

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This dissertation was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again – beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

### **University Microfilms**

300 North Zeeb Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

A Xerox Education Company

73-3762

NICHOLS, Robert Lewis, 1942--  
METROPOLITAN FILARET OF MOSCOW AND THE  
AWAKENING OF ORTHODOXY.

University of Washington, Ph.D., 1972  
History, modern

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

METROPOLITAN FILARET OF MOSCOW AND THE AWAKENING OF ORTHODOXY

by

ROBERT LEWIS NICHOLS

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

1972

Approved by *Donald W. Bradley*

Department *History*

Date *August 15, 1972*

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have  
indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

Date: July 17, 1972

We have carefully read the dissertation entitled Filaret of Moscow and the  
Awakening of the Russian Orthodox Church, 1782-1825

\_\_\_\_\_ submitted by  
Robert Lewis Nichols \_\_\_\_\_ in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
and recommend its acceptance. In support of this recommendation we present the following  
joint statement of evaluation to be filed with the dissertation.

Mr. Nichols has undertaken a pioneering task in attempting to evaluate important aspects of the history of the Russian Orthodox Church, a subtopic in Russian history that has so far attracted few if any specialists who have received American Ph.D. training. He has chosen to study the significance of the life and work of Filaret (Drozdov), metropolitan of Moscow, who played a vital role in re-shaping the pattern of teaching in the seminaries and in influencing the intellectual trends that underlay the development of Orthodox theology and whose personal impact on extra-ecclesiastical events was such that, for example, it was he who was selected to write Russia's Emancipation Proclamation in 1861. Using printed sources, Nichols has composed a dissertation in which carefully constructed narrative is interwoven with judicious analysis based on thorough understanding of broader trends in theology and other aspects of thought both in Russia and in Europe generally at the turn of the nineteenth century. Nichols terminates his study with 1825, the end of the reign of Alexander I, a date recognized as a watershed in the ecclesiastical and intellectual history of Russia; it is a defensible terminal point. We are glad to recommend approval of the dissertation.

DISSERTATION READING COMMITTEE:

Robert J. Butow

Marc Szeftel

David J. Zandy, Chair

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the doctoral degree at the University of Washington, I agree that the Library shall make its copies freely available for inspection. I further agree that extensive copying of this dissertation is allowable only for scholarly purposes. Requests for copying or reproduction of this dissertation may be referred to University Microfilms, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom the author has granted "the right to reproduce and sell (a) copies of the manuscript in microfilm and/or (b) printed copies of the manuscript made from microform."

Signature Robert Thibodeau  
Date Aug 15, 1972.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
PREFACE	iv
I. ANCESTRY, CHILDHOOD, AND SCHOOL	1
II. THE DWELLING PLACE OF PIETY	21
III. FORTRESS OF ZION	58
IV. FILARET AND THE RUSSIAN BIBLE SOCIETY, 1813-1822	92
V. FILARET'S CATECHISMS AND HIS CRITICS	135
EPILOGUE	181
NOTES	186
BIBLIOGRAPHY	217

## PREFACE

At the end of a short but lucid book, Wladimir Weidlé concluded that "the most clear-sighted judgement [Russia] has ever inspired was found among the papers of Gogol: the author of it, Philarete, the metropolitan of Moscow. The Russian people, he remarked, has 'little light but plenty of warmth'."<sup>1</sup> In a sense, this short aphorism is the subject of this study. For like many other remarks Filaret [Weidlé's Philarete] uttered in his lifetime, he meant far more than he said. It was at once an appreciation of the vitality of Russian religious tradition and almost a sigh of despair over the great obstacles strewn along the path of religious education which might give precision and direction to that warm emotion. The central difficulty the Russian Church faced in the nineteenth century lay in combining those two elements in a way which might lead toward a Christian society fully informed about what Orthodox Christianity means. Both ingredients--faith and learning-- were present at the beginning of the century, not as parts of an organic whole, but rather as separate layers divided by two centuries of historical experience. Popular Russian faith probably had not greatly changed in its expression since the 17th century, while the clergy had absorbed a series of sharp cultural and religious shocks which over time made it very difficult for the clergy to maintain contact with traditional religious life. These shocks came from outside Russia, first from Poland in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and then from the Protestant countries of northern Europe which Peter the Great so ardently admired.

In response, the Russian Church established schools to train

its clergy, partly in imitation of these countries further to the west, and partly as a defense against their almost overpowering influence. The curriculum of these new schools, however, only underlined the dimensions of this outside influence. In the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the Russian religious schools were dominated by a Roman-Catholic-inspired scholastic program taught in Latin very much like the Jesuit schools they were modeled on. By the middle of the eighteenth century, Catholic influence had given way to a Protestant-oriented theology deeply colored by pietism from Halle, although both the scholastic routine and Latin language remained. The result for the clergy was an education largely divorced from Russian life. The schools gave off light, but few Russians could see by it.

Only with the greatest difficulty was it possible to establish a creative link between the light of the schools and the warmth of the Russian people. The first step had to be the abandonment of the incomprehensible Latin and the abstract syllogism, so that a new theological terminology in Russian might develop, capable of being transmitted to the society as a whole, and so that the precise nature of Orthodoxy and its relationship to the rest of Christendom might be considered afresh. Two centuries of intense non-Orthodox influence, in both its Catholic scholastic and Protestant forms, did not encourage an historical perspective, and certainly not an Orthodox perspective, on the past. The second step required incorporating the learning of the schools into the daily religious life of the people. This meant virtually the complete retranslation of the Church literature into contemporary Russian language and the reexplanation of Church doctrine in a

language which could be understood. For while the forms of popular devotion remained much as they had been in the seventeenth century, the spoken language had not remained fixed. Church Slavic was no longer clearly understood, consequently neither was the Church service, the Slavic Bible, or the catechism. The opportunity to bring the learning of the schools to bear on the task of reinterpreting and retranslating Orthodox teaching so that the Russian people might have both the warmth and the light of the Church presented itself at the beginning of the nineteenth century to those willing to grasp it.

Metropolitan Filaret (Drozdov, 1782-1867) was prepared to carry through this difficult task. Filaret was born in the last quarter of the eighteenth century and, through a peculiar set of circumstances, was educated first in the Latin and Aristotelian routine characteristic of the schools in the first half of the century and then in the Protestant scholastic and pietist atmosphere of the Holy Trinity-St. Sergii Lavra seminary more typical of the second half of the century. He grew to maturity and exercised his greatest influence in the heyday of pietism, mysticism, and romanticism of the nineteenth century. As a student he was taught Latin, and he wrote Latin with the ease of a native language. As a teacher, rector, and bishop he was repelled by Latin because it expressed abstract ideas, artificial to the traditions of the Orthodox Church:

To insist on teaching theology in Latin would mean to block the growth of theological knowledge with a language at once unsuitable and unfamiliar. Moreover, the sway of Latin language (used first by pagans, then Papists and Protestants) is a phenomenon insufficiently in keeping with the spirit and purpose of the religious schools of the Eastern Church.<sup>2</sup>

By reforming the Russian religious schools, he hoped to pledge them to "the selfless service of truth." By making the Bible, Psalter, and catechism available in Russian rather than Slavic, he hoped that all Russians might then be able to "search the Scriptures."

As Filaret grew with the years and experienced the cross-- and often counter--currents present in Russian religious life at the turn of the nineteenth century, his work became more varied and his impact more widely felt. It seemed for a time in fact that he would attain his purpose and combine the light of the schools with a warm theology of the heart and Gospels in harmony with the traditions of the Eastern Church. But his work was interrupted by the reaction to the often excessive and even fanciful mysticism and pietism of Alexander's reign by critics able to convince the emperor that the true aim of these enthusiasms was revolution. Alexander's death was followed by what Filaret termed the "return path to scholasticism" with the revival of Latin in the schools and Slavic in the Church. Filaret could do no more than echo the words of St. Paul:

Now, brethren, if I come to you speaking in tongues, how shall I benefit you unless I bring you some revelation or knowledge or prophecy or teaching? If even lifeless instruments, such as the flute or the harps, do not give distinct notes, how will any one know what is played? And if the bugle gives an indistinct sound, who will get ready for the battle? So with yourselves; if you in a tongue utter a speech that is not intelligible, how will anyone know what is said? For you will be speaking in the air. There are doubtless many different languages in the world, and none is without meaning, but if I do not know the meaning of the language, I shall be a foreigner to the speaker, and the speaker a foreigner to me. So with yourselves; since you are eager for manifestations of the Spirit, strive to excel in building up the church....In church I would rather speak five words with my mind, in order to instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue....

Let all things be done for edification....For God is not a God of confusion but of peace.

I Corinthians 14, 6-33

The purpose of this study is to assess the significance for the history of the Orthodox Church of the life and work of Filaret from his birth in 1782 until the disruption of his work at the death of Alexander in 1825.

## CHAPTER I

### Ancestry, childhood, and school

If you wish to be worthy of the love of God and Christ, then love God and Christ more than father and mother, more than brother or sister, more than all else you love.

Slova i rechi, II, 102 from a sermon on All Saints' Day while visiting the city of Kolomna, 28 May 1822.

Filaret\* was born the day after Christmas, 1782, in Kolomna, a commercial and ecclesiastical center with its own episcopal residence, about one hundred versts southeast of Moscow. When he was christened six days later, he was given the Christian name Vasilii, supposedly in honor of St. Basil, and the patronymic Mikhailovich after his father Mikhail Fedorovich Drozdov, then a parish deacon and teacher of Latin grammar and syntax at the Kolomna seminary. His mother was Evdokiia Nikitichna, the daughter of a Kolomna priest. Vasilii Mikhailovich was her first child, born at the end of the first year of marriage, when Evdokiia was just turning seventeen.

Soon after Filaret's birth, his father was appointed a parish priest, but there was some dissatisfaction among the new parishioners who had a different candidate in mind, and the young Drozdov family lived for some years on the very meager support the parish provided. Eventually he was accepted and materially life began to improve. It has been suggested that these frugal years had a lasting impact on Filaret's development and "bred into him an awareness that unremitting effort, laying aside

---

\*

Filaret's monastic name will be used throughout this chapter.

all fruitless flights of the imagination, was needed if he was to make his way."<sup>1</sup> Although in some respects Filaret was a realist, his sense of realism was not so much grounded in early material hardships as it was founded on a belief in the artificial quality of Russian ecclesiastical life. Probably he did not think much along these lines while he lived in Kolomna, but he did have an opportunity there to become intimately familiar with the peculiar nature of the Russian clergy and with the even more peculiar nature of the small but growing educated segment of the clergy: for Filaret was born into what was known as the dukhovnoe soslovie, or clerical class.

By 1782, the clergy was a distinct social group, legally separate from the serfs and from the nobility. A son born to a clergyman was expected to become a clergyman; a daughter was expected to marry the son of a local or neighboring churchman. There were only a few ways by which a son might avoid the priesthood: by falling into the ranks of the serfs or by being pressed into the army. Neither of these courses had particular appeal, but periodically the government made such a change compulsory. However, two years after Filaret was born, in 1784, the government allowed children of clergymen to become merchants and traders, or they could become state peasants.<sup>2</sup> Yet despite these limited opportunities for social mobility, the clergy remained a separate social group set off from the rest of Russian society, living a life somewhat apart from the mass of the population. The social distinction between the clergy and the peasantry, even after the clergy was emancipated from corporal punishment, should not be over-emphasized, for it was trifling compared to the gulf which yawned between the

clergy and the nobility.

Far more important was the growing religious and cultural outlook--shaped in the seminaries--pulling the clergy further along the path away from Russia's medieval popular Christianity, but not necessarily moving it any closer to the cultural pursuits of the aristocracy. The number of seminaries (which were established at the beginning of the 18th century) had steadily grown and many of them, including the seminary at Kolomna, offered a complete religious education starting with rudimentary grammar, logic, dialectics and ending with theology. But the curricula of these schools were dominated by German Protestant textbooks written in Latin, a language that was believed necessary for any proper education of the clergy. In case of doubt, "the teacher must repeatedly tell the students the value to be derived from studying grammar [*i.e.* Latin grammar] and how it distinguishes those who know this branch of knowledge from those who do not, and that, without it, it is impossible to become an orator, a poet, a philosopher, or a theologian."<sup>3</sup> Protestant-oriented philosophical and theological systems, combined with a prolonged study of classical Latin authors, taught by scholastic routine and endless Latin drill, preoccupied the educated segment of the clergy with questions which had little in common with traditional Russian Orthodox Christianity. Whatever its positive aspects, such education was hardly an ideal basis for a clear grasp of the problems of Russian Orthodox religious life, and provided one more barrier to the coherent and continuous development of Russian religious culture.

Moreover, the new Latin scholastic education divided the

clergy into those who could learn Latin and those who could not, with those who finished the seminary course given preference in all Church offices. Giliarov-Platonov, who came from a clerical family in Kolomna, later maintained that those who failed the seminaries became "pariahs, foul Samaritans whom even 'the Jews wouldn't touch'".<sup>4</sup> This is a harsh judgement and an exaggeration, but there can be no doubt that great importance was attached to successful study at the seminary. "Everyone knows," wrote one cleric from Sevsk to his bishop, "that those under your protection enjoy your special attention upon finishing the course of studies."<sup>5</sup> Largely for this reason, as will be shown later, Filaret's father devoted so much effort to his son's education.

As far as the available evidence can show, Filaret had a purely clerical genealogy. On his father's side, his most distant known ancestor was his great-grandfather Ignatii, a minor Church servant, who trained two sons to become presbyters. One son, Fedor Ignat'evich (Filaret's grandfather), fulfilled these hopes and became a parish priest. His life spanned three-quarters of the 18th century from 1726 to 1799.<sup>6</sup> On his mother's side, Filaret's ancestry cannot be traced back as far. His grandfather was Nikita Afanas'evich, a priest and polemist with the neighboring Old Believers.<sup>7</sup> His grandmother was Domnika Prokopieva, reportedly a woman distinguished by her "piety and exemplary economy"--qualities she passed on to her grandson.<sup>8</sup>

Filaret's mother, Evdokiia Nikitichna, was born probably in 1765 and was a year or two younger than her husband. According to the parish registry (which oddly does not indicate the date of birth), Filaret's father entered school on 9 March 1772.

Since school age was then normally eight or nine, he must have been born in 1763 or 1764. Unfortunately, the only contemporary account of Filaret's parents was written by Giliarov-Platonov, who greatly disliked Filaret:

The parents of the famous metropolitan were people with foibles. They were not upset by a gift of Kizliar vodka and were not averse to tasting it. Mikhail Fedorovich was occasionally carried home from the inn near the Piatnitskie Gates. So Kolomna rumored. Avdot'ia [sic] Nikitichna, the archpriest's widow, while she was living within three strides of us with her son Nikita Mikhailovich, was like all the local wives of archpriests.<sup>9</sup>

Whatever truth there is in this description, it is also true that Filaret's deep love and respect for his parents, expressed over and over in his letters, indicates they were not devoid of moral qualities as well.

This sketchy data about Filaret's ancestry cannot serve as very valuable evidence about Filaret's early life. It merely shows the closed nature of the clergy in the 18th century. Three lines written by the sacristan in the Kolomna Cathedral of the Epiphany parish registry seem to sum up Filaret's position:

A son Vasilii was born to deacon Mikhail Fedorov. Christened 1 January [1783] The Godfather is Petr Vasil'ev, cathedral sacristan; the Godmother is Domnika Prokopieva, wife of archpriest Nikita Afanas'ev.<sup>10</sup>

Son of a deacon, grandson of a priest, sponsored in life by a sacristan, it seemed clear that Filaret was destined for a life in the Church.

That destiny was reinforced by the Kolomna seminary which, like many Russian seminaries, combined a general education with special training "in hopes of the priesthood." When Filaret was nine, he entered the school founded a half-century earlier by

bishop Kiprian (Skripitsyn) in 1739. Only rhetorics was taught in the Kolomna seminary until bishop Feodosii (Prokof'ev) introduced philosophy and theology into the curriculum.<sup>11</sup> Thus, by the time Filaret entered in 1791, the Kolomna seminary offered a complete seminary education. This was not always the case among Russian ecclesiastical schools in the 18th century and represented the long and continuous efforts of the Kolomna bishops to improve the quality of education in their dioceses.

The Kolomna seminary embodied many features of the 18th century "Latin" schools. During the first year, the students studied reading and writing [zapravnyi klass]. Actually the course was intended only for those who did not learn the rudiments of these subjects at home. They studied from the A B C book supplied by the Holy Synod which included both Slavic and Russian letters.<sup>12</sup> Not only did they learn the alphabet, but it was required that marks of punctuation be memorized as well. What such terms as quotation marks, exclamation marks, and so on might have meant to children still hardly able to read or write can only be guessed. The alphabet and punctuation exercises were followed by a small amount of moral instruction, such as memorizing "Be pious, trust in God, and love Him with all your heart," and lessons in the Catechism taught in Church Slavic which many Russian children could not understand. Giliarov-Platonov remembers that when he studied the line in the Catechism "Chaiu voskreseniia mertvykh" (I expect the resurrection of the dead), he thought it meant something about tea (chai) for the resurrected dead. "What is meant I did not understand and did not think it necessary to ask..."<sup>13</sup> After this preliminary study, Slavic and Russian reading and writ-

ing was pushed into the background. The students settled down to the task of learning Latin.

"Russia," once wrote Count Vorontsev, "is the only country in which the mother tongue is ignored and the younger generation has no knowledge of anything relating to the fatherland,"<sup>14</sup> This fully applied to the Russian ecclesiastical schools of the eighteenth century, or at least almost fully. Once past the first year, the students began a thorough study of Latin grammar, which was divided into two parts: lower and higher. Each lasted one year. In the lower class, the teacher explained only those syntactical rules the student might need to begin practicing translation from Latin into Russian and back again. The text often was the quite out of date Latin grammar by the Jesuit Alvarez (1526-1583) introduced into the Russian schools from Kiev in the 18th century.<sup>15</sup> Teachers continued to use Alvarez even after newer grammars by Lebedev and Bantysh-Kamenskii were published.<sup>16</sup>

More important than the texts were the repetitive exercises the teachers required in translations. They usually set the students translating Orbis visibilis, or Justin, Livy, and other classical authors. Each day several new vocabulary words and a few lines from various authors were given the students to be learned by heart. Written exercises in translation were assigned thrice weekly, carefully examined by the teachers, and then turned over to the seminary administration for further examination. By the end of the first year of Latin grammar, the students could usually speak some Latin and Russian was rarely heard in class. Toward the end of the first year, if Russian was spoken, the teacher "put the calculus in motion," that is, the offender was

given a leaf of paper (the calculus) on which he was to write down and memorize two pages of vocabulary or a passage from some Latin classical work in addition to his regular Latin lesson.<sup>17</sup>

The second year of Latin was devoted to syntax and prosody. The works of Cicero were studied, and by the end of the year the students were reading the difficult works of Horace, Ovid, and Virgil. Every day a long passage from some classical author had to be learned by heart or else several dozen new vocabulary words. Each word was studied according to its stem and all its derivatives, and usually a few illustrative sentences were included, so that the study of syntax had a special branch: syntaxis figurata or ornata.<sup>18</sup> The thrice weekly assignments continued from the previous year, but these writing exercises were more difficult. Oral recitation occurred every day. In order that the students might gain greater fluency, they were given only a few seconds to render a Russian phrase into its Latin equivalent. They were also given "perefrakty", an exercise in converting Latin prose sentences into their original Latin verse form.<sup>19</sup>

Among the best students Latin came to be something like a native language, and they actually thought in Latin rather than Russian, so that when they were in the higher grades and asked to write something in Russian they would outline it first in Latin. For the less able Latin became a horror, and many families hated to send their children "to that damned seminary for torture."<sup>20</sup> In any case, Latin often acted as a barrier to learning. Filaret later declared that "it was strange and crippling to the Greek Church to give sway to Latin, and it was strange that Feofan Prokopovich [the architect of seminary education in the 18th

century] mutilated teaching in this way, despite the prevailing opinion of the Russian hierarchy and despite the example of all Eastern antiquity."<sup>21</sup> This was confirmed at the time by Bishop Simon of Riazan': "After several years of living at the school, not only have they [the students] not become educated, but they are hardly better off than if they had never come here."<sup>22</sup> As might be expected, each higher class had fewer students, for one could only understand the subject matter of all later courses by understanding Latin, the language in which they were taught. It may seem a paradox, but in the 18th century (and not only then but later), only those who excelled at Latin were encouraged to become priests in Russian parishes.

After finishing the study of Latin grammar and syntax, Filaret, like many other seminarians, entered the poetics class, which marked the beginning of seminary education in the full sense: all previous work had been simply a preparation. The center of focus in poetics was on the works of Horace, Ovid, and Virgil, who were translated, paraphrased, imitated, and learned by heart. Russian poets especially Lomonosov and Sumarokov were studied, but the real muse of poetry was a Latin muse and classical mythology was considered the chief source of poetic beauty and inspiration. Ovid's Metamorphoses ranked in importance above all other books. Poetics was extremely popular among the students, and during Catherine's reign, every student wrote Latin odes and declamatory speeches. No public event, no seminary disputation, no holiday for the seminary patron saints went by without a flood of poems to commemorate the event. The rhetorics class would dedicate odes to St. John Chrysostom, and the philosophy class would

compose allegories in honor of St. Justin the Philosopher, while the theology class made verses to commemorate St. John the Great Theologian. May recreation, visitations by important persons, funerals of teachers and classmates, greetings to the rector and the bishop on their name days, Christmas and Easter were all occasions for a veritable torrent of Latin verses, madrigals, dithyrambs, epigrams, acrostics and whimsical verse.<sup>23</sup> But poetics was usually not taken too seriously by the seminary authorities and was often combined with rhetorics. Metropolitan Platon took the view that poetics depended "more upon the inclination of a happy nature" than on any definable qualities of the mind.<sup>24</sup>

Rhetorics was considered very important for a student's development, and there were several different printed textbooks by western European authors (Burgius, Heinecke) for Latin, while Lomonosov, Rizhskii (who followed the French Encyclopedists and Voltaire) and Amvrosii Serebrennikov were authorities for Russian rhetorics.<sup>25</sup> Each day the class would read aloud a small passage from the textbook and the next day the teacher would ask each student to translate it from Latin into Russian. This would be followed by an explanation of any obscure parts of the passage and all of the rules of rhetorics demonstrated in that passage. These explanations were then repeated by the students who also gave further examples to demonstrate the rules. Once a week they were given written assignments. Cicero's De Officiis, De Natura Deorum, and Consolatio were widely studied, as were Quintillian's Institutio Oratoria and the histories of Livy and Tacitus. Only after the turn of the century was there any attempt to introduce aesthetic criticism as part of rhetorics, although it then

threatened to become the center of study in the first years of the reformed schools (see below, chapter III). Feofan Prokopovich, Gedeon Krinovskii, Dmitrii of Rostov, Platon Levshin, Derzhavin, and Lomonosov were the models for Russian rhetorics. The students were expected to do additional reading outside class, reporting on this reading in special notebooks. Proper delivery and pronunciation were stressed, and much effort was expended in finding just the right rhythm, emphasis, and gestures for a speech or a sermon. Even when the students finished rhetorics and entered philosophy, they continued to devote time to rhetorics with the result that their philosophy presentations were often written not as dry syllogisms, but as oratorical addresses.<sup>26</sup>

At the time Filaret entered the philosophy class at Kolomna, the older texts and lectures based on the principles of Aristotelian scholastic philosophy were being replaced in many seminaries by new philosophy texts based on the writings of Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716) and Christian Wolff (1679-1754).<sup>27</sup> Partly this was a reaction to the inadequacies of Aristotelian philosophy which had been widely abandoned elsewhere in Europe under the influence of the scientific revolution. Partly it was the result of official attempts to counterbalance the impact of fashionable French philosophy. In any case, the course of study in the Russian seminaries of the first half of the 18th century had lagged behind the leading intellectual and cultural thought of the age. The significant advances in learning scarcely found any reflection in the seminary curriculum before 1760.

This situation slowly changed when Leibniz and Wolff were

introduced in the seminaries after mid-century as the bedrock on which to build all naturalistic explanations about God. All proofs about God's existence could be confirmed by recourse to Leibniz' Monadology where he shows that

...in God there is not only the source of existences but also that of essences, in so far as they are real, that is to say, the source of what is real in the possible. For the understanding of God is the region of eternal truths or of the ideas on which they depend, and without Him there would be nothing real in the possibilities of things, and not only would there be nothing in existence, but nothing would even be possible.

For if there is a reality in essences or possibilities, or rather in eternal truths, this reality must needs be founded in something existing and actual, and consequently in the existence of the necessary Being, in whom essence involves existence, or in whom the possible is actual.<sup>28</sup>

Thus God must exist if He is possible. Such explanations began to find their way into the instruction in philosophy in the Russian seminaries through various German textbooks written in Latin. The best and most widely used such text was Baumeister's Elementa philosophiae recentioris, introduced in the curriculum in the 1760's and even partially translated into Russian in the 1780's.<sup>29</sup> From Baumeister the student learned in a general way about logic, physics, metaphysics, and moral philosophy, but each of these categories was supplemented by special texts: Prokopovich and Weissen's De logicis distinctionibus were used for logic, while physics was supplemented by Winkler, Euler, and Peter Musschenbroek (1629-1761), the Dutch physicist acquainted with Newton, whose various books including Tentamina experimentorum naturalium (Leiden, 1731), Elementa physices (Leipzig, 1747), Compendium physices experimentalis (Leiden, 1762), and Introductio ad philosophiam naturalem (1762) were very characteristic of the new direction taken in the

curricula of the Russian seminaries after the middle of the 18th century.

The philosophy instruction at the Kolomna seminary apparently lagged somewhat behind this departure from the older Aristotelian scholasticism. Filaret, in the only passage in his later recollections concerning his life in Kolomna, recounts in this connection an interesting moment in his early education:

At the Kolomna seminary I studied as far as philosophy: the teacher of this class was such a man who might overcome even a gifted student. I wished to leave for the Academy (that is, the Slavono-Greco-Latin Academy), but my father thought the education at the Lavra seminary [the Holy Trinity-St. Sergii Lavra seminary] was more solid. My father quieted my fears about the poor living conditions at the Lavra seminary and the work they piled on the seminarians by promising to support me at his expense. The matter was decided. In March, 1800, I arrived at the Lavra. At first they did not wish to accept me directly into the philosophy class, for the seminary did not want to appear on the same level as others. They examined me in logic on definitions. I answered. In the evening I went with my father to see Rector Avgustin [Vinogradov], who set me writing a dissertation in his apartments on the question: an dantur ideae innatae? I could not answer from the lessons of my former teacher, but fortunately when I was studying at Kolomna, I read among my father's books a textbook by Winkler. I obtained from it a sufficient understanding about this question. My answer was satisfactory. They accepted me in the philosophy class. 30

The discussion of innate ideas in Winkler was a presentation of Leibniz' argument that ideas are shaped in the mind: a specific objection to Locke's contention that "there is nothing in the mind which was not first in the senses." Nothing, Leibniz agreed, "except the mind itself."<sup>31</sup> In this argument Leibniz planted the seed of later Kantian idealism based on the doctrine that our ideas are molded by the mind and are not simply the reflections of things.

Filaret, like many other Russian seminarians, traveled this path of German philosophy from Leibniz to Kant (whom he read in Latin when he went to St. Petersburg) via the German philosophy textbooks introduced into the seminaries beginning in the 1760's.<sup>32</sup> In so far as he accepted any philosophical explanations of reality and truth, Winkler's now long forgotten textbook must be reckoned the original source of Filaret's philosophical outlook. Later, when he was rector of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, this philosophical tradition, grounded in Leibniz' refutation of empiricism, was expressed in Filaret's critique of Feofilakt Rusanov's (his rival at the St. Petersburg academy) aesthetic theories. Yet it must be stressed that Filaret preferred theology to "cold philosophy" and in studying philosophy he preferred only to accept "the analysis and terminology of the most modern philosophers [who trace]... the formal principles (principia formalia) of human reason from metaphysics to logic, without, however, leaning toward skepticism or idealism, and while using their discoveries, still preserve the seeker of truth from their errors."<sup>33</sup>

The transition from Aristotelian scholasticism to the new curriculum had, among several important consequences, one result which was important for Filaret's later work. The new textbooks, especially Baumeister, attempted to provide some perspective on the historical development of philosophy and theology.<sup>34</sup> To be sure, it was rudimentary and quite brief, but it stimulated discussion and writing on Russian Orthodoxy's historical relationship to other religious confessions and encouraged attempts to write Church history from an Orthodox rather than a Catholic or

Protestant point of view. However small, a first step was taken toward bringing Russian religious education in contact with Russian religious life.

This newly developing interest was present in Kolomna when Filaret was a student at the seminary, for Mefodii Smirnov (1761-1815), who published the first history of the Church from an Orthodox and Russian standpoint, was then bishop of Kolomna. There is no evidence that Filaret was aware of Mefodii's work at this time, but in several respects it foreshadowed Filaret's later writings. Mefodii Smirnov was a graduate of the Slavono-Greco-Latin Academy, and after graduation he became a teacher at the Holy Trinity-St. Sergii Lavra seminary. Shortly after he returned to the Academy as rector, he was ordained bishop of Voronezh and subsequently appointed bishop in Kolomna, Tula, Tver', and Pskov.<sup>35</sup> He died as archbishop of Pskov. Mefodii's history of the Church was written as the culmination of discussions between Anglican theologians and the Russian Church in the early 1790's. Mefodii was asked by Metropolitan Platon to reply to the Anglican request for a summary of dogmas and rites which distinguished the Eastern and Western Churches. In the background of these discussions was the book De l'Eglise, du Pape, de quelques points de controverse et des moyens de reunion entre toutes les Eglises chretiennes (Geneva, 1781) by Louis Dutens (1730-1812), a French Protestant living in London and promoting the union of the Churches.<sup>36</sup>

Whether specifically in connection with Dutens' book or as a general observation, Mefodii at one point expressed his belief that a Russian history of the Church was needed, for foreign authors often distorted the historical facts about the Eastern

Church, either through ignorance or prejudice which had no place in science. This was true also, he maintained, even for many Russians, including Tatishchev, whose chapters in his history dealing with the Russian hierarchy were written under the inspiration of Luther and Calvin: "noster popularis D. [?] Tatischev, cujus caeteroquin expositio rerum ecclesiae nostrae prodit male affectum, lutherisantem vel calvinisantem ipsius animum..."<sup>37</sup> The ultimate result of Mefodii's efforts was the publication of his own Liber historicus de rebus, in primitiva sine trium primorum et quart ineuntis seculorum ecclesia Christiana, published in Moscow in 1805. Although it is written in Latin, the Liber historicus was the first general survey of the Christian Church written in Russia.<sup>38</sup>

The new interest in the historical development of the Orthodox Church and Orthodox doctrine generated by the change in the curriculum and reinforced by ecumenical conversations should not, however, be exaggerated even in Mefodii's work. His history is not strictly speaking pure history, but also includes a discussion of canon law, liturgics, and patristics, and even the historical material is presented in a mechanically chronological way. "In the school, among the public, and in the discipline, it was soon half-forgotten."<sup>39</sup> Still, it was a step in the direction Filaret wished to travel. The next survey of Church history was written jointly by Filaret and Innokentii Smirnov (no relation to Mefodii) as part of the general reform of Russian religious education. It was written in Russian, not Latin, and this transition from the one language to the other was an important indication of deeper currents in Orthodox religious life in Russia. But here, too,

Mefodii anticipated Filaret's later insistence that Russian be the language of the schools and of the Church, for as a teacher at the Holy Trinity-St. Sergii seminary, Mefodii encouraged students to break with Latin and read the Bible in Church Slavic.<sup>40</sup>

Despite the changes in the curricula of the schools and despite Mefodii's departure from the traditional pattern of education, the seminaries remained almost completely immersed in Latin. Philosophy and theology, studied in Latin textbooks written from a Protestant viewpoint, were taught in the old scholastic manner. Largely the change meant substituting Protestant scholasticism for Aristotelian scholasticism. The speech Radishchev puts into the mouth of a Novgorodian seminarian precisely described the weakness of these schools:

There is still such a deficiency in our manner of education...The knowledge of Latin alone cannot satisfy the mind thirsting for knowledge. I know Virgil, Horace, Titus Livius, and even Tacitus almost by heart. But when I compare the knowledge of the seminarians with that which I have had a fortunate opportunity to become acquainted, then I must conclude that our schools belong to the preceding century. We know all the classical authors...We are taught philosophy from logic through metaphysics and ethics to theology, but in the words of Kuteikin in The Minor [Nedorosl'], we reach the end of philosophy study only to start over again. Is it any wonder? Aristotle and the scholastics reign supreme in the seminaries. By a lucky acquaintance, I stayed in the home of a provincial councilor in Novgorod and acquired a smattering of French and German and was able to use the books in his home. What a difference...what possibilities there are for learning when the sciences are not mysteries open only to those who know Latin, but are taught in popular speech!--But why...in the higher schools, where science could be taught in the language of society, in Russian, do they not do so? Instruction would then be more intelligible to everyone...41

When Filaret finished the course in philosophy, he was

found by his teachers to be "gifted and assiduous, showing outstanding success."<sup>42</sup> He did not attend the theology class of Iakinf Karpinskii, who had obtained some notoriety in theology after the publication in 1786 of his Compendium theologiae dogmatico-polemicae. At the end of 1799, the Kolomna diocese was closed, the bishop transferred to Tula, and those seminarians able to pass the entrance examinations were given the choice among the Slavono-Greco-Latin Academy, the Holy Trinity-St. Sergii Lavra seminary, and the Prerevinsk seminary in order to finish their religious training. Filaret, on his father's advice, chose the Holy Trinity seminary.<sup>43</sup>

The fragmentary evidence on Filaret's life in Kolomna does not provide a very detailed picture. Earlier biographers have stressed the moral qualities and pious example of his mother, Evdokiia Nikitichna, and his grandmother, Domnika Prokopieva, as decisive for shaping his character and religious sentiments during these early years. "One must think that the gifted and impressionable child imbibed her [Domnika Prokopieva's] lessons with the same earnestness as once did Basil the Great the lessons of his grandmother Makrina."<sup>44</sup> But Filaret's father probably had a greater influence on him. From the scattered data that can be pieced together, he appears to have been a man of modest education, warm piety, and although he perhaps possessed some of the usual human weaknesses, at the same time he did as much as possible for his son's education and career. He had an interest in philosophy and theology in advance of that which he had been taught at the Kolomna seminary. Moreover, he kept a small library and apparently encouraged Filaret to use it. The books in that library helped

Filaret to pass the entrance examination at the Holy Trinity Lavra seminary, saving him from repeating the philosophy class after his transfer. It is characteristic that when Filaret went to the Lavra for that examination his father went with him to ensure his admission. . Filaret appreciated his father's efforts on his behalf, for at the time he decided to become a monk, he wrote to his father:

you will not lose a son who understands that he is indebted to you for more than life, who realizes the importance of his upbringing, and who knows the worth of your heart.<sup>45</sup>

Attempting to assess the importance of Filaret's youth at Kolomna for his later life is hazardous. As important as they doubtlessly are, it is difficult to accept the contention that in these early biographical data "is concealed the key to understanding his future greatness, in them are found the important markers lighting [sic] that path on which he traveled from strength to strength, until he became the great lamp of the Russian Church."<sup>46</sup> Such determinism is valid only if we believe that Filaret was born "for the fulfillment of His judgments in accordance with the demands of the age."<sup>47</sup> Filaret was fortunate in many ways: fortunate to be born in Kolomna, which was close to Moscow and enjoyed some of the advantages of being near a large center; fortunate to have a father who cared about his son's education and who was able to give him sound advice in choosing the Holy Trinity seminary (which actually was the best ecclesiastical school in Russia at the time); and fortunate to possess a remarkable intelligence. The combination of time, place, guidance, and natural ability set him on his way toward a long and fruitful ca-

reer in the Russian Church: a course already marked out by his clerical origins and seminary training.

Yet even after taking all of these things into consideration, the nature and direction of Filaret's later work was probably more the result of his experience after the Kolomna school doors closed behind him. Even Mefodii Smirnov's hesitant steps toward an historical appreciation of the Eastern Church and away from the sway of Latin came to his attention after he left for the Holy Trinity Lavra. The Kolomna seminary no doubt prepared him for long hours of hard work and gave him an excellent command of Latin, but his understanding of the Church and his willingness to pursue the highest ideals of Christian life still lay ahead at the Lavra and in St. Petersburg. That new understanding and willingness led him to break with the Drozdov tradition of parish service in Kolomna and dedicate himself to wider service in the Church. "If you wish to be worthy of the love of God and Christ," he later reminded his family in Kolomna, "love God and Christ more than father and mother, more than sister and brother, more than all else you love. 'He who loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me.'"<sup>48</sup>

He left home when he was seventeen.

## CHAPTER II

### The dwelling place of piety

Educate your children, so that in childhood you may bear them away and conceal them from Herod, that is, keep them from vice, bad habits, harmful examples, while, on the contrary, you teach them good morals by planting in good time the seeds of piety.

--Metropolitan Platon, The catechism, or primary instruction in Christian law.

And he was afraid, and said, 'How awesome is this place! This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven.'

--Genesis, 28, 17.

#### 1. Daily life at the seminary.

Filaret arrived at the Holy Trinity-St. Sergii Lavra fearing that the seminary would demand long hours of hard work. His fears were fully justified. By the end of March, 1800, his first month at the Lavra, he wrote to his father that "soon we will have disputations: no one knows precisely when, perhaps even today."<sup>1</sup> Plunging into the work of the school, he labored furiously, for "I must do what the others do and what they have already done. In four weeks I have used a full quire of paper."<sup>2</sup>

His work was hampered by the unexpected difficulty in finding a place to stay. At first he took a room on Pereslavka Street for three rubles a month, including board, but the Prefect of the seminary, Mel'khisedek, ordered all students living on that noisy street to move. He intended to rent a room in Il'inskaia sloboda [Elijah settlement] but the relationship between the landlord and several of the students was such that he decided against it.<sup>3</sup> Finally he found a room with the priest of the Church of Christ's Nativity in Sergiev posad [Sergii suburb]. Unfortunately the

priest's family life had utterly collapsed and "he led an unrestrained life with a woman. Some students expelled from the school for pranks were living with him. Because of their poverty, they lived on bread stolen from the bursary and they arranged it so that each one of them fed the entire group (there were five of them) for a week."<sup>4</sup> With only his father's small support, such rooms were all that Filaret could afford. It was either here, he wrote home, the street, or else a tiny room "with three isinglass windows, where even at midday it is impossible to read a book."<sup>5</sup> After a month, he went to the Prefect of the seminary and offered to pay if he could be allowed to stay at the school dormitory. Mel'khisedek granted permission but would not take his money.

Once the seminary gave him room, his daily life was regulated by the seminary Instruction, written by Mefodii Smirnov and approved by Metropolitan Platon (Levshin, 1737-1812) in 1787. Filaret rose to the peal of a bell every morning at five, straightened the straw mattress on his wooden bed, washed quickly and dressed. Pulling on his sheepskin coat (the dormitory and school were barely heated even in winter), he joined with boys from several neighboring rooms for prayer, and while one read, the others listened "with proper attention and ardor." After prayer he went back to his room and studied his philosophy and history lessons until the bell rang a second time. It was then time to study language, and Filaret was studying Hebrew and Greek. When a third bell rang, the students left their rooms and set off following the teachers for the school. Presumably the students ate nothing until after morning classes were over at eleven. From eleven to one, lunch and

rest. During lunch, the students practiced their manners, sat quietly, spoke only when absolutely necessary, and listened to the Scriptural reading which accompanied the meal. From one to four, classtime and afterwards the language students were sent to their rooms to study their lessons. The others spent the next two hours practicing their singing in the choir. At six, they were given a half-hour rest and then study again until eight. From eight to nine, dinner, after which it was time for prayer and bed for the younger students. The older boys stayed up until ten. On bath days, the oldest went first and scrubbed for fifteen minutes "without unnecessary noise"; the boys took care not to "burn one another with hot water."<sup>6</sup>

This routine, outlined in the Instruction, in general conformed with the Spiritual Regulation written by Feofan Prokopovich in 1721, which served as the official law governing all seminaries. Yet the Instruction marked a definite step away from the harsh, martial rules Feofan provided in the hopes that a regime of iron discipline would bring forth good and useful servants for Church and state. He assigned times "for every activity and relaxation, when to go to sleep, when to get up, to pray, to study, to go to the refectory, to stroll, etc. Each of those hours shall be designated by a bell, and all the seminarians, like soldiers upon a drumbeat, shall enter upon their work, whatever is scheduled for the set hour, upon the sound of bells."<sup>7</sup> Even though it was possible to be "beaten severely" for violation of the rules, Feofan cherished the idea that the seminarians would in time appreciate their advantages even if "such a way of life for young people appears to be irksome and similar to imprisonment."<sup>8</sup>

Platon's Instruction insured discipline, but it contained none of the military-penal character of the Spiritual Regulation. Platon aimed at cultivating the moral qualities of the students. All walks in the seminary gardens were to be accompanied by "honorable and properly becoming games." If the students went to the monastery market, they went in small groups, taking all precautions against giving or receiving offense. When permitted to walk along the Korbukha, a small river near the monastery leading to Platon's retreat and the smaller seminary Vifanii (Bethany), they left together orderly walking along the road and playing in "a proper manner." During Mass and Vespers, the boys entered church two by two and stood in rows quietly and "in reverence."

More importantly, the students were to be considerate toward one another. The students in the lower classes showed their respect for the older students by doffing their caps when they met and by calling the older boys by their first names and patronymics. In short, they were to behave "in every way respectfully, remembering the Apostle's words 'It is beyond dispute that the inferior is blessed by the superior' (Hebrews, 7,7)." No one was allowed to borrow money or accept debts, and they were to live together "fraternally," that is, with the utmost consideration for one another. "But if someone (God forbid!) is intentionally offended, then--without fighting or quarreling--he should report to the Prefect (or to the Rector, depending on the offense) about the offender and what occurred." It was axiomatic that since "community and friendship are founded on honorable fraternal love, no tomfoolery or harmfully intended pranks are permitted." Loose langu-

age was severely punished, and dirty letters and notes were not tolerated. "If anyone finds such a letter [anonymously written, presumably], he should burn it without a word." Breaking any of the rules, of course, was grounds for punishment, but personal offenses were the most serious. Such offenders "will be sent to the lower grades, have their names registered in the journal and read publicly in the dining hall, and then they will be presented to the metropolitan."

This emphasis on honorable conduct, consideration of others, and the cultivation of friendship and fraternal love was a completely new spirit from that expressed in the Spiritual Regulation. Platon hoped the students would obey the rules, "not only to avoid God's wrath, but also for the sake of conscience."<sup>9</sup>

## 2. Metropolitan Platon.

The Instruction, which created the special atmosphere of seminary and had a lasting effect on Filaret, expressed several of Metropolitan Platon's most cherished ideals formed over the previous half-century. Platon was born on 29 July 1737, the son of a minor church servitor in the village of Chasnikov, forty versts from Moscow on the St. Petersburg highway.<sup>10</sup> For a short time he attended the Kolomna seminary, but his father's persistent applications in Moscow finally made it possible for Platon to attend the Slavono-Greco-Latin Academy, where he studied Latin, poetics, rhetorics, philosophy and theology (the latter with Grigorii Afanas'evich Dranitsyn, later Gennadii, bishop of Smolensk).<sup>11</sup> Platon also cultivated some special interests which he found difficult to pursue at the academy. The first was his-

tory: "He [Platon writes in the third person] acquired a knowledge of history by constantly reading books throughout his life, and there was no more pleasant exercise for him than reading both world history and that of the fatherland."<sup>12</sup> This interest resulted in the first history of the Russian Church, which Platon published in 1805, the same year in which Mefodii Smirnov's Liber historicus made its appearance. Platon's history was also intended for the schools: "For the use and edification of youth studying in our ecclesiastical schools, so they, by imitating ancient holy and spiritual men [might] establish good works and piety in their hearts."<sup>13</sup> Platon's second special interest was Greek, and it was "with a certain sense of satisfaction that in Greek he was 'autodidaktos'..."<sup>14</sup> This was a relatively rare accomplishment in the mid-eighteenth century, and Platon spoke, wrote, and read Greek with some fluency.

