianskoi Biblii i Prosveshchenii," but it does inspire me to want to read the Italian's satirical book (which apparently evokes comparison with Swift). In it, *inter alia*, as Iusim points out, Muscovy is compared with the Ottoman Empire in regard to the desire of the authorities to keep the populace in ignorance, even if in the matter of religious tolerance the Ottomans are held up as a positive example.

While there is nothing here about Muscovy, Roald Kristiansen's essay on religious education in Norway in the 17th century at least suggests some possibility for useful comparisons of the challenges to education

faced there with the challenges faced in Muscovy. In both instances we have a national church and state efforts to direct religious policy, but arguably underinstitutionalization hindering the effecting of such control.

Other essays in the book deal with legislation in Poland on the role of schools, Strasburg university, emphasis on teaching through the Catechism in European education, Jansenist education in France, Catholic schooling for English catholics at a time when formally Catholic education was forbidden in England, French moralist and pedagogues' attitudes toward religious education. One place where I expected at least passing reference to its relevance for Russia was in Maurizio Piser's long and interesting essay on school reform under Maria Theresa, one focal point of which is Felbiger's pedagogical innovations. Yet there is nothing here on the centrality of Felbiger to the school reform of Catherine the Great.