His education and outlook were composed of several diverse elements characteristic of Russian religious education in the first half of the eighteenth century. His early reading centered on Church books such as the Reading Menaea, the Prologue (a book containing stories about the saints and information about the Church holidays; it was actually a "prologue" to the Reading Menaea), and Stefan Iavorskii's Rock of Faith [Kamen' very]. He also read the history of Caesar Baronius, a Roman Catholic 16th century publicist and historian whose Annales ecclesiastici--in part a polemic against the Eastern Church--was translated into Russian from a shortened Polish version published by Peter Skarga.<sup>15</sup> Platon also studied Cicero's De officiis for a better knowledge of Latin, but for style he found Quintus Curtius's thrilling and

picturesque stories about Alexander the Great the most satisfying. "It seemed to him [Platon] that the language in which Curtius wrote was loftier than mortal [language] with its sweet, sharp, and clever turns of speech which he did not find in any Russian writer; no one was so pleasing to his taste."<sup>16</sup> Such reading demonstrates the Latin, Catholic influence on the early 18th century Russian schools.

More important than any of these Church books, Catholic tracts, and pagan Latin authors was St. Paul, whose epistles "he read more than twenty times," and St. John Chrysostom, whose influence is visible in Platon's sermons.<sup>17</sup> Pietism, too, had its attractions. As a teacher of poetics, Greek, and catechetics at the Slavono-Greco-Latin Academy from September, 1757 to 15 July 1758, he read a series of catechetical lectures in the academy auditorium which show that pietist influence was very strong on him. In several respects these lectures were an attempt to explain the Nicene Creed in the language of the pietists, who taught that inner feeling, properly cultivated by reading Scripture, would lead to salvation--a salvation which did not depend on ritual or external observance. Platon's understanding of the power of Scripture also conformed to the pietist idea that man's inner light was guided by Divine Power through the Bible:

All alike seek an end, that is, the salvation of their souls. They come, some with vessels of gold, some with vessels of silver, but all dip in the fount of Grace. O' my holy and beloved gathering! We will never cease to pray God that He always acts in our hearts through His word.<sup>18</sup>

Platon did not go so far as to deny the Church, as some pietists did, but his definition in these lectures was none too rigorous: "What is the Church? It is not just any gathering, but an assem-

bly of chosen people called from the unclean world by the voice of God."<sup>19</sup>

These lengthy catechetical lectures, which dwell on the true path to Christ and salvation, evoke the image of Jacob Boehme, the German theosophist (1575-1624). Probably Platon did not know Boehme's writings directly, but more likely received them through the writings of pietists available in Russia.<sup>20</sup> He shared Boehme's belief in the continuous struggle between good and evil in the world: "Our lives...are a continuous struggle against invisible enemies, against the deceitful devil, against confused thoughts, against the allurements of this world which bring sin."<sup>21</sup> But there is an unmistakable element of Rousseau in Platon's writings as well, for Platon fully shared Rousseau's belief that civilization was the source of evil: its artificiality and corruption distort men's characters and make them unhappy. Platon also shared Rousseau's religious temperament, respect for the Bible, awe of the cosmos, and solitary meditation. He believed, as Rousseau did, in the importance of cultivating man's best traits such as kindness, generosity, honesty, and sympathetic understanding. Whatever its sources, Platon's preoccupation with the struggle of good and evil in the world must be accounted a decisive fact in his life. It explains his vision of monasticism, his relationship to the reforming policies of Catherine's reign, and his attitude toward education.

After a year in which he taught at the Slavono-Greco-Latin Academy, Platon was invited by the archimandrite of the Holy Trinity Lavra (Gedeon Krinovskii) to teach rhetoric at the Trinity seminary. When Platon accepted the position, Gedeon wrote back,

"I am delighted you will be with us at the Lavra, but my joy will be greatly increased when I hear you have taken the monastic life and its value. Later he explained to the Empress Catherine that he had chosen to be a monk "because of a special love of learning...which is not as easy with a wife and children and various worldly diversions as it is in monastic life where you are free from all that."<sup>23</sup> This explanation satisfied Catherine, but it only partly reveals what Platon understood to be the true monastic vocation. The monastery, in his view, was a holy place and a "school of piety" where the monks occupy themselves with works which promote goodness and godliness.<sup>24</sup> Monasticism was a "withdrawal from the world," not the natural world which contains "the beautiful works of a wise Creator" (Platon, like Rousseau, was an appreciative student of natural philosophy and not a dualist), but rather the world of "excessive worldly vanity, impious examples of others, harmful associations with bad people, every weakness and obstruction to good works and the pious life."<sup>25</sup> Platon chose the monastic life as the best possible way to escape the weaknesses of the world and dedicate himself "in sweet silence" to God and Godly thoughts. He was not an ascetic, and he did not believe the truly ascetic life of prayer was possible for most men. "If all day and the greater part of the night, the word of God peals gremit from your mouth and true feeling burns in your heart, then I must respect your good works and take your example for my salvation. But if the strength of our souls is not so firm and dedicated that we can be constantly at prayer, then at what holy task can we spend our time?"<sup>26</sup> The answer is good works and mutual instruction in faith, in order to strengthen one another

against the temptations and weaknesses of the world.

Platon attracted Catherine's attention by his sermon "on the utility of piety" addressed to her when she visited the Lavra in May, 1763. Piety, he assured her, was in harmony with enlightened reform. If it were not for Christian piety, he pointed out, socially men could not be trusted. They lie, cheat, and steal, but if instructed in piety, they are honest in business and industrious in farming. The same is true for rulers: if they have no proper piety, they act unjustly, they protect the guilty and persecute the innocent. "Solomon, when he revered God with piety, carried through all his affairs according to his wishes, but the moment he strayed from this holy path, his kingdom immediately threatened to collapse."<sup>27</sup> Finally, he noted that piety helps the clergy and the Church. The task of religion, he explained, is "to teach, rescue those in error, preach the word, and strengthen the weak." Only a clergy strong in piety is able to lead a flock along the path marked out by Christ for man's salvation, for men respond only to pious shepherds.<sup>28</sup>

Platon's message was not lost on Catherine, who removed him from the "sweet silence" of the Trinity Lavra by appointing him teacher of religion to the tsarevich Paul in 1763. At the same time she invited him to participate in reforming the ecclesiastical schools and raising up the social and moral level of the clergy. In 1766, Platon joined the small commission "for establishing useful ecclesiastical schools in the dioceses" together with Gavriil, bishop of Tver' and Innokentii Nechaev, bishop of Pskov. Their proposals were never approved by the Empress, but they reflected some of Platon's characteristic ideas. The Bible was placed at

the center of study, and "for the greater progress in theological studies, commentaries on the Holy Scriptures must absolutely be included at specified days and hours."<sup>29</sup> The rigorous discipline of the schools was softened and corporal punishment, especially with the rod and cudgel, ruled out. A greater departure from the traditional school network was the envisioned "ecclesiastical university" in which students would study the "higher sciences", eastern languages (Greek and Hebrew), and theology. In anticipation of this new university, Catherine sent several students abroad for training at Oxford, Göttingen, and Leiden. But these proposals were not fundamentally to alter the Latin character of the schools, for a knowledge of Latin was still thought to be the clergy's greatest claim to distinction and learning. Most of the proposed changes centered on expanding the curriculum; Greek and history were to be more fully studied (two of Platon's special interests).<sup>30</sup>

Despite the fact that the commission's proposals were set aside, Catherine continued to show her favor to Platon. He rose quickly in the hierarchy. In 1766, at the age of twenty-nine, he was appointed archimandrite of the Holy Trinity-St. Sergii Lavra. Soon afterward, Catherine made him a member of the Holy Synod, and in 1770, he was ordained archbishop of Tver' in her presence. During this brief period (1763-1770), Platon "was burning with zeal for the welfare of the Church and the clergy."<sup>31</sup> As archbishop of Tver', "his sole intention and purpose lay in reforming the clergy, promoting the better priests as much as possible, while correcting the poorer ones, or, if they could not be corrected, depriving them of office."<sup>32</sup> His purpose was in keeping with

Catherine's policies, and it also was consistent with his belief in the importance of a pious clergy enjoying greater respect in the parishes and the same time being freed from the economic uncertainties resulting from overcrowding. He continued these reforms after Catherine promoted him to archbishop, then metropolitan of Moscow in 1775.

Yet Platon was never very content to be a courtier, an administrator, or even an outstanding orator. He disliked the court with its "constant opportunities for sin."<sup>33</sup> He placed much higher value on his abilities as a teacher than as an orator, despite the fact that, as Catherine once declared, "Father Platon does as he likes with us; if he wants us to cry, we cry."<sup>34</sup> Eloquence, important as he thought it to be, was less important than piety obtained through study: "He always insisted that learning, if it was to have substance, should not depend on cleverness or eloquence, but on the purity and goodness of the teacher."<sup>35</sup> "He was a lover of solitude" and preferred to be at home alone or "walk about with a few trusted friends with whom he could speak as he would to himself, without any restraint and with complete openness...And he retained this love for solitude his entire life: even when he was busy with important matters as a hierarch. At court he most often stayed at home and went out only when his duties called him."<sup>36</sup> It was this preference for solitude which earlier prompted him to stay at the Slavono-Greco-Latin Academy rather than enter the newly opened Moscow University. His reluctance to mingle with the corrupt world gave the Trinity seminary (which was under his direction from the time he became

archimandrite of the Lavra in 1766) the peculiarly moral stamp illustrated by the Instruction of 1787 discussed earlier. His own days as a teacher there he accounted the happiest in his life, especially the summers when he could take walks with his friends along the Korbukha to the summer bathhouses and swimming ponds: "There Platon walked with his comrades in the gardens and woods; he swam in the ponds, enjoyed decent games, and in the friendly and often learned conversations time would pass unnoticed...That time was truly heavenly..."<sup>37</sup>

Under Platon's direction, the Holy Trinity seminary made the transition from Catholic inspired scholasticism to Protestant oriented theology and natural philosophy. Platon's lectures in theology were the first attempt in Russia to decisively eliminate any scholastic approach--Catholic or Protestant in orientation--from theology.<sup>38</sup> Shortly after he became archimandrite of the Lavra, Platon wrote to the seminary rector Ilarion that "dogma should be explained more briefly [than Ilarion had done in the conspectus he presented to Platon], so that all vapid and useless questions which adorn the books of Roman Catholics are eliminated. More attention is needed for moral instruction taken from the Holy Scriptures. Therefore, it would be desirable that moral teaching accompany each abstract theological point, so that theological speculation will lead to the formation of Christian morality."<sup>39</sup> Platon recommended Ilarion pay more attention to the Bible, expound its teachings every Sunday, and set aside time twice a week for the students to read the Bible aloud to their teachers, "for frequently the student of theology finishes the course and has not read the entire Bible..."<sup>40</sup>

The sources of Platon's theology were Feofan Prokopovich and Johann Andreas Quenstedt (1617-1688), whose Theologia didactico-polemica, sive Systema theologiae (Wittenberg, 1685) is written in the Lutheran scholastic style. Despite the scholastic approach of his sources, Platon did not devise a scholastic system, partly because many of his theology lectures and addresses were written as lessons for the tsarevich Paul, and partly because he was searching for a living theology for use in daily life. He divided theology into three parts: 1) natural knowledge about God (typical of the new attempt to ground theology in natural philosophy); 2) theology confirmed by revelation; and 3) the Commandments (that is, moral theology).

"This follows the natural order: for we begin with knowledge derived from natural reflection and then approach revelation."<sup>41</sup> Men must first be convinced through the use of their reason before they will believe the self-evident truths of revealed Christian doctrine.

"Reason," Platon explained, "is the means by which a thing distinctly presents itself. Therefore, God's reason is the most distinct conception of all things which not only exist, but which could be possible. For as His being is unlimited, then so His perfection must be unlimited. This is confirmed by Holy Scriptures: 'And before him no creature is hidden, but all are open and laid bare to the eyes of him with whom we have to do.' (Hebrews, 4, 13)."<sup>42</sup> Whether or not this Scriptural evidence actually provides the clinching argument, the passage is a restatement of Leibniz' idea of the "perfect being", who cannot contain a self-contradiction or limitation; who is the

greatest good, the greatest knowledge, the greatest power, and so on. Hence our existence and our world are the result of the exercise of this good, wise, and powerful mind which has a clear and distinct understanding.

For Platon, these rational proofs of God and his promise of salvation can only serve "to clarify" revealed truth.<sup>43</sup> God, in His infinite wisdom and boundless mercy, did not leave men alone with their reason, He also showed them the way to salvation through revelation. He filled their minds "with supernatural light and revealed to them the most secret mysteries and most amazing prophecies. These mysteries and prophecies, at the command of the Holy Spirit, were put in writing, so the revealed truths of God would remain unforgotten through all ages--this writing we call Holy Scripture."<sup>44</sup> But for what purpose did God, this perfect being, reveal His mysteries? For Platon the explanation was clear: it was to lead men along the path to true piety and salvation. The Commandments (which formed the third part of his theological discussions) were given precisely for this purpose, and because of their great importance, they "have been written on the heart of every man..."<sup>45</sup> This application of pietistic moralism to Leibniz' rational explanation of God and creation resulted in a form of theological instruction which linked the activities of the mind with the searchings of the heart in order to create Godly, moral, and pious men.

Yet Platon was not so overwhelmed by pietism and natural philosophy that he lost sight of Orthodoxy. In his search for a creative theology which satisfied the demands of both the heart and the mind, he went to some lengths to define what he understood

Orthodoxy to be and how it developed in Russia. His history of the Russian Orthodox Church was an important contribution to Russian religious life. Moreover, his attempts to explain his theology in Russian (all of his catechetical-theological discussions were written in Russian, not Latin) and his emphasis on Biblical study and history encouraged others to trace more fully the historical path of Orthodoxy:

Until now in studying theology we have used books foreign to us both in language and in religious outlook which contributed a great deal to our falling away from the Orthodox faith. But now when they begin to read your book the Orthodox teaching or Short Christian Catechism, 1765/written in harmony with Holy Scriptures and the Orthodox faith, there will be no need for foreign texts, for everything needful for salvation may be found in your book. You are worthy of the deep gratitude of both the learned and the unlearned who wish to enlighten their minds with true Godliness...<sup>46</sup>

To this it must be added that Platon's teaching "is free from the useless questions and clever subtleties used to explain Holy Scripture which presented so many difficulties and hardly related to salvation."<sup>47</sup>

Nevertheless, Platon did not intend to abandon Latin in the schools, and as time went by even in the Trinity seminary the scholastic routine reasserted itself. When the question of substituting Russian for Latin in all Russian ecclesiastical schools was raised, Platon spoke sharply against it:

Our clergy are regarded by foreigners as nearly ignorant, for we can speak neither French nor German. But we maintain our honor by replying that we can speak and copy Latin. If we study Latin as we do Greek, then we lose our last honor, for we will not be able to speak or write any language.<sup>48</sup>

The Latin erudition and Latin tradition of the schools, he be-

lieved, gave the clergy distinction, set it off from the rest of society, and gave it greater prestige among the people. This special position--which Platon carefully preserved and extended--was precisely the weakness of the schools. The artificial curriculum, learned in a language which no one else in Russia spoke, contributed little toward any organic growth of Russian religious life, for it found no nourishment in Russian tradition or that of the Eastern Church and hardly any point of contact with Russian life.

### 3. Teachers and subjects.

Filaret studied four subjects the first year: philosophy, Greek, Hebrew, and history. The teachers were competent, but not outstanding; the method of instruction (in Latin) appealed more to the memory than to the intellect; and the books were overwhelmingly inspired by German Lutheranism (orthodox and pietist) and English Protestantism.

Philosophy was taught by Evgraf Muzalevskii-Platonov (died 1809), one of the numerous graduates of Trinity seminary supported at Platon's expense and given Platon's name as a second surname. He was not an inspiring teacher.<sup>49</sup> In his hands Baumeister's once novel and fresh treatment of philosophy was shaped to fit the repetitive drill so popular in the schools. Each day he assigned passages to be memorized from Baumeister's Elementa philosophiae recentioris, while the students spent most of their time in class carefully and laboriously copying Evgraf's lectures word for word. Previous students had been partly spared this fatiguing and monotonous task by learning to explain logical proofs

with the rhetorical zest highly prized by earlier teachers such as Apollos Baibakov (1745-1801). While demonstrating the logical proof for the immortality of the soul, Apollos could humorously declare:

For the first proof about immortality maintains that our soul thinks, feels, imagines, desires, reflects, and so on, and from this it is acknowledged immortal. There is proof! Here is such a philosophy [that which denies the immortality of the soul] which not only compares beasts with men, but gives them preference!<sup>50</sup>

Under Evgraf's tutelage, philosophy completely sank below the surface of the scholastic routine which reasserted itself as an integral part of the seminary's education despite the transition from Aristotle to Leibniz and despite the benign supervision of Platon.

Yet Evgraf did not confine himself to Baumeister's compendium. He supplemented it with quotations, proofs, and additional arguments from various seventeenth century philosophers such as Ralph Cudworth, the Cambridge Platonist.<sup>51</sup> Probably he knew Cudworth's writings through the works of Johann Lorenz Mosheim (1694-1755), a German admirer of Cudworth.<sup>52</sup> In any event, Evgraf cited Cudworth's True Intellectual System of the Universe to refute the atheist, materialist, and determinist system of natural philosophy erected by Pierre Gassendi (1592-1650), the Franciscan teacher of mathematics. Gassendi's belief that all knowledge was derived from the senses encouraged the idea that one need not be concerned about imagination and feeling--a notion which hardly found favor at the Holy Trinity Lavra.

Samuil (Stefan) Zapol'skii-Platonov doubled as teacher of Greek and Hebrew.<sup>53</sup> Dressed in the special caftan of blue linen

and red piping with a red undergown and silk sash which Platon required as the uniform for Greek teachers, Samuil daily drilled his fifty eight students according to the same time honored methods used for learning Latin. On Monday, the boys learned the rules "for observing Greek eloquence" by deciphering the speeches of Demosthenes and St. John Chrysostom's addresses to the people of Antioch. Tuesday, translation from classical Greek into Russian and modern Greek. Wednesday, dictated translation from modern Greek into classical Greek and Russian. Thursday, all the passages which refused to yield any sense earlier in the week were once more assaulted and clarified. Friday, translation from the Gospels for the following Sunday service and conversational Greek (which was also to be practiced during all free times).<sup>54</sup>

There were very few texts and grammars of Greek in Russia during the 18th century for Samuil to choose from. Varlaam Liashchevskii's Greek grammar in Latin, written for his students at the Kievan Academy in 1746, was the standard authority. But Platon, who had a special interest in Greek, encouraged the teachers to push beyond the limits of Varlaam's grammar and acquaint the students with the language of the New Testament (passages of which were to be memorized). Learning Greek was largely for the purposes of Biblical scholarship, although it was hoped that if the students read Chrysostom's defense of monasticism, it might "more easily lead the students to choose the manner of life praised by the Holy Father."<sup>55</sup> Samuil believed in hard work and a firm mastery of the fundamentals. By the end of the first year, Filaret was able to compose a short

poem (not quite correctly) in Greek in honor of Metropolitan Platon's year-end visit to the school:

Sing thee in songs of Homer's grand heroes!  
 Dare thee not sing of the deeds of Platon;  
 Poets are inclined to magnify the truth--  
 But how can the deeds of a father be exaggerated?56

Hebrew was not a required subject, and only twelve students from the three highest classes, rhetorics, philosophy, and theology, enrolled for Samuil's lectures. There were no Hebrew grammars in Russian, and the seminary depended upon the seventeenth and early eighteenth century grammars written by Protestant Biblical theologians such as Matthias Wasmuth, whose Institutio Methodica Accentuationis Hebraeae and Hebraismus facilitati et integratati suae restitutus were published consecutively in Leipzig in 1694 and 1695. The Philologia sacra (Jena, 1623-36) by Solomon Glass (Glassius, 1593-1656) was the standard text on exegesis in the Russian Orthodox seminaries, just as it was for the Lutherans in Germany. Samuil set the students analyzing the Old Testament, especially the Pentateuch and the Psalms, from Glass' presentation of it as a document inspired by the Holy Spirit. The Old Testament--as an analysis of language would show--was written as a prefiguration of the New; as a book deliberately written to point toward the New Testament to come. Wasmuth and Glass were supplemented by Joachim Lange's Clavis Hebraei Codicis, published in the pietist center at Halle in 1735.

Platon required Samuil to focus the students' attention on vocabulary, roots, and "special meanings" of the Old Testament and practice translating passages from it once or twice a week.

Following Glass' interpretation of the Old Testament as a document divinely inspired, it followed that the text therefore could not be internally inconsistent. Platon made this view the basis of his instructions to the seminary teachers when dealing with Scriptures. "Where places are found in the Holy Scriptures in which one seems to contradict the other, they should be explained and harmonized with the aid of published concordances."<sup>57</sup> Samuil was to present first the literal meaning of the Bible, then explain its "spiritual and mysterious meaning," especially in the Old Testament, but without "seeking a mysterious meaning where there is none." This could be avoided by referring to the best commentators, above all the Church Fathers. No opportunity to pursue the moral instruction of the students was to be lost while engaged in this close scrutiny of the Bible.

Filaret's history lessons took their inspiration from that same appeal to the memory which informed his other studies: "A knowledge of history above all depends on reading and memorizing; it does not need much explanation."<sup>58</sup> Filaret probably did not receive much explanation anyway, for the teacher, Dimitrii Il'inskii (later he took the monastic name Dionisii) was a warm companion of the bottle. In 1803 he was finally sent to Markhastyn' "for an introduction to sobriety, for he does not seem to be very well acquainted with it."<sup>59</sup> The books assigned were a curious mixture of primary sources, Protestant texts, and Deist histories. Platon urged the students to read Nestor's chronicle and Nikon's chronicle for Russian history (supplemented by

Shcherbatov's History of Russia from the Earliest Times). World history could be obtained from the great Scandinavian writer Ludvig Holberg's short universal history, while Church history was studied from the works of Johann Mosheim, whose History of Modern Christianity (1741) was a Protestant interpretation of the Reformation. Joseph Bingham's Origines Ecclesiasticae (1708) was written from the elastic standpoint of many Protestant writers of that period who hoped there might be a reunion of at least the reformed Christian churches "upon such principles as are common to all the churches of the reformation." Johann Matthias Schroecka's lectures published in Berlin in 1777 under the title Historia religionis et ecclesiae Christianae were used also as a text despite the polemical character and narrow perspective "which does not even see the Eastern [Church]." <sup>60</sup>

At the end of his first year at the seminary, Filaret took his examinations and passed laudibillimus progressus.

The next two years held but little prospect for change from the previous year's routine in the seminary. The daily round of study was briefly relieved in late September by the Emperor Alexander's visit to the monastery. The students wrote poems, practiced their singing, composed speeches and disputations, and exhausted themselves trimming the parapets and columns of the monastery leading up to the main gate with fir boughs. Alexander's name, monogrammed in flowers, was fastened to the boughs and placed directly under a crown affixed to a garland arch. <sup>61</sup> It was an important occasion, for Alexander had only been on the throne a few months since the murder of his father Paul in March, 1801, and he was uncertain about Platon's reaction to the sudden

events. After several false alarms, Alexander arrived. "Finally we saw the great Genius of Russia," Filaret wrote to his father, "who had a humble, yet regal, appearance and an angelic smile... At 7 o'clock on the eve of the festivities he entered the Lavra and even the sullen weather cheered up. At least it was much brighter for us inside the monastery. After the liturgy on the day of the festivities, he did not forget to visit our seminary and, after dinner, the Vifanii seminary. He returned to the capital [i.e. Moscow], followed a few days later by the metropolitan, while we, after his gay departure, went back to our studies."<sup>62</sup>

Filaret studied theology and medicine in addition to Greek, Hebrew and history which continued from the first year. Medicine was added to the curriculum in 1802 "so that from [the seminaries] might come doctors of both the body and the soul," as Filaret remarked to his father.<sup>63</sup> He read William Buchan's Domestic medicine, or a treatise on the prevention and cure of diseases by regimen and simple medicines, (translated into Russian from a French edition) and hoped "neither you [his father] nor mother will ever need these medicines."<sup>64</sup> He did not have much interest in medicine, although when his father rebuked him for spending too much money, he declared, "I would zealously study this science if it might show me a way to heal dissatisfaction. Then I would send you a prescription and also heal myself. It is a shame that medicine cannot reach it. Philosophers vainly prescribe prudence, study, and hope. Such weak medicines! If they were combined with faith, they might work, but only in the strongest doses could the disease be fully cured. I am con-

vinced that you use this prescription and I wish to be your imitator."<sup>65</sup>

With such considerations in mind, Filaret studied theology with Avgustin Vinogradskii, then rector of the seminary and later archbishop of Moscow. "From him we received a notebook or two in Latin [that is his lecture notes] which discussed all the books of the Bible, not just the Old Testament. When he came to class, he made the students read these notes, translate them into Russian, and then he added a few of his own remarks to them."<sup>66</sup> Avgustin remained as teacher only until Christmas, 1801, when he was appointed superior of the Zaikonospasskii monastery and rector of the Slavono-Greco-Latin Academy located there. Evgraf, Filaret's philosophy teacher, was promoted to the rectorship and inherited Avgustin's theology class.

The Latin and scholastic routine, however, did not vary with the change of teachers, even though Platon was coming to the belief that theology might be better served by requiring a three year course in which the Bible would be read six times without any reference to systems.<sup>67</sup> Evgraf brought to class the ponderous tome by David Hollatz (Hollatius, 1648-1713) Examen theologicum acromaticum (Rostock and Leipzig, 1709; 7th and 8th editions by Romanus Teller, 1750 and 1763) for the students to copy, read, translate and explain to each other and to the teacher. The quaestiones were explained by probationes, followed by antitheses, against which were pitted instantia with the result that the dogmatic truths of faith were confirmed. Hollatz' text was only one of many German Lutheran textbooks which the teachers used and the students studied at Trinity. The Loci theologici by Johann Ger-

hard, the Lutheran professor of dogmatics at Jena, was also used, for it had the virtue of conceiving Scripture as the basis of all dogmatics and inspired in every respect right down to the Hebrew vowel points. Highly sympathetic toward the cause of inner feeling, Gerhard wrote several books as apologies for the Evangelical creed.<sup>68</sup> Johannes Quenstedt's Theologia didactico-polemica sive systema theologicum, with its artificial scholastic refinements--and one of the sources of Platon's theology--was still used at the turn of the century. The same was true for Johann Buddeus' Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae (1723) and Isagoge historico-theologica ad theologiam universam (1727) in which Buddeus, among other things, endeavored to combine the new learning of the 17th century with the pietism associated with Spangenberg, Spener and Zizendorf. These books and others by Joachim Breithaupt (1658-1732) and William Derham were compiled, summarized, "epitomized", and occasionally even published as compendiums by the seminary teachers (e.g. Iakinf Karpinskii, the teacher of theology at the Kolomna seminary, made a compendium published in Leipzig in 1786). There was a very real possibility that the Russian Church would be completely overwhelmed by Protestant doctrine.

Evgraf attempted to thread his way among the various Protestant teachings while remaining on Orthodox ground. "Those points we held in common with the Protestants such as the Holy Trinity, redemption, and so on, were dealt with systematically; while others, for example the Church, were not read at all."<sup>69</sup> Moreover, Evgraf was coming to the conclusion that there was more to Eastern theology than that contained in Protestant textbooks writ-

ten in Latin. "He saw the need to study the Fathers and he studied them."<sup>70</sup> During his rectorship the Lavra, "famous for its knowledge of Latin," began to abandon the study of Latin, for Evgrav "was more disposed to worry about perfecting a knowledge of Russian."<sup>71</sup>

Filaret passed all of his studies with relative ease. Evgraf declared that in theology he was "outstandingly sharp, assiduous, and successful," while he was ranked above all other students in Hebrew and Greek. When Filaret finished the school in 1803, Evgraf accounted him and Matfei Znamenskii "without any doubt the best of all in assiduity and sharpness of mind in all studies, especially poetics. They are distinguished by a singular modesty." Or Tum diligentia, tum ingenii acie, tum in aliis litterarum studiis, tum in poësi maxime, facile primi sunt omnium. Singularem eminentem modestiam, in the language of the schools.<sup>72</sup>

#### 4. Monastic vows.

Idle-minded: Tell me, which is the best estate we might choose?

Well-disposed: I told you there is none better than the spiritual.

Idle-minded: For what? Dragging about through the mud in a long cassock?

Well-disposed: The most divine fates lead us to that calling.  
But why do you revile it so?

Idle-minded: I don't revile it, I merely prefer another profession.

Well-disposed: Who more deservedly merits the respect of all others than the priest? Who has a better opportunity to study and thereby lead the most pleasant life? Who is more inwardly and outwardly at peace than the priest? In place of worldly riches, he possesses those which are heavenly and eternal and which not only he and his family, but entire Christian societies may use.

Idle-minded: I concede Mr. Well-disposed. Now I too wish to become a priest.

Well-disposed: Not so fast my friend! You must first prepare yourself.

Idle-minded: And how might I prepare myself for the priesthood?

Well-disposed: First study what you would teach others. Correct your life as you would correct others. In short, study theology, which contains all a priest needs to know both for himself and for others.

--A conversation at the Trinity seminary on choosing a way of life.<sup>73</sup>

In the summer of 1803, Filaret graduated from the seminary. He was twenty. He was a diligent, hardworking young man, a gifted linguist, and a poetically inclined student of theology with a deep sense of personal humility inherited from his father and encouraged by Platon and the life of the seminary. Three years of isolation and study left their mark on him. Now the solitude, isolation, and study in Platon's protected retreat were at an end. His classmates were leaving for the surrounding towns and villages to take posts as priests, settle down, marry, and raise families. Perhaps a few (as the Holy Synod reportedly hoped) might even cross "the endless steppe, through a waterless sea of sand to China, or close to it, to those wise people whose alphabet is hardly known."<sup>74</sup> A delegation from Kolomna had already been to the metropolitan asking that Filaret be assigned as a priest to one of the Kolomna churches. But he did not wish either to go to China or yet become a parish priest. He wanted to stay longer at the seminary, although, as he confessed to his father, "I cannot now explain why I feel this way."<sup>75</sup>

There were two other possible choices. He could leave the

seminary and the clergy for a civil, perhaps even a military, career. But he hesitated, partly because he did not wish to incur the wrath of Metropolitan Platon, who regarded such actions as treachery, and partly because he was so utterly ignorant of secular life. Latin, Hebrew, and Greek; Baumeister, Hollatz, and Mosheim had so little to do with civil service, war, or diplomacy. The other choice required monastic vows. It was a difficult, if not impossible decision. He alone of all his schoolmates seemed not to know what to be:

I am like a man who stands on an empty road in the dark of night, not wanting to be anywhere, not wanting to push forward, and who ponders the darkness in the weak light of the stars, yet a man who would rather spend the night in a house with men than in the forest with the beasts.<sup>76</sup>

Platon made it possible for him to postpone any decision by appointing him teacher of Greek and Hebrew at the seminary with a salary of 160 rubles a year.

Life went on very much as before, except that now he was a teacher rather than a student. No lifetime decisions were necessary. He taught Hebrew every day but Sunday and Greek from Monday through Friday. The familiar routine was reestablished in which "the grammar rules are read, themes assigned, translations composed with the syntactical rules noted, and the students are occupied with conversations."<sup>77</sup> For Greek lessons, they read St. Gregory of Nazianzus and St. John Chrysostom. For Hebrew, he explained the etymology of Hebrew words, while the students practiced translations of the Old Testament into Russian. He was simply teaching what he had been taught, and in the daily round of drill, translations and readings, he was able to shut out any

larger considerations for three years. During that time, he concentrated on developing his abilities as a writer and a speaker, and tested his willingness to become a monk.

In 1806, prompted by Metropolitan Platon, Filaret composed a sermon to be read before the entire Lavra, commemorating the liberation of St. Sergii's hermitage from the Poles during the Time of Troubles. It was to be a reminder, in the face of the growing power of Napoleon, that national resistance to foreign invasion which had centered on the Lavra in the 17th century still found its strength in the piety upheld by St. Sergii's successors. Filaret spoke of the horrors of the war and pestilence which infested the country during the Polish onslaught:

Death beyond the wall [of the monastery], death within the walls, death hovered in the air, death crept in by underground paths. Murderous weapons reached even this sanctuary, and God's Saints received wounds through their images [i.e. their icons]. Muscles grew too weak to turn aside the sword; only a few feeble hands remained to ward off the wrath of heaven.<sup>78</sup>

The desolation which followed in the wake of the Polish army proved the hopelessness of human guarantees for safety. Stripped of every means of defense, naked in the sight of God and the Poles, the Russians had nothing left but "faith and prayers." Filaret painted a large scale scene in which the hero, St. Sergii, was portrayed as a supernatural leader of the defenseless Russian warriors. Armed only with the faith and piety inspired by the Saint, the Russian soldiers were finally triumphant, for

firmness in faith and piety is, and always will be, the first foundation and sole guarantee of society's well being.<sup>79</sup>

He then moved from past epics to current events. Russia is once

more threatened by the Godless foreign enemy, not only armed with the sword, but schooled in the doctrine of the social contract. These Godless men uphold the belief that society is founded on the need for mutual protection and extended by the right of conquest. Such a society is nothing but a "union of bloodthirsty tigers and pitiful lambs." Yet, society is truly founded by God, and it thrives when governed by pious rulers and served by obedient subjects carrying out their duties. That was the lesson St. Sergii taught and the pious remnant at the Lavra learned in the 17th century. As long as it is remembered, "love for the Fatherland will never be quenched."<sup>80</sup>

Filaret's sermon embodied the prevailing understanding of Church, state, and society at the Trinity Lavra, where the rationalism and Deism of the Enlightenment were not held in very high esteem. Napoleon was the personification of the destructive power inherent in the teachings of the philosophes. Piety was the essential ingredient in religion, and religion was the true foundation of all God's created world. Platon was pleased with the sermon and gave Filaret a small present as a token of his approval. Not long afterward, he wrote to Avgustin in Moscow that "an outstanding orator has appeared among us--the teacher Drozdov. I am sending you his sermon and you will be surprised."<sup>81</sup> From that time onward, Platon was determined to persuade Filaret to take monastic vows.

On Good Friday of that same year, Filaret gave another sermon at Platon's request. His theme was "It is finished" from John 19, 30. He began by describing the great event completed by Christ's crucifixion in order to "soften the stony heart of

a cruel people." All evil rejoiced at that moment. "Hell gnashed its teeth and our proud enemy hoped to convince himself and his disciples that all was finished, meaning all was buried."<sup>82</sup> But that was not the significance of Christ's crucifixion and it was a false explanation of Christ's final words. He had a different purpose in uttering those words which he meant for us to contemplate. Fortunately, the Savior did not leave us in ignorance about the meaning of his last words and the tragic events on Golgotha. His meaning was fully explained beginning in the book of Genesis and ending in the life of Christ. "Reading these great books can and must occupy a lifetime...."<sup>83</sup>

The Scriptural explanation of the crucifixion which begins in Genesis is actually the history of God's attempts to rescue man from his constant pursuit of evil, for "every imagination he thought was continually on evil." (Genesis 6, 5)." From these thoughts "flowed a torrent of evil, transformed from thoughts to deeds, devouring everything and producing nothing but devastation."<sup>84</sup> Yet all was not hopeless. "In the plan of creation there must be a recreation of moral nihility--of man."<sup>85</sup> God, in His infinite wisdom, knew how to span this breach in the harmony between the created and the Creator. This hopeful event was foreseen by God and Described in the story of Christ's birth. He was made man so that men might become parts of the Divine Nature. "He is eternal love, descended to join those separated from it by the sin of death, having satisfied Heavenly Judgement for them. Thus the very birth of Jesus points to His death."<sup>86</sup>

Filaret then surveyed the current state of good and evil in the world:

Once more hostile hordes surround forsaken virtue.  
 Once more the pure warmth of zeal cools in the  
 dwelling place of piety; and superstition and  
 persecution kindle their fire (Luke 33, 55)....  
 Once more the coward and traitor, fearing the  
 difficult ways of Christ, hardly dares follow  
 even at a distance, and at the slightest admonishment  
 from one who disparages him, he renounces him  
 with the curse: 'I do not know this man.'  
 (Matthew, 26, 72). 87

Finally, at the climax of the sermon, he speaks of the personal  
 hardship and barrier which Christ's crucifixion and sepulcher  
 present to those who seek their salvation:

You are safe from this obstacle only when you  
 attentively examine this sepulcher with both the  
 outer and the inner eye; when your heart no  
 longer crucifies Jesus, but rather ceases to  
 crucify him. Such a change is your present  
 glory and your future blessedness. Bear the  
 cross of self-rejection and suffering in order  
 to enter the very highest love of God and man-  
 kind; crucify the passions and desires of the  
 flesh, kill the world to live with God. This is  
 done to acquire what the Godman completed; it  
 gives every imitator of Him, at the end of his  
 journey, the right to feel and say, 'It is  
 finished.' 88

Platon could scarcely believe his ears. "Wonderful!" he  
 wrote in the margin of the sermon. "Wonderful Praeceptor of  
 Greek and Hebrew! Wonderful! Memento: Wonderful, for now we  
 know you are the prince of preachers in the Lavra seminary!...."<sup>89</sup>  
 Platon heard his own voice in Filaret's sermon. His repeated  
 sermons on piety, the struggle of good and evil, the need for  
 isolation from the falseness of the world and inner struggle  
 could all be found in this one compact speech. It was Platon's  
 ideas which were echoed and amplified by this young speaker who  
 could bring all the prophetic and inspired meaning of the Bible  
 to bear on the personal dilemma of following God. The confirmation  
 of the monastic life, so eloquently made by Filaret at the close,

assured Platon he had not been wrong in urging Filaret to take vows. He gave Filaret two pomegranates and appointed him Lavra sermonist.

Yet Filaret's sermon was more than a magnification of Platon's ideas, for the ideal of a life dedicated to Christ through self-rejection, mortification of the flesh, and bearing the cross of suffering in imitation of Christ was not Platon's vision of the moral, comradely retreat from the world of a few men dedicated to learning. It was much more austere and ascetical; it was uncompromising and hard. At first glance Filaret seemed to say what his teachers had taught him, but on closer inspection his expectations and demands were far more rigorous. It was precisely the gulf between the reality of the monastic life he saw every day in the monastery and the ascetical ideal which made Filaret hesitate to take monastic vows from the moment he graduated from the seminary three years earlier. If he were to become a monk, would he be satisfied with the monastic life at the Lavra? Could he maintain an outward show of conformity while following a different path inwardly? "The first lesson of living in society is learning to become more or less a chameleon," he confided to his father.<sup>90</sup> Platon and others urged him "to choose that sort of life in which the sole object is learning," but that did not seem to him a sufficient reason to become a monk or an adequate ideal to which to dedicate his life.<sup>91</sup> "I do not sufficiently care about that which I see and to which they encourage me. I do not know well enough that which stands against it."<sup>92</sup>

In August, 1806, Platon appointed Filaret to teach rhetoric and poetics, while carrying on the duties of Lavra sermonist (for

an additional fifty rubles a year). It was a more burdensome but more varied existence than the grammar lessons and drill. Six hours a day in class and a sermon on every second Sunday and on the numerous special holidays: "these are the duties you call a pleasure," he wrote to his father. "True, they are more various than before, more interesting, and occupy me with greater satisfaction."<sup>93</sup> His father was pleased that Filaret was held in such high esteem by the metropolitan of Moscow and enjoyed his special favors. Yet Platon's favors, including the fifty rubles Filaret received as sermonist, came directly from him with the purpose of making Filaret more tractable. "Think about this new and unusual generosity and its consequences," he complained to his father. "What new claims does it make on my gratitude and submissiveness!!"<sup>94</sup> Under the circumstances, "I decided --and what else could I decide-- I decided to surrender to this outer will as much as my strength will allow."<sup>95</sup>

Filaret could find some relief in the daily round of teaching. Three days a week he lectured on rhetoric; twice a week on poetics. On Saturday, he combined both classes and lectured them on Virgil, Suetonius, Pliny, Cicero, and other classical Roman authors. In the evenings after dinner, they read St. Paul together.<sup>96</sup> For the November 18 "collection" of congratulatory poems in honor of Platon's name day, he wrote a long poem entitled Old Age richly embellished with a plethora of classical allusions.<sup>97</sup> It was a break from the daily round of the seminary, with its emphasis on scholastic routine, which otherwise seemed stifling. "As for our current preoccupations, I can find nothing to say. We will now vainly dispute the Mosaic Pentateuch: it is the only

thing our circle is occupied with."<sup>98</sup>

In the meantime, he was prepared to wait on any decisions about vows, so that he might know his own mind. "I await a few rays of light to fall on the road. Some might call it a sign of weak faith; but I deem it trusting to Providence....It seems to me that a few years of indecision are more forgivable than a minute of haste where the subject is one's entire life. Let others chase after the will-o'-the-wisp of happiness; I go calmly, for I do not see a steady light anywhere...."<sup>99</sup> As Platon's favors increased, however, it became more difficult to put off a decision. After an Easter sermon in 1807, Platon gave him a fresh cucumber from the three or four on his table, which "let me know my sermon was pleasing. In the evening I was called in alone and I received a large egg [probably a Paschal egg], twenty volumes of His Holiness' sermons, the promise of half-caftan and some sort of outer garment.--Forgive me that I write you my little details: it is only so you might see my position."<sup>100</sup>

The summer of 1808 provided a release both from the routine of the school and from Platon's continuous pressure. Filaret looked forward to the vacation he would spend at Vifanii and the opportunity to come to some decision. He was nearly twenty four, and he could not postpone it forever. As the summer approached, he wrote a few Latin lines: "We stand on the threshold of study; relinquishing the mountains of the Muses, soon to besiege the plains of Vifanii, we will battle on the Korbukha, occupy it, or ourselves be conquered by its amenity."<sup>101</sup> At the end of summer, he wrote to his father to verify his birth date in the parish register. On the first day of November, just before his father's name day, he

wrote again:

I do not know if you will like the news which I am about to tell you. However, if your letters speak your heart, I hope I will not offend you or act against your will by having taken an important decision on my own, although I dare say, after sufficient thought. Father! Vasilii will soon be no more. But you will not lose a son who understands that he is indebted to you for more than life, who realizes the importance of his upbringing, and who knows the worth of your heart. Forgive me, I did not mean to flatter you, and I do not know how to express myself.<sup>102</sup>

On the sixteenth of the month he was tonsured; on the twenty first ordained a hierodeacon.

It seemed as though Filaret's decision was the only obstacle to a number of changes in his life, even though his new life as a monk did not seem particularly different. "I see practically nothing new around me. The same manner of life, the same duties and responsibilities, the same quiet, except that before I sometimes thought: what will be, what will happen."<sup>103</sup> The answer was soon provided by the Commission on Theological Schools in St. Petersburg, which requested him to come to St. Petersburg as a teacher in the newly reformed theological academy. His former teacher, Evgraf, had already left in April to become the new rector, to the great indignation of Platon. "I have long noticed that a wolf always looks to the woods....," he wrote to Avgustin. "Evgraf has set off for Peter[sburg] without any delay."<sup>104</sup> Platon tried to prevent Filaret's departure by making a special request to the Holy Synod, but it did no good. Filaret wanted to go, although he did not say so. It was an opportunity to break with the scholastic routine of the seminary and its Latin tradition. It was an opportunity to create a religious education

related to Russian realities and taught in the Russian language. Besides, as he wrote to Gavriil, archbishop of Tver', "The entire wisdom [of the seminary] consisted of poems for the 18th of November," Platon's name day.<sup>105</sup>

## CHAPTER III

### Fortress of Zion

And I was with you in weakness and in much fear and trembling; and my speech and my message were not in plausible words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and power that your faith might not rest in the wisdom of men but in the power of God.

--2 Corinthians 2, 3-5.

And as I urged you when I was going to Macedonia, remain at Ephesus that you may charge certain persons not to teach different doctrine, not to occupy themselves with myths and endless genealogies which promote speculations rather than divine training that is in faith; whereas the aim of our charge is love that issues from a pure heart and a good conscience and sincere faith. Certain persons by swerving from these have wandered away into vain discussion, desiring to be teachers of the Law, without understanding either what they are saying or the things about which they make assertions.

--1 Timothy 1, 3-7.

#### 1. First steps toward reform.

Filaret was invited to St. Petersburg in 1809 because the students at the newly reorganized St. Petersburg Theological Academy had not displayed the progress in their studies (other than in literature) anticipated by the Commission on Theological Schools.<sup>1</sup> It is difficult to know just what the Commission did expect, despite the fact that there had been several years of discussions about reforming the ecclesiastical schools and several projects submitted to the Holy Synod. The bulk of these discussions centered on the external administration of the schools, but little attention was devoted to any fundamental reorganization of the curriculum or method of instruction.

As far as many of the bishops were concerned, the existing pattern of religious education was more or less satisfactory.

(When the bishops were questioned about reforms in 1804, only Avgustin Vinogradskii suggested any important departures.)<sup>2</sup> Even Metropolitan Platon was satisfied that the existing arrangements were best. There was, he suggested, no need for any increased central direction of these schools or any need for complete uniformity of education. Certainly administration was secondary to teaching: "Let them [the new reformers in St. Petersburg] learn from us," he wrote to Metropolitan Amvrosii in 1805. "The schools should not be judged by their administration but by their progress. If there is good progress, then it is obvious that there is good administration."<sup>3</sup> Platon feared the new reforms would introduce the secular spirit of the public schools into the ecclesiastical schools. "Being human, perhaps I am mistaken, and therefore I should pray God to arrange everything for the best, for the confirmation of faith and piety, and for the extirpation of irreligion, false doctrine, and free thinking."<sup>4</sup> The new reforms offered little comfort for Platon and other bishops who were accustomed to administering their schools with little interference even from the Synod.

There certainly had been changes in the course of the 18th century both in the number and the quality of the schools. Platon and others had suggested some possible improvements (which were discussed earlier) in 1762-63, but these had been set aside by Catherine. In 1785, it was decided to reform the seminaries along the lines of the new public schools. Three years later, the Synod made some provision for special training of teachers at the Alexander Nevsky seminary in St. Petersburg, and, in 1799, it was planned to make the Nevsky seminary and the Kazan' seminary into

academies with curricula in keeping with their new designations. As part of this plan, the Synod the previous year specified that the Alexander Nevsky Academy, once it was reformed, would be given the responsibility for reforming the other academies on a more uniform basis. In the meantime, the best students of the seminaries were to be sent to the Alexander Nevsky Academy for training as teachers.<sup>5</sup> When Alexander became the new emperor, he instructed the Synod to prepare a comprehensive school reform. Anastasii Romanenko-Bratanovskii (1761-1806), then archbishop of Mogilev and a former member of the Russian Academy, drew up a plan, but it was either inadequate, inept, or ignored, for in 1804, the Synod requested Metropolitan Amvrosii (Podobedov, 1742-1818) once again to review the position of the ecclesiastical schools, so that in the future they might "attain the best results in educating and instructing youths for the religious calling...."<sup>6</sup>

Amvrosii was intimately familiar with the character and quality of the Russian ecclesiastical schools, for as a bishop this had been one of his central concerns.<sup>7</sup> In every diocese he administered new seminaries were founded or older ones transformed. As bishop of Sevsk (1778) he established one seminary at Sevsk and one in the Orlov-Uspenskii monastery. At Kazan' and Simbirsk, where he served as bishop (1785), he opened new seminaries. He pursued the same policy as metropolitan of St. Petersburg and Novgorod in the Tikhvinsk, Svirsk, and Kirillov-Belozersk monasteries. In each case he followed a dual plan: he acquired the best possible teachers and expanded the curriculum. Most of the teachers came from the Trinity seminary, the Slavono-Greco-Latin Academy, and Moscow University. In addition to the

rudimentary Russian and Latin grammar, both classical languages (Greek and Hebrew) and modern languages (French and German) as well as geography, poetics, philosophy, and ultimately theology were either added or strengthened. Although Amvrosii's work was important for the improvement and extension of religious education in Russia, it in no way differed from the pattern of school expansion in the 18th century. Schools were created through the initiative of zealous bishops, and it was natural that these hierarchs would come to feel a special concern for the schools of their dioceses.

However, Amvrosii did not personally draw up any new proposals for reforming the schools. Instead, he gave the task to his vicar, Evgenii Bolkhovitinov (1767-1837, later metropolitan of Kiev). Evgenii's proposals were not very far-reaching. He suggested the schools pay less attention to Latin literature and confine the use of Latin to the final two classes, philosophy and theology. "Our present program," he declared, "is not a scientific program, but only a course in Latin literature."<sup>8</sup> In this respect, Evgenii was attempting to bring Russian religious schools into conformity with the latest trends in western Europe, and by breaking with Latin (although only partially), he believed he was imitating what was being done "in all the best European schools."<sup>9</sup> Yet, he was not prepared to suggest that the Russian church schools attempt to formulate a curriculum designed to create a Russian theological vocabulary which might in turn facilitate the transmission of school learning to the rest of society. He would only encourage the wider use of Russian language, not the creation of a Russian perspective. "It is best to teach from translations as

we have always done."<sup>10</sup>

The most original proposal in Evgenii's program was the creation of an "academic conference" which was to be an integral part of the academy administration. This conference was to be a "special society of learned men" somewhat like the earlier Society of Friends of Learning at Moscow University and even more like the Moscow Society of History and Russian Antiquities established at the university in 1804. The conference included the bishop of the diocese in which the academy was located, the academy rector, all the professors of the academy, and any prominent persons (prominent for their learning presumably) either lay or clerical from the surrounding region who might be chosen by the conference.<sup>11</sup> The members of the conference were to carry out three important functions: censor books, conduct examinations, and grant degrees. Evgenii also suggested that the seminaries no longer be under the direct supervision of the bishops, but rather under the academy administration. He noted, however, that

the members of the Synod, with the exception of the metropolitan [Amvrosii], quarrel with the subordination of the seminaries to the academies. This is not to the likes of the diocesan bishops. ...But who is at fault that many of these bishops do not care about the progress of their seminaries or about the salaries they arbitrarily assign. Nor do they have any understanding about the quality of the teachers they appoint.<sup>12</sup>

This was certainly an exaggeration. In any case, from the standpoint of uniformity and central direction, Evgenii's proposals did not fundamentally alter the schools or change the direction or character of the instruction. Some of his suggestions (the academic conference) were later put into effect, but on the whole his plan was not found suitable because "the Russian schools re-

main on their same former basis."<sup>13</sup>

On 29 November 1807, Prince A.N. Golitsyn, the Over Procurator of the Holy Synod, received approval from the Emperor Alexander to form a "Committee for perfecting the ecclesiastical schools." The committee included the metropolitan of St. Petersburg Amvrosii, Feofilakt (Rusanov, then bishop of Kaluga), State-secretary M.M. Speranskii, Protopresbyter Sergii Krasnopevkov, the Tsar's confessor, Ioann Derzhavin, the head military chaplain, and, of course, Golitsyn. The most important member of the committee was Speranskii, who transformed the plan outlined by Evgenii into an elaborate scheme of centralized school administration.

Speranskii actually retained very little of Evgenii's proposals. Only Evgenii's short historical survey of Russian religious education and his complex academic conference were included in the final reports of the committee presented to Alexander six months later on 26 June 1808. Florovsky points out that the entire plan recalls Napoleon's organization of the Université de France, and certainly Speranskii stressed the need for administrative symmetry which characterized Napoleon's reforms. Under Speranskii's guidance, the committee drew up two documents: A report on perfecting the ecclesiastical schools and An outline of the rules on forming ecclesiastical schools and on supporting the clergy in the churches.<sup>15</sup> These reports urged the Tsar to form a special "Commission on Theological Schools" directly subordinated to the Holy Synod in order to provide the ecclesiastical schools the central administration they traditionally lacked:

The ecclesiastical schools, organized on the model of

the Kievan Academy and evolving from small grammar schools with no exact rules and with almost no general supervision or uniformity, still have no complete statute of rules, no precise link with the academies, although this has long been admitted necessary.<sup>16</sup>

The new organization for the schools possessed Speranskii's characteristic balance and symmetry. Directly below the new Commission, four academies were to be created as the centers of four broad school regions. Within these regions there were four types of schools: parish schools, district schools, seminaries, and academies. These schools formed an ascending ladder of education and were ranked in a territorial hierarchy with the lower schools administratively subordinated to the schools immediately above them. One or several parishes would have one parish school; a group of parish schools were directly supervised by a district school. Each diocese was to have at least one seminary which administered all of the district schools of the diocese. Several dioceses then formed a larger educational region headed by an academy directly responsible for all seminaries within the region.

Students entered the parish schools between the ages of six and eight. After graduation, they went to the district schools for four years. From ages twelve to sixteen, they studied in the seminaries, and if they intended to stay in the clergy rather than pursue a civil career, then they were expected to take an additional two year course "for perfection of philosophy and theology and for exercises in reading the Holy Scriptures and the Holy Fathers, as well as religious works."<sup>17</sup> At the highest rung of the ladder stood the academy which offered a four year course. Thus, the student who began at age six normally finished at age twenty two.

In keeping with Evgenii's earlier proposals, the academies were expected to combine several diverse functions. Three separate departments of the academy administration were assigned to carry out 1) "the education of clerical youths for higher ecclesiastical offices" 2) the extension and stimulation of learning among the clergy (this was Evgenii's proposal originally) and 3) the administration of the schools of its region.

The new schools were to be strictly separate from the civil schools and were only to be partially under the control of the bishops. The third department of the academy (which was to administer the regional schools) was composed of the bishop of the diocese in which the academy was located, the rector of the academy, and the steward [ekonom]. The bishop could only remove the rector with the full knowledge and consent of the Commission. Each day the bishop was to receive a report on academy proceedings and make suggestions which could be implemented only with the consent of the other members of the academy administration. If there were any disagreements, the matter was referred to the Commission.<sup>18</sup>

The ultimate goal of these reorganizations was to create schools able to provide

a solid study of subjects appropriate to the religious calling: therefore, all subjects taught in these schools should be related to that sort of study and should investigate true sources in their entirety. Consequently, [this means] the study of classical languages, especially Greek and Latin, a firm knowledge of Slavic and Slavono-Russian, a knowledge of ancient history, particularly Sacred and Church history, a knowledge of the best models of religious literature, and finally, the study of theology in all its branches....<sup>19</sup>

When Alexander sent an ukaz to the Holy Synod approving the committee's report, he added that the schools should be founded

on "the rules of good morals and Christian teaching....for the progress of true enlightenment on the basis of piety...."<sup>20</sup>

Speranskii finished only the first part of the new statute for the schools dealing with the academy's internal administration before his new duties as a member of the commission for codifying the laws made it impossible for him to complete the statute. The remainder of the academy statute and the statutes for the seminaries and the district and parish schools were written (in conformity with the main outlines already drafted by Speranskii) by Feofilakt (Rusanov, by late 1808, archbishop of Chernigov). Feofilakt was a former teacher at the Alexander Nevsky seminary at the time when Speranski taught there, and it was quite probably at Speranskii's request that Feofilakt was brought to St. Petersburg from Kaluga where he had been appointed bishop to participate in the work of the Commission. In any case, his ideas about a new centrally directed education were in harmony with those of Speranskii. "Perhaps it is unjust," Feofilakt wrote to Metropolitan Amvrosii in 1805, "but it seems to me that the seminaries should not be subordinated to the academies under the restrictive power of the bishops....Would it not be better for the academies and the seminaries if they were administered by the Holy Synod or by a special body of hierarchs chosen by it on the model of the secular schools?"<sup>21</sup> It is not surprising that when Feofilakt was placed in charge of those sections of the draft statute dealing with the authority of the bishops over the administration of the new schools, he constructed rules designed to limit episcopal control. Filaret was later convinced that Feofilakt's purpose in doing so was to control the new academy in St. Petersburg,

exclude the authority of Amvrosii from it, and thereby hopefully elevate himself to the office of metropolitan:

Feofilakt planned to rule through the draft charter. The first part, dealing with the internal administration had already been written; the second part, written under Feofilakt's influence, stated that the external administration was to consist of members of the internal administration and members of the [academic] conference. The metropolitan was granted no authority over the external academy administration. The seminary administration should have reported to its bishop (and the St. Petersburg bishop, that is, the metropolitan, among them), but these reports, along with their resolutions, could then be rejected by the academy administration. I spoke of this irregularity to my colleague Leonid who taught esthetics under Feofilakt's guidance and who was close to Feofilakt. I tried to show him the blindness of such an arrangement. But he was convinced that this was only temporary: 'When Feofilakt is metropolitan, everything will be changed.' However, I insisted that the external administration must be placed in proper relationship to the diocesan bishop.<sup>22</sup>

Since the academy administration was to be composed of the bishop of the diocese, the rector, the steward, and one professor from the academy, Feofilakt accepted the post of professor of literature and esthetics. There ensued a struggle between Feofilakt and Amvrosii over the direction of the new schools. The highly charged atmosphere in the Synod, in the Commission, and at the Alexander Nevsky monastery was an essential part of the air Filaret breathed during his first four years in St. Petersburg.

2. Scylla and Charybdis: Archbishop Feofilakt and Ignatius Fessler in the St. Petersburg Academy.

Filaret arrived in St. Petersburg on 6 January 1809 nearly half-frozen. He brought with him only a few books, a portrait of Metropolitan Platon, an attestation from the Trinity seminary concerning his abilities and qualifications, and a letter

--ineffective as it turned out-- from Platon to Amvrosii pleading that Filaret be sent back to Moscow to comfort him in his old age.<sup>23</sup> Filaret stayed at the Alexander Nevsky monastery, and for the next two months he lived with Evgraf, his former theology teacher at Trinity, sharing his room and his meals "in the Christian manner, bread and water mixed with wine" and sleeping on the floor.<sup>24</sup>

St. Petersburg startled Filaret and confused him. "The course of affairs here is entirely incomprehensible to me," he wrote to his father a month after his arrival. The isolated life at the St. Sergii-Holy Trinity Lavra had not prepared him for the secular life and frenzy of the capital made tense by the Napoleonic wars. Shortly after he arrived, Evgraf introduced him to Feofilakt, who rather abruptly asked him "What is truth?" "I was familiar with the older Wolffian and Leibnizian philosophical conceptions and I answered that logical truth was one thing, metaphysical truth another. Dissatisfied, Feofilakt asked 'What is truth in general?'. I was stumped and did not know what to answer. Thanks to the rector [Evgraf], I was extricated by a joke. Jesus Christ, he said, did not answer that question."<sup>25</sup> This was the first hint for Filaret that the intellectual climate of the capital was considerably different from that in Moscow.

He received a second intimation not long afterward, when Amvrosii invited Filaret to meet the Over Procurator of the Holy Synod at a masquerade ball at the Tauride Palace. While fireworks were exploding outside, the members of the Holy Synod and Filaret were arranged like a chorus along one side of the ballroom:

Then a short man, his breast adorned with stars and medals, entered the room and began threading his way through the hall. He was wearing a three cornered hat and some sort of silk cape over a knit uniform. He mingled politely with the members of the Synod, nodding to them, shaking their hands, briefly murmuring a word or two first to one and then another. No one seemed surprised either at his costume or his familiarity.<sup>26</sup>

Only afterward did Filaret (who had never heard of a masquerade ball before) discover he had just met Prince A.N. Golitsyn, the Over Procurator.

These first few months in the capital convinced Filaret that "there is a great deal in the type of education and life here which I do not like."<sup>27</sup> Especially in the seminary and the academy there seemed to be an excessive attention to secular pursuits which were not in keeping with either the interests of the Church or the welfare of a Christian society. His training and life at the Trinity Lavra were out of step with the newly reformed schools. "Those of us on the one side [i.e. those teachers sent from the Lavra to St. Petersburg] gather to teach one another, but we don't understand a thing."<sup>28</sup> Most difficult of all to understand were the esthetic and empirical concerns of Feofilakt, who dominated the academy.

Feofilakt Rusanov (1765-1821) was a graduate of the Olonetsk seminary in the Alexandro-Svirsk monastery in 1788. He then entered the Alexander Nevsky monastery (one year before Speranskii). Because Feofilakt and Speranskii were both outstanding students, they were appointed teachers at the Nevsky seminary after they graduated. Feofilakt taught poetics and rhetoric, while Speranskii taught first mathematics and physics and then higher rhetoric. In 1794, Feofilakt took monastic vows and was appointed religion

teacher in the "Greek Corps" (soon renamed the "Corps for foreign Orthodox"). At the same time he began the first of series of translations (he knew Latin, Greek, and French). He translated from Latin Boëthius' De consolatione philosophiae, a work which reflected Feofilakt's interest in purely secular literature.<sup>29</sup> The next year he was ordained archimandrite and appointed to the Zelenetsk monastery. In 1796, he was transferred to the Sergii hermitage. He was ordained bishop of Kaluga at the Emperor Paul's court at Gatchina in 1799, and on his way from Gatchina to Kaluga, he passed through Moscow where he met Platon. "A young man, not very dedicated to the office," Platon reported to Amvrosii on 15 April 1800.<sup>30</sup> As bishop of Kaluga, he established a new Kaluga seminary, and several of the Trinity students, including Leonid Zaretskii, an outstanding Latinist and later Feofilakt's assistant, were sent there to study. In 1801, Feofilakt published a translation from Latin entitled Vrchestvo ot unynia i otchaiania [Cure for melancholy and despair] which provoked a warning from Metropolitan Amvrosii that he should translate books more in keeping with his position as a pastor of the Church.<sup>31</sup> In an effort to do so, Feofilakt then began to translate writers who demonstrated the authenticity of Biblical truths by rational demonstration. His translation from the French edition of a book by David Jennings into Russian under the title Sozertsanie khristianstva (probably Jennings' The Scripture Testimony examined and confirmed by plain arguments: or, an appeal to reason and common sense for the truth of Holy Scriptures. In two discourses [on John 21, 24]) is characteristic of Feofilakt's outlook. In 1806, he was summoned to St. Petersburg to attend the meetings

of the Holy Synod, and the following year he was invited to join the newly established Commission on Theological Schools.

As a bishop and a member of the Commission, Feofilakt hoped to use the resources and the authority of the Church to combat Deism by refuting its teachings on its own terms:

It is essential to guard the faithful from trusting in them [the Deists] by refuting the ruinous basis of that philosophy. It is also essential that pastors act in a totally different way that they acted in the 17th century when the Church, enjoying peace [!], had no need of defenders [?]. The superiority of our faith is not to be proven by the fact that it comes from God, but because its origin is divine, that it alone destroys the barrier dividing man from man and unites men with God. Thus... from our boundless zeal for the Apostolic faith, we cannot allow it to be defamed by the Deists. We no longer live in an age when one can simply say: 'Do not question, but believe.' Against our wishes they will begin to inquire, and then our frightened silence will aid them [the Deists] victoriously to reduce the number of believers.<sup>32</sup>

In Feofilakt's view (and he took his inspiration from John Locke), true wisdom was acquired through the senses rather than by promptings of the heart:

If a man from childhood was deprived of the use of his senses, then he could have no knowledge of either God or himself. From this it follows that reason is not the source of knowledge, but rather knowledge is received either through experience or through divine revelation. For what purpose were we given self awareness and sense if not through them to undertake knowledge?<sup>33</sup>

This was simply a restatement of Locke's contention that the mind was a tabula rasa at birth, and that reason, once informed of the knowledge of God derived from experience, could act as the arbiter of religious truths. (It is true Feofilakt also speaks of divine revelation as a source of religious truth, but the supernatural miracle of God's word was less real for him than the miracle of

His works in Creation.) From these comments it is not surprising that Feofilakt was more at home in the rationalist and empiricist concerns of France and England in the 18th century than in the mystical and pietist currents emanating from Germany. This fact alone made Feofilakt's position at the academy increasingly difficult. According to one assessment, "nature was much too real for Feofilakt to have any interest in the shadows of mysticism."<sup>34</sup> This was confirmed at the time by Lopukhin, a leading mason and "Searcher for True Wisdom", when he wrote to Speranskii in 1805 that "it seems Feofilakt still has not acquired a taste for the pure thing."<sup>35</sup> Although it was Feofilakt's intention to confirm revelation by arguments based on experience and reason, it was also a short step from the rationalization of revealed truth to an attack upon and banishment of revelation all together. In 1810, when Ignatius Fessler arrived at the academy, Feofilakt discovered that such conclusions could be drawn by others equally hostile to Deism, empiricism, and revealed religion.

Ignatius Fessler (1756-1839), a Berlin Mason and a leader of the interconfessional Berlin "Society of Friends of Humanity", was invited by Speranskii to St. Petersburg to teach Hebrew and Church antiquities in the newly opened academy. Speranskii soon discovered that Fessler possessed a wide knowledge of philosophy, and therefore he proposed to the Commission that Fessler occupy the chair of philosophy as well. Fessler was little interested in either the revealed truths of Christianity or the historical and institutional Church. He viewed both the teachings and the institutions of Christianity as manifestations of ideal religious archtypes. The Church was only a symbol of an inner or ideal

truth; an external husk or shell, a "preconception, even a threshold of the Kingdom of God, that is, the kingdom of piety and wisdom." The Church was valuable only for the idea it contained, just as the rituals were "dramatic and lyrical presentations" of an inner wisdom.<sup>37</sup> All external expressions of religion contain "ideas" which are in the process of achieving their ultimate aims and complete realization.

Shortly after his arrival, Fessler was given an opportunity to reorder the academy curriculum in a way which directly infringed upon Feofilakt's leading position. At Golitsyn's prompting, Fessler suggested to the Commission that there were too many courses being offered at the academy, and that because the students spent long hours trying to master so many subjects, they could expect to make very little progress. A similar fate had already befallen many of the German Protestant schools, and Fessler confessed that he did not know very many truly learned men who studied in those schools "who would not consider lost all the time they spent listening to a multitude of different lectures...."<sup>38</sup> He made two suggestions: first, the amount of time in class should be divided into two parts. A higher category of studies would include philosophy and theology; a lower category, geography, history, and esthetics (which Feofilakt taught). Those subjects in the second category were to receive much less attention than those in the first. This plan, he believed, would enable the students to "pursue the only sure path to learning and scholarship."<sup>39</sup> Golitsyn presented these suggestions to the Commission in late February or early March, 1810. A month later, Metropolitan Amvrosii provided the Commission with Fessler's course proposals

for Hebrew, Church antiquities, and philosophy.

On the basis of these curriculum and course proposals, it was not difficult to see that a new and powerful voice had spoken in the academy. Fessler quickly undermined Feofilakt's prestige among the students, for his arrival coincided with the enthusiastic discovery of Kant's writings at the academy (Filaret, too, read Kant in Latin). At the same time Feofilakt's young protege Leonid Zaretskii, whom Feofilakt had brought from Kaluga, was lecturing on modern poetry and eloquence from the writings of Friedrich Bouterwek (1766-1828), a disciple of Kant and a professor of philosophy at Göttingen University (after 1797). Leonid was not familiar with Kant's philosophical terminology and could not explain it properly, nor could Feofilakt, and when they could not, the students went to Fessler, who could. He soon acquired an eager following at the academy.

Fessler's course proposals gave Feofilakt an opportunity to attack him in the Commission. The philosophy conspectus was found to be "dark" (temnyi) because it did not propose to teach philosophy "according to the methods and terminology of Wolff".<sup>40</sup> Fessler was quite rightly accused of idealism. "The innate idea is an arbitrary proposition which Mr. Fessler can in no way demonstrate," Feofilakt objected. Fessler's idealism was also expressed in his other course proposals. He divided Church antiquities into three separate subjects or studies, in each of which (in Fessler's words) "symbolic representations of intuition and pious ideas" were to be discussed.<sup>41</sup> Moreover, Fessler intended to deal with Russian Church antiquities in a similar manner. Feofilakt found all of Fessler's proposals unsatisfactory and impugned Fessler's religious sincerity:

Fessler promises to speak about monks and fasts. I do not know how he will explain these and similar subjects when he is of a confession which does not possess the former and rejects the latter. To speak in favor of our Orthodox Church means he must alter his faith. I do not know if Fessler will agree to do this. Perhaps. If he agrees, then it shows indifference, that is, indifference to all religious confessions. To teach an opinion contrary to our Church would be ruinous to the students and would not be permitted. Here is his Scylla and Charybdis!<sup>42</sup>

Fessler was asked to leave the academy.

Fessler's short interlude at the academy was significant mainly because it demonstrated that a new spirit was spreading through Russian intellectual and religious life. The religious, ethical, and esthetic teachings of the 18th century--reflected in the teachings of Feofilakt-- had been one-sided and shallow. Increasingly there was a new sense that spiritual needs and deeper, unseen realities must now be explored. The artificial, mechanical, superficial rationalism of the immediate past was inadequate to give full expression to human experience, or even begin to encompass the whole range of human emotions, possibilities, and intuitions. Reason, if it was to have any meaning at all, had to yield a more deeply satisfying and richer explanation of life than the firmly molded thought of the 18th century had been able to provide. These considerations were at the bottom of Speranskii's warning to Feofilakt when Fessler was transferred to the commission on the laws in July, 1810:

The goal of philosophical education in the exact understanding of the academy charter is not to continue a murky system of materialism on which all sensual philosophy is founded, but to refute all these useless errors by reawakening reason and preparing it for Christian philosophy, for that philosophy which is -- in the words of St. Paul--'not after the rudiments of the world', but after the foundation of eternal truth which

is singular and whose source we will seek in vain in the eyes, minds, hands, and other senses.<sup>43</sup>

Filaret had not been a party to the contest between Feofilakt and Fessler, although he had translated Fessler's course proposals from Latin for the secular members of the Commission. In fact, Filaret had not received very favorable treatment at the academy after his first unrewarding interview with Feofilakt. He was not appointed to teach theology at the academy as he had expected when he left Moscow. Instead, he was appointed inspector of the St. Petersburg seminary, and he taught philosophy with the title of academy baccalaureate. Shortly afterward, on 28 March 1809, he was ordained an hieromonk (a monk who is also a priest) and later that same year, he was given the additional duty of rector of the Alexander Nevsky district school. In August he was promoted to rector of the seminary. Both as inspector and then rector he was confronted with the task of supervising two or three hundred students he had never known before and was compelled to listen to all their clamor, quarrels, and denunciations. It was, as he wrote to his father, "a post for which I am entirely unfit." These defects were compounded by his dislike of the philosophy he now had to teach. "I think you know," he continued, "that I love theology, for I find consolation in it. But now I must study cold philosophy to which I did not pay sufficient attention earlier. I now realize my inadequacies."<sup>44</sup>

At the beginning of 1810, at the same time Fessler arrived, Filaret was transferred to the academy to teach dogmatic theology, Church history, and --after Fessler's expulsion--Hebrew and Church antiquities. These tasks were more to his taste, and at the academy

he found himself "surrounded by quiet and books. I pray God... that He allows me to travel in a way worthy of my calling."<sup>45</sup>

It worried Filaret greatly that under Feofilakt's direction the students studied poetry and esthetics far more than they studied theology. The next four years he spent attempting to reverse this order of priorities. He was aided by the changing climate of opinion in the capital after 1812, the increased support of Prince A.N. Golitsyn, and his own appointment as rector in the academy that same year. One investigator suggests that with Filaret's appointment as rector, the academy obtained "the strength necessary for ordering the chaos, harmonizing its divergent forces, and guiding it toward one defined and general goal."<sup>46</sup> Yet, Filaret did not harmonize the divergent forces, but rather he worked to eliminate them. He began with Feofilakt.

Shortly after Fessler left the academy, Feofilakt presented a translation from the French of a book entitled Mélanges de littérature et de philosophie written by Jean-Pierre Frédéric Ancillon. Feofilakt hoped the translation might be published by the Commission as the "first fruit" of the academy. The book was characteristic of Feofilakt's interest in rationalism and religion. Ancillon's point of departure in literature and philosophy was his belief that all the central preoccupations of art and poetry: beauty, the good, heroism, nobility, and so on must be seen against the background of Nature whose truths God made apparent to all men through Reason. God and creation were conterminous, for both the universe and God were infinite. In so much as His works can be seen, the highest and best in Nature can be contemplated and expressed in poetry and philosophy. While little can

be said of the invisible Infinite, His codex in nature can be read and understood. This applies to all of the sublime truths of Christianity, for they are "based on abstractions" derived from a rational survey of God's creations.<sup>47</sup> If this was not naturalism, as Filaret charged, then it was dangerously close to it.

The changed climate in the academy after 1812 delayed publication of Feofilakt's translations which had already lingered in the hands of the censor for two years. After Speranskii ceased to attend the meetings of the Commission, Golitsyn began to play a greater part in the direction of the reforms. Moreover, in 1812, with the support of Metropolitan Amvrosii, Filaret was chosen to be rector of the academy, despite Feofilakt's hopes that Leonid Zaretskii would obtain the position. Because of the long delay, Feofilakt demanded the return of the manuscript, so that he might submit it to the civil censorship for approval, for "by its very contents it does not belong within the province of the ecclesiastical censorship...."<sup>48</sup> Since Feofilakt originally submitted the translation to the Commission as the work of the students at the academy, Filaret, as the new rector, was prompted to write an extensive critique of both the book and the translation.

Filaret dismissed the idea that beauty in nature and art could evoke a Christian feeling for religion as Ancillon claimed: "Can we term religious the feeling produced by the Apollo of Belvedere...? We agree that there is a religion of beauty, but only for those whose religion does not have as its subject the true God."<sup>49</sup> Christianity, he argued, was not a compendium of abstract truths distilled by the mind from Nature, for "to base

the Christian religion on reason alone means to reject it and stand in its place a dreamy natural religion. The true Christian religion is based on revelation, and revelation is not an abstraction." Christianity is founded "as on a cornerstone, on the Lord our Jesus Christ, and He is not an abstract idea, but an actual being, true God and true man."<sup>50</sup> Filaret was convinced that Ancillon's miscellanies had no place in a school devoted to preparing Orthodox clergymen. The Commission concurred and refused to consider Feofilakt's refutations composed in answer to Filaret. Prince Golitsyn obtained an imperial directive prohibiting publication of the book. In November, 1813, Feofilakt was ordered to his diocese in Chernigov.

By the end of 1813, Filaret was placed fully in charge of the St. Petersburg academy and was responsible for carrying through the final years of its reform. Both the moral idealism of Fessler, which reduced Christ to the greatest philosopher, and the empiricism of Feofilakt, which reduced the universe to an assemblage of parts and the mind of man to an aggregate of sense-impressions, were both eliminated from the academy. The way was clear for a Christian education which demanded not only the light of "cold philosophy" but also the warmth of faith: a union of light and warmth, head and heart, in the act of Faith.

### 3. The face of Orthodoxy.

During the Napoleonic invasion of Russia, when the emperor himself experienced his "conversion", Filaret was greatly excited by the possibilities for religious renewal of both the upper and lower classes in Russian society. In men like Prince

Golitsyn and those who followed his example (including Alexander), Filaret detected a religious thirst which he believed Orthodoxy could satisfy if the Church made its voice heard in a manner appealing to their minds and hearts. Filaret and Golitsyn became close friends in 1812, and through Golitsyn, Filaret came into contact with the aristocratic society of St. Petersburg. He began to make speeches and addresses on important state occasions. Several times he was asked to conduct the Holy Service in Golitsyn's private chapel and present sermons there. His optimism derived from the religious outpouring and effusion which he encountered on these occasions:

Admist the general alarm, one man surprised me with his courage. When many had already left their homes, Prince Aleksandr Nikolaevich [Golitsyn] built a chapel in his home. I consecrated it on the first day of October in the presence of the nobility....The church of the Holy Trinity [Golitsyn's chapel] is not large, but it is magnificent. Not many frequent it, but one may view with awe those who do as models of piety.

Several times I have had the satisfaction to conduct the Holy Service there. On one such occasion, I was urged to repeat the sermon given at the dedication of the chapel, but I did not wish to do so, and instead I delivered a discourse....It was successful enough that on the thirtieth of last month [October, 1812] I was once again asked to conduct the service in that chapel and repeat it before people I never dreamed would be my audience. I would never have believed any prophecy about what transpired. I heard words of piety which melted me like wax; words of piety which enflamed me. But I am afraid I will fall into vanity if I try to elaborate on my surprise and satisfaction.<sup>51</sup>

The unsettling events of 1812 stimulated a religious awakening which Filaret viewed as a great opportunity for the Church. He was convinced that Feofilakt's rational empiricism was irrelevant and inadequate for the Church's task of welding faith and learning in this changed context. Fessler might well have led

any religious search down the path to false idols. If the schools could show the true way, and the clergy give credence to the wisdom of the schools, then Orthodoxy could unite the spirits and minds of men in a creative whole within the framework of the Church. "It is highly desirable," Filaret told the Commission on Theological Schools, "that Russian religious learning which is now being stimulated and which has borrowed so much that is foreign,...should now show its face in the true spirit of the Apostolic Church."<sup>52</sup>

The theology of the schools must become an integral part of Christian life and be rooted in the soil of a truly Christian society. Filaret did not mean by theology a scholastic system of tightly organized and logically demonstrated thought, but rather a kind of practical course of study in Christian life based on Scriptures which must "ceaselessly be on the lips of every Christian, especially those dedicating themselves to serving faith and the Church. All human teaching must center upon it. All studies must take their spirit and light from it."<sup>53</sup> This statement, which has a Protestant sound to it --the Bible being the sole basis of the religion of Protestants--shows how difficult it would be for Filaret to show the face of Orthodoxy after a century of continuous Protestant contact.

Filaret's aim at the academy was to establish a

society of those who revere God: first as students who must teach the word about God; second as members of one body of the Church who must maintain their mutual relationships in accordance with the properly established unity of the whole; and third, as a spiritual flock, whose pastors, wise in God, must wisely and ceaselessly guide and protect it along the path to renovation and the spiritual life.<sup>54</sup>

The schools must focus on theology, and they must find men willing to teach Christian truth in the spirit of the Gospels rather than in the light of French empiricism or German philosophy.

"What a sorrowful page it would be in the history of modern education if the libraries contained no theological writings, dogmatic works, and disputations; if few teachers could be found to synthesize the truths of practical theology and teach them in the schools!"<sup>55</sup>

How was this to be accomplished? Even if willing men were found, how would they be able to teach the truths of theology in the way Filaret thought necessary? Filaret answered these questions by insisting that true theology must begin with an examination of the heart: it must be grounded in faith in Christ. Since Christ, the Incarnation of the Word, is the light of true knowledge, He must be allowed to illuminate man's heart. Without Him, no amount of human intelligence can know or even begin to know God. The tension between the mind and the heart is meaningful only when we trust the larger hope of the heart first. The 18th century belief that the reverse was true led to the isolation of Nature from God and separated men from true wisdom. Only when thoughts and actions are performed from faith as their center will human knowledge generate warm light. Without the assistance of Christ's illumination, human reason and knowledge will not lead to the love of God, but only to the deification of man. By some odd and curious paradox, the rational explanation of the universe, God, and man --which should logically demonstrate man's insignificance as part of a huge, indifferent, mechanical cosmos-- has made the "rational being" arrogantly proud:

Blinded by his own splendor, he [the rationalist] finds nothing in the world his equal; he raises man higher than the heavens; and he adorns him with the name 'rational being' as if the heart, which is capable of loving God, is nothing in comparison with the rational ability to know Him. God, who is inaccessible to the mind, wishes only to inhabit the heart: our present knowledge serves us temporarily; the heart serves us for eternity.<sup>56</sup>

Only from the purified "springs of the heart" can true religious understanding and true knowledge pour forth.

If cultivation of faith was the first step in religious education, then the "investigation of truth" was the second. The subject matter of truth can only be the Word of God: "not the verbal word alone, but more importantly, the word of the mind and the heart."<sup>57</sup> Both His Works and His Word contain truth about God, but "the ordinary light of natural knowledge about God is like a lamp alongside the sun in comparison with the higher light of revelation." The schools must teach the students about the saving power of God's Word and its immanence in the world. It cannot remain theoretical and abstract and still lead men to salvation. Theoretical knowledge left unapplied would be like a building without a foundation or like sketch of an artist showing only the vague outlines of a deeper truth. School learning would remain what it now was "an ostentatious ornament on house with a rotten foundation which is ready to collapse."<sup>58</sup>

Between April and August of 1814, Filaret obtained the opportunity to officially redirect the reform of the ecclesiastical schools. Spernaskii's original draft of the statute for these schools provided for a revision when the first class finished its course of study. The Commission on Theological Schools held special meetings to discuss any changes, and Filaret presented a

note at the first of these sessions which was received favorably. "This compels me to find every opportunity to write more and more about what I think to be useful," he told his father.<sup>59</sup> During the next six months, he drafted projects, reviewed and supplemented the seminary and district school statutes, supervised the reforms in progress, reorganized the curriculum (even providing a detailed conspectus for theology as a model), and personally inspected all of the schools affected by the original draft statute.

Filaret insisted on the autonomy of the religious schools within the framework of the Church. The academy must be "a religious society of learned men located in such a place where the sphere of learning will not, so to speak, be swallowed up by political calculation."<sup>60</sup> This insistence was embodied in a joint report presented by Filaret and Metropolitan Amvrosii to the Commission in May, 1814 entitled An attempt to modify and supplement the first part of the draft statute for ecclesiastical schools. The purpose of these modifications was to 1) restore the authority of the rector over the internal administration of the schools, and 2) place the responsibility for the overall direction of the schools within a region in the hands of the bishop.<sup>61</sup> Point 41 of the draft statute had provided for a division of authority for the internal administration of the academy among the rector (for the educational administration), the inspector (for matters relating to the conduct of the students), and the steward [ ekonom ] (for financial affairs). The power of general supervision had been granted to the rector, although he could not personally observe the conduct of those duties allotted

to the inspector and the steward. Filaret objected to this as an experiment in "educational republicanism".<sup>62</sup>

If [the rector] enters a room to see personally how [the students] occupy their time or to see if proper order is being observed, then he has exceeded the limits of his authority....If he happens to glance in the direction of the dining hall in order to see personally if the food is satisfactory and if there is order and cleanliness, then he can be brought to trial. How, under such circumstances, can he extend his supervision over the [steward and the inspector] as is required by this very article of the statute?<sup>63</sup>

He suggested that administrative abuses might be circumvented more easily "by strict selection of those to whom [authority] is entrusted" than by any "division of powers".<sup>64</sup> Authority must be tempered with "a greater paternal spirit"--an idea which Filaret surely brought with him from the Trinity seminary.

At the same time that the rector's authority was being restored, the bishop's control over the schools was also reasserted. Earlier provisions which granted the academy administration the power to appoint graduates of the schools to parish positions were now amended in order to return this responsibility to the bishops. The previous arrangements were found harmful, for they "place the higher authority beneath the lower [authority]" and consequently, they will "more likely lead to unrest and disruption than be of real use."<sup>65</sup>

Another object of special attention in these remarks submitted to the Commission in May was the explicit form which had been given to the literature course in the 1808 statute. According to the draft statute, the purpose of literature was to introduce the students to "the opinions on esthetics among the best writers, who are: among the ancients, Plato, Aristotle, Cicero,

Horace, Quintilian, and Longinus; and among the moderns, Fenelon, Rollin, Boileau-Despreaux, Schlosser, Baumgarten, Diderot, Buffon, and especially Beccaria."<sup>66</sup> Filaret objected that since no other names or books were listed elsewhere in the statute, they should be eliminated here. "Why should the names of literary men be better known in the ecclesiastical schools than those of the theologians?"<sup>67</sup> "Who are these teachers," he demanded, "naturalists and supporters of Voltarian philosophy!" He especially disliked Cesar Bonesana Beccaria (1735-1793) who in his book on crimes and punishments "declares the oath to be only a useless ritual and contrary to human nature....He also justifies suicide." "Is it possible," he asked, "the human mind can achieve the sublime only among the enemies of truth and the good?"<sup>68</sup>

Filaret did not confine himself to the single May report to the Commission. The following month two more reports were submitted on the second and third parts of the statute. At the same time, the results of Filaret's inspections of the schools in the St. Petersburg school region and his remarks on the progress made in the first step toward reforming the Moscow school region were also handed over to the Commission. The amendments to be incorporated into the revised statute were decided on the basis of Filaret's various reports. (The final statute was published in the Complete Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire for 14 August 1814.) Two days before the Emperor Alexander left for the Congress of Vienna, Golitsyn handed him the completely revised statute. Alexander signed it into law after adding a short "clarification" of his "intentions" that the new schools be "schools of truth":

Enlightenment, by its very definition, is the extension of light, and of course it must be that light which shines in the darkness but is not consumed by the darkness. By adhering to this light at all times, those who study will be led to the true source about which the Gospels simply but wisely teach: Christ is the way, the truth, and the life. Consequently, the sole aim of these schools will be the inner education of youths in practical Christianity.

On this basis it is possible to create instruction necessary for their station without fear of reason's abuses, for it reason will be subject to a higher consecration.

I am certain that the Commission on Theological Schools, by beseeching the Savior's aid, will direct all its energies to attain this goal without which it is impossible to expect anything of true worth.<sup>69</sup>

In harmony with Filaret's conception of religious education, the statute declared that the aim of the new schools must be the full development of the moral and mental capacities of the students by instilling in them "true piety", so that they might become "pious and enlightened servants of the Word of God."<sup>70</sup> The new statute also incorporated Filaret's belief that faith and morality were the first lessons of Christian education by requiring that the students receive a moral education through an intimate awareness of their relationship to God:

The foundation of wisdom is fear of the Lord. This saving fear must be inculcated not through constant repetition of empty words, but rather through a firm grounding in and extension of a sound understanding in youths of our intimate bond with God and the acts of His providence on every moment of our lives. This understanding must be strengthened by the example of God fearing teachers and supervisors. Their piety is the cornerstone of a Christian education.<sup>71</sup>

Since piety was the aim of education, the new statute devoted considerable attention to the means for developing Christian morality and piety in the students. "All exercises directed toward

piety," the statute ruled, "especially prayer, must be sacredly observed. In the ecclesiastical schools the omission or careless observance of established hours of prayer must be considered a greater evil than the omission of important lessons."<sup>72</sup> Discipline was to be strict ("no one can be humble before God who is stubborn before men"),<sup>73</sup> and both study and leisure were to contribute something toward moral development ("even walks should be instructive").<sup>74</sup> Every encouragement was to be extended to those who showed signs of proper moral improvement. Success in studies was its own reward, but "pious conduct deserves special approval and protection."<sup>74</sup> For those who need correction, it should be administered justly and with careful attention to the age, character, degree of sensitivity, and mental qualities of the student. Punishments, although rare, should be obligatory and administered "without any desire for revenge, without spite, and above all, without humiliation."<sup>75</sup>

Prayer and piety, as important as Filaret believed them to be, were not to be the only pursuits of the new schools. The students were expected to study and think. This meant more than the old routine of rote memorization of lectures read aloud in class:

There is nothing more useless and feeble than learning acquired through hearsay. The very first rule of education is: arouse the personal powers of the students and give them the opportunity and the possibility to act. The best teacher is not he who speaks brilliantly and clarifies, but he who sets the students thinking and clarifying.<sup>76</sup>

While the students were to be given work to develop their own capacities for independent thinking, the teachers were required to make certain that the lessons were grasped and consumed. All

dictation was strictly forbidden under the new rules. "The teacher must help only to develop the mind."<sup>77</sup> The students were to compose their own work (under the close and critical supervision of the teachers), and their reading was to be fully brought to account: "nothing can be more harmful than willful, superficial, disconnected reading, without any purpose and without any analysis; it inflates the mind, darkens understanding, scrambles thoughts, and is nothing but food for idleness and vice."<sup>78</sup> In short, the purpose of education was creative understanding; the purpose the teacher "to plant, so to speak, his root in the minds of his listeners."<sup>79</sup>

Theology, not esthetics or philosophy, stood at the center of the curriculum. All theology, the statute declared, was to take the Bible as its point of departure. "The best method of theological study, without doubt, consists of reading the Holy Scripture and examining its true meaning according to its original presentation [i.e. in its original languages] and with the best commentaries of the Holy Fathers."<sup>79</sup> This being the case, it is not surprising that after dogmatic theology hermeneutics was given first place as the focus of all theological study. In keeping with Filaret's dislike of scholastic disputations, polemical or argumentative theology was minimized, for "the word of God is not made of human arguments and constructions."<sup>80</sup> The students were expected to write and present sermons, while the teachers were to do the same, both in order to be "living examples" for the students and to serve the favorable reputation of the schools among the "Christian public". The common goal of student and teacher was to "serve society usefully and instructively."<sup>81</sup>

All other subjects, too, were to take their inspiration from the "truths of the Gospels."<sup>82</sup> Philosophy must be taught in such a way that the students will never "look upon the light of higher philosophy as the sole truth, if it cannot be found in Christian teaching; only those theories which are rooted in the truth of the Gospels are sound and just. There is only one truth, but errors are infinite."<sup>83</sup> Moral philosophy was to be stressed. In literature, Scriptures replaced Feofilakt's philosophes as the focus of attention. The Biblical prophets were "the most powerful representatives" of religious writing, although the Church Fathers were also recommended as worthy models. Beccaria, Buffon, and the other "Voltarians" were replaced by Bossuet, Fénelon, and Massillon as moderns deserving attention. History (to be presented as the story of the rise and fall of states and false religions) was to serve as the best illustration of the success of Christianity. Russian Church history was to be seen as part of this wider dimension of Christian history. Significantly, no mention of Latin was made in the statute. The sway of Latin in the schools was eliminated by silence.

Filaret celebrated the victory over the old Latin scholastic schools in a speech before the assembled members of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy Conference on 13 August 1814. The schools, he stressed, were "humble dwellings...in which people sacrifice the luster of earthly happiness and social advantage to heavenly wisdom, and sow the first seeds of knowledge useful for both the Church and the Fatherland...."<sup>84</sup> The students, who "because of their parent's station have more diligence and indefatigability than abundance of means," at last had an opportunity to study "the

right faith and understand through piety truths which are useful for all who hope for life now and in the future."<sup>85</sup>

All obstacles had been overcome: the Latin routine abandoned, the control over the schools reserved for the Church, the secular spirit of the first teachers eliminated, so that the clergy might now be trained in the "study of truth as well as piety."<sup>86</sup> A new course was set, and Filaret could only hope that

He may bless this dwelling of learning with the blessing of its Royal Founder, and may it never resemble the proud tower of Babylon, more than once erected with earthly wisdom. But let this be a stout fortress of Zion and let us place faith and piety in these assemblies, and let the prospective rewards be not for those who search for human gain, but as a pledge of selfless service to truth; and let there be no other enlightenment here but that which flows from one source into all spheres of true knowledge--from the true light which enlightens every man on earth!<sup>87</sup>

The day Alexander signed the statute into law, Filaret wrote to his father that this outcome "does not so much gladden me as amaze me when I recall the dangers and the hopelessness of the matter at the outset." He achieved his first goal to provide an education for clergymen who might more ably uphold and place on firmer foundations the authority of the Church and the teachings of Orthodoxy. The awakening of education and faith which derived its power from the Bible, now compelled Filaret to join in the work of the Russian Bible Society in order that the Bible might be translated into Russian. The Russian Bible was to be the "first fruit" of the academy.

## CHAPTER IV

### Filaret and the Russian Bible Society, 1813-1822

#### 1. Pietism and the Bible Society.

And I saw another Angel fly in the midst of Heaven having the everlasting Gospel to preach unto them that dwell on the earth, and to EVERY NATION, AND KINDRED, AND TONGUE, AND PEOPLE."

--Revelations, XIV, 6

The dominant current in the intellectual life of St. Petersburg after 1812 was Protestant-oriented pietism. Russian pietism was derived from two sources. First, it was one among many expressions of the religious and moral searchings in Russia which traces back to the 18th century. Russia was beginning to experience fully the European-wide movement away from the Church, its traditions, and its teachings. Yet, as the rapid growth of pietism in Alexander's reign demonstrates, rejection of the Church and tradition did not mean rejection of religion. Alexander's was a period of religious searching--a searching which effected every level of society, but especially the gentry, newly emancipated from state service, and the clergy, although the lower classes were also touched by it, a fact which can be verified by the rapid growth of sectaries at the dawn of the 19th century. Escaping from what they felt to be the hide-bound traditionalism, narrowness, and ignorance of the Church, many Russians attached themselves to the current enthusiasms: Voltarianism, masonry, mysticism, sentimentalism, atheism, and pietism.

The second source of pietism sprang from the Napoleonic wars, which converted all of Europe into a battleground and induced a general fear and expectation that the world was entering upon a

new era. The decisive events of the wars led many to see the Hand of God in everything which transpired. Napoleon became the Apocalyptical Beast, while Alexander ("whom Providence chose to be the ecumenical preacher of piety") was the instrument of God's deliverance.<sup>1</sup> The victory over the "Gauls and the twenty tongues", as Napoleon's army was described by the Russians, was ascribed to Providence and a coin was struck to commemorate the event. Faced with the overpowering movements directed by an All-Powerful Hand, men were no longer confident in their own abilities and importance. The religious searchings carried on outside the Church suddenly found that true religion could only be obtained by surrendering one's will to God, by giving oneself up to religious exaltation and passivity. The heart should be opened up to God, so that He might write His Word upon it. All this fit perfectly with the central message of pietism, which in Russia by 1817 became almost official state ideology.

The Emperor Alexander, who had been raised in an atmosphere of sentimental humanism by La Harpe, became one of the most enthusiastic supporters of the "pietist revolution" which swept across Europe in the aftermath of the Napoleonic wars. Abroad, his enthusiasm was expressed in the Holy Alliance. The signatories bound themselves to govern their countries according to Christian principles of morality and fraternity, while acknowledging that their rule was subject to the All-Powerful Lawgiver of all nations. The alliance was to serve as a "preparation for that promised Kingdom of the Lord on earth as it is in heaven." At home, the preparation for the promised Kingdom was carried on in two new organizations. One was the Ministry of Spiritual Affairs and

Education or the "Dual Ministry" which combined the "affairs of all creeds" with education "in order that Christian piety will always be the foundation of true enlightenment."<sup>2</sup> The Holy Synod was included in the new ministry as only one department of an interconfessional organ of the state which was attempting to bring "faith, knowledge, and power" into one harmonious union. In this way, the state donned the sacred garb of a kind of pietist ideology in order to channel the religious awakening of the period toward a new Christian theocracy of all nations. The Bible, the Book for every land, was to be placed at the foundation of this new theocracy, and Bibles were to be distributed by the Bible Society, the second, but unofficial, organization in Russia preparing the new Kingdom on earth.

The Russian Bible Society was originally a branch of the British and Foreign Bible Society founded in London in 1804. The purpose of the British and Foreign Bible Society was to distribute Bibles in every language "without notes or comment" over as wide an area of the world as circumstances permitted. The Bible, "the only book which 'has God for its Author, Salvation for its end, and truth without any mixture of error for its matter,'" was thought to be the only instrument which could work salvation. The members of the Bible Society were merely hands which "scatter abundantly the good seed, and God gives to it an abundant increase." By placing the Bible within the reach of every man, they sought to ensure man's salvation. Scripture, "the Oracles of the living God," would, through God's Providence, fill all hearts. Thus, salvation depended solely on reading the Scriptures or hearing them read. For example, the London Bible Society re-

ported that "a few days ago, one of Dr. Leyden's pundits was reading aloud to himself a translation he was making of St. Luke's Gospel. It was Gabriel's salutation. He was overheard by a Cashmirean Brahmanee. The woman 'cast in her mind, what manner of salutation this should be'. She said at last, 'This must be the Saviour'; and began to inquire. She is now under instruction. She can read Persian. What a treasure you are bringing for her and for thousands!"<sup>3</sup>

This Biblical ideology drew directly on the pietist beliefs of the 17th century and the religious reaction to the wars of religion which led away from the sectarian church. By the time the Treaty of Westphalia was signed in 1648, the Lutheran Church in many eyes had become an organized hierarchy ruling over its flock with something like papal absolutism. Pietism, as it was called by its opponents, provided an alternative path and stressed broad religious toleration. The movement began with Philipp Jakob Spener (1635-1705) and spread throughout Germany, northern and eastern Europe, and Russia in the course of the next century. Spener, partly following Johann Arndt in his True Christianity (1606-1609), formulated several points which came to characterize the pietist movement: He urged that the Bible be studied; the laity be given a share in church government; the practice of Christianity be recognized as an essential supplement to the study of Christian doctrine; the heterodox be tolerated rather than persecuted; devotional life be incorporated more fully in the university curriculum; and preaching be simple, unadorned, genuine, and devout.<sup>4</sup>

Pietism aimed to revive Christianity by prayer and diligent

study of the Bible. The Bible was not simply to be a source from which to quote chapter and verse, but a source of divine revelation suited to the nourishment of the soul. This had practical consequences expressed in greater toleration of one's neighbor, an active investigation of the needy at home and the still unconverted abroad. Most important, it proclaimed a new individualism, for religion was now no longer the private domain of the theologians, but the heritage of the common man who could find God for himself. How could the Bible be a part of this renewal? The Bible contained Truth, that is, truth of faith. This truth was beyond the literal "sense" of Scripture and could be understood only as feeling or illumination. The "Word of God" was contained in Scripture rather than present in every syllable. It was not the words themselves which were important, but the saving power of the Holy Spirit which lay within them. The Bible thus had a double character: it was the external physical and literal Bible and an "internal" Bible in which the Holy Spirit--that giver of all inward illumination--speaks to the heart. This inner Bible, the peculiar possession of each believer, speaks for itself and cannot be misinterpreted. The external Bible was merely a collection of "mute signs" or "oracles" which the reader, with the Aid of the Author of Light, could expect to evoke a ready response in his heart and allow him to dwell in Christ's saving grace.

That the external words were not themselves of great value, pietists argued, is obvious after a moment's reflection. The text of Scripture had been redacted, edited, and translated so many times that if it were not the purpose of Providence to provide believers with an "inner guide" to follow, Scripture would

be of little use. The words, expressed in the native language of the reader, would only trap one in the accumulated ignorance and error of the past, if the inward efficacy of Grace did not provide a basis for unquestionable truth--"that truth which the Gospels teach." By emancipating themselves and others from the stifling effects of all formalism, dogmatism, and, in a sense, even scripturalism, it was the hope of pietists to make a fresh start at Christian universalism. Discovery of the inner principle of the Bible, the pietist equivalent of the 17th century discoveries in science, was a fresh revelation by God to set man free from the dead hand of the past and permit each man to attain salvation through the action of the Holy Spirit and each society to reach perfection with the help of Divine Providence. By attending to the voice within, each man could discover universal truth, for God had placed within him a certain "witness" of truth, and it was now the task and privilege of man to build a new kind of Church which was above the squabbles and wrangling of the existing churches, above the brawling of sect and creed. This new Church would be above the dogmas and barren speculations of the past precisely because it would refrain from any dogmatic statements. It was with something very like this logic that the Bible Society explicitly refused to include notes and comments in their editions of the Bible. By supplying a "standard" translation of the Bible without notes or comments, the Society hoped to prevent "propagators of novel and deteriorated versions" from obscuring the "unadulterated Word of God."<sup>5</sup>

Filaret was able to find enough common ground with the founders of the Bible Society in Russia to participate in their work

which was translation and distribution of Bibles. He agreed with them in so far as he believed that Scriptures were the revealed Word of God and that the teachings contained in the Bible were necessary for salvation. But this was a view common to many Russian clergymen who had been exposed to the Protestant-oriented ecclesiastical schools in Russia during the last half of the 18th century. Filaret accepted the prevailing view that Scripture was the "one pure and sufficient source of teaching about faith...."<sup>6</sup>

But unlike the proponents of the Bible Cause, who believed that the Scriptures were the "unadulterated Word of God" and therefore non-dogmatic, Filaret insisted that the Scriptures contained all the dogmatic teachings necessary for salvation. "Everything needful for salvation is set forth in Holy Scriptures with such clarity, that each reader with a sincere desire to enlighten himself can understand it."<sup>7</sup> All other teachings about Christ and salvation were secondary and to be observed only if they are in agreement with "Divine Revelation and Holy Scriptures". The Bible, "the supreme judge", resolves all questions and doubts about the faith.<sup>8</sup> Again, unlike the Bible Society champions, Filaret did not believe that simply a passive reading or hearing of the Gospels could work enlightenment: Bible study should be an active investigation first for the theologians, whose duty it was to study the original texts of the Bible in order to discover the actual meanings of the words which clearly conveyed God's revelation; and second for the ordinary believers, whose duty it was to read the Bible and grasp that meaning which God provided with perfect clarity. In short, for Filaret Biblical study actually meant studying the past, especially the languages of the past, so

that Christ's message might be fully laid bare for everyone to read and understand. The idea of active, scholarly investigation strongly contrasts with the pietist and Bible Society notion that simply an unannotated "standard" Bible would provide God's message regardless of the actual meanings of the words.

Since Scripture was the focal point of Christian teaching and required an active reading, Filaret insisted that it was the duty of each Christian to know and understand it. "Christianity is not foolishness or ignorance, but a 'secret and hidden wisdom, which God decreed before the ages for our glorification.'" (ICor., 2.7). The Church, both clergy and laity, must "search the Scriptures," as far as it is within the ability of each member to do so.

It is true that not everyone is granted the gift or the duty to teach, and the Church has few worthy of the name of theologian. However, in Christianity, no one is allowed to be completely unlearned and remain ignorant. Did not the Lord call Himself a teacher and His followers disciples? Even before Christians called themselves Christians, they were to a man called disciples. Is this really only an empty title having no meaning? Then why did the Lord send the Apostles into the world? --above all, to teach the people: 'go and learn all languages'.... If you do not wish to learn and understand yourself in Christianity, then you are not a disciple and follower of Christ --and the Apostles were not sent for you --you are not what all Christians have been since the very beginning of Christianity --and I do not know what you are or what will become of you.<sup>9</sup>

Before the "secret and hidden wisdom of God" could shine forth for Russian Christians, they had to be able to understand the language of the Bible, and the language of the Bible had to convey the true meaning of the Scriptural texts. Filaret hoped to make such a Bible available for Russians by participating in the work of the Bible Society, even though he did not share all

of the assumptions of the Society and even though he would have to redirect the Society from its original purpose to distribute Bibles only among the non-Orthodox of the Russian Empire. His work in the Bible Society passed through two stages, the first being a preliminary step toward the second. First, he hoped to broaden the scope of the Bible Society to include the distribution of the Slavic Bible among the Orthodox. Second, he hoped the Society, with the Synod's consent, would publish a modern Russian edition of the Bible based on the best methods of Biblical philology.

## 2. Filaret and the Slavonic Bible.

Filled with hope, but with some misgivings, Filaret decided to attend the first meeting of the St. Petersburg Bible Society (later renamed the Russian Bible Society) on 11 January 1813. His hesitation can clearly be seen in his letter to his father shortly afterward:

It is perhaps not new to you--for it was published in the papers--that a Bible Society was opened here. Even before its opening, I was one of four members of the Greco-Russian clergy invited [to join]. I did not like it that they were occupied exclusively with non-Orthodox, while our own people are in just as great a need as they, and those whose duty it is to be concerned with this matter either will not or cannot do so. Therefore, when leaving the first general session, I could not make up my mind whether or not I should place my name on the list of members. But before I could explain myself to the President of the Society, Prince A.N. Golitsyn, the journal of the meeting was presented to me which already contained the names of the Metropolitan, Archbishop Serafim, and [Alexander's] Confessor, one of whom had already signed. Having been with them at the meeting, I realized that it was too late to disassociate myself in the journal and I also signed.<sup>10</sup>

Having joined, Filaret then began to urge that the Society begin attending to the needs of the Orthodox. After the first

meeting, he told Prince Golitsyn about his ideas and "received the promise that upon obtaining a sufficient sum, the Society would present it to the Holy Synod for printing a Slavic Bible according to the rules of the Society [that is, without notes or comments]."<sup>11</sup> This was an encouraging beginning, and Filaret was optimistic that the Bible Society would be useful for his purposes. "Let's not throw out the baby with the bath," he told his father.<sup>12</sup>

During the course of the following year and a half, the Russian Bible Society, as it was renamed in 1814, was persuaded to distribute the Slavic ("Elizabeth") Bible. At the first annual meeting of the Society on 16 September 1814 in Taurida Palace, Prince Golitsyn announced to the members that the Slavic Bible would now be at the disposal of the Society. The Synod agreed to print at the Society's expense 5,000 copies of the entire Slavic Bible as well as 5,000 copies of the Slavic New Testament at its own Moscow Synodal Printing Office. The Society then received 606 copies of the Slavic Bible which the Synod had on hand, while the government agreed to give up the revenue derived from certain state publications. The over-all supervision of the printing was entrusted to Filaret--an another instance of his close connection with the decision to have the Slavic Bible printed and distributed by the Bible Society. He also made certain that the Bible Society include this work in their official statement of goals which the Society was then preparing for publication. On 23 December 1814, Filaret wrote to the secretary of the Society, V.M. Popov, who was preparing the pamphlet entitled On the Goals of the Bible Societies and the means to attain them. "There need be only one

small addition," he told Popov, "which would announce that now the matter especially concerns the Slavic Bible."<sup>13</sup>

The Bible Society, through one of its leading members, John Paterson, who was also a member of the British and Foreign Bible Society, sought to reduce the cost of printing the Slavic Bible by arranging to have it printed by the stereotype method. He brought Thomas Root of the London based Root printing firm (which published stereotype Bibles for the London Bible Society) to St. Petersburg to establish a new press. Filaret, who was in charge of the printing of the Slavic Bible, now had to solve the difficulty of creating the type designs for the Slavic letters:

It is strange [he wrote to Popov] but I cannot conquer the Slavic alphabet. I see mistakes, but I cannot correct them, nor do I know someone who can. Today, on a gamble, I drew the letters and explained their theory to Mr. Pinkerton [Robert Pinkerton, one of the founders of the Russian Bible Society]. He was convinced that he understood my rules and saw the reasons for following them. He promised to repeat this lesson to the designer and thus perfect my imperfect drawings. I don't know what will happen. In the meantime, it would be desirable to make a complete alphabet with the assistance of a knowledgeable designer and stenographer.<sup>14</sup>

By March, 1815, the ten thousand copies of the Slavic New Testament were printed and ready for the Society's use.<sup>15</sup> This was the 1778 Moscow edition of the Slavic Bible. Previously, only about sixty thousand copies had been sold, for it was a very expensive Bible costing nearly thirty rubles per copy-- the chief reason why there were only about four hundred sold annually.

Thus, by 1815, Filaret had achieved his first goal, for the Bible Society to attend to the needs of the Orthodox, whom he felt

were in just as great a need to know the Bible as the Catholic, Protestant, sectarian, and even pagan recipients of the Bible Society's inexpensive Bibles. The change in the Society's activities was underscored by the election of Orthodox clergymen to official posts at the September, 1814, annual meeting, for there had not been a single officer in the Society elected from the Orthodox clergy during its first year and half of existence. Metropolitan Serapion of Kiev, Metropolitan Amvrosii, Archbishop Mikhail Desnitskii, Archbishop Serafim, Archbishop Iov of Kherson and Taurida, and Archbishop Dosifei of Telav were all elected vice-presidents. Filaret and Ioann Muzovskii, the Court Presbyter, were elected directors. While the Society officially regarded the new task of printing and distributing the Slavic Bible as "a new sign of God's blessing on our society," it was largely due to the efforts of Filaret who took the initiative and supervised every aspect of the work.

### 3. Filaret and the Russian Bible.

Even though he had achieved his first goal, Filaret was still dissatisfied. He felt that the Slavic Bible itself was a serious impediment to understanding God's Word (and understanding was necessary for a correct knowledge of Christian teaching). He was well aware that the Slavic Bible was at many points at variance with the Greek and Hebrew original texts and needed corrections. Moreover, Slavic was not the popular language of Russians and was not understood even by educated Russians. The Emperor himself read the Scriptures in French rather than Slavic. Speransky, who was a devoted reader of the Slavic Bible, admitted that those passages

which he could not understand he checked against the English Bible. Slavic and vernacular Russian had long been drifting apart with only sporadic and unsystematic attempts being made to make them more closely approximate one another. The constant repetition of the Scriptures during the Holy Service had helped somewhat to keep Slavic in active usage, but by the end of the 17th century the rapid development of the Russian language made it very difficult for Russians to understand Slavic. Several efforts were made to update the service manuals, especially the Psalter and the Psalms. In 1663, Abram Firsov, a translator in the Foreign Office, translated the Psalter into "our simple, customary" language. During the 18th century, Archbishop Amvrosii Zertis-Kamenskii collaborated with the then Archimandrite Varlaam Liashchevskii of the Donskoi Monastery to produce a Psalter in "Slavono-Russian", while Tikhon of Voronezh (died 1783) made a modern translation from the Greek.

Yet Filaret feared that simply correcting the Slavic Bible and annotating some of the more garbled passages would be insufficient to make the Bible useful and generally accessible, for "the Russian speech currently found in popular usage is so far removed from the Slavic used in the ancient translation of Holy Scripture, that in order to make its meaning easier for the people, it is no longer sufficient to exchange a few archaic disused words for new, more commonly used words, but the renovation of the entire translation is need in accordance with the current state of Russian speech."<sup>16</sup>

In 1816, Prince Golitsyn announced to the annual meeting of the Society that its purpose was now "to disseminate the knowledge

and acts of the written Word of God...among the members of the Fatherland and Orthodoxy...."<sup>17</sup> More importantly, this written Word (as Filaret remarked to his father) was to be in contemporary Russian "partly for the common people and partly for the enlightened of the current age, who, not understanding the Slavic speech, read the Gospels in French."<sup>18</sup> This decision marked the beginning of the second phase of Filaret's work in the Bible Society. Although Filaret championed the cause of translating the Bible into Russian, the initiative came from Alexander himself. The emperor, Golitsyn reported, had personally taken steps when he returned to Russia in late 1815 to overcome the barriers of Slavic "which have concealed the Gospels of Jesus from so many Russians until now."<sup>19</sup> He was referring to Alexander's decision of 28 February 1816 in which he stated that (in Golitsyn's words) "in accordance with the aspirations of his heart, which is always filled with beneficent concern for the true welfare of his beloved Russians, and being deeply concerned for the great common good to be derived from reading the Word of God, he verbally instructed the President of the Russian Bible Society [that is, Golitsyn] to propose to the Holy Synod the sincerest and precise desire of His Majesty to provide Russians with the means of reading the Word of God in their own native Russian language, which is more comprehensible for them than Slavic in which our Holy Scriptures are now published."<sup>20</sup>

Golitsyn, aided by Alexander's verbal directive, obtained the consent of the Synod for a "translation" (pereložhenie) of the Slavic Bible into Russian. The new translation was to be printed following the earlier model of the "Epistle to the Romans"

which contained the Slavic and Russian texts in parallel columns and which had already been approved by the Holy Synod. But the Synod did not take direct responsibility for the translation (probably at Alexander's instruction); instead it entrusted the work to the Commission on Theological Schools which in turn would select competent translators from the St. Petersburg Theological Academy for the work. The translation, when completed, was to be reviewed by a committee of the Bible Society which the Synod directed should only be composed of "ecclesiastical members," that is, only Orthodox clergy. The Bible Society made this membership more specific in its 1815 Report when it declared that the membership of the translation committee would include only "members of the Holy Synod". No doubt these stipulations betray a general uneasiness in both the Society and the Synod about the proper authority for publishing such a Bible. After all, this was more than simply printing a Slavic Bible already approved by the Synod; the new translation was to be the direct responsibility of the Bible Society, composed in accordance with the Society's rules, and distributed in the belief that this new Bible would serve as the foundation on which to reconstruct the social, political, and ecclesiastical order of the country. In this connection, it is characteristic that the initiative for the Russian Bible came from Alexander himself rather than the Synod. Be that as it may, the responsibility for the Russian Bible was suspended uncertainly between the Synod and the Bible Society.

As might be expected, the Commission on Theological Schools appointed Filaret to supervise the new translation and select competent assistants to help speed the work. He divided the work

up among four translators including himself. The Gospels were the first objective, and each translator was allotted a separate book. Father Gerasim Pavskii, whose neological approach to translation was later to cause so much difficulty, was given Matthew; Archimandrite Polikarp Gaitannikov, then Inspector of the St. Petersburg Theological Seminary, was responsible for Mark; while Archimandrite Moisei Bogdanov-Platonov, rector of the Kiev Theological Academy, translated Luke. Filaret translated the Book of John. Filaret's three assistants were all his former students at the St. Petersburg Theological Academy. The Gospels in Russian, therefore, rather than Feofilakt's translation of Ancillon's Mélanges de littérature et de philosophie, became the "first fruit" of the Academy and is symbolic of Filaret's efforts to make religion the central preoccupation of the ecclesiastical schools and Biblical scholarship the heart of theological study. The translators were to meet together as often as possible to read and correct each other's translation and hopefully bring the various books into some sort of uniformity. As the translations progressed, parts were sent to the translation committee of the Bible Society which included, despite the precautions of the Synod, both V.M. Popov, a layman and secretary of the Society, and A. Labzin, one of the leading mystics and masons of Alexander's reign. Their participation in the translation work lent support to the suspicion that the Bible Society was in some secret way attempting to undermine Orthodoxy by tampering with the Bible. The archbishops Mikhail Desnitskii and Serafim Glagolevskii as well as Filaret also served on the Bible Society translation committee.

At the same time Filaret was appointed by the Commission to

supervise the translation, the Commission (although it was Filaret's work) outlined the rules governing the translation. This guide is one of the few statements about the underlying assumptions of the new Russian translation and provides the key to understanding some of the later objections raised by critics of the Bible Society. In all there were nineteen rules, but the most important were those dealing with the relationship of the new translation to the old Slavic Bible. First, the Greek version was to be the basis for translation, not the Slavic. This in itself made the new translation more than a simple "transposition" from Slavic into "native Russian". Moreover, where there was any disagreement between the meaning of the Greek and Slavic texts, preference was to be given to the Greek original. Second, the number of Slavic words in the Russian version were to be kept to a minimum, for "the greatness of the Holy Scriptures is in its force [sila] and not in the beauty of the words; from this it follows that there should be no undue attachment to the Slavic words and phrases for the sake of their alledged importance."<sup>21</sup> Slavic words were to be used only when there was no Russian equivalent or when the Slavic word or phrase more closely approximated the meaning of the Greek original "without producing any darkness or looseness of speech." Finally, the translation was always to preserve the proper "spirit" of the language: conversation would be translated with conversational language, narrative with the appropriate narrative language. The translators were instructed to aim first for accuracy, then clarity, and finally purity. Thus, the new translation was to be an exercise in Biblical philology and a literary presentation, and on both counts its connections with the Slavic Bible were to

be kept to a minimum.<sup>22</sup>

These rules were an expression of Filaret's conviction that the Bible must accurately convey the meanings of God's Word as it was historically revealed and that the language of the Bible be that most readily and fully understood by the reader. Any blind clinging to the old Slavic Bible, especially those passages which obscured the meaning of Christian dogma, he rejected completely. "The contention that the dogmas contained in Holy Scripture have been deliberately concealed by a certain darkness remains unproved and is entirely unjust and offensive to the dignity of Holy Scriptures. The Holy Spirit spoke the Holy Scriptures to enlighten, not darken."<sup>23</sup>

The new translation of the Gospels was finished three years later in 1819 and published according to the format stipulated by Alexander earlier, that is, the Russian and Slavic were to be printed in parallel columns. Two printings of 10,000 copies each were carried through in 1819, while a third printing without an accompanying Slavic text was published the following year. By 1821 all the remaining parts of the New Testament were translated, including the Epistles and Revelations. Shortly after the appearance of the Gospels in Russian, Prince Golitsyn and Metropolitan Mikhail Desnitskii (who replaced Amvrosii as metropolitan of St. Petersburg in 1819 when Avrosii died) obtained permission to have the Old Testament translated into Russian as well. More translators were added to the project and the work was divided up among the three theological academies: St. Petersburg (Genesis), Moscow (Exodus), and Kiev (Leviticus). The various parts were to be published as they were finished. As it

turned out, the Psalter was published first.

#### 4. Filaret and the Psalter, 1821-1823

##### a. Filaret's theological and exegetical perspective on translating the Psalter.

The decision to translate the Old Testament raised a number of questions which were first faced in the translation of the Psalter. What relationship did the Hebrew text have to the Septuagint and the Slavic translation which was based upon it? How were the discrepancies between the Hebrew and the Greek texts to be reconciled? What was to be done if the new translation significantly differed from the Slavic Bible? How much importance should be attached to the Masoretic texts? Since the new translation would not replace the Slavic in the holy service, to what extent should departures from the Slavic be explained to the reader?

The very discussion of such questions was symptomatic of the growth of Biblical scholarship in Russia. Partly this was the fruit of the 18th century schooling, but partly it was an expression of a broader European reawakening of interest in the Bible. Biblical scholarship was at that time a central preoccupation in many German schools, where the main effort was directed at a new, scientific explanation of Scripture to answer the seventeenth and eighteenth century criticisms of Hobbes, Spinoza, Père Simon and others who had noted the composite nature of the Bible. The Bible was also embraced by the Romantic movement. Herder and Eichhorn attempted to show that the Old Testament was the highest expression of a particular people. Herder called it the folk soul of Israel. Eichhorn came to broadly the same conclusions, but he stressed the

importance of comprehensively applying critical scientific methods to all of the Old Testament books. Thus, both the scholarly and Romantic currents often began to merge. Broadly speaking these and other similar currents coincided with the despair in the churches over the Enlightenment and Protestant scholasticism. Neander was the outstanding spokesman for new methods for reading the Bible. The purpose was to show either the truths of revealed religion or the sacredness of poetic expression through a scientific reading of the Bible. Neander declared that "a new life of faith had awakened which began to inspire study. A superficial, heartless enlightenment, which despised the greatness and the glory of the ages, was condemned both by life and by science."<sup>24</sup> The alliance between religion and science had far-reaching effects on Biblical criticism and was part of a general movement toward reconciling the life of the mind with daily experience. In literature this was called realism, but it had a religious side as well: the Bible was to have a place in daily life too. Although the exact nature of this movement in Russia has yet to be examined, it is clear that the new Biblical criticism was a constituent element in the climate of religious opinion in St. Petersburg during Alexander's reign.

Filaret, who should rightly be considered the founder of modern Biblical criticism in Russia, was influenced by this re-awakened interest in the Bible, although his scholarly methods were derived from his student days in Moscow where Protestant scholastic theology and exegesis still formed the backbone of the curriculum. In his exegetical approach to Scriptures, Filaret seems closest to Campegius Vitringa (1659-1722), a Dutch Reformed

theologian and orientalist at Franeker University and Johann Jacob Rambach (1693-1735), also a noted Hebrew scholar who based his work directly on that of Vitranga. Filaret recommended Vitranga's careful and accurate exegesis of texts in order to determine their true meaning with due regard for the historical background of the Bible.

Filaret had already worked out his own solutions to the problems presented by the new translation of the Old Testament. These solutions emerged from his study and teaching at the St. Petersburg Theological Academy (and also at the seminary) and were printed in several important works published between 1811 and 1820. His first work of Biblical criticism to appear was entitled Introductiones in singulos libros Veteris Testamenti, in supplementum libri classici conscriptae, written apparently in 1811. Two years later, for A.N. Olenin, he wrote Opyt iz "iasneniia Psalma LXVII (An attempt at clarifying Psalm LXVII), and it was published in 1814. Filaret briefly described the character of David as the author of the Psalms in a letter to Count A.K. Razumovskii (29 May 1814), while his conspectus for his course in theology, Obozrenie bogoslovskikh nauk v otnoshenii k prepodavaniiu ikh v vyshikh dukhovnykh uchilishchakh (A survey of theology for the purpose of instruction in the higher ecclesiastical schools) was published at the end of that year. Filaret wrote the first major work on Biblical criticism in Russia: Zapiski na knigu Bytiia, rukovodstvuiushchiia k razumeniiu pismeni'eia.i k ispytaniiu dukha eia, pri posredstve slicheniia perevodov s podlinnikom, mnenii sv. Otets i tolkovatelei, preimushchestvenno zhe iasnykh, i soboiu drugiia ob "iasniaiushchikh, mest samago

Sviashchennago Pisaniia (Notes on the Book of Genesis which serve as a guide to the understanding of its letter and for the investigation of its spirit, by means of comparing the translations with the original, the opinions of the Holy Fathers and commentators, primarily of clear passages and others which can be explained by them of Holy Scripture). These "Notes" were dedicated to Alexander and appeared in print in 1816. The long winded title exactly conveys the approach which Filaret endeavored to use in analyzing the Book of Genesis. It is an attempt to understand the letter and the spirit of Scriptures by comparing the original Hebrew text with subsequent translations while taking into consideration the writings of the Fathers and later commentators. Filaret sketched out the historical background of the Scriptures in his Nachertanie tserkovno-bibleiskoi istorii (Outlines of Church-Biblical history) published that same year (1816). It serves as a companion volume to the "Notes". The fundamental considerations put forward in these two books were embodied in Filaret's Opredelenie o perevode Sv. Pisaniia Novago Zaveta na russkii iazyk podrobnymi pravilami vedeniia etogo dela (A definition concerning the translation of Holy Scriptures of the New Testament into Russian with detailed rules of instruction), which served as the basic guide for the new translation of the Gospels into Russian approved in March, 1816. Expressions of his exegetical methods were also published in Prorocheskiia knigi vetkhago zaveta (The Prophetic Books of the Old Testament) and Tolkovanie na II psalmom (Comments on Psalm 2) (1820). There were also several smaller works, mostly introductions to the various translations of the Biblical books which appeared between 1819 and 1826, as

well as his long and short catechisms which will be discussed in a separate section. These works contain all of Filaret's basic principles of textual analysis, and they must be discussed in order to understand his solutions to the problems raised by the new translation of the Old Testament. Hopefully, a discussion of Filaret's perspective and methods will also help to clarify the very different view of the matter taken by other translators who worked on the Old Testament.

Which were Filaret's exegetical methods and why were they pertinent to the new translation? It must be stressed that Filaret's methods were not directed toward the theological systematization popular in the 18th century schools, but he was not wholly free from scholastic influence. By its very name systematic theology implies the systematization of all the various truths expressed in Scriptures. To this end it is necessary to sort out all the various propositional truths, show that any apparent discrepancies are not real contradictions, but only different aspects of a larger truth, and then arrange them according to the fundamental principles of interpretation which underlie the Biblical books and which bind them together in a single Book, the Word of God written. This was the accepted scholastic method, and it left its influence on Filaret. He spoke of distilling the truths of Scripture and forming them into a system in his Survey of Theology.<sup>25</sup>

In spite of the strong influence of scholastic theology upon him, there are two reasons why Filaret cannot be regarded as a scholastic and why he never succeeded in building a system. First, he considered the revelation of God in Scripture not to be final or fixed, but continuous. God's revelation was not just one

moment in the past, but the eternal, immutable appearance of God's grace and power in all ages and for all time. Second, Filaret had a keen sense of history and the Church. History was the story of God's approach to man and man's approach to God; the story of the continuous and repeated revelation of God to man within the Church. The Church existed with Creation, contained the true knowledge of God, and acted through history as the guardian and disseminator of God's Word.<sup>26</sup> Scripture was a part of Church Tradition: that is, the written history of the Church. But this Tradition--and this point is essential-- was not human tradition, it was divinely revealed testimony, preserved by the Church for men's salvation and serves as the sole source of our knowledge about God.<sup>27</sup> Such knowledge was revealed "in time," that is, in history, first as direct knowledge about God (Adam, Filaret pointed out, knew God first hand), then indirectly after the Fall. At first this indirect knowledge was preserved through oral tradition, but as the human race multiplied and the danger increased that God's word might become distorted and lost, God took steps to ensure that knowledge of Him would continue. Moses and others were divinely inspired to write down His Word. Thus God revealed himself through Scriptures, but he did so gradually, and He did not make every revelation fully understandable at the time it was first written. Our knowledge of God in this manner continued until the Annunciation to the Virgin, when a turning point was reached and it was possible for man once again to know God directly and, more importantly, to become God. The history of God's revelation entered upon a new phase: the "mystery" which shrouded the Old Testament was "solved" by Christ's Coming. The Old Testa-

ment prophecies and enigmatic revelations were now presented in their fullness and could teach men how to find God.<sup>28</sup> This great scheme, Filaret believed, was preserved in the divine treasury of God on earth: the Church and Scriptures.

While history was God's Agent in the sense that it was the continuum in which God's design unfolded and continues to unfold for all ages, secular history had a way of interfering with man's search for God. Secular history, the complex movement and change in human society, acted to obscure the meaning of God's Word. In the very act of spreading the Word about God, the "force" of the original words was either lost or muted. Knowledge about the languages of the Bible--Hebrew and Greek--did not keep pace with the demand that the Bible be known in every tongue. Translations soon became inadequate even where they were made with due regard for accuracy. Each country, each people developed and continues to develop its own language. Language is not static or stagnant. The Christians of each generation in any country understand the meanings of the words in ways different from their parents. For example, in the sixteenth century the Psalms in Old Church Slavic were heard and read with perfect clarity and understanding, but by the beginning of the nineteenth century those same words were no longer part of the vital living vocabulary of Russians and consequently they had lost their impact. A breach occurred between the language of the Scriptures and the daily voice of the people.<sup>29</sup>

The breach was serious. Each man's salvation was imperiled, for he was cut off from God. The social order was shaken, morality

threatened, and the Church isolated from its historical task of preserving and spreading the Word. The rise and spread of free-thinking, naturalism, excessive rationalism, moral relativity and skepticism, world-wide destruction (Napoleon) were indications that Christian order and morality were declining and knowledge of God was claiming less and less attention. This was in large measure due to the isolation of Scripture from everyday life in all classes of society.

Filaret's Biblical scholarship must be viewed against this background. He wanted to provide Russians with a Bible which would allow them to feel the force (and this is the quality he repeatedly stressed) of God's revealed truths. After all, these truths were not revealed only one time in the past and only for one generation, they were eternal truths just as necessary "for the needs of the present." The "truths of faith and piety" contained "in purity" in the Scriptures were essential for any "society of those who revere God," that is, the Church. Following St. Paul's injunction that "all Scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be equipped for every good work" (2 Timothy III, 16, 17), Filaret formulated the great task of Biblical scholarship: the Bible must yield the truths of Scripture in the purest possible form.<sup>30</sup> For this reason it is impossible to separate his work as a translator from his work as an exegete and Biblical historian.

While Filaret's sense of the historical dimension in God's revelation set him off from the scholastics of the eighteenth century, his belief in the "inner mystery" of the Bible, partially

derived from pietist influence, kept him some distance from the secularizing tendency in much modern Biblical scholarship. Only those who possess faith in God and in the divine inspiration of the Bible are able to discover the meaning of God's Word and render its vibrant qualities into contemporary speech. The sense of the prophecies would be meaningless if it did not touch a believing heart. If the translator did not enter into the mystery of the Bible in order to grasp its deepest meaning, he could never convey it to others. A Christian translation of the Bible must convey the deeper, inner meaning of the Bible, for it is this meaning which bears the efficacious force of God's Word. The exegete must consult the original texts to determine "how the Word was offered," how "God's Word [was] spoken to men in various circumstances and at various times." The goal was to show clearly and unmistakably "the traces of this [His] design" in the "entire history of the world...with all the miracles of God's almightiness, wisdom, and grace manifested in it...."<sup>31</sup> Thus exegesis and translation were related steps toward achieving the deeper mystery of Scripture. Both focused on words.

How did Filaret set about this task? He used three tools: historical analysis, comparative examination of passages of the Old and New Testaments, and philological examination of words. These three tools were designed to extract the inner meaning of the Bible along with the literal meaning, and they coincided with what Filaret considered to be the threefold structure of the Bible which contains historical, instructional, and prophetic parts. Both the New and Old Testaments adhere to this threefold division, while the Psalter, which contains all three elements, is a micro-

cosm of the entire Bible. Historical analysis was well suited to the narrative books: the Pentateuch (the narrow history of God's covenant with a single people) and the Book of John. The comparative method was best suited to the didactic parts such as Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, and Paul's epistles to the Romans and Hebrews. Here the attention of the exegete and translator must be focused on the subject matter of each book and the lessons derived from it. The prophetic aspects of the Bible could best be studied in the Psalms, Prophets (especially Isaiah), and Revelations. These parts were most important for they "shed light on all the others."<sup>32</sup> However Revelations must be approached with great caution and one should only attempt to clarify the main "truths" which have been confirmed by events since Revelations was written. This part of God's continuing revelation was still not completed and all answers must be tentative.

Filaret also tried to establish the proper relationship of the Old Testament to the New. Only in the light of the New Testament could the Old be properly elucidated; only by weighing the words of the Old Testament against their "explanation" in the New could passages vital for the Christian message be properly understood and translated. Since these passages tended to be the prophetic parts of the Old Testament, Filaret attempted to establish some general guidelines for interpretation so that it might be determined if a prophecy was actually from God and an essential teaching which every Christian needed to know. Such a prophecy, he maintained, had to be about God, pleasing to God, directed toward piety, holiness, and truth, and directed against evil. If this prophecy is in harmony with earlier prophecies, "then we can-

not doubt [its] divine origin." Aside from this test of reason, there is one further test which was very characteristic of Filaret and his time: true prophecy would also transmit "a certain inexplicable inner impression that the revealed mystery comes only from God and not from some other source."<sup>33</sup>

b. Texts and commentaries for the Psalter.

It was customary in Russia before the nineteenth century to publish the Psalter with accompanying commentaries, so that readers might understand the Christian meaning of the Old Testament psalms. Such a practice actually dates back to the Apostles and was part of a general Christian endeavor to include the Old Testament into the canon of Christian literature. The Russian Bible Society's sponsorship of the new Russian Psalter made the inclusion of such commentaries an impossibility. It also raised some unexpected problems. The greatest danger was that without explicit commentaries the new translation might more easily depart from an Orthodox Christian rendering of the words of the psalms. Filaret hoped that the lack of commentaries might be compensated for by the simultaneous publication of commentaries under the authority of the Holy Synod. The Synod in fact had as recently as 1814 published a two volume Tolkovanie na Psaltir' (Commentary on the Psalter). This "Commentary" had importance for the subsequent publication of the Russian Psalter for two reasons which merit investigation. First, this 1814 "Commentary" was criticized by Filaret and thereby gives us a glimpse at Filaret's solutions to the problems raised by the new Russian translation of the Psalter. Second, it throws light on the nature of the criticism to which

Filaret's translation was subjected by one of the other translators, Father Gerasim Pavskii.

On 4 August 1819 the Moscow Synodal Printing Office approached the Holy Synod with a request that the "Commentary on the Psalter" be reprinted. Before making a decision, the Synod asked Filaret for his opinion. Filaret reported that the "Commentary" was an arbitrary combination of two separate and mutually contradictory works: "These versions contradict one another, and if the explanations of the second version are correct, then those of the first must be false. Yet the second, commenting on this same psalm [Psalm 2, the only psalm Filaret discussed in this report] refers the reader to the first as though there were no contradiction."<sup>34</sup> Further examination revealed that the first version "adheres to the Septuagint text, while the second follows the Hebrew, but not always accurately. The first often cites the Holy Fathers, the second does not. The first frequently turns its attention to the force [sila] of each word in the text, the second more to the text as a whole. The first gives a prophetic interpretation to the text, the second suggest the literal, historical sense, while it relegates the prophetic sense to a secondary and auxiliary position. The first is not quite firmly grounded, the second sometimes encourages neology which regards the psalms as historical and moral poetry, having a prophetic aspect only by the accidental application of ancient passages to modern events. There is a greater coherence and clarity in the second than in the first."<sup>35</sup>

Filaret did not recommend publication of either version. The Synod (28 April 1820) decided that another version should be

published which would be more in keeping with Church teaching, hopefully by taking the best parts of each version and making one good commentary. Filaret also thought this was possible, but he did not want to be a party to such a project: "Partly because I lack the time; partly because I could not from conviction confine myself to the framework which both of these books present."<sup>36</sup>

What framework did Filaret prefer? He adopted the Hebrew text as the primary source, but he explained psalms, particularly the prophetic parts, by reference to the New Testament and the commentaries of the Holy Fathers. Only when this was impossible did he offer an explanation derived solely from the Hebrew. For example, he noted that in the second psalm there was no assigned author in the Hebrew text, but in the Septuagint David is assigned authorship. He then goes on to examine the psalm line by line, interpreting the psalm as a prophecy and explaining the meaning of the words by reference to the New Testament. Thus, "by the word 'tongue' or simply 'peoples' is meant pagans, for that is how the Apostles understood it (Acts, IV) and that is how the word is usually meant in the Old Testament."<sup>37</sup> Filaret's methods were used in the new Russian Psalter, although the Synod decided to publish the 1814 "Commentary" in 600 copies at the Moscow Synodal Printing Office. This was done in July, 1822, just after the Russian version of the Psalter came from the presses of the Russian Bible Society.

c. Publication of the Psalter and Pavskii's criticisms.

Since the Psalter "from antiquity has customarily been printed separately from the other sacred books" for special use

"in prayers, in the Church, and in the home," Filaret was convinced that "it is urgently necessary to make them as far as possible understandable to everyone..."<sup>38</sup> To that end, the Psalter was translated by the same committee which had produced the Gospels. The new translation was based on the Masoretic texts but with reference to the Greek and Slavic versions. Unlike the Gospels, the Psalter was printed in Russian without parallel Slavonic columns.

Emperor Alexander gave his approval to the new translation but with the condition that an introduction be attached which explained why the Russian text was at variance with the familiar Slavic psalms. Filaret then wrote a "Foreword to the Christ-loving Reader" to "witness the accuracy of the Russian translation from the Hebrew text from which the entire translation was made."<sup>39</sup> "It is not difficult to judge if it is right that in composing the translation attention was given to the original," he assured the reader.<sup>40</sup> Despite this rather offhand assurance, there was great misgiving precisely on this point. Filaret, Alexander, the Synod, and many others (not all of them in sympathy with the new Psalter) feared that the alterations would create doubts about its authenticity and produce a new schism in the Church or at least allow the Old Believers to seize upon it as further proof of the Church's apostasy. In large measure this was the reason for Alexander's cautious approval of the new translation only if it forewarned the reader about the new wording he would encounter. Filaret had earlier expressed a similar anxiety when he wrote to his grandfather, an experienced debater with Old Believers around Kolomna, just before publication of the Gospels.

I would like to hear from you when you have a moment how this new translation seems to you and others around you; for it is our desire that it be pleasing to the readers; and if it might be corrected for intelligibility and perfection, then we are prepared to do so as far as possible.<sup>41</sup>

The "Foreword" and the Psalter were examined by Metropolitan Serafim and Archbishop Simeon Krylov and then sent by Filaret to Prince Golitsyn for the tsar's approval on 2 August 1821. When the tsar approved the "Foreword" on 21 August, Filaret, Serafim, and Simeon were required to sign it. The first edition of the Psalter appeared in early 1822, followed by the second and third editions before the year was out. The Psalter went through twelve stereotype printings before 15 March 1823. The revisions in the later editions were made by the translation committee not by the Bible Society. These changes were given to V.M. Popov, the Bible Society secretary. This should be kept in mind, for it has been suggested that the criticisms aimed at the Psalter under Filaret's supervision were symptomatic of the general wavering of the Bible Society's position as well as the authority of Prince Golitsyn. "With the publication of the Psalter [the first edition] the best period in the work of the Bible Society came to an end. The Society began to tremble on its foundations."<sup>42</sup> The criticism of Filaret's first edition of the Psalter did not come from among the opponents of the Bible Society or from opponents of the translation work per se. The criticism arose within the circle of translators and came specifically from Father Gerasim Pavskii. Pavskii's objections were not of the same kind or quality as those put forward by Filaret's later critics Admiral Shishkov and Archimandrite Fotii, and Pavskii does not seem to have been a

party to their schemes to bring down Golitsyn and the Bible Society. This becomes quite clear once Pavskii's theological conceptions are understood.

Gerasim Pavskii (1787-1864) was one of the outstanding students of Hebrew in Russia in the nineteenth century. He had been among the first graduates of the newly reformed St. Petersburg Theological Academy where he studied with Feofilakt, then Fessler, and finally Filaret. Pavskii had a low opinion of the teachers at the Academy. "They taught us poorly. The only good professors were Filaret (later metropolitan of Moscow who taught theology and Scriptures) and Fessler who taught Hebrew and then philosophy."<sup>43</sup> Fessler probably influenced him more, but Filaret encouraged his studies. Pavskii was made a director in the Russian Bible Society in 1815 and because of his excellent knowledge of Hebrew Filaret invited him to join the committee then being formed to translate the Gospels. Apparently Filaret and Pavskii were able to work harmoniously, for there is no record of any disagreements.

Shortly after the first edition of the Psalter appeared, Pavskii began to urge changes on the committee and Popov, the secretary of the Bible Society. Filaret was away from the capital at the time, attending to his new duties as archbishop of Moscow. Pavskii took advantage of his absence to write to Popov (5 July 1822) that "it was pleasing" to metropolitan Serafim and "the other members of the translation committee" that "the translation of the Psalter, in as much as it was done from the Hebrew anyway, should strictly correspond to the original without any divergence in favor of the Septuagint or the Slavic translation."<sup>44</sup> Pavskii

then retranslated those passages which had been translated "in accordance with the Slavic." "The committee," he went on to say, "approved the new translation of these places"<sup>45</sup> and had empowered him to communicate these changes to Popov so that they might be incorporated into the second edition of the Psalter then in preparation. One can only speculate on the extent of Serafim's knowledge and approval of this matter. Two days later Pavskii again wrote to Popov that Filaret's "Foreword" had provided for the possibility of only one revision of the Psalter and he hoped this might be amended to allow for further alterations, for it was too late to include his changes in the second edition. The third edition finally embodied Pavskii's changes. When Filaret learned of them he immediately protested to Popov in two letters, each written after a meeting of the translation committee (6 and 28 September 1822). The outcome was a fourth edition which removed the "little sins" included by Pavskii in the third edition. Filaret's authority still carried full weight both in the committee and in the Bible Society.<sup>46</sup>

What was the nature of the disagreement between Filaret and Pavskii? In the deepest sense it was the difference of two divergent theological conceptions, two different approaches to religion and the Bible. However the contest between Pavskii and Filaret never came out into the open until much later (in the 1840's); their conflict over the Psalter cannot be traced in all its details. The points on both sides must be deduced from the writings of each before and after 1822. While the fundamental issue was theological, the immediate issue was language and philology. In general terms it can be said that Pavskii, with a self-styled

moral idealism which he worked out for himself under various influences, aimed at a religiously inspired poetic translation of the Old Testament. He did not believe in the prophetic mystery of the Old Testament as a prefiguration of the New. The Old Testament was not, as Filaret believed, a mystery "solved" by Christ; it was not God's Word revealed which awaited Christ's clarification. In short, Pavskii argued, one need not bother about the New Testament, the Septuagint, the commentaries of the Fathers or anything else when translating the Old Testament. The Hebrew text and the Hebrew text alone is sufficient.<sup>47</sup> The task of the translator was not to translate the Old Testament from any standpoint other than that of philological and poetical accuracy. The translator must aim at the "sense" of the entire text and not labor over possible "deeper" meanings of the individual words. Rather, he must convey the sense of Scriptures in modern phrases in harmony with the "spirit of the times." Filaret had already objected to such a treatment of the Old Testament in his critique of the 1814 "Commentary on the Psalter." Such a treatment was neological.<sup>48</sup>

Pavskiii formulated his religious outlook from two closely related but distinct currents which had found expression at the St. Petersburg Theological Academy: pietism and idealism. He subscribed to the pietist idea that the Bible is capable of imparting God's truths directly to men's minds and hearts, but these truths were not revealed knowledge about God, but moral instructions. Religion and the Bible were designed to bring morality into the hearts of the people, and Pavskii's interest in religion was confined to the manner in which "it appears as

a benefit for man and human society."<sup>49</sup> But there was more to Pavskii's theories. Moral instruction must be linked to the innate religious feeling present in each man at birth. This innate religious ideal is naturally felt most fully in children; they have "a more religious life."<sup>50</sup> But feeling left untended will wither or become deformed. Children must be introduced to the morally perfecting quality of religion through a cultivation of reason's understanding. "When religious ideas are embraced by reason, or when inner religious feelings are depicted in external forms, then positive religion begins...."<sup>51</sup> Religious study, above all study of the Bible, strengthens innate religious feelings and gives light and life to each man's reason. True religion exists as a perfect ideal, perceived by everyone, but attained by none. Detected in early years as feeling, this innate religious ideal can with proper care grow toward ideal perfection. Both mind and heart will be completely infused with religious understanding. Pavskii's ideas are reminiscent of Ignatius Fessler and show how important his brief influence was at the St. Petersburg Theological Academy.

The Church, in Pavskii's view, had an important but secondary role in religious life. At the point where "positive religion" begins, the Church begins to play a part. Each child must learn the dogmas, rules, and laws of the Church. Dogmas are most important, for they are statements of reason's understanding about religious ideas. Rituals, too, are significant as emotional representations of religious ideas in their outward forms.<sup>52</sup> Of course these outward forms--dogmas, rules, rituals, and so on--these devices of reason cannot plumb the depths of religious

feeling or adequately express the perfection of ideal religion. They are limited; they are merely "hints" which put into definite form or shape "the inner living feeling of religion."<sup>53</sup> They are only instruments, even symbols, of something deeper: some holy, eternal, unchanging essence of religion. They are only temporary manifestations and not to be placed on the same level as religious feeling. This had been the error of every church in every age. Orthodoxy here had no special distinction. External form obscured religious feeling and allowed a narrow legalism to triumph over morality. Since there is an inherent gulf between essence and externals, between the animating spirit and the body, the ideal conception of religion must abide in the spirit and be universal. The Kingdom of Heaven which Christ revealed through his life, teaching, and redemptive death is unobtainable for man on earth. He can only aspire to it. Yet the efficacious idea of this perfect kingdom enlightens, perfects, and exalts men and society and urges them forward to new heights. Likewise, the external, visible Church with all of its splintered denominations is only a symbol or hint of the True Church: "Every visible church must know that it is only on the road to perfection, but full perfection is far from it in the invisible kingdom of heaven."<sup>54</sup> Thus Pavskii laid aside any historical claims the Orthodox Church might make as the true Apostolic society of God on earth. It was simply one expression of the movement of all churches toward a new ecumenical ideal. (It should not be supposed that Pavskii was at cross purposes with the "Dual Ministry" and its utopian ecumenical schemes!)

Pavskii saw a dualism in all things: the outer husk of forms

concealing the inner feelings of religion; the text of Scripture which contained the essence of God's Word; the denominational churches reflecting the ideal universal church. Moreover, he believed that Holy Scriptures were now so perfectly understood that it would be possible to separate what is of essence in them from what is not; what is eternal from what is temporary; what is universal from what is particular. All aspirations by individuals or by churches must be measured against this standard: the ideal standard of true religion.<sup>55</sup>

Pavskii aimed at nothing less than a new ecumenical Bible for a new ecumenical church. Therefore, it could not be a dogmatic Book; it must be the standard with which each church verifies its teachings and rules. Their dogmas, being temporary and particular, laden with the accrued meanings of history, must be checked against the true spirit of Scriptures. Such an understanding reduced any argument for religious authority based on Tradition to a few meaningless phrases. If dogmas are simply periodic religious expressions of religious feeling in rational terms, then Tradition does not bear the seal of divine sanction, but only represents imperfect human understanding. They may not coincide with more sublime current perceptions of the religious ideal. Dogmas, formed in the history of men, may have been true enough for their time, but new life must be pumped into these old forms if they are to remain meaningful. The authority for determining what is eternal from what is temporary, in Pavskii's view, rested with each individual. Some individuals develop such an understanding more rapidly than others or than the Church and it is incumbent upon these advanced "seekers after truth" to help the Church and the slower

members distinguish between the wheat and chaff of religious truth. "It is not an easy matter to reconcile the thoughts and customs of the people with the spirit of the times, but it is absolutely necessary for well-being."<sup>56</sup>

As one of the intellectually and spiritually advanced, Pavskii dedicated himself to pumping new meaning into the old forms of the Bible and reconciling the Church with the spirit of the times. His translation of the Old Testament was more than a literary task, it was a theological quest. If successful, Russian Christians would be able to advance along the road to perfection aided by the ideal of religion portrayed in its Scriptural setting. Pavskii's translation thus became a special form of exegesis (although all translation is exegesis) which removed the confusing language of the past, conditioned as it was by the spirit of past ages, and substituted a new language free of historical accretions and fresh with the essence or sense of Scripture. Pavskii's translation easily conformed to the rules of the Russian Bible Society which stipulated that the Bible be published without notes or comments. For Pavskii the really essential point was not notes or comments, but purity of translation. Purity transcended any attachment to the texts, even the Hebrew text upon which he based his work:

The language was not dear to me [he recalled later], but the purity of Holy Scriptures which cannot be expressed by commentaries; through a knowledge of language I wanted to achieve a true commentary on Holy Scriptures. A true understanding of Hebrew will lead to an understanding of theology.<sup>57</sup>

With these ideas in mind, Pavskii's alterations of Filaret's version of the Russian Psalter urged upon Popov in July of 1822

become clearer and their intention more understandable. He objected to Filaret's Psalter because Filaret would not countenance his idealist "true interpretation" of the Old Testament. One fundamental difference between them was Pavskii's elimination of the historical element from his translation and his theology. The historical manifestations of Christianity-- the dogmas, doctrines, even Scriptures and the Church--were contingent things, secondary and inexact representations of pure idea of religion. This was precisely the opposite of Filaret's view that God's truths were revealed in history and could only be understood in the historical dimension, particularly in Scriptures where the historical relationship between the Old and the New Testaments was vital: not just in the inner logic of historical events, but in the deepest sense as the overriding expression of God's divine purpose. Filaret did not wish to see Pavskii exorcise the revealed and prophetic quality of the new Psalter in favor of a new intuitive translation which substituted modern meanings for old ones in the language of the Bible.

#### d. Conclusions.

By the end of 1822, Filaret had realized at least one of his objectives when he joined the Bible Society: he had successfully shepherded through the press a new Russian translation of the New Testament and a new Russian Psalter, in spite of all the difficulties. "Praise God," he wrote to Prince Golitsyn on 11 September 1822, "each day the door of His Word opens wider for the people who cannot enter this sanctuary along the narrow road of scholarly investigation."<sup>58</sup> He was optimistic that a recon-

ciliation of Scripture and society could be achieved; the language of the Bible could be reconciled with the living language of the street and salon. Just as the leading literary figures were rebelling against the artificial restraints of classicism on Russian literature, Filaret was protesting the artificial fetters of scholastic Latin and incomprehensible Slavic on the living force of Scriptures. There were dangers to be sure but at least Pavskii's neology had been successfully avoided. And wasn't Golitsyn right when he declared at the ninth annual meeting of the Bible Society that "bringing to completion the translation of the New Testament and the Psalter in the Russian language of our Fatherland is an event marking an epoch in the history of the Russian Bible Society"?<sup>59</sup>

But Golitsyn did not realize that the next epoch of the Bible Society would be radically different and in three years' time the Society would be abolished and the Russian Bible suppressed. The Old Testament was not finished before the agitation against Golitsyn brought about the termination of the Society. The Pentateuch followed the Psalter from the press and its final corrections were entrusted to Pavskii, who completed them in 1825. Because of the changed circumstances not only were they not published, they were confiscated and burned. All translation of the Bible ceased. The uprising against Golitsyn and the "pietist revolution" he championed disrupted Filaret's work in the Bible Society and led to what Filaret called the "return to scholasticism". Archimandrite Fotii and Admiral Shishkov, Filaret's leading critics, shook the Bible Society to its foundations, but they did not use Pavskii's criticism in an

attempt to defeat the Psalter, they concentrated their abuse on Filaret's catechism.

## CHAPTER V

### Filaret's catechisms and his critics

Your catechetical teaching, which combines deep and exact theological simplicity with an accessibility for all has become a textbook of the Church, a guide to faith for all, and a witness of our confession before [the confessions of] foreigners, arousing them to communion and union with the true Apostolic Church.

--A.V. Gorskii, on the fiftieth anniversary of Filaret's service as a bishop, 1867.

1. Introduction: the purpose of Filaret's catechetical work and his predecessors.

If Filaret's efforts to bring Scripture into contact with everyday Russian life were to be more than a literary exercise, more had to be done than simply distribute Bibles in an updated Russian language. The language barrier could be removed, but so many Russians were entirely ignorant of their own faith. How could they be taught? Even the faithful did not study, and the Church had proven less than a diligent teacher. Readings from the Slavic instructional books, rattled off practically from memory by the priest just before the liturgy, made no impression either on the mind or on the heart. The occasional sermon of a parish priest was usually abstract with no visible relation to its audience. These things taken together sapped the living strength of religion. Those who wanted to learn the articles of their faith could not do so. Those who were indifferent were never brought to a more active faith, but instead they slipped off from the cathedral the moment the priest reached the instructional part of the service. Crass ignorance led to mechanical devotion; lax morality led to vice. The Schismatics, ignorant themselves, used Orthodox ignorance to refute the Orthodox cause.<sup>1</sup>

Moreover, many priests were reluctant to take any initiative in bringing Christian nourishment and instruction to their flocks. Caution was deeply ingrained in the clergy, for Russia was not a free country and spontaneous Christian zeal among the clergy might arouse the suspicions of the authorities. Filaret saw this reluctance everywhere and even had it forced on his attention soon after he became Archbishop of Moscow by the Governor-general, D.V. Golitsyn. Golitsyn reported that the Vereia prison chaplain, Presbyter Skobeev, would not read the Gospels aloud to the inmates of the prison without official approval. The Moscow Committee of the Russian Bible Society had distributed the new Russian Gospels and Psalter among the prisoners only to discover that not a single prisoner could read. A Vereia lawyer, who wished to carry through the well-intended if ill-informed efforts of the Moscow Committee, urged Skobeev to read the Gospels to the inmates, since they could not do it for themselves. But Skobeev held back and decided to request permission first. When Filaret received his "request", he was furious, "The priest Skobeev," he wrote, "has thoughtlessly reported that without the permission of his superiors, he dares not undertake a work of Christian philanthropy. If visiting those confined to prisons is a general obligation incumbent upon all Christians, then how much more are the servants of the Christian faith and church required whenever they visit those in prison to comfort and instruct them. The administration leaves it to their voluntary zeal with the hope that this zeal might bring forth good fruit...."<sup>2</sup>

Filaret suggested some partial measures to the Holy Synod designed to eliminate ignorance among the faithful and encourage

the clergy to bring forth good fruit. In those churches where the clergy was competent and the need the greatest, he urged that catechetical teaching be included as part of the liturgy and not be given separately before the liturgy began "so that the lessons might more easily find an audience."<sup>3</sup> This instruction could substitute for the sermon and there could be a designated time each Sunday for catechetical instruction both to insure continuity of instruction and to provide a definite place and time for those who wish to know the articles of their faith. The essential point, he argued, was that all instruction must be suited to the audience. At first it might be best to devote only ten or twenty minutes to this work, so that "the listeners are not overwhelmed by a long lesson."<sup>4</sup> Coherence and suitability were the most important qualities to be sought. A short sermon, putting forth the articles of faith in proper order, supported by only the most important proofs and explanations "with all possible adaption of thoughts, feelings, and language to the level of understanding and station of the listeners, along with the utmost care that nothing base, crass, or garbled be mixed with this simplicity," would accomplish far more than any mechanical recitation of the Creed.<sup>5</sup> He also suggested to the Synod that priests obtain, read, and take as their model St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Catechetical Lectures once the Synod had retranslated and reprinted them. As additional catechetical guides, he suggested Peter Mohyla's Orthodoxa Confessio Fidei, the Catechism of Dimitrii of Rostov, and Tikhon Zadonskii's On true Christianity. These suggestions were only partial measures "in expectation--upon the approval of the Holy Synod--of a catechism composed for the people...."<sup>6</sup>

Filaret was already seriously considering a new catechism for the Church. The appearance of the Gospels in Russian made such a popular manual even more compelling. Moreover, the Russian Church had had no complete statement of its doctrines in relation to the wider Christian community since Peter Mohyla's confession in the 17th century. What was needed was a catechism which was simple, direct, and concise, so that all Russians could understand it, and at the same time it must be complete enough to make clear to other Christian confessions the specific teachings of Orthodoxy. Each of these qualities had been embodied separately in the catechisms of Filaret's two most important predecessors: Peter Mohyla's Orthodoxa Confessio Fidei written in Latin circa 1640 and translated in full into Slavic only in 1696; and Metropolitan Platon (Levshin) six catechetical experiments.<sup>7</sup> From Mohyla Filaret adopted the form and fullness of presentation (with important modifications); while he continued Platon's efforts to present the teachings of the Church in simple, easily understood prose.

Mohyla's confession of faith was divided into three parts: Faith, Hope, and Love which discussed the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and the Decalogue respectively. This presentation was punctuated with polemical refutations of various Protestant doctrines, for the confession was actually a rejoinder to the Calvinist-inspired confession of Patriarch Cyril Lucaris. Moreover, Mohyla, writing during the intense struggle between Orthodox and Protestants in the Ukraine in the 17th century, did not hesitate to use Catholic scholastic weapons to counter his opponents.<sup>8</sup> Taken together, the polemical nature and Catholic scholastic tenor of the confession

made it undesirable for Filaret merely to translate it into a more contemporary language. Filaret was writing in a period of ecumenical pietism, not religious warfare. What Filaret retained from Mohyla was the threefold division of Faith, Hope, and Love, partly because it enjoyed the approval of the Eastern Patriarchs (although Mohyla's confession was not an ecumenical statement of faith) and partly because by doing so he reestablished a catechetical tradition which went back to St. Augustine. In any case, Filaret was definitely returning to early patristic sources: "A knowledge of the writings of the Holy Fathers, which is the most useful after a knowledge of Scriptures is not sufficiently widespread....," he wrote to his Moscow consistory in 1822.<sup>9</sup>

Filaret's new catechism, published by the Holy Synod a year later, at the beginning of 1823, was closer in spirit and content to Metropolitan Platon's catechisms. Platon composed six catechisms over a period of thirty years beginning in 1757-58 with A catechism, or primary instruction in Christian law, popularly explained.<sup>10</sup> This was followed by a more widely used Short catechism for instructing young children in Christian law.<sup>11</sup> Platon then published another Abbreviated catechism for instructing youths.<sup>12</sup> These three catechisms were all presented in simple language easily understood by those with little, if any, formal education. Simplicity made Platon's catechisms unique: they were the first catechisms published in Russia designed to be accessible to all. As a special handbook for the clergy, Platon wrote An abbreviated catechism for church servitors, with an appendix of passages from Scriptures, the Rules of the Holy Apostles and Holy Fathers, the Spiritual Regulation, and Oaths.<sup>13</sup> His purpose in

all of these catechisms was to express the theology of the Church in everyday language, not in the language of the schools: "The various systems of theology," he declared, "now taught in the schools smell of the schools and human erudition."<sup>14</sup> To this end he composed an Orthodox instruction, or an abbreviated Christian theology which was written as a textbook for Paul I.<sup>15</sup> His crowning work, however, was the catechism prepared under his supervision for the public schools established by Catherine II in 1786. This Detailed catechism for the instruction of youths in Orthodox Christian law was the most widely used catechism in Russia before Filaret's catechism was published in 1823.<sup>16</sup>

Like all of Platon's catechisms, the Detailed Catechism was designed to harmonize and blend the naturalistic theories of the 18th century Enlightenment with Christian teaching. This resulted in a kind of sentimental-moral humanism, which did not stress the sacramental or mysterious aspects of Christianity or the Church. The Church was simply "a society of men who believe in Jesus Christ ....and live according to His law."<sup>17</sup> Moreover, Platon's catechisms were on the whole incomplete and usually did not explain all of the articles of the Creed. The Lord's Prayer was omitted in several, and in the Abbreviated Catechism for youths, Platon omitted any discussion of the seven sacraments. When these omissions were later criticized, Filaret defended Platon's work by pointing out that "without a doubt the reason for these omissions in the catechisms was the brevity required in those times when it was necessary to inspire study by ease and brevity and not by intimidation with the difficulty and magnitude of the task."<sup>18</sup>

Platon's catechisms presented Filaret with models still worth considering, even though Filaret admitted that Platon wrote "when theological terminology in Russia was still not yet established" and even though the language in them "has already become slightly archaic."<sup>19</sup> He readily recognized the defects in Platon's work: "in several [of the catechisms] the Lord's Prayer was not included, in several only two or three sacraments are mentioned, the expression 'Holy Rituals' is encountered as applied to Baptism and the Eucharist, and he says nothing about traditions in suggesting that Holy Scripture is the basis of instruction in faith....These imprecisions, which the current age [1847] does not look kindly upon, should not remain: but it is difficult to handle with poor hands the work of good hands."<sup>20</sup> This was written much later, when Filaret himself had suffered for being imprecise about traditions, but this should not obscure the fact that Filaret admired Platon's attempts to put the teachings of the Church into the hands of every Russian and that he appreciated the difficulties which Platon faced. Brevity and simplicity were still needed; and the confrontation between Christianity and natural philosophy was still, in 1823, an important matter.

The tension between the revealed truth of Christianity and the natural proofs required by reason guided the organization of all Platon's catechisms and underlay his Orthodox instruction, or an abbreviated Christian theology, which was divided into two parts. The introductory first half deals with natural knowledge about God. In Platon's scheme this discussion of natural theology would then "lead" the student to the second section which dis-

cussed revealed theology. Although Filaret did not retain this twofold division in his 1823 catechism, he thought it sufficiently important to include it in his preface, pruned, to be sure, of some of Platon's ornate embellishments. This can be seen in a simple comparison of texts:

1) From Platon's Abbreviated theology:

Proof that God exists. Beginning with an examination of ourselves we learn first of all that we could not create ourselves. Therefore of necessity we must conclude that there must be and is something all mighty and not created from which I and other creatures have been made. And by this something, in the common understanding of all, we mean God. Moreover, a diligent study of this world shows God's existence. This world is like a theater which presents God's glory to us; it is like a book which preaches of its Creator; it is like a mirror, in which we see reflected the wisdom of God.

2) Introduction to Filaret's catechism (1823):

Q/uestion: How is it possible to know God?

A/nswer: Man can partially know about God, first by contemplating himself; second by contemplating the world.

Q/uestion: How?

A/nswer: We were all born: our parents came from their parents and so forth. By contemplating in this manner we come to the first people: and since it was impossible for them to bear or create themselves, then we know that the first people were created by God.

We note that in the world many things are destroyed while others proceed anew from older things. Contemplating this, we trace back to the beginning of the world, and we know that it received its foundation from God.

The artist conceived the work and always the artist is more perfect than the work. And because there is reason and goodness in man: then it is possible to know that God, his Creator, is wise and good; because there is beauty in the world, it is possible to know that God, its Creator, is the highest beauty; because God created all, it is possible to know that He is Almighty.<sup>21</sup>

Thus, stripped of its theaters, books, and mirrors, Platon's

teachings on natural theology were fully embodied in the new catechism. But it must be stressed that they were confined to the introduction only, for Filaret regarded natural theology as a pale candle alongside the bright sun of divine revelation.

2. The first edition of the Detailed Catechism, 1823: its format, content and character.

It has been contended that Filaret was asked to write a catechism so that he might be kept out of the serious work of the Holy Synod presided over by the new metropolitan of St. Petersburg, Serafim Glagolevskii.<sup>22</sup> If this is true, Filaret did not look upon his task as busy work, but rather as an important step toward bringing the Church and society closer themselves faithful, and, regrettably, this is found most among those who have the greatest pretensions to enlightenment."<sup>23</sup> In any case, it was at Serafim's suggestion in 1822 that Filaret began work on the catechism, which was published in early 1823 under full title: Khristianskii katikhizis pravoslavnyiia kafolicheskiiia vostochnyia Greko-Rossiiskiiia tserkvi. Although Filaret wrote it, it was thoroughly examined by Metropolitan Serafim and the other members of the Holy Synod before being submitted to the tsar for approval. After publication by the Holy Synodal printing office, it was offered to the public as the official catechism of the Holy Governing Synod and not simply as a private statement of faith by Filaret. Filaret was awarded the Order of St. Alexander Nevsky, and an accompanying imperial rescript commended him for his "outline, in the spirit of the Orthodox Eastern Church and with the understanding of the truth of the Gospels, of the Cat-

echism approved by the Holy Synod."<sup>24</sup>

The new catechism was written in simple Russian, in the belief that in this way the teachings of the Church might be more easily understood and consequently play a greater role in daily life. All passages in the Catechism quoted from the Bible were either taken from the new Russian translation of the New Testament or translated from Old Testament manuscripts by Filaret according to the translation rules he established for the Russian Bible. He also supplied new translations of the writings of the Church Fathers where necessary. No Slavic constructions were allowed in the text, even where retaining the older phrasing would present little difficulty.<sup>25</sup> Thus, the new catechism contained accurate, scholarly translations of Scriptures in the context of an easily understood prose. It is difficult to convey this simple style in English translation, but a short passage from the Creed may give some idea of the original text:

1. I believe in one God, the Father, who is Almighty, the Creator of heaven and earth, of everything visible and invisible; 2. I believe in the one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, Who was born of the Father before all ages, Light from Light, true God from true God; begotten and not created; Who is of one being with the Father; by Whom all was created; 3. Who for men, for our salvation, descended from heaven, took the flesh from the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, and became man; 4. Who was crucified for us by Pontius Pilate, suffered, and was buried; 5. Who, on the testimony of Scripture, rose on the third day; 6. Who ascended to heaven and sits on the right hand of God; Who will come again to judge the living and the dead; Whose kingdom will be without end; 8. I believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord who creates life, Who proceeds from the Father, Whom we worship and praise together with the Father and the Son; and Who spoke through the Prophets; 9. I believe in the one Holy and Apostolic Church; 10. I acknowledge one

baptism for forgiveness of sins; 11. I expect a resurrection of the dead; 12. And life in a future age.  
Amen.26

The format of the catechism was similar to the Russian edition of the Gospels: the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and the Decalogue were printed in parallel Russian and Slavic columns. Large type was used where central teachings were expressed (these passages were later excerpted and reassembled as a Abbreviated Catechism), while small type was used to convey ideas of secondary importance. Printed in octavo, it consisted of 204 pages. The parallel printing of the Slavic and Russian versions of the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Decalogue was a precaution against any outcry from the Old Believers and it was also intended to serve as a transition from the sound and rhythm of the old Slavic translation. Paradoxically this break with the Slavic tradition was done in order that the living religious tradition might be reestablished with the Church; in order that the idiom of the Church might once again coincide with the idiom of the faithful.

Filaret's catechism expressed several ideas--most notably his conception of the Church-- which were compatible with the religious awakening in Russia during the first decades of the 19th century. The same spiritual revival which inspired Alexander I to create a new Christian Nation composed of all the individual nations of Christendom as one federation ruled over by the True Sovereign of all Christian people, Jesus Christ Himself, also inspired Filaret to provide an ecumenical definition in his catechism for the Church. Like Alexander, he stressed Christian unity. But Alexander thought of Christian unity in religious-political terms, while Filaret focused his attention on the Church, that

"society of men established by God and united by Orthodox faith, the law of God, the hierarchy, and the Sacraments."<sup>27</sup> This is the Church of Christ, not just the Russian Orthodox Church. Those who belong to it partake of the grace which flows from its Head, Jesus Christ. The Church, as Filaret presents it in his catechism, is the Body of Christ, mysteriously constructed in invisible and visible parts. It is invisible because it contains the Grace of God and visible because "it is on earth and all orthodox Christians who live on earth belong to it."<sup>28</sup> It is visible because we are a part of its earthly organization, but the Church "is also in heaven and all who died in the true faith and sanctity belong to it."<sup>29</sup> The Church, Christ's Body, is one: "because it is one spiritual body, it has one head, Christ, and is inspired only by God's Spirit...."<sup>30</sup> The individual churches, Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Russia, are members as "partial churches; parts of one Ecumenical Church. The division of the visible organization does not prevent them from being great members of one body of the Ecumenical Church, to have one head, Christ, and one spirit of faith and grace. This unity is visibly expressed by the uniformity of confession of faith and communion in prayers and sacraments."<sup>31</sup> However, this was only a partial statement about the mysterious composition of the Church, limited to the eastern churches. The catechism was not the place for a broader discussion of his vision.

In his Conversations between a seeker and a believer concerning the truth of the Eastern Greco-Russian Church (1815), Filaret elaborated on the wider membership in the true, mysterious Church. This book was originally written as the result of Fil-

aret's talks with A.M. Golitsyn, the sixteen year old nephew of Prince A.N. Golitsyn, who doubted the orthodoxy of the Orthodox Church and was considering conversion to Catholicism.<sup>32</sup> The book was to be a guide to Orthodox who were subject to strong Catholic pressure. The seeker is uncertain which Church teaches what is pleasing to God and necessary for salvation. In the course of the conversations about the Creed, Filaret discusses the relationship of the Eastern Orthodox Church to other Christian churches. This passage is worth quoting at some length, for it is very characteristic of Filaret's thought and provides the broader perspective in which his catechetical teaching about the Church must be seen:

Seeker: May I really believe in what is not mentioned in the Eastern Creed [the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed]?

Believer: You may believe that about which it does not speak, but which is included in a clear or mysterious way in the Holy Scriptures, and consequently is in the spirit of this Creed.

Seeker: For example?

Believer: For example, you say in the Creed: 'I confess one baptism'; but you do not say: 'I confess the sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood.' However, you can and must believe the latter along with the former.

Seeker: I understand. You wish to say that in as much as the Creed, which confirms known truths, does not exclude or reject others which are not word for word contained in it--then consequently there are no grounds for fear that it does not prohibit you to believe such things which God commands to be believed.

But everything you have said until now about the Eastern Church and its teachings hardly, if at all, serve to refute the teachings of other Christian Churches.

Believer: It was not my intention to refute the other churches.

Seeker: But in order to prefer one Church to others with different teachings, they must be refuted.

Believer: Have you thought what you are asking me? What does it mean to refute churches with different

teachings?

Seeker: To show and make manifest that certain known churches are unorthodox, that is, they do not have the right teachings about faith.

Believer: An what do you call acts by which it is shown and made manifest who is right and who is wrong?

Seeker: Call it what you will: I hope there is no disagreement on this point.

Believer: I call it judgment.

Seeker: I won't quarrel with that.

Believer: But you demand that I show and make manifest that certain churches are wrong.

Seeker: Yes.

Believer: Then you wish that I pronounce judgment on certain churches?

Seeker: Well, what of it? Do you think to astound me with such an expression?

Believer: No, I myself am astounded by God's Word: 'Judge not, that you be not judged.' Mat. 7,1. 'Therefore do not pronounce judgement before the time, before the Lord comes, who will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purposes of the heart.' I Cor., 4,5....

Thus, examine yourself: Do you dwell in the faith of the heart? Or, to put it another way, does Jesus Christ dwell in you? And if it the fait of the heart does not appear in you, then examine further: is there not something affected in you, that is, is there not in you a too free disposition which prevents the act of faith and union with Jesus Christ? The humble Christian always finds such defects, and therefore is always and everywhere engaged in judging himself. But in this way, the humble more easily and faithfully examine the purity of faith and the Church, unblinded by self-conceit and pride of reason....See how simply the holy apostle John teaches people to examine their confession of faith: 'do not believe every spirit, test the spirits to see whether they are of God. By this you will know the Spirit of God, and every spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God.'

Seeker: By this acknowledgment, the Eastern and Western Churches are both of God: for each confesses Jesus Christ who came in the flesh; however, these two churches each have different teachings.

Believer: Yes, each of them has a special spirit or a peculiar relation to the Spirit of God. 33

Both the catechism and these conversations present a statement about the Church consonant with the ecumenical mood of pietist and mystical revival in Europe. Filaret's definition of the Church as the mysterious Body of Christ required of other churches no more than a confession of belief in Christ for membership. He would not "pronounce judgement before the time" and he admonished others "for your part do not give cause for faction and hostility among believers in one God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit."<sup>34</sup> The visible differences between the members of Christ's Body he explained as mysterious expressions of their "peculiar relation to the Spirit of God."

While it is important to stress the similarity between Filaret's outlook and that of his age, he was also guided by the writings of the Church Fathers, especially Saint Augustine. There is a recognizable connection between Filaret's division of the Church into visible and invisible parts and Saint Augustine's conception of the unity of the heavenly and earthly churches:

The whole Church is to be understood here, not only that part which is in pilgrimage upon the earth... but also that part which ever since its foundation has always remained steadfast to God and has never experienced any evil consequent upon a fall. This part, made up of holy angels, has abided in blessedness and gives assistance, as is meet, to that part which is in pilgrimage. The two parts will make one fellowship in eternity, and are now one in the bond of charity, ordained together as a whole for the worship of God.<sup>35</sup>

Filaret also had the same understanding of the mysterious construction of the Church presented by Augustine in his Handbook on Faith, Hope, and Charity (Enchiridion de fide, spe et caritate) as the Body of Christ (although both were following Saint Paul):

It is God, therefore, who dwells in His temple; not

only the Holy Spirit, but also the Father and the Son, who also says of His body, through which He was made the Head of the Church which is among men ('That in all things He may have first place'): 'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.'<sup>36</sup>

In his catechism, Filaret also included quotations from Saint Cyril of Jerusalem's Catechetical Lectures as well as from Saint Dionysius the Areopagite, Basil the Great, and Gregory the Great Theologian (the latter two are invoked as authorities on natural theology). Thus, Filaret's thought, expressed in his catechism and elsewhere, included a wide familiarity with the Fathers of the Church. Armed with his mysterious concept of the Church derived from Saint Augustine, he attempted to formulate the doctrines of the Russian Church in relation to the wider Christian community: it was the first significant attempt to do so since Mohyla's Confession was written in the 17th century.

### 3. The shifting ecclesiastical background.

While Filaret's personal efforts to bring the Church and Russian society closer together were moving steadily forward during these years in St. Petersburg, there was growing apprehension among the hierarchy over the direction taken by the state in religious affairs. In October, 1817, a new government department, the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Education, was created in order to give institutional expression to the abstract ideals of the Holy Alliance concluded by the Emperor in Paris in 1815. The Holy Alliance and the new ministry were directed toward the same goal: to establish society in Europe as a whole and in Russia in particular on the firm foundation of religious piety. The new

"dual" or "combined" ministry was to achieve this end by combining religion and science; by merging faith and knowledge:

Desiring that Christian piety always be the basis of true enlightenment, We deem it useful to combine the affairs of the Ministry of Education with those of all religious confessions under one Administration, entitled the Ministry Religious Affairs and Education. The affairs of the Holy Governing Synod will be attached to it and it will have the same relation to the Synod as the Ministry of Justice has to the Governing Synod except, however, in judicial matters.<sup>36a</sup>

The metropolitan of St. Petersburg, Amvrosii (Podobedov, 1742-1818), whose education and outlook had largely been formed during the reign of Catherine II, seemed curiously out of step with the pietist revolution of the capital and the mystical elasticity of Prince Golitsyn, the new head of this Combined Ministry.<sup>36b</sup> He distrusted the motives of Golitsyn and Alexander from the outset of this program: "When the great war [of 1812] aroused a religious and patriotic spirit," Filaret later wrote to A.N. Murav'ev, "when the Blessed Emperor Alexander returned at its end to the Fatherland filled with religious feeling and faith in all-guiding Divine Providence, I said to Metropolitan Amvrosii, 'It seems a favorable time is beginning for the Church as well as for the Fatherland.' He replied, 'You are still inexperienced. Wait and see what happens! Alas! The metropolitan was experienced and saw into the dim future.'<sup>37</sup> Under considerable pressure from Golitsyn, Amvrosii wrote to Alexander in Warsaw where he was attending the opening of the Polish diet and asked him for permission to retire to Novgorod. Alexander consented on 26 March 1818. Amvrosii died two months later.<sup>38</sup>

The same day Alexander allowed Amvrosii to retire, he appointed Mikhail Desnitskii, archbishop of Chernigov, to replace Amvrosii

in St. Petersburg because "the services you have rendered and the exemplary piety which adorns your soul have always brought you to My attention."<sup>39</sup> Under the circumstances, Mikhail obviously had more appeal to Golitsyn, for he was highly regarded as a mystical and sentimental sermonist in the fashion of the late 18th century. As a young man he had joined the "Society of Friends of Learning" founded by Novikov and Schwarz to remedy the moral and spiritual ills of Russia. Mikhail wrote on such themes as "the description of the old, outer man of the flesh, and the new man of the spirit"; a "lamentation of a Christian over the spiritual captivity of Israel"; "conversations on the various degrees of the true action of God's grace, based on the 50th psalm of David"; and "the labor, nourishment, and peace of the human spirit."<sup>40</sup> These themes expressed Mikhail's expectation of the spiritual kingdom of Jerusalem which was to descend on earth, bringing new mysteries, a new church, a new sanctity, and a new love; in short, a complete renewal of society.<sup>41</sup> But Mikhail's mysticism was more inclined to quiet contemplation of God and prayers than to the religious ecstasy of some of the leading mystics of Alexander's reign. Golitsyn soon became convinced that Mikhail was not sufficiently expressive of the new religion. "I know your excellency was dissatisfied with Mikhail when he did not rewrite his sermons to your taste," Labzin wrote to Golitsyn in 1823.<sup>42</sup> Still, Mikhail was favorably disposed to the translation of the Bible, and like Amvrosii before him, participated in the work of the translation committee, using his authority "to speed the completion of this work."<sup>43</sup>

As metropolitan, Mikhail attempted to keep some distance be-

tween himself and those closely associated with Prince Golitsyn, including Filaret, who was then Mikhail's vicar:

From the time he became metropolitan he wanted to send me to Kamenets-Podol'sk. I told him that as long as my position [as vicar] was not too burdensome, I was ready to serve in that office; but if your holiness has someone else in mind and desires to replace me with another, it is more than enough to appoint me to a second class diocese and I will be satisfied with a third class one. There the matter stopped, but he still did not trust me.<sup>44</sup>

Golitsyn's powerful position as head of the Dual Ministry overshadowed Mikhail, who, according to Vigel', "was known for his meekness."<sup>45</sup> There was little he was able to do to restrain Golitsyn's wrath against those among the clergy opposed to his plans. Filaret's good friend Innokentii (Smirnov), who was then head of the censorship committee at the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, had attempted to use the censorship to stem the flow of mystical books which he felt threatened the teachings of the Church. He criticized Jung-Stilling's Triumphal Song, or Commentary on the Apocalypse, "the first five books of which," according to Filaret, "were remarkable, but which were infused entirely with a Protestant spirit, especially when dealing with the councils."<sup>46</sup> When this effort did not result in the removal of Stilling's book from circulation, Innokentii refused to review in the Academy censorship committee a catechetical-like book entitled The fundamental basis of the Christian religion for the use of young people designed for those schools under the authority of the Dual Ministry.<sup>47</sup> Golitsyn insisted on approval and appealed to Filaret to present his own special opinion to the committee. Filaret could do nothing but inform Golitsyn that "according to the statute of the Academy,

the censorship does not depend on me and I have no right to present my opinion."<sup>48</sup> Innokentii was convinced that Golitsyn was attempting to go behind the back of the Holy Synod, and insisted that since the book was a "catechetical work" it properly belonged in the censorship committee of the Holy Synod. Shortly afterward, Innokentii permitted the publication of a book by Stanevich, An address on the immortal soul at the grave of a youth, which was an attack on Fenelon and the Swiss mystic DuToit, whose book, Divine Philosophy, had just been printed in Russian at the tsar's expense. Golitsyn, to put it mildly, was furious. He immediately sent a rebuke to the Commission on Theological Schools which supervised the Academy censorship committee:

I must admit my amazement that a book with this content could be approved by the ecclesiastical censorship; the author...works up a defense for our Greco-Russian Church before anyone has attacked it. The Church needs no private person to take it under his protection....The defense of the outer Church against the inner Church pervades the entire book: an incomprehensible division in Christianity! For the outer Church without the inner is a body without a soul.... Therefore I have presented this book with my notations to the Sovereign Emperor for examination. His excellency is extremely dissatisfied that the censorship at the Theological Academy, after its new reform, could approve a book imbued with such a spirit. The censor, Archimandrite Innokentii, who examined it, is to be given a severe reprimand for his thoughtlessness.... The Sovereign Emperor hopes the Commission on Theological Schools will take appropriate measures, so that such writings, which strive to eliminate the teachings of the inner spirit of Christianity, cannot emerge from the censorship of its department.<sup>49</sup>

Stanevich was exiled from the capital. Through the good offices of Princess Meshcherskaia, Mikhail was able to save Innokentii from exile as the new bishop of Orenburg and obtain his appointment as bishop of Penza. But it was clear from this episode who had the initiative in the administration of the Church. The

metropolitan could do little more than appeal to the tsar, which he did just before his death in 1821. According to Vigel', Mikhail wrote to the tsar at Verona describing "eloquently, convincingly, and movingly the danger to which the Greco-Russian Church was subject."<sup>50</sup>

Filaret, too, was worried that Golitsyn's activities were beginning to get out of hand. Shortly after Mikhail's death (21 March 1821), he wrote to Count S.P. Potemkin (the grandson of Catherine's lover), that

a few days before his [Mikhail's] death, someone dreamed that a great pillar with a crown-like capital toppled with a crash: in my opinion the dream is correct. I cannot describe this event, which like a fog has concealed the sun from me for several days, or else held up the saddest prospects before me. Still, God's firm foundations are not borne up by men. At last I have deduced from all this some rules which comfort me. One is stay clear of as much as possible. For the sake of many, pray with us that the Lord gives us a man with the spirit and strength of Elijah; penance must be preached and forbearance in Christ; there must be charity and comfort without any hope for personal comfort.<sup>51</sup>

Certainly Filaret's position during this period was exceedingly difficult. He never denied that Prince Golitsyn was his benefactor, "but I did not permit myself to agree with him on everything."<sup>52</sup> When Madame Tatarinov's "circle" published a book favorable to the Castrates (Skoptsy), a religious sect which made its first appearance in Russia during Catherine's reign, Golitsyn sent ten copies of the book to Filaret for distribution in his Iaroslavl' diocese. Filaret, despite Golitsyn's protestations, refused to send them out, although he paid the required ten rubles. "As a churchman," he explained, "I could not act otherwise."<sup>53</sup> At Golitsyn's suggestion, Filaret decided to correct the book, but

without telling Mikhail, "for I was little trusted by him in our relations."<sup>54</sup> Steering a course between Scylla and Charybdis, Filaret could claim few friends and supporters on any side.

When Alexander returned to St. Petersburg from the congress at Verona, he appointed Metropolitan Serafim (Glagolevskii, 1757-1843) of Moscow to succeed Mikhail as the St. Petersburg metropolitan. Serafim's background was similar to Mikhail's. He had attended the Holy Trinity Seminary and the Slavono-Greco-Latin Academy in Moscow and together with Mihail attended lectures at Moscow University while joining Novikov's Society of Friends of Learning. After he became a monk, he began to climb the hierarchical ladder. During the Napoleonic invasion, his Minsk diocese was overrun by the Grand Army and Serafim was called to St. Petersburg to attend the meetings of the Holy Synod. At the same time he became a temporary member of the Commission on Theological Schools and was elected as a vice-president of the Bible Society. His later repudiation of the Bible Society was grounded in ecclesiastical considerations rather than any theological or philosophical opposition to the idea of Biblical translation. In any case, that same year (1814) he was appointed archbishop of Tver' and five years later became metropolitan of Moscow.

Filaret's relations with Serafim were correct but strained. The Commission on Theological Schools had instructed Filaret in the summer of 1820 to attend the final examination of the second graduating class under the new statute at the Moscow Theological Academy. He was also instructed to appoint new inspectors to visit the other schools of the Moscow diocese. These acts seemed directly to impinge on Serafim's authority in his own diocese, especially

since he had already appointed inspectors for the Moscow Theological Seminary and Vithanii Seminary.<sup>55</sup>

Serafim was apparently less than anxious to assume his new honor as metropolitan of St. Petersburg. When Princess Meshcherskaia read him a letter preceding the official appointment, he said, "Not there! Mikhail was healthier than I, and he lasted only three years; in my condition, I'll be dead in six months."<sup>56</sup> Serafim's appointment was regarded as a sign that some effort was going to be made to free the Church from the "Egyptian yoke" of the Dual Ministry.<sup>57</sup> Filaret wrote to Count Potemkin that "by agreeing to the transfer, he [Serafim] is making a pure sacrifice."<sup>58</sup> He hoped Serafim's old age would command respect and his humility make it possible to avoid any open quarrel. But he was as uncertain as Serafim what lay ahead for the new metropolitan in St. Petersburg. "May the Lord do everything for the good of the Church!" he wrote on 11 June 1821.

Serafim's arrival in St. Petersburg in August of 1821 marks the beginning of the "uprising", as Filaret called it, against the seemingly all-powerful Prince Golitsyn, the Dual Ministry, and the Bible Society. He contributed to the uprising primarily by lending his authority to those able to bring down the "blind minister." Vigel' describes Serafim as a "wise old man, both clever and steadfast," and this assessment seems close to the mark, but Serafim's horizons were narrow.<sup>59</sup> He was prepared to sacrifice, at least temporarily, the wider interests of the Church to the immediate aim of overthrowing Golitsyn. He was even willing to lie. However, he was not the leading spokesman for the reaction against the pietist revolution. The ideological attack

was taken up by two others: Archimandrite Fotii and Admiral Shishkov; and behind them all was Arakcheev.

4. Critics of Filaret's Catechism: Archimandrite Fotii and Admiral A.S. Shishkov.

The publication of Filaret's catechism in early 1823 provided Fotii and Shishkov with an opportunity to discredit the translation work of the Bible Society, indirectly attack Golitsyn, and embarrass one of his few friends among the hierarchy. On the surface there seemed to be no question or disagreement about Filaret's catechism even as late as December, 1824. There had been some minor changes in mid-1823, and, even though this was done without Filaret's prior knowledge, these changes did not seem to signal any radical departure from the current attitude of the Synod toward Filaret's work. On the contrary, Metropolitan Serafim wrote to Filaret in Moscow that Golitsyn had come to him with a request from the Empress Dowager, Maria Feodorovna, that she might be allowed to provide the catechism to the various institutes under her protection. Serafim not only recommended the catechism to the Empress Dowager, he also encouraged Arakcheev to supply copies of it for his village at Gruzino. He passed a resolution in the Synod requiring the Detailed Catechism and the Abbreviated Catechism be used in the Novogorod and St. Petersburg dioceses in all examinations of candidates for clerical offices.<sup>60</sup> The Synod made the catechism a required text in the lower grades of the ecclesiastical schools.

Rumors, however, began to spread in the summer of 1823 that Filaret was now out of favor in the capital. "They speak un-

flatteringly" about him and "in St. Peter[sburg] he is a little boring," wrote Simeon Krylov to Parfenii Chertkov...<sup>61</sup> The least flattering remarks about Filaret's work came from Archimandrite Fotii:

In the city of the Holy Peter there is much water: 1) the River Neva; and how good and pure is the water in it! It has three main branches (no matter if it has additional sources); 2) there are the canals--three or four or more, I don't know. But what kind of water is in them? Water, but canal water. What kind? Everybody knows about that. 3) The River Neva is the catechism of Petr Mohyla and the three branches are the parts about faith, hope, and love. But the canal water is this catechism which you [A.A. Pavlov] sent me. The people drink canal water.<sup>62</sup>

This outburst requires some explanation.

a. Archimandrite Fotii.

Archimandrite Fotii (1792-1836) was born on Sunday during the fast of the Apostles Peter and Paul (that is, on 6 June 1792) in the district of Novogorod and the parish of Spasskii. His Christian name before he became a monk was Petr, and he was given a surname, Spasskii, after his parish, by the Rector of St. Antonii's monastery seminary in Novgorod, where Fotii entered school at the age of eleven. Fotii came from a poor clerical home. His father had been a deacon, but when Fotii's mother died, his father gave up the position in order that he might marry again and provide a mother for his two sons Evthimii and Petr. When Fotii showed promise as a student, he was enrolled at St. Antonii. After graduation, he was sent to St. Petersburg to the theological academy under Filaret's supervision.

In his remarkable Autobiography, Fotii repeatedly states that

"in his heart he [Fotii writes in the third person] always had the intention to dress in the angelic image and accept an angelic dwelling," that is, to become a monk. No doubt this desire easily placed him in the good graces of Filaret and Innokentii at the St. Petersburg Academy, for they were both dedicated to the monastic revival inspired by Tkhon Zadonskii in the 18th century. At any rate, Fotii was strongly attracted to asceticism (which he adapted to his own peculiar vision). During an earlier brief stay in St. Petersburg (1803), Fotii had glimpsed two anchorites who deeply impressed him. Later "he learned that there had been no anchorites in the Laura [the Alexander Nevsky Monastery] for over one hundred years."<sup>63</sup> Filaret and Innokentii were his models of monastic life: "Innokentii and Filaret were constantly like two living lamps in his eyes."<sup>64</sup> Monasticism suggested to Fotii a purely orthodox form of religious practice free from foreign contamination. Of course he was plagued by the same questions which troubled the other students at the St. Petersburg Theological Academy: which is the true path to salvation? Do foreign authors provide the answers? Is the millennial kingdom of Christ on earth about to begin? Do the prophetic and mystical books of Jung-Stilling, Eckharthaüsen, and others actually contain true knowledge about the impending awful events? These questions were part of the religious awakening and brooding of Alexander's reign. But wasn't it possible that these same authors were agents of the anti-Christ? Two characteristic moments in Fotii's studies in 1816 illustrate his uneasy state of mind. Through a friend he smuggled out a copy of Stilling's Triumphal Song from Filaret's room without his knowledge. Stilling's prophecies about Christ's

coming and the fate of the Church "compelled Petr [Fotii] to read this book, but he was afraid of harm." At once he realized the book was "an apostasy from faith."<sup>65</sup> During summer work as a tutor, he systematically taught the Gospel according to Matthew, where it speaks of "the coming of Christ to earth for judgement and about the uncertainty of the hour, day, and date of his coming...."<sup>66</sup>

Paradoxically, Fotii combined his determined dislike of foreign books, his monastic asceticism, and his apocalyptic forebodings with an intense Biblicism derived from foreign influences. This is surely not the only paradox of Russian religious life during Alexander's reign, but it is a very characteristic one. Perhaps unknowingly, he shared the prevailing belief inspired by various Protestant currents entering Russia for more than a century that the Bible alone was the source for salvation. "Holy Father," he once said to Innokentii, "I have no books of the Holy Fathers, I do not read modern books and sermons, I cannot endure secular books; I have only the Holy Bible and I read it."<sup>67</sup>

Filaret's claim that the uprising of 1824 was carried out for personal considerations was not entirely true for Fotii. He believed he was saving the Church from foreign paramours of the anti-Christ, and his hysterical language was simply a part of his sense of impending catastrophe. His hostility to the translation of the Bible was grounded in his fear of the Beast and fear for the Church. This explains why Fotii condemned Filaret's work, even though he admired Filaret in other respects, as can be seen in this description he has left of Filaret:

He was of middle height, dark complexioned, with long dark hair and a long beard. His face was always bright; he seemed happy. His eyes were sharp and piercing. He had a wan, strict, yet pleasing countenance. His walk was dignified and unhurried. His voice was quiet and thin, but clear, and his speech distinct, for he spoke incisively in an elevated manner, and wisely too, but more to the mind than to the heart. He freely elucidated Scripture as though it simply flowed from his mouth. He completely won over his students by his ability to speak, so that when the class hour was over, there still remained a great desire to listen to him, even if it meant foregoing food and drink.<sup>68</sup>

Fotii recognized Filaret as the "strength, glory, distinction, and honor of our Academy" even though many other students told "shabby stories" about him and "few loved him." He declared that Filaret was "the most learned man of his time and the creator of all the outstanding ecclesiastical schools."<sup>69</sup> Moreover, Fotii did not question Filaret's personal orthodoxy and could discover nothing un-Christian in Filaret even when he lived near Filaret at the Alexander Nevsky monastery and "secretly" watched him:

Fotii always lived close to Filaret...and not too often, but frequently he went to visit him Filaret. Filaret was always benevolent toward him, and Fotii had great respect for him: he always bent an ear to hear a prayer. Fotii never heard a word from his lips against either the orthodox faith or against the eastern Church of Christ. He was silent, kind, quiet, his every word had weight and force. The man was filled with great learning: judged ...by his words, conversations, manner of living, one cannot but respect him as a great lamp of learning.<sup>70</sup>

His learning, orthodoxy, and kindness were not enough, however, to save him from Fotii's wrath, for Filaret had participated in the work of the Bible Society and knowingly permitted the corruption of the Holy Bible by advocating it be translated into "simple Russian speech." This work indelibly stained him, for he could see the errors in the new translation which were abso-

lutely contrary to the Greek original which had been purified by the Church in earlier centuries. These errors (Fotii makes no specific references) cannot be ascribed to Labzin, Popov, or any other members of the Bible Society, for they would never have been able to make Filaret accept them. These secular men "were not wrothy to even pull off his boots."<sup>71</sup> Serafim and Mikhail, who had signed the foreword to the translated New Testament were not guilty, for they had no real knowledge of Greek. Of course they could have erred through ignorance. But the fact is that Filaret "whose every word had weight and force even in simple conversation" would never have allowed their ignorance to interfere with the translation. "He has himself to blame for the eclipse of his worldly glory before God and his shining glory on earth."<sup>72</sup> He saw the errors in the translation and kept silent.

Fotii sincerely believed that he was the divinely appointed defender of Orthodoxy and the Church. He linked his monastic name to Patriarch Photius "a wise man and a pillar of Christ's Church" who was removed from his office for his unswerving devotion to the Church.<sup>73</sup> Fotii saw himself as the sole obstacle between the Church and the angels of Satan: Labzin, "the mad woman Krudener," and the "pagan goddess" Madame Tatarinova. He relates a very symptomatic dream of an all night vigil in a chapel where he stood alone with the royal doors to the altar ajar:

I stood in full priestly vestments before the holy throne, serving God and praying. Then I saw Labzin, dressed in a simple gray peasant shirt...enter the church and desire to run to the royal doors. Seeing nothing to prevent him, he ran toward them, and as he drew nearer to me, I turned around, seized him by the shoulders, turned his face, and threw him from the holy altar, saying: Godless enemy, you must not enter through the royal doors and be at the Holy Altar....<sup>74</sup>

The symbolism is obvious enough, and it gives some insight into Fotii's psychological state of mind. Everything connected with the mystics, the Bible Society, the Dual Ministry, and Golitsyn was filtered through this apocalyptic lens. Thus, when Filaret's catechism, written in "simple Russian speech" and based upon the false New Testament of the Bible Society (which like Labzin was attempting to overturn the Holy Altar of the Church), Fotii attacked it as polluted "canal water."

b. Admiral Shishkov: the Russian Diotrepes.

"And here is Shishkov pale over the Saints."  
--Bludov.

By 1824, Prince Golitsyn's position was greatly shaken. On 15 May, the combined Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs was for all practical purposes dissolved, when Admiral Shishkov replaced Golitsyn as Minister of Education, while the office of Minister of Religious Affairs was left vacant. The Synod reverted to its old position before the new ministry was created in October, 1817.<sup>75</sup> Simultaneously, Metropolitan Serafim replaced Golitsyn as president of the Russian Bible Society. But the Bible Society was not closed, and in Moscow, under Filaret's direction, it remained active, publishing its monthly Izvestia on its work. The "half-dead Shishkov" (Vigel'), exhumed to replace Golitsyn, directed his first efforts at suppressing the work of the Moscow branch of the Bible Society. (Serafim had already made it clear to the St. Petersburg society that he did not intend to allow the society to be very active.) Shishkov also declared Filaret's new catechism to be unorthodox. Neither the Bible Society nor the catechism

were actually within the sphere of Shishkov's authority, and he quickly became guilty of the same interference in religious affairs for which he had condemned Golitsyn. Nevertheless, Shishkov outlined his objections to all of Filaret's work in a letter to Arakcheev on 2 November 1824:

In my previous letters I had the honor to explain to your excellency about the persisting endeavors to continue the meetings of the Bible Society and to distribute, not a translation, but so to speak, a transposition [perekladka] of the Holy Scriptures from a high and dignified language into simple popular speech: the two most powerful weapons of revolutionary designs. At present I consider myself obligated to send to you the latest evidence, namely; the monthly publication of a book entitled Izvestiia of these societies, where their affairs are extolled to heaven; and another: the Abbreviated Catechism which was printed here at the Synodal printing office apparently in eighteen thousand copies. I have reason to beg your excellency to report on this to the Sovereign Emperor and take prompt measures so that the publication of the former book and the distribution of the latter be stopped at least until they have been closely examined. For if the latter [the catechism] is sent everywhere, then the actions which it will produce cannot be averted. I will not mention several rules incorporated in it which are not quite in harmony with the teachings of our Church, but I will only touch on the most important prayers included in it which constitute our religious education and with which every father instructs his son who is just beginning to jabber the prayers in which everything must seem inviolable and holy. Prayers such as the Lord's Prayer, I believe in the one God the Father [the Creed] and also the Lord's Commandments have been transposed into simple speech, altered, and for the most powerful effect deliberately printed with Church [that is, Slavic] letters. This only shows for what purpose such an enormous number have been printed.<sup>76</sup>

The purpose, obviously, was revolution.

Admiral Alexander Semionovich Shishkov (1754-1841), "our first Slavophile" according to Vigel', was the outstanding exponent of the purity of "Slavono-Russian language" which he saw being contaminated by the new "Russian" translation of the Bible, psalter, and catechism.<sup>77</sup> The new Bible and the new catechism were not, in

his eyes, so much a religious heresy as a "literary heresy."<sup>78</sup> This new translation was an entirely unneeded innovation, inspired by the example of western European literature which was being so slavishly imitated in Russia. At best, he thought that the very idea of a distinct Russian language was a myth, at worst it was a weapon for revolutionary upheaval.

Following Lomonosov, Shishkov distinguished three kinds of language in Russia: first, an ancient and exalted language which was the source of all modern languages, although it was concerned with spiritual contemplation and reflection. Contemporary language, he argued, derives its grandeur and strength from this ancient, archtypal language. A second kind is the national language [narodnyi iazyk] which is not so much exalted as holy, and often it is the source of a kind of concealed "sweetness of the heart." A third kind is an artificial grafting onto the language "from writing we did not possess" which had been flowing into Russia "for more than a century." This writing was of course western European and adopted in Russia along with western ideas and western preoccupations with the result that "we diverted ourselves from our own affairs."<sup>79</sup>

Shishkov contended that there were two important aspects to this Slavono-Russian language, the national language: "We have a Slavonic and a Russian language, one and the same thing, only divided into exalted and simple parts." Literary or colloquial Russian is the simple national dialect, but it does not exist separately from Slavonic: "Would it not be strange to affirm the existence of a language in which there does not exist a single word...?"<sup>80</sup> Slavonic, that is, the "exalted and learned language,"

is the language of books and can only be learned through reading. It is also the language of the Church and of faith, while colloquial language is the language of the "passions" and the "theater." Both are constituent parts of a single language, but they must be kept separate. The "transposition" [perekkladka] of the one into the other would lead to the death of both. Thus, the holy, exalted language of the Slavonic Bible would be immediately drained of its inspirational content if it were "transposed" into the language of the street or the theater. Orthodoxy, for Shishkov, was contained in the Slavonic words themselves. Any alteration would do irreparable damage: after all, the Slavonic Bible was "from the mouth of God." "How dare [they] alter words considered to come from the mouth of God."<sup>81</sup>

With such an understanding of the Bible, it is not surprising that Shishkov had neither patience with nor understanding of Biblical scholarship. The new translation of the Bible, the new catechism, expounded in what he considered the language of the passions, had as their basis the Greek and Hebrew texts of the Bible. This alone, in his view, was enough to destroy the Bible: not only was the new translation a mangled work of literature which obliterated its holy inspiration, it was not even based on Slavonic, the language--in its archetypal form--in which God had chosen to speak to men. "The pride of some monk [Filaret] or learned braggart says: thus it is in the Hebrew. Well, who will convince me that he knows the full force of such a little known language written so long in the past."<sup>82</sup> Worse still, the new translation was hasty, "thrown to a few students at the academy with instructions to do it as fast as possible." All of these

things together would ruin the Bible and undermine all confidence in its teachings. In any case, the Bible Society, at the very best, was laboring under a misconception. Wide distribution of the Bible in its new form was not helpful. It would not bring one additional soul to salvation. The new Bible, printed in such large numbers, was costly, wasteful, and harmful, for it would "act no more on the human mind than on the human heart."<sup>83</sup> Without the proper guidance of the clergy, the prodigious increase in the number of Bibles could only result in misinterpretations and probably indifference. When the Bible is found in every home it will become a mere piece of furniture. Bibles with no notes or comments, he argued, could do nothing but cause confusion in the minds of the faithful.

Wasn't confusion precisely the aim of the Bible Society, the Dual Ministry, Filaret's catechism, and the mystical movements of the capital? Confusion was the first step toward revolution. The country would be split by heresies and schisms: "although it is not called Carbonarism among us, it is exactly that, and it has already strengthened itself and spread by various means, so that if vigilant attention is not given to it now and the necessary measures not taken against it, but is allowed to grow, then nothing will halt its power."<sup>84</sup> Russia must expect the revolutionary upheavals being prepared for it as the result of its contact with the west. The revolutionary events of the last century, the invasion of Russia by the French, the current unrest in France, Germany, the Netherlands, Greece and Italy only testify to the nature of western ideas. The Bible Society, the mystics, the pietists, the masons were agents of the same revolutionary movement. As a

result of their activities in Russia, there was a multiplication of sects, doubts about faith, and harmful opinions for the government. The new Russian Bible and the new catechism were not designed to promote enlightenment, but to destroy and subvert the natural order. "Who among us," he declared, "does not understand the Church service [in Slavic]? Only he alone who has torn himself away from his Fatherland and forgotten his language....Is it necessary [because of the differences between the two aspects of the Slavono-Russian language], nay permissible to utter such baseless opinions about establishing a necessary division between the language of the Church and the language of the people? And cannot this false necessity, by debasing the importance of Scriptures, produce anything other than heresies and schisms?"<sup>85</sup>

Shishkov was a defender of the Church as a pillar of the state and as one of the essential ingredients in the social-political life of the country. He could not conceive of the Church as a society apart from the state or as an organization with its own mind and reality and its own vision of society. As far as Shishkov was concerned, its aspirations would coincide with those of the government and ultimately only those ideas "useful for the good of the state from now on should not be restricted."<sup>86</sup> The new Bible and catechism tampered with the delicate mechanism of the national life and the national past. Any break with the language of the past would lead to a rupture between the people and the tsar. Slavono-Russian language, the historical and national language of Russia--the language of Church, faith, and people--was the intimate bond uniting the tsar with the people and was the highest expression of their manner of thinking

and acting under all circumstances. Any artificial separation of these integral parts could only rend the seamless fabric of state and society. Curiously and paradoxically, Shishkov and Filaret had arrived at the same conclusion: the language of faith was vital in a Christian society. For Filaret the voice of the Church had already become isolated both from the popular faith of the people and from the minds of the educated. For Shishkov that isolation was only imminent but not yet achieved, and could be avoided by preserving the chastity of Russia's national language.

Shishkov was prepared to interfere even in the inner life of the Church--something Golitsyn had never attempted--in order to realize his literary vision. In this respect his views and actions took on a greater significance not only for Filaret but for the Church. On November 4, two days after Shishkov had written to Arakcheev complaining of the Moscow Bible Society Izvestiia and Filaret's catechism, both Shishkov and Arakcheev went to see Serafim about them. Apparently Serafim attempted to defend the new Russian Bible translated "from Slavenic (as all the journalists [Filaret] who do not know the language call it)",<sup>87</sup> arguing that many Russians cannot understand Slavonic.

What! I said with some heat. Who among us does not understand the Church service? Only he who has forsaken his Fatherland and forgotten his language! Can it reasonably be believed that we do not understand Veruiu vo edinago Boga [I believe in the one God] but we can understand Veruiu v odnago Boga?....And is it necessary basis for the division of the language of the Church from the popular tongue? And will not this imaginary necessity, having diminished the dignity of the Holy Scriptures, produce nothing other than heresies and schism?<sup>88</sup>

According to Shishkov, Serafim finally agreed, but was worried

only where so many copies of the Bible might be hid and how the subscribers to the publications of the Bible Society might be reimbursed. Both Shishkov and Arakcheev at this point "could hardly maintain the necessary respect due to holy office" and told him to stop the distribution of these books and "avert this evil."<sup>89</sup> The result of this debate was an agreement that the Bible Society must cease to exist, the translation of the Bible be prohibited, and the publication of the Abbreviated Catechism be halted.<sup>90</sup>

That Serafim actually put up such a weak-minded defense is doubtful, but nevertheless Shishkov's literary notions were beginning to carry official weight, even without the express approval of the tsar. Shishkov actually had little appreciation for the finer points of Orthodox doctrine (his description of the Creed and Commandments as prayers in his letter to Arakcheev was at best an imprecision).<sup>91</sup> Shishkov was preparing to go beyond the question of "transposition" to the unorthodox elements in the catechism. He had already implied in his letter to Arakcheev that the catechism contained heresy, but he needed stronger authority than his own opinions if his charges were to carry much weight. After all, the catechism had been completely examined and approved by the Holy Synod and published at the express instruction of the tsar. Apparently Shishkov had enlisted the aid of a priest, Ioakim Simeonovich Kochetov, who had earlier been recommended by Filaret as the priest and religion teacher at Alexander's new lycee at Tsarskoe Selo in 1817.<sup>92</sup>

The results of this collaboration were presented in a report entitled simply Comments. These "comments" are divided into two

parts dealing separately with the Abbreviated Catechism and the Detailed Catechism. The central theme of the report is purely Shishkovian: the writer noted that the literal sense of the translations, which had been examined by the Holy Synod, was correct. The weakness and danger in the catechisms came from the "transposition" of the language. Once again the danger to the state and Church was reiterated: the new catechism will confuse youths; religious differences produced by reading these works will split families, and children will unknowingly be led into heresy. "Will not all of these factors, taken together, lend new weapons to the schism against our Orthodox Church and strengthen them with new like-minded adherents? Everybody knows what happened in Nikon's time, when only a few Slavonic words were altered by other Slavonic words in our holy books."<sup>93</sup> It was also implied that Filaret's catechisms were Protestant-inspired and in fact on important points did not give as vigorous a defense of Orthodoxy as some Protestant writers. Filaret, the reviewer claimed, did not give an adequate defense of icons in his detailed catechism, for he merely argued that the Second Commandment against graven images did not apply to icons. The reviewer construed this to mean that the Second Commandment, then, does not require the possession of icons, but merely does not specifically prohibit them. Their use or omission is left to the arbitrary decision of each worshipper. "...If the very use is arbitrary, then so must be their veneration--Lutherans and other Protestants, of course, say no less about icons in their own catechisms, and several of their teachers say much more."<sup>94</sup>

It is doubtful that many councils would find Filaret guilty

of heresy on such slim grounds. But this report was sufficient for Shishkov, who then (on 21 November) wrote to Serafim asking if "on the strength of an imperial directive addressed to me on the 17th day of this month, would it not be possible for your most holiness to propose to the Synod that the new published Christian Catechisms: both the detailed and abbreviated versions, in which the prayers noted have been transposed into simple Russian speech and printed and distributed both here and in Moscow, be stopped until an imperial resolution is forthcoming."<sup>95</sup> This was a rather odd request, for the directive to which Shishkov refers seemed precisely to justify what Shishkov wished the Synod to deny. The directive of 17 November provided authorization to suppress books printed by private presses which had printed them without Synodal approval. Now Shishkov was asking Serafim and the Synod to suppress books printed on its own press with their express consent! Shishkov was acting without the approval of the tsar and was far beyond the authority belonging to him as Minister of Education.<sup>96</sup> Nevertheless, Serafim complied with this demand, and a directive from the Synod was sent to the Moscow Synodal printing office. Filaret was faced with the complete repudiation of his work.

Filaret, who had been informed of the events in St. Petersburg by his friend Grigorii Postnikov, the vicar of Serafim, viewed Shishkov's attacks in the widest sense as an attack on Orthodoxy and the Church itself.<sup>97</sup> He did not hesitate to point this out to Serafim in a letter which deserves to be quoted at length:

It is painful that I should now have to write to your holiness; but I believe I must write. God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,

who is blessed forever, knows that I do not lie when I begin this letter without the least alteration, through God's mercy, of my constant feeling of filial respect and love for you, my ordainer and teacher! But I must dedicate myself to the Church no less than to you. It has come to my attention that by the directive of the Holy Synod to the printing office, it has been prescribed that the printing and sale of the catechism, which has been examined and published this past year by order of His August Imperial Majesty, be stopped. I do not know what this is about: but I can only guess that it is about Orthodoxy. Having said that much, I ask your holiness to cast your memory back over the history of this catechism [Filaret relates the events already described].... Thus, the catechism, in the composition of which I was the instrument, first in my presence and then again in my absence had been confirmed by your holiness and the Holy Synod, not only in all the parts which contain teachings, but in all the words and phrases, and this complete confirmation was published not only by the decree of the Holy Synod and in numerous copies of the catechism, but by imperial edict addressed to me on the second day of June, 1823, which agreed with the Synodal approval, and said that it was written in the spirit of the Eastern Orthodox Church and in the sense of Evangelical truth. It is not clear by whom, how, or why this matter, so perfectly and purely affirmed by all that is holy on earth, is now being brought into question. The concern would not be great if this doubt threatened only the person who was the instrument in this affair; but does it not threaten the hierarchy? Does it not threaten the Church? If the orthodoxy of the catechism, so solemnly confirmed by the Holy Synod, is in doubt, then will not the orthodoxy of the Holy Synod itself be called into question? Does not the admission of this doubt shake the hierarchy to its foundation? Does it not disturb the peace of the Church? Will the judgement which one priest pronounces over the acts of the Holy Synod (if it is true that one priest was entrusted to deliver an opinion about a catechism confirmed by the Holy Synod) persuade the entire Church and yet disrupt only the hierarchical order through the admission of such a judgment? I need not remind you, your holiness, that by the sacred laws of the Ecumenical and Apostolic Church, the only true and worthy judge over the acts of the Holy Synod in matters of faith is none other than the august judgment of a full national [pomestnyi] or ecumenical council under the protection of the most holy Sovereign Emperor.

I think there is no special directive concerning the catechism, for if there was it would have been given to the Holy Synod as a matter of course. But if the suppression of the catechism has been inferred

from the imperial directive published last November 17, then it was done, not on the strength of this directive, but in contradiction to that imperial directive which confirmed the catechism approved by the Holy Synod. It has now come to my attention that in regard to the Minister of Education, who was mentioned in the directive of the Holy Synod to the printing office, that the Creed has not been called the Creed or the Confession of Faith, **but** a prayer. I do not know to whom to ascribe this confused understanding of Church matters....And with such an understanding these unknown actors take the judgment of the Holy Synod upon themselves! For the sake of those who hope for Thy affirmation, Lord, affirm the Church! In the name of God I ask you, most holy bishop, before the eyes of God, examine everything I have said and, by directing your attention to this Synodally confirmed catechism, give it a direction in keeping with the truth, order, and worthiness of the hierarchy and with the peace and purity of the Orthodox Church. And give me special instruction how to act for the benefit of the flock entrusted to me in these special circumstances which point toward the weakening confidence in the word of truth and the mutual fidelity between the official and the correct word. Let me hope that this letter will be received with your usual condescension and will obtain for me your needed instruction. For to your most holy protection and prayers I dedicate myself with that expectation.<sup>98</sup>

Serafim did not deny that he approved the catechism or admit that the other members of the Synod, specifically Grigorii Postnikov, his vicar, entertained any doubts about its orthodoxy. "Thus, you see," he wrote back to Filaret later in December, 1824, "that I was completely convinced of its orthodoxy then and remain so now."<sup>99</sup> Even the careful eye of the metropolitan of Kiev, Evgenii Bolkhovitinov, had found it suitable to print. Why then was it now stopped? Because of the request of the Minister of Education, "who did not say a word about their both the detailed and abbreviated versions non-conformity with Orthodoxy (which he, as an orthodox son of the Church, could not say) but he demanded that they be stopped awaiting an imperial order only because the Creed, the Lord's

Prayer, and the Decalogue were expressed in Russian and not in Slavonic....Your honor as an orthodox pastor of the Church remains without the slightest blemish, just as the Holy Synod has not been humiliated by this affair."<sup>100</sup> This reply was, if not a lie, then only a half truth, for we know from Shishkov's memoirs and the anonymous comments on Filaret's catechism that in fact the question of orthodoxy had been raised by the Minister of Education. It could not be otherwise, for Shishkov maintained that the holiness of Orthodoxy was contained in the Slavonic words themselves. Serafim either did not understand this, or did not wish to understand it. By reassuring others that Shishkov was only objecting to the translation, he must have hoped to avoid an open conflict between the Church and the new powers in the government. Perhaps he was trying to conceal what was in fact a humiliation for the Synod. At any rate, he could give Filaret no satisfactory answer why the Abbreviated Catechism, designed for small children, should be published only in a language they could not understand, despite the fact that the New Testament and the psalter were at that moment available in a language which they could understand.

To this and many other questions which might be asked in this connection I cannot give you any satisfactory answer. I hope time will explain to us that which now seems clouded. In my opinion that time will soon come.... I feel your position is burdensome and I am ashamed from all my heart that I have not the means to lighten your load. Therefore, be patient, good pastor; patience does not humiliate, it give you the experience which will later be very useful to you as I myself had an opportunity to discover.<sup>101</sup>

Actually, Serafim had more answers than he admitted. Writing to Bishop Parfenii of Vladimir at the very end of December, he re-

solved the paradox of the Russian Bible and the Slavonic catechism: "This language [Russian] will not be heard in the Old Testament and it seems it will soon be eliminated in the New."<sup>102</sup>

During the following year, there was little Filaret could do about his catechism or the Russian Bible. He allowed himself to be reassured by Serafim and wrote to his mother that the talk of his heresy was only rumor: "thus my conscience is at peace, and that which they now wish to do I will not judge."<sup>103</sup> But he was deeply humiliated by the Synod's order to the Moscow printing office, which not only prohibited printing any more copies of the catechism but also ordered all copies on sale in the bookstores be removed. "Those who were curious of the reasons were willing to pay 25 rubles a copy, but they could not obtain one," a contemporary wrote, "...Some who visited the archbishop were incautious enough to ask 'Is it true, your holiness, that your catechism has been suppressed? He replied, 'No, not mine, but that published by the Holy Synod and printed by imperial directive.'"<sup>104</sup>

However humiliated he might have been, Filaret would not be silent about Shishkov's unwarranted interference in the Church. His sermons during 1825 were remarkable for their criticism of all those who considered themselves Orthodox but would not accept the authority of the Church. On St. Alexis day (February 12) he warned "Let not many of you become teachers, my brethren, for you know that we who teach shall be judged with greater strictness" (James, 3,1). This precept, he maintained, upheld the authority of the Church, for all those who accepted the Church's authority ought no to "disrespect it in matters you were not called upon to

interfere with; on the contrary, you must willingly fulfill the duties of a subordinate." The teachers of the Church are appointed by the Church. No one else has the right to claim that he speaks for it. Each Christian is enjoined to listen to his lawful teachers and not "run quickly to other teachers appointed by no one, or to prophets whom God did not send....This precept [of James] applies to all of us more than it might seem at first glance."<sup>105</sup> Filaret intended these remarks to apply to himself in his relations with Serafim as much as to Shishkov or Fotii. But when he quoted a short passage from the "Third Epistle of John" (9,10), his target was clearly the new Minister of Education and self-appointed guardian of Orthodoxy:

I have written something to the Church; but Diotrefes, who likes to put himself first, does not acknowledge my authority. So if I come, I will bring up what he is doing, prating against me evil words. And not content with that, he refuses himself to welcome the brethren, and also stops those who want to welcome them and puts them out of the church.<sup>106</sup>

Filaret expressed his innermost convictions in his sermon on the day of the Annunciation to the Holy Virgin (15 May 1825), which, for clarity, precision of theological thought, and, above all, for depth of feeling, is one of his most outstanding sermons. He begins with a quotation from Luke "'But she was greatly troubled at the saying [of the Archangel Gabriel], and considered in her mind what this greeting might be.'" This great moment, Filaret explained, was a turning point in history and produced a profound change in each man's life. "What was obtainable by no one before, when She was only the servant of the Lord, was now obtainable by all, when She is the Mother of the Lord."<sup>107</sup> All historical

events had led up to this central moment, or rather this opening act of Christ's redemptive work.

But Mary was thrown into confusion by Gabriel's greeting and his message of the son to be conceived in her womb. What was the cause of this confusion? She was troubled because she knew from her reading of Scriptures, from her contemplation and understanding of the profound wisdom of Isaiah, that Gabriel meant the Lord foretold by that prophet. Yet her perfect humility did not permit her to see the image of the Mother of Immanuel in herself. It was only when this image, called back to her memory by the words of the archangel, was "held up before her like a mirror," that she was momentarily troubled.<sup>108</sup> "Thus, just as pure water quivers and ripples in the breath of a gentle breeze and comes alive with movement without losing its purity, so the pure soul of Mary quivered from the word of the heavenly spirit, encouraging her to further progress in a life of God without altering the purity of her feelings."<sup>109</sup>

In this great moment there is a lesson in true wisdom and true humility: "She possessed wise humility and humble wisdom."<sup>110</sup> "He who thinks he can grow in wisdom without humility is the same one who wishes his garden to grow without soil."<sup>111</sup> Superficial wisdom has contributed only errors, only sectaries in philosophy, and only heresies in the Church. Unlike the Holy Virgin, who understood the Scriptures, "the superficial, worldly sages have planted their orchard in the air, not in the soil, while the Devil has planted his in the fire, that is, these light-thinking men have decided to make pride the soil of wisdom."<sup>112</sup>

Was it right that Christians should be excluded from any

knowledge of that great moment when God became flesh, so that man might become God? If the Church and Scriptures both taught that it was each Christian's duty to inform himself of God's Word for salvation, then who could speak against it?

If you are told that the aspiration for perfection is a dream, that love of wisdom is an insolent cleverness, that contemplation about faith, study of God's law, reading of God's word, is either unnecessary or dangerous: listen carefully, does this sound like the voice of the Angel Gabriel? Is it like spiritual teaching? Is it like a heavenly commandment? Compare it with the true and pure voice of the prophet: 'Blessed is the man...his delight is in the law of the Lord, and on his law he meditates day and night.' Psalms, 1,2. Compare it with the instruction of the Divine Teacher: 'Search the Scriptures.' John, 5,39. Compare it with the Apostle's sermon: 'Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly, as you teach and admonish one another in all wisdom.' Col.,3, 16. Compare it with Mary's example: no one forbade this young woman of Israel to read the book of the Prophet Isaiah and to ponder on the Immanuel in it."<sup>113</sup>

But Shishkov, who "spent his life in St. Petersburg as a master card player, easily able to make connections with important people and important homes," knew more than the Virgin Mary about the quality of Scriptures. The Russian Bible was burned and the catechisms suppressed.<sup>114</sup>

## EPILOGUE

### The return to Latin scholasticism.

Filaret hoped that the new emperor, Nicholas I, might support the continued translation of the Bible into Russian, the more so that Nicholas had shown his favor to Filaret by promoting him to the office of metropolitan of Moscow while he was in Moscow for the coronation ceremonies in August, 1826. However, in May, 1827, when Filaret arrived in St. Petersburg to attend the meetings of the Holy Synod, Serafim greeted him with the threat to retire if Filaret raised the question of translation once more. Filaret replied that the translation would be useful for the Church. Not all of the clergy, he reminded Serafim, were sufficiently well trained to be able to refer directly to the original texts of the Bible when the need arose. Instead, Russian clergymen had to rely on Catholic and Protestant translations composed in keeping with their respective dogmatic beliefs. He suggested that if the Synod undertook the task of translating the Bible into Russian, it might then be done with less haste, and when finished greater precautions could be taken to insure that it was signed by those hierarchs who could not be suspected of heresy. "However," he added, "I have not reached that state of mindlessness in which I consider your holiness's service superfluous for the Church."<sup>1</sup>

Yet, Filaret was not deterred by Serafim's warning from proposing to the Synod that it continue the translation of the Bible which was interrupted by the events of 1824 and 1825. He recapitulated to the Synod the arguments he had earlier privately expressed to Serafim. But Serafim was no more willing to approve

Filaret's proposals in the Synod than he was outside it. Even Nicholas' tentative approval of Filaret's remarks was insufficient to budge the metropolitan of St. Petersburg and the metropolitan of Kiev, Evgenii Bolkhovitinov, who supported him. Filaret gave way to their unwillingness. When Golitsyn asked Filaret why he did not insist on his opinion when he had the tsar's support, he replied that "I did not wish to create a schism in the Church."<sup>2</sup> Thus, in order to prevent a split in the hierarchy, Filaret had to postpone what he had worked so hard to achieve: a Bible translated from an Orthodox perspective which Russians could understand.

At the same time, he was defeated in his efforts to save the reformed ecclesiastical schools from the return to Latin scholasticism. In November, 1827, he presented a concise history of the Russian schools to Nicholas which deserves extended quotation, for it is actually a summary of Filaret's own life:

Before the reform of the ecclesiastical schools, several of them were distinguished by a knowledge of Latin, and the students even wrote artistic Latin verse. They devoted a greater part of their time and effort in studying Latin orators and poets in order to attain and perpetuate this glory. The result was priests who knew Latin pagan authors well, but who knew religious and Church writers very little. They could speak and write Latin better than Russian. They possessed memories laden with a multitude of words, but minds which did not bear fruit in the living knowledge of truth. Only dogmatic theology was taught and then in the school manner. The result was a dry, cold knowledge, lacking animation and true edification in studies.

In place of examinations in the higher subjects, the so-called 'disputations' were used, in which the majority of students did not participate and consequently were not examined. The rest were divided into two sides: one side defended truth with all the firmness it had, while the other side proved a lie with all the daring it could muster. A clever objection was approved no less, if not more, than a well-founded refutation. As a result of this preference for debate (which was often debilitating and never

useful in teaching anyone), these studies did not enter the sphere of understanding directed toward people. Their 'objections' and decisions were largely the inventions of the schools and presented in school fashion. Theological understanding, crushed by the great weight of school terminology taught in Latin, did not freely act on the mind during the period of study, and after study only with the greatest difficulty was it transposed into Russian for communication to the people.

The means for improving the education for the students in the ecclesiastical schools...used during the reform of the schools...are now being rejected. Practical theology [deiatel'noe bogoslovie, 'practica'] had been introduced, and as a result, theological knowledge became more fully useable in life. In place of disputations between a few over a few truths, examinations of the students in all subjects were introduced. The Russian language was permitted in teaching theology. Knowledge of Latin became weaker, but at the same time the school terminology began to give way to a purer and clearer exposition of truth. The extension of true knowledge was strengthened and its communication to the people made easier....

But in 1825, the Commission on Theological Schools [ordered]...that theology be taught exclusively in Latin....This return from intelligible teaching in the native language to Latin scholasticism cannot facilitate the perfection of those being prepared for the clergy, and it is surprising that in a time which is praised for its zeal for Orthodoxy a preference for Latin should return. In its original form it was a pagan language, and it is now used as the language of the Western Church, but it has no reason to be the language of the Eastern Church.<sup>3</sup>

Nicholas wrote the single word "just" [spravedlivo] on the margin of Filaret's comments (which formed part of a more detailed report on means to improve the quality of the parish clergy). Yet the "return to Latin scholasticism" was not averted. The Commission on Theological Schools decided to require the use of the 18th century scholastic texts. The dogmatic theology of Feofilakt Gorskii and Irinei Fal'kovskii's "compendium" of Orthodox dogmatic theology, both written in Latin, were chosen as standard texts. Winkler, Baumeister, and Brucker were re-

vived and put to work once more. Moreover, since late 1824 the membership of the Commission had undergone changes which brought several members of the clergy to the Commission who were in favor of the Latin traditions of the 18th century schools, including Metropolitan Evgenii Bolkhovitinov and Filaret Amfiteatrov, then archbishop of Riazan'.

The defense of Latin in the schools was undertaken by Filaret Amfiteatrov, who argued that Latin, once the glory of the schools, had seriously declined as a result of the Alexandrine reforms. He warned that "knowledge of Latin, even now inadequate in studies, will be even more seriously weakened if theology is taught in Russian."<sup>4</sup> "According to the generally held opinion of educated men," he maintained, "Latin is the key to any solid education."<sup>5</sup> Moreover, many of the teachers of the Eastern Church wrote only in Latin as do "most modern authors of theological systems."<sup>6</sup> Finally, he concluded that Latin serves as a protection for the common people, for Latin textbooks act as a barrier from accidental or casual acquaintance with false doctrines:

When these false teachings are presented in a Latin book to students already prepared to distinguish truth from falsehood, then the presentation of these falsehoods by experienced teachers with accompanying refutations leads to a confirmation of the dogmatic truths of faith. But if false teachings are printed in a Russian book, even with well-founded refutations included, then from this book those falsehoods reach every strata of the people, who will not be prepared for them, and more harm than good will come from reading such books.<sup>7</sup>

The difficulty in communicating the learning of the schools to the people, he suggested, could be overcome by reissuing Metropolitan Platon's catechisms and popular theologies published in the last century. He also suggested that Mohyla's Orthodox

Confession of Faith be republished in Russian with a Slavic text also included.<sup>8</sup> With some modifications, Filaret Amfiteatrov's opinions were accepted as policy by the Synod. By 1829, Filaret's hopes that he might save and even extend the changes he inaugurated during Alexander's reign had to be set aside. The Russian translation of the Bible was not renewed until the reign of Alexander II, and, as time went on (especially during the period when Count Protasov was Over Procurator of the Holy Synod), the Latin curriculum in the schools remained in effect. Filaret feared that the opportunity for Orthodoxy to find its own path and its own voice might irretrievably have slipped past. "My spirit is sorrowful," he wrote to his vicar Innokentii (Sel'no-Krinov) in 1829. "It seems to me that judgement, proceeding from the house of God, is more and more revealing itself."<sup>9</sup>

NOTES

Preface

1

Wladimir Weidlé, Russia: Absent and Present, New York: Vintage Books, 1961, 173.

2

S.K. Smirnov, Istoriia Moskovskoi dukhovnoi akademii do ee preobrazovaniia (1814-1870 g.), Moskva, 1879, 96.

## NOTES

### Chapter I

- 1  
Ivan Korsunskii, "Lira Filareta mitropolita Moskovskago," Russkii Vestnik, 1884, November, 267-268.
- 2  
Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii s 1649 goda, XXII, 15978, 11 April 1784, 95-97. Hereafter cited as PSZRI with volume, number, and date.
- 3  
An instruction by Metropolitan Platon in 1802 quoted in P. Znamenskii, Dukhovnyia shkoly v Rossii do reformy 1808 goda, Kazan': Tipografiia imperatorskago universiteta, 1881, 737-38.
- 4  
N.P. Giliarov-Platonov, "Iz prozhitago," Russkii Vestnik, 1884, May, 342.
- 5  
Znamenskii, op. cit., 570.
- 6  
N.V. Sushkov, Zapiski o zhizni i vremeni sviatitelia Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago, Moskva: Tipografiia A.I. Mamontova, 1868, 28.
- 7  
Pis'ma mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta k rodnym ot 1800-go do 1866-go goda, Moskva: Tipografiia A.I. Mamontova, 1882, 215.
- 8  
A.A. Smirnov, Detstvo, otrochestvo, iunost', gody ucheniia i uchitel'stva v Troitskoi lavrskoi seminarii mitropolita Filareta 1782-1808 g., Moskva, 1893, 19.
- 9  
N.P. Giliarov-Platonov, Iz perezhitago, Moskva, 1886, I, 76. This is a retitled, revised, and expanded edition of his Russkii Vestnik article cited above.
- 10  
Sushkov, op. cit., prilozhenie XII, 20.
- 11  
S.K. Smirnov, "Uchitel' Troitskoi seminarii Vasilii Mikhailovich Drozdov," Sovremennaia letopis', 1867, no. 44, 4.
- 12  
PSZRI, XXVI, . 19532, 25 August 1800, 277-278.

- 13 Giliarov-Platonov, "Iz prozhitago," op. cit., 1884, June, 684-85.
- 14 Henri Troyat, Pushkin, translated from the French by Nancy Amphoux, Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1970, 32-33.
- 15 John Edwin Sandys, A history of classical scholarship, New York: Hafner Publishing Co., 1958, II, 163.
- 16 Vasilii Lebedev, Kratkaia grammatika Latinskaia, Spb., 1762; 11th edition, 1817. Nikolai Nikolaevich Bantysh-Kamenskii published several elementary texts for the seminaries: Latin alphabet books, Latin-French-Russian copy books, a Latin grammar, and an abbreviated Hebrew grammar. These books are listed in his Slovar' dostopamiatnykh liudei russkoi zemli, St. Petersburg: Tipografiia shtaba otdel'nago korpusa vnutrennei strazhi, 1847, I.
- 17 Znamenskii, op. cit., 739.
- 18 Idem.
- 19 Ibid., 739-40.
- 20 Georgii Florovskii, Puti russkago bogosloviia, Paris: YMCA Press, 1937, 101.
- 21 Ibid., 175.
- 22 Quoted in Znamenskii, op. cit., 740.
- 23 Ibid., 748.
- 24 Idem.
- 25 Amvrosii Serebrennikov (or Serebriakov), Kratkoe rukovodstvo k oratorii rossiiskoi, M., 1778; 2-e izd., M. 1791. Ivan Stepanovich Rizhkii, Opyt ritoriki, (1796 and 1805). His Nauka stikhotvorstva (1811) is one of the first attempts to present poetics in Russian.
- 26 Znamenskii, op. cit., 753.

- 27 S.K. Smirnov, Istoriia Troitskoi lavrskoi seminarii, Moskva: Izd. A.V. Tolokonnikova, 1867, 158-62.
- 28 Quoted in Ruth Lydia Shaw, Leibniz, Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1954, 76.
- 29 Baumeister's text was first published in Kiev in 1752 and later in Moscow (1777) by Bantysh-Kamenskii.
- 30 "Iz vospominanii pokoinago Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1868, August, 507-508.
- 31 Preserved Smith, A history of modern culture, New York: Collier Books, 1962, volume II, 159.
- 32 Pis'ma k rodnym, op. cit., 120.
- 33 Sobranie mnenii i otzyvov Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago i Kolomenskago, po uchebnym i gosudarstvennym voprosam, edited by Savva, archbishop of Tver', Sankpeterburg: V Sinodal'noi tipografii, 1885, II, 22-24. Hereafter cited as SMIOF with volume and page.
- 34 Znamenskii, op. cit., 756.
- 35 On Mefodii see M.I. Sukhomlinov, "Istoriia Rossiiskoi Akademii," Sbornik otdeleniia Russkago slovesnosti imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1875, XI, 2, 241-245; I.M. Snegirev, Zhizn' mitropolita Platona, Moskva, 1831, II, 106; Nachertanie zhizni i deianii sv. pravitel'stviushchago sinoda chlena Mefodiia, arkhiepiskopa Pskovskago, Lifliandskago, i Kurliandskago, s prilozheniem nekotorykh pouchitel'nykh slov, prezhde napechatannykh i posle ego konchiny sobrannykh, Moskva, 1823; and P.M. "Iz proshlago," Russkii Vestnik, 1868, April, 481-83.
- 36 On Dutens see M. Pierre Larousse, Grand dictionnaire universel du XIX<sup>e</sup> siecle, Paris: Librairie classique Larousse et Boyer, 1870, 6, 1447.
- 37 Sukhomlinov, op. cit., 243.
- 38 A.P. Lebedev, "Kratkii ocherk khoda razvitiia tserkovno-istoricheskoi nauki u nas v Rossii," Bogoslovskii Vestnik, 1895, December, 295.

- 39 Ibid., 296.
- 40 Smirnov, Istoriiia Troitskoi seminarii, op. cit., 280.
- 41 A.N. Radishchev, Puteshestvie iz Peterburga v Moskvu, Moskva-Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury, 1961, 34-35.
- 42 Smirnov, "Uchitel' Troitskoi seminarii," op. cit., 4.
- 43 Idem.
- 44 Smirnov, Detstvo, op. cit., 23.
- 45 Pis'ma k rodnym, op. cit., 106. Letter of 1 November 1808.
- 46 Smirnov, Destvo, op. cit., 13.
- 47 Idem.
- 48 Sochineniia Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago i Kolomenskago; Slova i rechi, Moskva: Tipografiia A.I. Mamontova, 1873, II, 362.

NOTES

Chapter II

- 1  
Pis'ma k rodnym, op. cit., 2.
- 2  
Ibid., 3.
- 3  
Iz vospominanii, op. cit., 508.
- 4  
Idem.
- 5  
Pis'ma k rodnym, op. cit., 4.
- 6  
Smirnov, Istoriiia Troitskoi seminarii, op. cit., 456-464.
- 7  
Alexander Muller, The Spiritual Regulation of Peter the Great, Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis, University of Washington, Seattle, 1966, 142.
- 8  
Ibid., 141.
- 9  
Smirnov, Istoriiia Troitskoi seminarii, op. cit., 463-464.
- 10  
Polnoe sobranie sochinenii Platona (Levshina) mitropolita Moskovskago, Spb., Izdatel'stvo P.P. Soikina, 1913, II, 330.  
Hereafter cited as PSSP with appropriate volume and page.
- 11  
S.K. Smirnov, Istoriiia Moskovskoi Slaviano-Greko-Latinskoi Akademii, Moskva: V tipografii V. Grot'e, 1855, 201.
- 12  
PSSP, II, 333.
- 13  
Ibid., II, 3.
- 14  
Ibid., II, 334.
- 15  
The Annales ecclesiastici was translated into Russian in the

17th century But only under the title Deianiia tserkovnyiia i grazhdanskiia ot rozhdestva Khrista do XIII st. was it actually printed by the Holy Synod in 1719. Extracts of the 17th century translation has been made by the Old Believers (along with spurious additions under Baronius' name), and it was for this reason the Synod published an official text.

16

PSSP, II, 335.

17

Idem.

18

Ibid., I, 806.

19

Ibid., I, 876-877.

20

See the interesting, stimulating, but inconclusive article by Zdenek V. David, "The Influence of Jacob Boehme on Russian Religious Thought," Slavic Review, Volume XXI, Number 1, March, 1962, 43-64, but especially, 49.

21

PSSP, I, 812.

22

Ibid., I, 5.

23

Ibid., II, 340.

24

Ibid., I, 216-220.

25

Ibid., I, 217.

26

Ibid., I, 218.

27

Ibid., I, 29.

28

Idem.

29

Znamenskii, op. cit., 474.

30

Gr. Istomin, "Postanovleniia imperatritsy Ekateriny II

otnositel'no obrazovaniia dukhovenstva," Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi adademii, 1867, September, 580-624.

31 PSSP, II, 351.

32 Idem.

33 Ibid., II, 340.

34 Ibid., I, 7.

35 Ibid., II, 338.

36 Ibid., II, 336.

37 Ibid., II, 343.

38 Smirnov, Istoriia Troitskoi seminarii, op. cit., 257.

39 Ibid., 262.

40 Ibid., 262-263.

41 PSSP, I, 699.

42 Ibid., I, 702.

43 Ibid., I, 717.

44 Ibid., I, 718.

45 Ibid., I, 770.

46 Letter from Varlaam, rector of the Trinity seminary to Platon, 27 May 1765, Pribavlenie k tvoreniiam sviatykh ottsev, 1863, chast' 22, 408.

47 Ibid., 408-409.

48

Florovskii, Puti, op. cit., 113.

49

Filaret later declared, "in philosophy he did not display the qualities of a good teacher." Iz vospominanii, op. cit., 509.

50

Smirnov, Istoriia Troitskoi seminarii, op. cit., 294.

51

Ibid., 502-503.

52

Evgraf may have known Cudworth's True Intellectual System from Mosheim's Latin translation with notes and comments entitled Systema intellectuale hujus universi, Jena, 1733.

53

Samuil was later bishop of Kostroma. He died in 1831.

54

Smirnov, Istoriia Troitskoi seminarii, op. cit., 343.

55

Ibid., 342.

56

I. Korsunskii, "Lira Filareta mitropolita Moskovskago," Russkii Vestnik, 1884, November, 277.

57

PSSP, II, 691.

58

Smirnov, Istoriia Troitskoi seminarii, op. cit., 335.

59

Pis'ma k rodnym, op. cit., 60.

60

SMIOF, I, 73.

61

Smirnov, Istoriia Troitskoi seminarii, op. cit., 442, note "o".

62

Pis'ma k rodnym, op. cit., 13.

63

Ibid., 26.

64

Ibid., 32.

- 65  
Ibid., 21-22.
- 66  
Iz vospominanii, op. cit., 509.
- 67  
Pis'ma k rodnym, op. cit., 57.
- 68  
See his Confessio catholica, in qua doctrina catholica et evangelica, quam ecclesiae Augustanae confessioni addictae profitentur, ex Romano-catholicorum scriptorum suffragis confirmatur, 4 parts, Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1634-1637; his Mediationes sacrae (1606) and Schola pietatis (1622-23).
- 69  
Iz vospominanii, op. cit., 509.
- 70  
Idem.
- 71  
Idem.
- 72  
Smirnov, "Uchitel' Troitskoi seminarii," op. cit., 5.
- 73  
Smirnov, Istoriia Troitskoi seminarii, op. cit., 582.
- 74  
Pis'ma k rodynm, op. cit., 34.
- 75  
Ibid., 40.
- 76  
Ibid., 75-76.
- 77  
Smirnov, "Uchitel' Troitskoi seminarii," op. cit., 5.
- 78  
Slova i rechi, op. cit., I, 117-118.
- 79  
Ibid., 118.
- 80  
Ibid., 121.
- 81  
Smirnov, "Uchitel' Troitskoi seminarii," op. cit., 5.

- 82 Slova i rechi, op. cit., I, 122.
- 83 Idem.
- 84 Ibid., I, 123.
- 85 Idem.
- 86 Ibid., I, 124.
- 87 Ibid., I, 126.
- 88 Ibid., I, 126-127.
- 89 Ibid., I, 127, note.
- 90 Pis'ma k rodnym, op. cit., 66.
- 91 Ibid., 73.
- 92 Ibid., 76.
- 93 Ibid., 79.
- 94 Idem.
- 95 Idem.
- 96 Smirnov, "Uchitel' Troitskoi seminarii," op. cit., 6.
- 97 Korsunskii, "Lira," op. cit., 280-285.
- 98 Pis'ma k rodnym, op. cit., 82.
- 99 Idem.
- 100 Ibid., 87.

101  
Ibid., 98-99.

102  
Ibid., 106.

103  
Ibid., 107.

104  
PSSP, II, 607.

105  
Korsunskii, "Lira," op. cit., 275.

## NOTES

### Chapter III

1

Ilarion Chistovich, Rukovodiashchie deiateli dukhovnago prosveshcheniia v Rossii v pervoi polivine tekushchago stoletiiia, Sanktpeterburg: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1894, 44-46.

2

Florovskii, Puti, 141.

3

PSSP, II, 592-93.

4

Idem.

5

Opis' dokumentov i del, khраниashchikhsia v arkhive Sviateishago Pravitel'stvuiushchago Sinoda. Dela komissii dukhovnykh uchilishch, 1808-1839 gg., S.-Peterburg: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1910, 3.

6

N. Poletaev, "K istorii dukhovno-uchebnoi reformy, 1808-1814," Strannik, 1889, 8, 515.

7

Very little investigation has been made into the work of Metropolitan Amvrosii, although much as been assumed by historians. The above information draws on I. Chistovich, "Preosviashchennyi Amvrosii (Podobedov), mitropolit Novgorodskii i S. Peterburgskii," Strannik, 1860, May, 149-212; June, 217-241. The May installment contains only a reproduction of Chistovich's earlier article in Khristianskoe Chtenie, 1857, II. See also his later Rukovodiashchie, 1-184, passim. See also his later Runkevich, "Mitropolit Amvrosii," Bogoslovskaiia entsiklopediia, I, cols. 590-592. Amvrosii wrote very little. His Rukovodstvo k chteniiu Sviashchennago Pisaniia Vetkhago Zaveta (largely a translation from Hofmann) published in 1779 long remained a text in the ecclesiastical schools. His sermons were published under the title Sobranie pouchitel'nykh slov, v raznyia vremena propovedannykh Sv. Prav. Sin. perv. chlenom Avrosiem, 3 izdanie v 3-kh chatiakh, M., 1825. He also wrote a Sokrashchenie bogoslovskikh dogmatov; as well as Opyt' Slovenskago slovariia; and Molitvy dlia chteniia v bol'nitsakh. Only a fraction of his correspondence is published. See S.G. Runkevich, Aleksandro-Nevskaia Lavra, 1713-1913, Sanktpeterburg: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1913, 830-864.

8

Poletaev, "K istorii...", -533.

- 9  
Idem.
- 10  
Idem.
- 11  
Opis', 33.
- 12  
Chistovich, Rukovodiashchie, 20.
- 13  
Poletaev, "K istorii...", 538.
- 14  
Florovskii, Puti, 143.
- 15  
The two documents are reproduced in full in Opis', 1-40.
- 16  
Ibid., 5.
- 17  
Ibid., 27.
- 18  
Ibid., 36.
- 19  
Ibid., 6.
- 20  
Ibid., 40.
- 21  
Poletaev, "K istorii...", 1889, 9, 67.
- 22  
"Iz vospominanii", 511-512.
- 23  
Pis'ma k rodnym, 413.
- 24  
Ibid., 116-117.
- 25  
"Iz vospominanii", 510-511.
- 26  
N.V. Sushkov, Zapiski o zhizni i vremeni sviatitelja Filareta mitropolita Moskovskago, Moskva: Tipografiia A.I. Momontova, 1868, 224.

- 27 Pis'ma k rodnym, 152.
- 28 Ibid., 116-117.
- 29 The Russian translation is Uteshenie filosofskoe, Sanktpeterburg, 1794.
- 30 Chistovich, Rukovodiashchie, 31.
- 31 Ibid., 35.
- 32 V pamiat'grafa Mikhaila Mikhailovicha Speranskago, 1772-1872, S.-Peterburg: Izd. Imperatorskoi publichnoi biblioteki, 1872, 371, note.
- 33 Chistovich, Rukovodiashchie, 51.
- 34 Ibid., 39.
- 35 "Pis'ma I.V. Lopukhina k M.M. Speranskomu," Russkii Arkhiv, 1870, 618-619.
- 36 Chistovich, Rukovodiashchie, 52.
- 37 Idem.
- 38 Ibid., 48-49.
- 39 Ibid., 48.
- 40 Ibid., 50.
- 41 Ibid., 52.
- 42 Ibid., 53.
- 43 Ibid., 51-52. Filaret has left a short description of Fessler's influence at the academy.

The influence of Fessler on his students was profound. I recall one student who graduated from the academy without any belief in Christ as God. I advised him at the end of the course not to enter the clergy, and in fact he entered government service....At the time of Speranskii's disgrace (and Speranskii was responsible for inviting Fessler), they found among his things a notebook written by Fessler entitled De transitu orientalis in occidentalismum [which Filaret translated for the investigators], in which he showed that Jesus Christ is nothing more than the greatest philosopher....That is the sort of man they brought to the academy!

"Iz vospominanii", 517.

44

Pis'ma k rodnym, 116.

45

Ibid., 131-132.

46

Chistovich, Rukovodiashchie, 47.

47

See "Oproverzhenie primechanii na knigu gospodina Ansil'iona pod zaglaviiem: 'Esteticheskiia razsuzhdeniia' Riazanskago arkhiepiskopa Feofilakta." Chteniia v imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei Rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete, 1872, 1, smes', 186-209. Hereafter articles in this journal will be cited Chteniia OADR, with appropriate year, volume, and page.

48

Ibid., 183.

49

Ibid., 201.

50

Ibid., 204.

51

Pis'ma k rodnym, 166-167.

52

SMIOF, I, 141.

53

Ibid., I, 128.

54

Ibid., I, 127.

55

Ibid., I, 141.

- 56  
Slova i rechi, I, 166-167.
- 57  
SMIOF, I, 123.
- 58  
Slova i rechi, I, 167.
- 59  
Pis'ma k rodnym, 186.
- 60  
Chistovich, Rukovodiashchie, 119.
- 61  
Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, s 1649 goda, Sankt-peterburg, 1830, XXXII, 25,673, 30 August 1814, 915, articles 12-20. Hereafter cited as PSZRI with appropriate volume, number of law, date, and page.
- 62  
Chistovich, Rukovodiashchie, 121.
- 63  
Idem.
- 64  
Ibid., 122.
- 65  
PSZRI, XXXII, 25,673, 30 August 1814, 888.
- 66  
Chistovich, Rukovodiashchie, 122-23, note 1.
- 67  
Ibid., 126.
- 68  
Ibid., 123.
- 69  
PSZRI, XXXII, 25,673, 30 August 1814, 911.
- 70  
Idem.
- 71  
Idem.
- 72  
Idem.

73  
Ibid., 912.

74  
Idem.

75  
Idem.

76  
Idem.

77  
Idem.

78  
Ibid., 927.

79  
Idem.

80  
Idem.

81  
Ibid., 926.

82  
Idem.

83  
Sushkov, Zapiski, 50.

84  
Idem.

85  
Idem.

86  
Ibid., 52.

87  
Pis'ma k rodnym, 189.

NOTES

Chapter IV

- 1  
Sushkov, Zapiski, op. cit., 50.
- 2  
PSZRI, XXXIV, 27, 107, 24 October 1817, 814; the entire ukaz is on pp. 814-834.
- 3  
Rev. John Owen, The history of the origin and first ten years of the British and Foreign Bible Society, London: Tilling and Huges, 1816, II, 257.
- 4  
The most recent account of the pietist movement in English is Ernest F. Stoeffler, The rise of evangelical pietism, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965.
- 5  
Owen, op. cit., I, 265; III, 106.
- 6  
"Mneniia raznosti mezhdou vostochnoiu i zapadnoi u tserkviiu, s istoriiu razdeleniia ikh, predstavleniia eia imperatorskomu velichestvu, gosudaryne imperatritse, Elizavete Alekseevne, oberprokurorom sviateishago sinoda, kniazem A.N. Golitsynym," Chteniia OADR, I, Izsledovaniia, 32.
- 7  
Ibid., 34.
- 8  
Ibid., 36.
- 9  
Slova i rechi, op. cit., IV, 151-152.
- 10  
Pis'ma k rodnym, op. cit., 171.
- 11  
Idem.
- 12  
Idem.
- 13  
Ivan Korsunskii, "O podvigakh Filareta mitropolita Moskovskago, v dele perevoda Biblii na russkoi iazyk. Istoriko-kriticheskoe izsledovanie," Sbornik izdannyi obshchestvom liubiteli dukhovnago

prosveshcheniia po sluchaiu prazdnovaniia stoletniago iubeleia so dnia rozhdeniia (1782-1882) Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago, II, 231, note 1.

14

Chistovich, Istoriiia perevoda, op. cit., 24, note 1.

15

Vtoryi otchet komiteta Rossiiskago bibleiskago obshchesta za 1814 god, Sanktpeterburg: V tipografii Pravitel'stvuiushchago Senata, 1815 goda, 109.

16

Korsunskii, "O podvigakh," op. cit., II, 457-461.

17

Tretii otchet komiteta Rossiskago bibleiskago obshchestva za 1815 god, Sanktpeterburg; V Morskoii tipografii, 1816 goda, I.

18

Pis'ma k rodnym, op. cit., 211.

19

Tretii otchet, op. cit., VI.

20

Ibid., 14.

21

Chistovich, Istoriiia perevoda, op. cit., 27.

22

Ibid., 26-28.

23

"Zamechaniia na germenevtike," Chteniia v obshchestve liubitelei dukhovnago prosveshcheniia, 1868, V, 150-167.

24

George Peabody Gooch, History and historians in the nineteenth century, 2nd edition, revised, London: Longmans, 1952, 491.

25

SMIOF, I, 125.

26

Nachertanie tserkovno-bibleiskoi istorii, Moskva: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, izdanie tridnadsatoe, 1897, 1.

27

Ibid., X.

28

Slova i rechi, op. cit., II, 368-373.

- 29 This is a summary of Filaret's Announcement to the Christ-loving reader written as a forword to the 1819 edition of the Gospels. See Korsunskii, "O podvigakh," op. cit., II, 457-461.
- 30 SMIOF, I, 125.
- 31 Ibid., I, 129.
- 32 Ibid., I, 131.
- 33 For a complete discussion of prophecy in the Old Testament see "Prorocheskiia knigi vetkhago zaveta. Iz akademicheskikh chtenii Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago," Chteniia v obshchestve liubitelei dukhovnago prosveshcheniia, 1873, V, May, 508-522.
- 34 SMIOF, II, 26.
- 35 Ibid., II, 26-27.
- 36 Ibid., II, 26-28.
- 37 Ibid., II, 28.
- 38 Korsunskii, "O podvigakh," op. cit., II, 254.
- 39 Ibid., II, 251.
- 40 Predislovie k Psaltiri, S.-Peterburg, [publisher?], 1822, I-III.
- 41 Pis'ma k rodnym, op. cit., 235.
- 42 Korsunskii, "O podvigakh," op.cit., 260-261.
- 43 N. Barsov, "Gerasim Petrovich Pavskii," Russkaia Starina, 1880, January, 118.
- 44 Korsunskii, "O podvigakh," op. cit., 257.

- 45 Ibid., 258.
- 46 Ibid., 257-261.
- 47 Ibid., 257.
- 48 SMIOF, II, 26-27.
- 49 "Mysli zakonouchitel' protoiereia Gerasima Petrovicha Pavskago o religioznom uchenii i vospitanii ego imperatorskago vysochestva gosudaria velikago kniazia naslednika tsarevicha Aleksandra Nikolaevicha, izlozhennyya v 1826 godu," Sbornik imperatorskago russkago istoricheskago obshchestva, XXX, 1881, 61.
- 50 Idem.
- 51 Ibid., 61-62.
- 52 Ibid., 62.
- 53 Idem.
- 54 Ibid., 64.
- 55 Ibid., 63-64.
- 56 Ibid., 64.
- 57 Florovskii, Puti, op. cit., 194.
- 58 Chistovich, Istoriia perevoda, op. cit., 37.
- 59 Deviatii otchet komiteta Russkago bibleiskago obshchestva za 1822 god, Sanktpeterburg, 1823, V.

## NOTES

### Chapter V

1

This is a paraphrase of the complaints presented to the Holy Synod on 19 December 1819 and 2 March 1820. Archbishop Antonii of Iaroslavl' suggested that those who heard these complaints should write separate opinions about them. On 15 March Filaret presented his report. See Sobranie mnenii i otzyvov Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago i Kolomenskago, po uchebnym i tserkovno-gosudarstvennym voprosam, edited by Savva, archbishop of Tver', Sanktpeterburg: V Sinodal'noi tipografii, 1885, II, 22-24. Hereafter cited as SMIOF with volume and page.

2

"Materialy dlia istorii Moskovskoi eparkhii pod upravleniem (1821-1867) mitropolita Filareta," Sbornik izdannyi Obshestvom liubitelei dukhovnago prosveshcheniia, po sluchaiu prazdnovaniia stoletniago iubileia so dnia rozhdeniia (1782-1882) Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago, Moskva: Tipografiia L.O. Snegireva, 1883, I, 164-165. Hereafter cited as Sbornik OLDP, with volume and page.

3

SMIOF, II, 22-24.

4

Idem.

5

Idem.

6

Idem.

7

The Latin text of Mohyla's Orthodoxa Confessio Fidei is in A. Malvy and M. Miller, "La confession orthodoxe de Pierre Moghila," Orientalia Christiana, X, 39, Rome, 1927. An English translation exists, edited by J.J. Overbeck, The Orthodox Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church, faithfully translated from the original version of Peter Mogila, London, 1898.

Mohyla's confession, or catechism, was part of the cultural counter-offensive of the Ukrainian Orthodox against strong Protestant pressure. It was endorsed by the Council of Jasi (1642) and subsequently approved by Patriarch Parthenius II and the Holy Synod in Constantinople. It did not become an official confession for the whole Church, although it was widely used as a statement of Orthodox faith. Filaret understood the confession precisely in this light and did not ignore the Catholic flavor of Mohyla's work:

"But you will see," he wrote to A.N. Murav'ev, how much more humbly the Orthodox Church acts than some of its children [Murav'ev] and the experience of considerable duration justifies her humility. Peter Mohyla was not removed from the Church: his book [i.e. the Trebnik] was not burned: his Latin book led no one astray into the Latin faith, and did not prevent his other book, the Orthodox Confession, from enjoying great respect in the Orthodox Church....," Pis'ma k A.N.M. Murav'evu....., 1832-1867, Kiev: Tipografiia Davidenko, 1869, 240-241.

Mohyla's confession was first published in Greek translation in Holland in 1667; the original Latin version was printed in 1695 in Leipzig, and in 1696 a Slavic translation was made from the original Latin version.

8

There is an excellent summary of the chief features of Mohyla's confession in Steven Runciman, The Great Church in Captivity, Cambridge: University Press, 1968, 338-347.

9

Sbornik OLPD, I, 166.

10

Katikhizis, ili pervonachal'noe nastavlenie v Khristianskom zakone, kotoroe, po obychaiu v Moskovskoi Slaviano-Greko-Latinskoi Akademii izdavna priniatomu, Preosviashchennym Platonom vsenarodno tolkovano bylo v Akademicheskoi auditorii, s Sentiabria 1757 po 15 Iiulia 1758 goda, Moskva: V Senatskoi tipografii, 1781, 2 vols.

11

Kratkii katikhizis radi obucheniia maloletnykh detei khristianskomu zakonu.

12

Sokrashchennyi katikhizis dlia obucheniia otrokov.

13

Sokrashchennyi katikhizis dlia sviashchennosluzhitelei, s prilozheniem mest iz Slova Bozhii, pravil Sv. Apostol i Sv. Otets i Dukhovnago Reglamenta i prisiag. PSSP, II, 482-503.

14

Georgii Florovskii, Puti Russkago bogosloviia, Paris: YMCA Press, 1937, 111.

15

Pravolsavnoe uchenie ili sokrashchenno khristianskoe bogoslovie, Pervym tisneniem napechatana 1765 goda, Moskva: U soderzhatelia Senatskoi tipografii F. Gippius, 1780.

16

Prostrannyi katikhizis dlia obucheniia iunoshestva pravoslavnomu

zakonu khristianskomu, izdannyi pri uchrezhdenii narodnykh uchilishch v Rossiiskoi imperii, 7 tisnieniem, V Sanktpeterburge, 1806, 225 p. The text was published in Church Slavic.

- 17 Florovskii, Puti, op. cit., 112.
- 18 SMIOF, III, 221.
- 19 Ibid., 223, 224.
- 20 Pis'ma mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta namestniku Sviato-Troitskiiia Sergievy Lavry arkhimandrita Antoniiu, 1831-1867, Moskva: Tipografiia Mamontova, 1877, II, 296. Letter of 1 February 1847.
- 21 Ivan Korsunskii, "Filaret, mitropolit Moskovskii v svoikh katikhizisakh," Sbornik OLDP, II, 682-683.
- 22 I.A. Chistovich, Rukovodiashchie deiateli dukhovnago prosveshcheniia v Rossii v pervoi polovine tekushchago stoletiiia, Sanktpeterburg: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1894, 226.
- 23 SMIOF, V, 45.
- 24 Ivan Korsunskii, "Sud'by katikhizisov Filareta mitropolita Moskovskago," Russkii Vestnik, 1883, January-February, 327.
- 25 For example, Chto takoi katikhizis rather than Chto est' katikhizis.
- 26 Quoted in Korsunskii, "Filaret" Sbornik OLDP, II, 693-94 from Khristianskii katikhizis pravoslavnyiia kafolicheskiiia Greko-Rossiskiiia tserkvi, Spb, 1823, 23-27.
- 27 Prostrannyi khristianskoi katikhizis pravoslavnyiia kafolicheskiiia vostochnyia tserkvi, Moskva: V Sinodal'noi tipografii, 1904, 43.
- 28 Idem.
- 29 Ibid., 43-44.
- 30 Ibid., 44.

- 31 Ibid., 45.
- 32 Razgovory mezhdru ispytuiuushchim i uverennym o pravoslavii vostochnoi Greko-Rossiiskoi tserkvi, s prosivokupleniem vypiski iz okruzhnago pis'ma Fotiia, patriakha tsarogradskago, k vostochnym patriarshim prestolam, Spb., 1815. All quotations are taken however from the 1916 edition, Petrograd: Tip. Vys. utv. O-va rasp. relig-nravst. prosv, Obvodnyi, 1916. The conversations were written for the sixteen or seventeen year old nephew of Prince A.N. Golitsyn, A.M. Golitsyn, who had doubts--under Jesuit pressure--about the orthodoxy of the Eastern Church. Prince A.N. Golitsyn asked Filaret to speak with him about catholicism and write down the conversations. In 1829 an Archimandrite Innokentii translated the book into Polish.
- 33 Ibid., 11-15.
- 34 Ibid., 6.
- 35 Writings of Saint Augustine, "Faith, Hope, and Charity," New York: Cima Publishing House, 1947, 416-417.
- 36 Ibid, 417-418.
- 36a PSZRI, 34, no. 37106, 17 October 1877, 814; the entire law is discussed on 814-834.
- 36b "Completely ignorant of theology, Golitsyn belonged to every sect and to none. It was odd to watch this humble man become a harsh prosecutor for questions which he could neither explain nor understand." F.F. Vigel', Zapiski Filipa Filipovicha Vigelia, Moskva: V universitetskoi tipografii, 1891, part VI, 36.
- 37 Pis'ma mitropolita Moskovskago Filaret k A.N.M., op. cit., 623.
- 38 See the letter of Filaret to Count S.P. Potemkin, 27 May 1818 in "Filaret, mitropolit Moskovskii i arkhim. Innokentii (Smirnov) v pis'makh k gr. S.P. Potemkinu, 1812-1848 gg.," Russkaia Starina, 1883, June, 559.
- 39 Chistovich, Rukovodiashchie deiateli, op. cit., 184.
- 40 These are the titles of a few sermons. Very little of Mikhail's writings was ever published. See Besedy v raznykh mestakh i v

raznyia vremena govoreniia, S-Peterburg, I. Ioannosov, 1817-19, vols. 1-7.

41

Chistovich, Rukovodiashchie deiateli, op. cit., 189.

42

"A.F. Labzin i ego ssylka," Russkii Arkhiv, 1892, 12, 384, note 44.

43

Chistovich, Istoriia perevoda Biblii, op. cit., 34.

44

"Iz vospominanii pokoinago Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1868, August, 520.

45

Vigel', op. cit., part VI, 37.

46

Quoted in Chistovich, Rukovodiashchie deiateli, op. cit., 191.

47

The title in Russian is Nachal'nyia osnovaniia religii khristianskoi v pol'zu iunoshestva, see Ibid., 195.

48

Idem.

49

"Iz vospominanii," op. cit., 520.

50

Vigel', op. cit., part VI, 37.

51

"Filaret...k...Potemkinu," op. cit., 564.

52

"Iz vospominanii," op. cit., 540-541.

53

Idem.

54

Idem.

55

Chistovich, Rukovodiashchie deiateli, op. cit., 209.

56

N.F. Dubrovin (ed.), "Materialy dlia istorii pravoslavnoi tserkvi," Sbornik imperatorskago Russkago istoricheskago obshchestva, S-Peterburg: Tipografiia tovarishchestva 'Obshchestvennaia Pol'za', 1902, CXIII, 20.

- 57 A.N.L'vov(ed.), Pis'ma dukhovnykh i svetskikh lits k mitropolitu Moskovskomu Filaretu, s 1812 po 1867 gg., S-Peterburg: Tipografiia Lopukhina, 1900, 38-39.
- 58 "Pis'ma...k...Potemkinu," op. cit., 565; letter dated 11 June 1821.
- 59 Idem.
- 60 Sushkov, op. cit., appendix, 52-53.
- 61 "Pis'ma raznykh lits k Parfeniiu," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1872, 23-26.
- 62 "Avtobiografii Iur'evskago arkhimandrita Fotiia," Russkaia Starina, 1882, August, 287
- 63 Ibid., 1894, March, 162-63. Despite the fact the monastery was not in existence over a century earlier, the point Fotii was making is valid: there was new life pulsing in monastic veins-- one of the most distinctive signs of the revived strength of the Orthodox Church after the shock of the Petrine ecclesiastical reforms.
- 64 Ibid., 1894, May, 105.
- 65 Idem.
- 66 Ibid., 1894, May, 108.
- 67 Ibid., 1894, May, 105.
- 68 Ibid., 1894, May, 92-93.
- 69 Ibid., 1894, July, 217.
- 70 Ibid., 1894, July, 218-219.
- 71 Ibid., 1894, July, 219.
- 72 Ibid., 1894, July, 218.

- 73  
Ibid., 1894, July, 201.
- 74  
Ibid., 1894, July, 214.
- 75  
PSZRI, 39, 29914, 15 May 1824, 319.
- 76  
"Zapiski admirala A.S. Shishkova, s Maia 1824 po Dekabr' 1826 goda. S predisloviem O.M. Bodianskago," Chteniia v imperatorskom obshchestve istorii i drevnostei Rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete, 1868, 3, "Materialy otechestvennye," 47-48.
- 77  
Vigel', op. cit., part II, 55.
- 78  
Florovskii, op. cit., 161.
- 79  
V.V. Vinogradov, Ocherki po istorii Russkogo literaturnogo iazyka XVII-XIX vv., Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1949, 198.
- 80  
Florovskii, op. cit., 162.
- 81  
Idem.
- 82  
Idem.
- 83  
Ibid., 163.
- 84  
"Zapiski...Shishkova," Chteniia, op. cit., 49.
- 85  
"Zapiski...Shishkova," Chteniia, op. cit., 49.
- 86  
"Mnenie A.S. Shishkova o tsenzure i knighopechatanii v Rossii," Russkaia Starina, 1904, July, 203.
- 87  
"Zapiski...Shishkova," Chteniia, op. cit., 49.
- 88  
Ibid., 49-50.
- 89  
Ibid., 50.

- 90  
Idem.
- 91  
Ibid., 48.
- 92  
Professor N.I. Barsov, Khristianskoe Chtenie, 1881, November-December, 783-785, has attributed this criticism to Father Gerasim Pavskii. I. Korsunskii, however, is probably correct in identifying the author as Kochetov. The criticism is quite different in spirit from Pavskii's known views. See Ivan Korsunskii, "Filaret," Sbornik OLDP, II, 704 and note 1.
- 93  
Ibid., 709.
- 94  
Ibid., 712-713.
- 95  
Sushkov, op. cit., appendix, 48-49.
- 96  
The text of the 17 November ukaz is in "Iz vospominanii," op. cit., 1868, XXVI, 542.
- 97  
M.I. Sukhomlinov, "Iz bumag v boze pochivshago mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta," Zhurnal ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniia, 1868, I, 20.
- 98  
Sushkov, op. cit., appendix, 49-50.
- 99  
Ibid., 53.
- 100  
Idem.
- 101  
Idem.
- 102  
Pis'ma...k Parfeniiu," op. cit., 60.
- 103  
Pis'ma k rodnym, op. cit., 263; letter of 20 December 1824; see also the letter of 31 December, 264.
- 104  
M.M. Evreinov, "Nekotoryia vospominaniia o mitropolite Filarete," Dushepoleznyia Chteniia, 1870, II, Izvestii i zametok," 15-16.

- 105 Sochineniia Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago i Kolomenskago; Slova i rechi, Moskva: Tipografiia A.I. Mamontova, 1873, II, 362.
- 106 Ibid., II, 366.
- 107 Ibid., II, 368.
- 108 Ibid., II, 370.
- 109 Idem.
- 110 Ibid., II, 373.
- 111 Ibid., II, 372.
- 112 Idem.
- 113 Idem.
- 114 Vigel', op. cit., part II, 56.

NOTES  
Epilogue

- 1 Iz vospominanii, 526-527.
- 2 Ibid., 529.
- 3 SMIOF, II, 158-160; the entire statement is on pp. 156-170.
- 4 Chistovich, Rukovodiashchie deiateli, 275.
- 5 Idem.
- 6 Idem.
- 7 Ibid., 276.
- 8 Idem.
- 9 Ibid., 278.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- I. Primary and secondary literature concerning Filaret.
  - A. Writings
  - B. Sermons
  - C. Papers, resolutions, memoirs, and opinions
  - D. Correspondence
  - E. Memoirs and reminiscences concerning Filaret
  - F. Secondary studies on Filaret
  
- II. Other primary and secondary sources.
  - A. Primary sources
  - B. Secondary sources

### Abbreviations:

<u>Chteniia OADR</u>	<u>Chteniia v Moskovskom obshchestve istorii i drevnosti rossiiskikh pri Moskovskom universitete.</u>
<u>Chteniia OADP</u>	<u>Chteniia v obshchestve liubitelei dukhovnago prosveshcheniia.</u>
<u>TSORP</u>	<u>Tvoreniia sviatykh otsev v Russkom perevode.</u>
<u>ZMNP</u>	<u>Zhurnal ministerstva narodnago prosveshcheniia.</u>

### A. Writings by Filaret Drozdov, Metropolitan of Moscow, 1811-1825.

"Izlozhenie raznosti mezhdu vostochnoiu i zapadnoi tserkoviiu v uchenii very," Chteniia OADR, 1870, I, 31-44. (1811-1812).

Razsuzhdenie o нравstvennykh prichinakh neimovernykh uspekhnv nashikh v voine 1812 goda. S. Peterburg: Izdanie Smirdina, 1855, (20 May 1813).

Zametki na perevod traktata Ansil'ona ob iziashchnom, sdelannyya studentami, pod redaktsieiu arkhiep. Feofilakta. (1813)  
Published only as part of next entry.

"Oproverzhenie primechanii na knigu gospodina Ansil'ona pod zaglaviiem 'Esteticheskii razsuzhdeniia Riazanskago arkhiepiskopa Feofilakta,'" Chteniia OADR, 1872, I, smes', 179-209. (1813)

Introductiones in singulos libros veteris testamenti, in supplementum libri classici conscriptae. Sanktpeterburg, 1813

Opyt iz "iasneniia psalma LXVIII: Da voskrese Bog i rastochatsia vrazi Ego. Iz urokov Spb. dukh. akademii. Spb. 1814. Later edition Moskva: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1889.

Obozrenie bogoslovskikh nauk v otnoshenii k prepodavaniuu ikh v

vyshikh dukhovnykh uchilishchakh. Spb.: V tipografii I. Ioannesova, 1814.

Razgovory mezhdru ispytuiushchim i uverenym o pravoslavii vostochnoi Greko-Rossiiskoi tserkvi, s prosovokupleniem vypiski iz okruzhnago pis'ma Fotiia, patriarkha tsarogradskago, k vostochnym patriarshim prestolam. Spb., 1815. Second edition Moskva: V sinodal'noi tipografii, 1833.

"Prorocheskiia knigi Vetkhago Zaveta. Iz akademicheskikh chtenii Filareta, m.M.," Chteniia OLDP, 1873, 5, May, 508-522; 6 June, 712-752; 7, July, 1-35. (1812-1816).

Nachertanie tserkovno-Bibleiskoi istorii, v pol'zu iunoshestva, obuchaiushchegosia v dukhovnykh uchilishchakh. Spb. i Moskva: Pri sviateishem sinode. 1816.

Zapiski na knigu Bytiia.... Iz urokov Spb. dukhovnoi akademii. Spb.: V tipografii I. Ioannesova, 1816. Second edition, corrected, Spb., 1819.

Tablitsy chteniia iz Sviashch. Pisanii, tserkovnoi i grazhdanskoj pechati. Spb.: Izdannyi glavnyim pravleniem uchilishch, 1819.

Chteniia iz chetyrekh evangelistov i iz knigi deianii apostol'skikh, dlia upotrebleniia v grazhdanskikh uchilishchakh. Spb.: Izdannyi glavnyim pravleniem uchilishch, 1820.

"Vecherniaia psen' puteshestvennika," Dushepoleznoe Chtenie, 1867, IX, 34-35. (Poem, August 24, 1820).

Chteniia iz knig Sv. Pisaniia Vetkhago Zaveta. Spb.: Izdannyi departmentom narodnago prosveshcheniia, Spb.: 1822.

Rech' v general'nom sobranii Moskovskago komiteta Rossiiskago Bibleiskago obshchestva. Moskva: V universitetskoj tipografii, 1822.

Manifest o naznachenii naslednikom prestola velikago kniazia Nikolaiia Pavlovicha, 1823. Published in full only in "Iz bumag v Boze pochivshago mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta," ZMNP, 1868, I, 1-38.

Khristianskii katikhizis, pravoslavnyiia kafolicheskiia vostochnyiia Greko-Rossiiskiiia tserkvi. Sanktpeterburg: V Sinodal'noi tipografii, 1823.

"Rech' v general'nom sobranii Moskovskago komiteta Rossiiskago Bibleiskago obshchestva, 23 Marta 1824 g.," Izvestiia o Bibleiskikh obshchestvakh za 1824 g., no. 5. Moskva, 1824.

B. Sermons.

Slova Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago, 1806-1808 godov. Moskva: V universitetskoj tipografii, 1874.

Pouchitel'nyia slova, govorenniia v raznyiia vremena, Sanktpeterburg: Pri svaiteishem sinode, 1820.

Slova i rechi sinodal'nago chlena Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago. Moskva: V tipografii Got'e i Monietti, 1848-1861, 3 volumes.

Sochineniia Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago i Kolomenskago. Slova i rechi. Moskva: Tipografiia A.I. Mamontova, 1873-1885, 5 volumes.

C. Papers, resolutions, memoirs, and opinions.

Gosudarstvennoe uchenie Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago. Moskva: Tipografiia E.G. Protapova, 1888.

"Iz bumag v Boze pochivshago mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta," ZMNP, 1868, I, 1-38.

"Iz bumag Moskovskago mitropolita Filareta," Chteniia OADR, 1880, II, 2, 1-36.

"Iz vospominanii pokoinago Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago," Pravolsavnoe Obozrenie, VIII, August, 507-542.

Mneniia, otzvyvy i pis'ma Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago i Kolomenskago, po raznym voprosam za 1821-1867 gg. L. Broskii (ed.). Moskva: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1905.

Polnoe sobranie rezoliutsii Filareta mitropolita Moskovskago. Korsunskii and Markov (eds.). Moskva: Universtitskaia tipografiia, 1903. 2 volumes.

Rezoliutsii po raznym razdelam i glavam ustava dukhovnykh konsistorii i po unpravleniiu dukhovno-uchebnymi zavedeniiami. Orel: Tipografiia V.P. Matveeva, 1889.

Sbornik myslei i izrechenii mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta, izvlechennykh iz perepiski ego s raznymi litsami. Moskva: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1897.

Sobranie mnenii o otzvyvov po delam pravoslavnoi tserkvi na vostoce. Sanktpeterburg: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1886.

Sobranie mnenii i otzvyvov Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago i Kolomenskago, po uchebnym i tserkovno-gosudarstvennym voprosam. Archbishop Savva (ed.). Sanktpeterburg: V sinodal'noi tipografii, 1885-1888. 5 volumes in 6. Tom dopolnitelnyi. Spb.: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1887, is published separately.

D. Correspondence.

- Pis'ma Moskovskago mitropolita Filareta k pokoinomu arkhiepiskopu Tverskomu Aleksiiu, 1843-1867. Moskva: Tipografiia Z. Lissner i IU. Roman, 1883.
- Pis'ma mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta k namestniku Sviato-Troitskiiia Sergievy Lavry arkhimandritu Antoniiu, 1831-1867 gg. Moskva: Tipografiia A.I. Mamontova, 1877-1883. 3 volumes.
- Pis'ma Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago k Filaretu Gumilevskomu, vposledstviu arkhiepiskopu Chernigovskomu. Moskva: Tipografiia M.N. Lavrova, 1884.
- "Pis'ma Moskovskago i Kolomenskago mitropolita Filareta k Gavriilu, arkhiepiskopu Riazanskomu i Zarskomu," Chteniia O IDR, 1868, II smes', 114-207.
- "Pis'ma Filareta k S.M. Golitsynu," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1883, I, January, 1-32; II, February, 33-48; III, March, 49-80; IV, April, 81-112.
- Pis'ma dukhovnykh i svetskikh lits k mitropolitu Moskovskomu (s 1812-1867 gg.). A.N. L'vov (ed.). S.-Peterburg: Tipografiia A.P. Lopukhina, 1900.
- "Pis'ma protoiereia Aleksandra Vasil'evicha Gorskago ot Marta 1867 g. k Moskovskomu mitropolitu Filaretu," Bogoslovskii Vestnik, 1907, III, September, 160-171.
- "Pis'ma vysokopreosviashchennago mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta (Drozdova) k nastoiateliu Troitskoi Sergievoi pustyni arkhimandritu (vposledstviu episkopu) Ignatiiu Brianchaninovu, 1833-1842 g.," Bogoslovskii Vestnik, 1912, XII, December, 682-688.
- "Pis'mo Moskovskago mitropolita Filareta k protoiereiu Kazanskago sobora, Ioannu Dmitrievu," Chteniia O IDR, 1870, II, smes', 173-174.
- Pis'ma mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta khраниashchikhsia v sobranii avtografov Imperatorskoi Publichnoi Biblioteki. S.-Peterburg: Tipografiia V.S. Balasheva, 1891.
- Pis'ma Filareta mitropolita Moskovskago k Leonidu episkopu Dmitrovskomu vposledstviu Arkhiepiskopu Iaroslavskomu. Moskva: V universitetskoii tipografii, 1883.
- Pis'ma mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta k A.N. M /urav'ev/, 1832-1867. Kiev: V tipografii I. i A. Davidenko, 1869.
- Perepiska Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago s S.A. Nechaevym. Sanktpeterburg: Tipografiia I. akademii nauk, 1895.
- Pis'ma vysokopreosviashchennago Filareta Moskovskago k Ekaterine Vladimirovne Novosil'tsevoi. Moskva: 'Russkaia Pechatiia', 1911.

- "Desiat' pisem k A.N. Oleninu mitropolita Filareta, s 30 Maia 1812 g. po 26 Ianvaria 1841," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1869, III, March, 365-371.
- "Pis'ma raznykh lits k preosv. Parfeniiu, arkhiepiskopu Voronezhskomu. S predisloviem i primechaniem prof. I.N. Korsunskago," Russkii Arkhiv, 1899, V, 185-217.
- "Pis'ma mitropolita Filareta," Rusaskaia Starina, CXIII, 1900, February, 359-362.
- "Pis'ma vysokopreosviashchenneishago Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago," Russkii Arkhiv, 1868, I, 138-141.
- "Filaret, mitropolit Moskovskii i arkhimandrit Innokentii (Smirnov) v pis'makh k gr. S.P. Potemkinu," Rusaskaia Starina, 1883, June, 557-572.
- "Predpisanie mitropolita Filareta," Russkii Arkhiv, 1899, III, 521.
- "Moskovskii mitropolit Filareta v pis'makh svoikh k raznym litsam," Chteniia O IDR, 1870, III, smes', 140-189.
- Pis'ma mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta (v mire Vasiliia Mikhailovicha Drozdova) k rodnym ot 1800-go do 1866-go goda. Moskva: Tipografiia A.I. Mamontova, 1882.
- "Chetyre pis'ma mitropolita Filareta k mitropolitu Sergiiu," Moskovskiiia Vedomosti, 1899, no. 331, December I, 2.
- Pis'ma Moskovskago mitropolita Filareta k igumeni Spaso-Borodinskago monastyria Sergiiu. Archbishop Savva (ed.). Tver', 1890.
- "Pis'ma mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta ober prokuroru sv. sinoda, grafu A.P. Tolstomu," Starina i Novizna, 1901, VI, 26-34.
- "Pis'ma Moskovskago mitropolita Filareta k preosviashch, Vitaliiu, episkopu Dmitrovskomu, vikariiu Moskovskoi eparkhii," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1887, II, February, 217-249; III, March, 425-465.
- Pis'ma mitropolita Moskovskago i Kolomenskago k vysochaishim osobam i raznym drugim litsam. Tver': Tip. gubernskago pravleniia, 1888.
- E. Memoirs and reminiscences concerning Filaret.
- Beliaev, A.A. "Zamechaniia Moskovskago mitropolita Filareta na poslednyi tom istorii Russkoi tserkvi Filareta, arkhiepiskopa Chernigovskago," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1889, I, 103-121.
- B...v, A. "Iz otzyvov i vospominanii P.S. Kazanskago o mitropolita Filarete," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1882, VIII, August 723-733.

Leonid (Krasnopevkov). "Vospominaniia i otzyvy Moskovskago mitropolita Filareta," Russkii Arkhiv, 1907, I, 49-55.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Iz vospominanii mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta," Russkii Arkhiv, 1906, III, 214-217.

"Iz vospominanii igumen'i E. o Moskovskom mitropolite Filarete," Sbornik starinnykh bumag, khраниashchikhsia v muzee P. I. Shchukina. Moskva: Tovarishchestvo tipografii A.I. Mamontova, 1901. Volume 9, 427-433.

"K vospominaniiam o Moskovskom mitropolite Filarete," Chteniia O IDR, 1877, I, smes', 138-144.

"Vospominaniia P.A. M-oi o Moskovskom mitropolite Filarete," Sbornik starinnykh bumage, khраниashchikhsia v muzee P.I. Shchukina. Moskva: Tovarishchestvo tipografii A.I. Mamontova, 1901. Volume 9, 398-426.

Murav'ev, A.N. "Vpechatleniia konchiny i pogrebeniia mitropolita Filareta," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1868, II, February, 1-20.

Nikodim (Kazantsev). "O Filarete mitropolite Moskovskom, moia pamiat'," Chteniia O IDR, 1877, II, i-iv, 1-114.

Smirnov, M.P. "Melochi iz vospominanii," Istoricheskii Vestnik, XXI, 1885, 576-591.

Sushkov, N.V. "Zameta na zametku," Chteniia O IDR, 1868, II, smes', 208-214.

\_\_\_\_\_. Zapiski o zhizni i vremeni sviatitelia Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago. Moskva: Tipografiia A.I. Mamontova, 1868.

Romanskii, Nikolai. "K kharakteristike Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago," Bogoslovskii Vestnik, 1901, V, May, 76-107; VI, June, 284-310.

Titov, A. "Iz zapisok Tverskago arkhiepiskopa Savvy," Russkii Arkhiv, 1906, 3, 505-536.

"Vospominanie o mitropolite Filarete," Russkii Arkhiv, VII-VIII, 1869, 1178-1183.

#### F. Secondary studies on Filaret.

A., P.M. "Izdanie sochinenii Filareta mitropolita Moskovskago," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1878, VI, June, 331-341.

Avgustov, Dmitrii. Iz istorii Moskovskoi dukhovnoi akademii. Otnoshenie mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta k Moskovskoi dukhovnoi akademii. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

St. Petersburg Theological Academy?, 1913. Reviewed by N.D. Protasov and M.M. Bogoslovskii in Bogoslovskii Vestnik, 1914, I, 180-184.

Barsov, N.I. "Mnenie arkhiepiskopa Innokentia o katekhizisakh mitropolita Filareta," Khristianskoe Chtenie, 1885, 5-6, 732.

\_\_\_\_\_  
"Vzgliad na zhizn' i deiatel'nost' mitropolita Filareta Moskovskago," Neskol'ko izsledovanii istoricheskikh i razsuzhdenii voprosakh sovremennykh. Spb.: Tipografiia M.M. Stasiulevicha, 1899, 42-49.

Beliaev, A.A. "M.m. Filaret v pis'makh k rodnym," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1883, III, March, 499-523.

\_\_\_\_\_  
"Voprosy i otnoshenii i sobytiia shestnadesiatykh godov i otnoshenie k nim mitropolita Filareta," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1889, IX, September, 3-51; XI, November, 501-540.

Bogomolov, Vasilii. Mitropolit Moskovskii Filaret (Drozdov), kak tserkovno-obshchestvennyi deiatel'. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Kazan' Theological Academy, 1910. Reviewed by I.M. Pokrovskii and A.F. Preobrazhenskii in Protokoly zasedanii soveta Kazanskoi dukhovnoi akademii za 1910 god, 102-118.

Bukharev, A.M. "O Filarete kak plodotvornom dvigatele raz. pravoslavno-Russkoi mysli," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1884, IV, April, 717-749.

Dernov, A.A. Filaret mitropolit Moskovskii i Innokentii arkhiepiskop Khersonskii: opyt kratkoi kharakteristiki (po povodu stoletia so dnia rozhdenii ikh). S.-Peterburg: Tipolitografiia M.P. Frolovoi, 1901.

"Filaret Drozdov, mitropolit Moskovskii," Russkaia Starina, 1885, June, 559-590; July, 1-26; October, 143-166; 1886, May, 253-266; August, 277-304.

Filaret, mitropolit Moskovskii, Sbornik. Spb.: Izd. pod redaktsiei Bogoslovskago Vestnika, 1918.

Glinskii, Ivan. Filaret, mitropolit Moskovskii, kak propovednik. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. St. Peterburg Theological Academy? 1913. Reviewed in Bogoslovskii Vestnik, 1914, II, 243-246.

Gorodkov, Aleksei. Dogmaticheskoe bogoslovie po sochineniiam Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago. Kazan': Tipografiia gubernskago pravleniia, 1887. Reviewed in Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1887, XII, 766-776 and by E. Burdin in Pravoslavnyi Sobesednik, 1887, II, 481-508.

Grigorii, Arkhimandrit. "Materialy dlia istorii Russkoi tserkvi. Materialy dlia biografii m. M. Filareta," Chteniia OLDP, 1873, V, 81-115; IX, 136-163.

"Iubileynyi den' v Boze pochivaiushchago mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta v Kazan'," Pravoslavnyi Sobesednik, 1883, I, 92-96.

Kazanskii, P. "Mysli i chuvstvovaniia m. Filareta po delu otobraniiia litografirovannago perevoda knig Vetkhago Zaveta, po pis'mam ego k a. Antoniiu," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1878, I, 106-118.

Kharlampovich, K. "K biografii Moskovskago mitropolita Filareta," Bogoslovskii Vestnik, 1914, II, May, 6-8.

Kliuchevskii, V.O. "Otzyvy o knige S. Smirnova: Istoriia Moskovskoi dukhovnoi akademii do ee preobrazovaniia," Otzyvy i otvety. Tretii sbornik statei. Petrograd: Literaturno-Izdatel'skii otdel, Kommissariata narodnago prosveshcheniia, 1918.

Korsunkii, I.M. "Deiatel'nost' Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago v kholeru, 1830-1831' godov," TSORP, XXXIX, 1887, February, 222-339.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Lira Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago," Russkii Vestnik, 1884, November, 267-307.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Oдно iz bogoslovskikh sochinenii mitropolita Moskovskago Filareta, po sude inostrannago kritika," Chteniia OLDP, 1884, I, 19.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Opredelenie poniatiiia o tserkvi v sochineniiakh Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago," Khristianskoe Chtenie, 1895, II, 47-90.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Propovednicheskaiia deiatel'nost' Vasiliia Mikhailovicha Drozdova ( v posledstvii Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago) 1803-1808 gg.," Vera i Razum, 1884, II, 286-305; IV, 362-402.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Peterburgskii period propovednicheskoi deiatel'nosti Filareta (Drozdova), v posledstvii mitropolita Moskovskago (1809-1819)," Vera i Razum, 1884, XIII, 13-40; XV, 131-154; XX, 490-502; XXII, 591-612; XXIII, 739-769.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Sud'by katikhizisov Filareta mitropolita Moskovskago," Russkii Vestnik, CLXIII, 1883, January-February, 322-383.

\_\_\_\_\_ Sviatitel' Filaret, mitropolit Moskovskii. Ego zhizn' i deiatel'nost' na Moskovskoi kafedre po ego propovediam, v sviazi s sobytiiami i obstoiatel'stvami togo vremeni (1821-1867 g.g.). Kharkov, 1894.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Vozsoedinenie uniatov i Filaret, mitropolit Moskovskii," TSORP, XLIV, 1889, March, 112-199.

Leskov, N. "Iz melochei arkhierieiskoi zhizni," Istoricheskii Vestnik, II, 1880, June, 255-267.

- Levashev, F. "Napravlenie i kharakter propovedi Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago," Strannik, 1875, October, 7-38; November, 108-140; December, 197-232.
- Mudroliubov, Vasilii. Ucheniie o pravoslavii po sochineniiam Moskovskago mitropolita Filareta. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. St. Peterburg Theological Academy, date?
- Nazarevskii, V.V. Gosudarstvennoe uchenie Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago. Moskva, 1883.
- P[avlov]., D[mitrii]. "Cherty iz zhizni mitropolita Filareta," Moskovskiaia Vedomosti, 1899, No. 331, 1 December, 3.
- Ponomarev, S. "Vysokopreosviashchenneishii Filaret, mitropolit Moskovskii i Kolomenskii. (Materialy dlia ocherka ego zhizni i uchenoi deiatel'nosti," Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii, 1867, December, 509-566; 1868, February, 316-380; March, 571-621; April, 106-186.
- "Prazdnovaniia stoletniago iubileia Filareta v Moskve," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1883, I, 187-190
- Rozanov, N. "Metricheskaia zapis' o rozhdenii pokoinago vysokopreosviashcheishago Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago," Sovremennaia Letopis', 1867, No. 45, December 10, 1.
- Sbornik izdannyi obshchestvom liubitelei dukhovnago prosveshcheniia, po sluchaiu prazdnovaniia stoletniago iubileia so dnia rozhdeniia (1782-1882) Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago. Moskva: Tipografiia L.O. Snegireva, 1883, 2 volumes.
- Shevyrev, S.P. "Slova i rechi mitropolita Filareta Moskovskago," Moskvitianin, I, 1846, 181-224.
- Slotskii, A. "Protoierei G.P. Pavskii i mitropolit Filaret," Russkaia Starina, 1881, July, 479-486.
- Smirnov, A.A. Detstvo, otrochestvo, iunost', gody ucheniia i uchitel'stva v Troitskoi lavrskoi seminarii mitropolita Filareta (1782-1808). Moskva: Tipografiia T.I. Gagen, 1893.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Peterburgskii period zhizni mitropolita Filareta (1808-1819). Moskva: Tipografiia A.I. Snegirevoi, 1894.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Filaret arkhiepiskop Tverskoi, Iaroslavskii i Moskovskii (1819-1826). Moskva, 1896.
- Smirnov, S.K. "Uchitel' Troitskoi seminarii Vasilii Mikhailovich Drozdov," Sovremennaia Letopis', 1867, No. 44, December 3, 4-6.
- "Stoletnii iubilei," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1882, X, 852-853; 1883, I, 187-190.

Trudy mitropolita Moskovskago i Kolomenskago Filareta po pereložheniiu Novago Zaveta na Russkii iazyk. Sanktpeterburg: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1893.

Vinogradov, Vasilii P. "Platon i Filaret, mitropolity Moskovskie," Bogoslovskii Vestnik, 1913, I, 10-34; II, 311-347.

Vysheslavitsev, Grigorii. O semeinoi zhizni po ucheniiu Filareta, mitropolita Moskovskago. Spb.: A. Katanskii, 1894.

Zaozerskii, N.A. "Filaret m. M., kak sluzhitelj slova," Bogoslovskii Vestnik, 1907, XI, 550-568.

Zaritskii, Iakov I. Filaret mitropolit Moskovskii kak propovednik. Spb., 1898.

## II. Other primary sources and secondary studies.

### A. Primary sources.

#### 1. Avgustin Vinogradskii.

"Pis'ma Avgustina k Platonu," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1869, V, May, 1-17; VI, June, 18-32; VIII, August, 33-88; 1870, VII, July, 89-104; VIII, August, 105-120; X, October, 121-135.

Rechi i slova. Spb.: Izdanie Korablevym, 1819.

#### 2. Commission on Theological Schools.

Opis' dokumentov i del, khраниashchikhsia v arkhive sviateishago pravitel'stvuiushchago sinoda, s ukazateliami k nei. Dela komissii dukhovnykh uchilishch, 1808-1838 gg. S.-Peterburg: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1910.

#### 3. Archimandrite Fotii.

"Avtobiografiia IUr'evskago arkhimandrita Fotiia," Russkaia Starina XXV, 1894, III, March, 135-163; IV, April, 99-123; V, May, 91-114; VII, July, 195-230; X, October, 127-142; XXVI, 1895, II, February, 174-216; III, March, 177-184; XI, November, 207-236; XXVII, 1896, VII, July, 163-199; VIII, August, 423-443.

"Iz zapisok Fotiia, arkhimandrita Novgorodskago IUr'evskago monastyria," Chteniia O IDR, 1868, I, smes', 262-273.

"Poslaniia sviashchenno-arkhimandrita Fotiia k dukhovnoi dshcheri ego Anne (1820-1822 gg.)," Chteniia O IDR, 1881, I, smes',

## 4. Giliarov-Plantonov, N.

Iz perezhitago. Avtobiograficheskiia vospominannia. Moskva: Izdanie tovarishchestva M.G. Kushinova, 1886. 2 volumes. Also published as "Iz prozhitago," Russkii Vestnik, May-November, 1884; April, July, 1885.

## 5. Feofilakt Rusanov.

"Mnenie o raznosti mezhdou vostochnoiu i zapadnoi tserkvoiu," Chteniia O IDR, 1870, I, 15-26.

Sobranie perevodov. S.-Peterburg, 1809. 4 volumes.

## 6. Prince A.N. Golitsyn.

"Dva pis'ma kniazia A.N. Golitsyna k IUR'evskomu arkhimandritu Fotiiu," Chteniia O IDR, 1868, III, smes', 237-239.

"Kniaz' A.N. Golitsyn i arkhimandrit Fotii, v 1822-1825 gg.," Russkaia Starina, 1882, 275-296.

"Pis'ma raznykh lits k kniazii A.N. Golitsynu," Russkii Arkhiv, 1905, III, 488-495.

"Kniaz' Aleksandr Nikolaevich Golitsyn, v ego pis'makh k imperatoru Aleksandru Pavlovichu, k baronesse Kridner, k kniagine A.S. Golitsynoi, k baronu i baronesse Berkheim (1812-1840)," Russkii Arkhiv, 1905, III, 360-455.

"Razskazy kn. Aleksandra Nikolaevicha Golitsyna: Aleksandr I i ego vremia," Russkaia Starina, 1884, I, January, 123-134.

"Zapiski kniazia G.S. Golitsyna (kn. A.N. Golitsyn)," Russkii Arkhiv, 1905, III, 573-591

## 7. Mikhail Desnitskii.

Besedy o raznykh stepeniakh istinnago deistviia blagodati Bozhiei, osnovannoi na 50 psalme Davidovom, S.-Peterburg, 1819.

Besedy v raznykh mestakh i v raznyia vremena govorenniia.... S.-Peterburg: I. Ioannosov, 1817-1819. 7 volumes.

Izobrazhenie vetkhago, vneshniago, plotskago i novago dukhovnago cheloveka, S.-Peterburg, 1798.

Plach khristianina nad dukhovnym pleniem Izrailia. S.-Peterburg, 1798.

Trud, pishcha, i pokoi dukha chelovecheskago, S.-Peterburg, 1798, 7 volumes.

8. Platon Levshin.

Polnoe sobranie sochinenii Platona (Levshina) mitropolita Moskovskago. S.-Peterburg: Izd-vo P.O. Soikina, 1913. 2 volumes.

9. Pavskii, G.P.

"Mysli zakonouchitelia, protoiereia Gerasima Petrovicha Pavskago o religioznom uchenii i vospitanii ego imperatorskago vysochestva gosudaria velikago kniazia naslednika tsarevicha Aleksandra Nikolaevicha, izlozhennyya v 1826 godu," Sbornik imperatorskago Russkago istoricheskago obshchestva, XXX, 1881, 61-69.

10. Russian Bible Society.

Otchety komiteta Rossiiskago Bibleiskago obshchestva, S.-Peterburg, 1814-1822. 8 volumes.

11. Serafim Glagolevskii.

Izsledovanie dokazatel'stv bytiia Bozhiia, Moskva, 1789.

"Otnoshenie preosviashchennago Novgorodskago mitropolita Serafima k grafu A.A. Arakcheevu," Chteniia O IDR, 1873, II, smes' 262-264.

Pastyrskoe uveshchanie po sluchaiu kholery. S.-Peterburg, 1831.

12. Shishkov, A.S.

"Aleksandr Semenovich Shishkov i dve vsepoddanneishiia ego zapiski," Russkaia Starina, XI, November, 573-589.

Sobranie sochinenii i perevodov A.S. Shishkova. S.-Peterburg, 1818-1819.

"Zapiski admiral A.S. Shishkova, s Maia 1824 po Dekabr' 1826," Chteniia O IDR, 1868, III, materialy otechestvennye, 1-142.

Zapiski, mneniia i perepiski admirala Shishkova. Berlin; Izd. Kiseleva, 1870.

B. Secondary studies.

1. Avgustin Vinogradskii.

Snegirev, I. Ocherki zhizni. Moskva, 1841.

2. Biblical studies in Russia.

Sol'skii, S.M. "Obozrenie trudov po izucheniiu Biblii v Rossii s XV veka do nastoiashchago vremeni," Pravoslavnoe Obozrenie, 1868, X, October, 97-180; 1869, II, February, 190-221; IV, April, 538-577; VI, June 797-822.

Vishnekov, N.P. O proiskhozhdenii Psaltiri. Spb.: Tipografiia Eleonskago, 1875.

Voskresenskii, G. "K voprosu o Slavianskom perevode Evangeliiia," Sbornik otdeleniia Russkago iazyka i slovesnosti imperatorskoi akademii nauk, XL, 1886, 4., 1-41.

3. Ecclesiastical schools.

Beliavskii, F.N. O reforme dukhovnoi shkoly. Spb., 1907. 2 volumes.

Chistovich, I.A. Istoriia S.-Peterburgskoi dukhovnoi akademii. Spb., 1857.

S.-Peterburgskaia dukhovnaia akademiia za posledniia 30 let (1858-1888 gg.). Sanktpeterburg: V sinodal'noi tipografii, 1889.

Rukovodiashchie deiateli dukhovnago prosveshcheniia v Rossii v pervoi polovine tekushchago stoletiiia. Komissiia dukhovnykh uchilishch. Sanktpeterburg: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1891.

D'iakonov, K.P. Dukhovniia shkoly v tsarstvovanie imperatora Nikolaia Igo. Sergiev posad: Tipografiia Sv. Troitskoi Sergievoi Lavry, 1907.

Glubokovskii, N.N. Po voprosam dukhovnoi shkoly. Spb., 1907.

Istomin, G. "Postanovleniia imperatritsy Ekateriny II otnositel'no obrazovaniia dukhovenstva," Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii, 1867, September, 580-624.

Kniazev, A. "Ocherk istorii Pskovskoi seminarii ot nachala do preobrazovaniia eia po proektu ustava 1814 goda," Chteniia ODR, 1866, I, smes', i-ii, 23-102.

Pokrovskii, Ivan. "Ob otkrytii dukh. uchilishch v Rosii, so vremeni preobrazovaniia ikh imperatorom Aleksandrom I," Strannik, 1860, November, 311-320.

Poletaev, N. "K istorii dukhovno-uchebnoi reformy 1808-1814," Strannik, 1889, VIII, 514-541; IX, 54-77.

Prilezhaev, Evgenii. "Tsarstvovanie Aleksandra I v istorii Russkoi dukhovnoi shkoly," Khristianskoe Chtenie, 1878, I, 253-275.

Rostislavov, D.I. Ob ustroistve dukhovnykh uchilishch v Rossii. Leipzig, 1863.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Peterburgskaia dukhovnaia akademiia do grafa Protasova," Vestnik Evrony, 1872, VII, July, 219-243; VIII, August, 664-706; IX, September, 152-207.

Smirnov, S.K. Istoriia Moskovskoi Slaviano-Greko-Latinskoi akademii. Moskva: Tipografiia V. Got'e, 1855.

\_\_\_\_\_ Istoriia Troitskoi lavrskoi seminarii. Moskva: Izd. A.V. Tolononnikova, 1867.

Swan, Jane. "A note on clerical education in nineteenth century Russia," Russian Review, XXIII, 1964, October, no. 4, 377-385.

Titlinov, B.V. Dukhovnyia shkoly v XIX stoletii. Vil'na, 1908-1909. 2 volumes.

Voronov, N.P. Istoricheskoe obozrenie uchebnykh zavedenii Spb. uchebnago okruza. Spb., 1854. 2 volumes.

Znamenskii, P.V. "Osnovnyia nachala dukhovno-uchilishchnoi reformy v tsarstvovanie imperatora Aleksandra I," Pravoslavnyi Sobesednik, 1878, January, 3-42.

\_\_\_\_\_ Dukhovnyia shkoly v Rossii do reformy 1808 goda. Kazan': Tipografiia imperatorskago universiteta, 1881.

#### 4. Evgenii Bolkhovitinov.

Ponomarev, S. "Materialy dlia biografii mitropolita Evgeniia," Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii, 1867, VIII, 293-353.

"Propovednicheskie trudy pokoinago mitropolita Kievskago Evgeniia," Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii, 1867, IX, 522-579.

Shmurlo, E. M. Evgenii, kak uchenyi. S.-Peterburg, 1888.

Tikhonravov, N. "Kievskii mitropolit Evgenii Bolkhovitinov," Russkii Vestnik, 1869, V, May, 5-38.

#### 5. Feofilakt Rusanov.

El'chukov, A. "Feofilakt Rusanov, znamenityi Russkii ierarkh epokhi imper. Aleksandra I," Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi

akademii, XLV, 1904, X, October, 211-237; XI, November, 434-446; XLVI, 1905, IX, September, 41-119.

Pokrovskii, N. "Ekzarkh-Gruzii, Feofilakt Rusanov i ego propovedi," Strannik, 1877, January, 3-18.

## 6. Archimadrite Fotii.

Elagin, N. Zhizn' grafiny Anny Alekseevny Orlovoi-Chesmenskoi. Spb., 1853.

Karovich, E.P. "Arkhimandrit Fotii, nastoiatel' Novgorodskago IUr'eva monastyria, 1789-1838 gg. Biograficheskii ocherk," Russkaia Starina, 1875, VII, July, 301-332; VIII, August, 459-489.

Kazanskii, P.S. "Vypiski iz bumag IUr'evskago arkhimandrita Fotiia," Russkii Arkhiv, 1870, 893-896.

Lileev, M. "Podrobnoe opisanie rukopisnykh sochinenii IUr'evskago arkhim. Fotiia, khраниashchikhsia v Chernigovskoi seminarsoi biblioteke," Chteniia O IDR, 1880, I, 1-18.

Popov, K.D. "IUr'evskii arkhimandrit Fotii i ego tserkovnoobshchestvennaia deiatel'nost'," Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii, 1875, II, February, 373-384; VI, June, 696-817.

Miropol'skii, S.I. "Fotii Spaskii, IUr'evskii arkhimandrit," Vestnik Evropy, XII, 1878, XI, November, 8-59; XII, December, 587-636.

Sushkov, N.V. "O zapiskakh IUr'evskago arkhimandrita Fotiia," Chteniia O IDR, 1869, III, smes', 187-202.

## 7. Prince A.N. Golitsyn.

Barsov, N.I. "Kniaz' A.N. Golitsyn i arkhimandrit Fotii, 1822-1824," Russkaia Starina, 1882, III, March, 765-781; IV, April, 205-222; V, May, 427-442; VI, June, 683-700; VIII, August, 275-296.

Stelletskaia, N. "Kniaz' A.N. Golitsyn i ego tserkovno-gosudar. deiatel'nost'," Trudy Kievskoi dukhovnoi akademii, XLI, 1900, III, March, 488-532; VII, July, 353-427; X, October, 250-305; XLII, 1901, IV, April, 571-600; VI, June, 179-210; VIII, August, 425-463; IX, September, 3-36.

## 8. Mikhail Desnitskii.

Ocherk zhizni mitropolita Mikhaila, S.-Peterburg, 1857.

## 9. Iefodii Smirnov.

Rozanov, N.P. "Pokushenie na zhizn' Tverskago arkhiepiskopa Mefodiia," Istoricheskii Vestnik, 1887, X, October, 198-204.

10. Pavskii, G.P.

Barsov, N.I. "Gerasim Petrovich Pavskii. Ocherk ego zhizni uchenoi i professorskoi deiatel'nosti, 1787-1864 gg.," Russkaia Starina, 1880, I, January, 111-128; II, February, 269-288; III, March, 495-510; IV, April, 705-730; V, May, 105-124; VI, June, 219-232.

Slotskii, A. "Protoierei G.P. Pavskii i mitropolit Filaret. Zametki," Russkaia Starina, 1881, VII, July, 479-486.

11. Platon Levshin.

Snegirev, I.S. Nachertanie zhitia Moskovskago mitropolita Platona. Moskva: V tipografii S. Selivanskago, 1831. 2 volumes.

Nadezhdin, A. Mitropolit Moskovskii Platon Levshin, kak propovednik. Kazan': Tipografiia imp. universiteta, 1882.

12. Russian Bible Society.

Owen, John A.M. The history of the origin and first ten years of the British and Foreign Bible Society. London: Tilling and Huges, 1816, 3 volumes.

Pinkerton, Robert. Russia: or miscellaneous observations on the past state of that country and its inhabitants. London: Seeley and sons, 1833.

Pypin, A.N. Religioznyiia dvizheniia pri Aleksandre I. Petrograd: Izdanie 'Ogni', 1916.

Zacek, Judith Cohen. The Russian Bible Society, 1812-1826. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Columbia University, 1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Russian Bible Society and the Russian Orthodox Church," Church History, XXV, 1966, no. 4, December, 411-437.

Christovich, I.A. Interiia perevoda Biblii na Russkii iazyk. S. Peterburg: Tipografiia ... Stukulevicha, 1899.

13. Gerasim Gladolevskii.

Alferov, A.A. "Mitropolit Gerasim na pematnoi ploshchadi, 14-go dekabria 1827," Istoricheskii Vestnik, LXXXIX, 1905, 166-177; C, 1906, 89-107.

Adravomyslov, K. "Serafim (v mire Stefan Vasil'evich Glagolevskii)," Russkii biograficheskii slovar', XVIII, 344-346.

14. Sermons.

Istoricheskii ocherk Russkago propovednichestva. Spb.: Tipografiia F.G. Eleonskago, 1878.

Zaveedev, A. Istoriia Russkago propovednichestva ot XVII veka do nastoiashchago vremeni. Tula, 1879.

15. General bibliography.

Barsov, N.I. Istoricheskie, kriticheskie, i polemicheskie opyty. S.-Peterburg: Tipografiia Departmenta udelov, 1879.

Barsov, T.V. "Sviateishii sinod v tsarstvovanie Ekateriny II, Pavla I, i Aleksandra I," Khristianskoe Chtenie, 1875, I, 249-287; 505-526.

Bantysh-Kamenskii, D. Slovar' dostopamiatnykh liudei Russkoi zemli. S.-Peterburg: Tipografiia shtaba otel'nago korpusa vnutrennei strazhi, 1847.

Blagovidov, F.V. Ober-prokurory sviateishago sinode v XVIII i v pervoi polovine XIX stoletia (otnosheniia ober-prokurorov k sv. sinodu). Kazan': Imperatorskago universiteta, 1900.

Bogoslovskii, M.N. Istoriia Rossii XVIII veka, 1725-1796. Moskva: Izd. O-va vzaimnopolomoshchi, 1915.

Bouyer, Louis. Orthodox spirituality and Protestant and Anglican spirituality. New York: Dasclee Company, 1969.

Bulich, N.N. Ocherki po istorii Russkoi literatury i prosveshcheniia s nachala XIX veka. S. Peterburg: Tipografiia N.M. Stasiulevicha, 1902. 2 volumes.

Denisov, I.I. Pravoslavnye monastyri Rossiiskoi imperii. Moskva: Izdanie A.D. Stupina, 1908.

Dubrovin, N.F. "Materialy dlia istorii pravoslavnoi tserkvi v tsarstvovanie imperatora Nikolai I," Sbornik imperatorskago Russkago obshchestva, CXIII, 1902.

Filaret Gumilevskii. Istoriia Russkoi tserkvi. Moskva: Izdanie Ferapontova, 1888.

Obzor Russkoi dukhovnoi literatury. Kharkov: V universitetaskoi tip., 1899.

Morevskii, Georell. Puti Russkago bogosloviia Paris: YMCA Press, 1917.

\_\_\_\_\_ "The Orthodox Churches and the ecumenical movement prior to 1910," A history of the ecumenical movement, 1517-1948. S. Neill and R. Rouse (eds.). 2nd edition revised. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.

Glubokovskii, N.N. Russkaia bogoslovskaiia nauka v eia istoricheskom razvitii i noveishem sostoianii. Varshava: Sinodal'naia tipografiia, 1928.

Iz...kov, D. "Otnoshenie Russkago pravitel'stva v pervoi polovine XVIII stoletia k protestantskim ideiam," ZMNP, 1867, X, October, 59-81.

Jugie, Martino. Theologia dogmatica Christianorum orientalium ab ecclesia catholica dissidentium. Parisiis, 1926. 6 volumes.

Lebedev, A.P. "Kratkii ocherk khoda razvitiia tserkovno-istoricheskoi nauki u nas v Rossii," Bogoslovskii Vestnik, 1895, XII, December, 298-321.

\_\_\_\_\_ Tserkovnaia istoriografiia v glavnykh eia predstaviteliakh s IV-go po XX v. Moskva: Pechatnia A.I. Snegirevoi, 1910.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Vzgliad na usloviia razvitiia tserkovno-istoricheskoi nauki u nas," Bogoslovskii Vestnik, 1907, V, May, 705-723.

Muller, Alexander Wilhelm. The Spiritual Regulation of Peter the Great. Unpublished Master of Arts thesis, University of Washington, 1966.

Nadler, V.K. Imperator Aleksandr I i ideia sviashchennago soiuza. Riga, 1886-1892. 5 volumes in 3.

Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii...1649-1913. S.-Peterburg i Petrograd, 1830-1916. 234 volumes.

Pravoslavnaia bogoslovskaiia entsiklopediia ili bogoslovskii entsiklopedicheskii slovar'. Sostavlenn pod redaktsiei N.N. Glubokovskago. S.-Peterburg i Petrograd, 1905-1915. 12 volumes.

Pypin, A.N. Obshchestvennoe dvizhenie v Rossii pri Aleksandre I. S.-Peterburg: Tipografiia W.M. Stasiulevicha, 1900.

Raev, Marc. Michael Speransky. Statesman of Imperial Russia, 1772-1839. Martinus Nijhoff: The Hague, 1969.

Runkevich, S.G. "Russkaia tserkov' v XIX veke," Istoriia khristianskoi tserkvi v XIX veke. S.-Peterburg, 1900. Volume 1.

Saw, Ruth Lydia. Leibniz. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1954.

Stoeffler, F. Ernest. The rise of evangelical pietism. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965.

Sturdza, A.S. Pamiatnik trudov pravoslavnykh blagovestnikov Russkikh s 1793 do 1853 goda. Moskva: V tipografii V. Got'e, 1857.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Zapiski A.S. Sturdy: sud'ba Russkoi pravoslavnoi tserkvi v tsarstvovanie Aleksandra I-go," Russkaia Starina, 1876, II, February, 266-288.

Sukhomlinov, M.I. Istoriia Rossiiskoi akademii. S.-Peterburg, 1874-88. 8 volumes.

Vigel', Filip Filipovich. Zapiski Filina Filipovicha Vigelia. Moskva: V universitetskoj tipografii, 1891. 6 volumes in 3.

Vinogradov, V.V. Ocherki po istorii Russkago literaturnago iazyka XVII-XIX vv. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1950.

Znamenskii, P. Chteniia iz istorii Russkoi tserkvi za vremia tsarstvovaniia Aleksandra I. Kazan': Tipografiia imperatogrskago universiteta, 1885.

\_\_\_\_\_ "Chteniia iz istorii Russkoi tserkvi za vremia tsarstvovaniia Ekaterina II," Pravoslavnyi Sobesednik, 1875, January, 3-22; February, 99-143; April, 392-418; May-June, 3-44; August, 327-347; September, 87-109; November-December, 354-411.

\_\_\_\_\_ Prikhodskoe dukhovenstvo v Rossii so vremeni reformy Petra. Kazan': Universitetskaia tipografiia, 1873.