

Honor, Tradition and Solidarity:
Corporate Identity Formation at the Kiev-Mohyla Academy (1701-1765)

By
Hanna Sheliah

Submitted to
Central European University
Department of History

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Laszlo Kontler

Second Reader: Doctor Katalin Straner

Budapest, Hungary

2016

Statement of Copyright

Copyright in the text of this thesis rests with the Author. Copies by any process, either in full or part, may be made only in accordance with the instructions given by the Author and lodged in the Central European Library. Details may be obtained from the librarian. This page must form a part of any such copies made. Further copies made in accordance with such instructions may not be made without the written permission of the Author.

Abstract

This thesis describes the process of shaping of corporal identity through social interaction. It focuses on the problematic relations and conflict situations in the urban society of which the Kiev-Mohyla Academy (KMA) was an active agent. I intend to show how the academics posed themselves in the local *socium*, what were the reactions they received from different social “others” and how these reactions affected their identity and self-fashioning. I also analyze individuals inside the university community (mainly students) and their positioning in the inner-academic hierarchy in context of the wider academic relationships.

The main actors of this narrative are students, professors, city priests, monks, burghers and cossacks, all of whom lived in Kiev-Podil. The main problematic points of their interactions are separation of space, authority and legal jurisdiction in their common place of living. In this paper I look closely at the details of these problems through the materials of violent conflicts recorded in the local courts. As a result, we see how the Kiev-Mohyla Academy posed itself in its social surrounding in its attempts to legalize as a university corporation in opposition to both local authorities and the state power.

To my helpful and charming supervisor Laszlo Kontler for providing me with knowledge, skills and inspiration.

To my enthusiastic second reader Katalin Straner for her attentive attitude and a lot of useful remarks.

To my advisors and mentors from the Kiev-Mohyla Academy Maksym Jaremenko, Natalia Jakovenko and Natalia Starchenko for their harsh critics and moral support.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	5
Material.....	5
Expected results.....	8
Technology.....	11
Chapter 1. Academy and Church.....	16
1.1 Local church communities vs academic community.....	16
1.2 Laics, clergy and educated monks: the war of statuses.....	28
Chapter 2. Academy and City.....	36
2.1 Academic traditions vs urban laws.....	37
2.2 Student tribunal – a symbol of autonomy and corporative solidarity.....	45
Chapter 3. Academy from within.....	52
3.1 Student community against renegades.....	52
3.2. Student solidarity vs professor's authority.....	63
Conclusions.....	76
Bibliography.....	84

Introduction

Material

Since the topic promises a history of the university, it is necessary to note here that the Kiev-Mohyla academy officially have never become a university in the classical sense, meaning a closed and independent community of intellectuals, with its own territory, budget, law and court, code of honor, etc. It was formed on the basis of the two educational initiatives, one launched by the lay commune and the other proposed by the Kiev metropolitan and local ecclesiastical administration. The most probable date to start its history is 1615 – the year when the Brotherhood monastery was founded and the school was created on its territory. The funding and patronage of this school was divided between the monastic community and the so called Kiev Fellowship or Fraternity (*Братство*), the voluntary association of lay people whose aims were to propagate the Orthodox faith, piety and morality, and to care of the “vulnerable social groups”, as we would call them today (the poor, the sick, the homeless, widows, orphans). The Fraternity was a corporation that united the “pious Christians” of all the social categories including quite a number of the most influential cossack chiefs¹.

At first the so called Fraternal school was the only educational institution in the city, which provoked the dissatisfaction of the church, regarded as the traditional patron of any intellectual enterprise. So the second school was founded under the auspices of the St.

¹ The beginning of the Academy as a Brotherhood school is one of the major topics in the relevant general literature. The most detailed and complex separate studies were done by Jaroslav Isajevych. See his monograph *Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early-Modern Ukraine*. Edmonton, Toronto. 2006. (where the Kiev Orthodox Fellowship is studied in comparison with its analogy in L'viv and respectively the two schools are compared) and his article “The Kiev-Mohyla College” in *History of Ukrainian culture* (Encyclopedia in 5 volumes). Vol. 2: *Ukrainian culture in 13th – first half of 17th centuries*. Kiev. 2001 (under his own general editing).

Florus and Laurus monastery by the initiative of metropolitan Petro Mohyla, who became the formal head of its administration and took the most active part in shaping of its program and faculty. The competition between these two newly founded schools was rather harsh but ended by a compromise – in December 1631 they were merged into the Kiev college under the financial care of the Brotherhood monastery. This new institution received the status of a corporation, close to that of the Western colleges or universities and it had a triple jurisdiction under the authorities of the lay Kiev Fraternity, the church administration, and under the personal patronage of the Kiev metropolitan.²

During the period of the Polish-Russian and Turkish wars the Kiev Fellowship was dissolved (mainly because the military elite no longer had the opportunity to participate a lot) and the rule over the college remained in the hands of the Orthodox church and the metropolitan. Nevertheless, it was not turned into a seminary. Only two of the classical faculties existed there, Arts and Theology, and the program never went beyond the *trivium* and *quadrivium* (except some modern languages introduced in the eighteenth century), but the school accepted boys from any social strata, and most of them did not take the ecclesiastical profession after studies there. According to the list of subjects, the program and the content of the library it was very close to the model of theological high schools introduced by the Jesuits (which Petro Mohyla took as a main example). In terms of the official status it was a local ecclesiastical school, subordinated to the Kiev metropolitan and the Kiev consistory, and economically depended on the Brotherhood monastery. At the same time it preserved traditions once introduced by the Fellowship and was commonly perceived as a university corporation or a guild of “those-who-teach and those-who-study” (учащих та учащихся) as they called themselves.

2 See for example: Jabłonowski, A. *Akademia Kijowsko-Mohilanska*. 80-7; Mukhin, N. *The Kiev-Brotherhood Academical monastery: the historical outline*. 24-8; Sydorenko, A. *The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century*. 26-34.

The issues of jurisdiction and official status became even more complicated after the Eternal Peace of 1686 when Kiev was transferred to the Russian empire, and so entered a new political and cultural reality. The year 1701 is frequently marked by the researchers as a year when the Kiev-Mohyla college received the name of Academy and turned into a real university. Actually, this date corresponds to the privilege, signed by Tsar Peter I, where he officially gave the Kiev school the name and the status of academy. But whether this document really changed anything in the life of this educational center is doubtful. I will come to this document in more details in the second chapter, here I only want to state that it did not solve the problem of legal status of the Kiev-Mohyla schools. From the point of view of the imperial government, the ecclesiastical administration and the formal law this organization under the name of academy was in a position of a seminary, it did not have any documents to confirm its rights, even the official academic regulations were at first issued only in 1733. Yet, despite its nonofficial status, the academy saw itself as a corporation with its own laws, culture and moral code.³

It was not an easy task for its members to preserve this kind of status under the rule of the Russian empire, a state which had no notion of any corporative culture or even of an autonomous community as such. It was even more difficult to defend the university status from governmental and ecclesiastical bureaucrats and to claim real autonomous rights in the time of active centralization of the Empire. One could even interpret the academic self-fashioning of the Kiev-Mohyla community as anti-imperial politics, the struggle against absolutism, though I think, this would be too radical. What I intend to do in this paper is to demonstrate the relevance of such terms as community, corporation and university to my

3 See, for example: Askochienskij, V. *Kiev and its oldest school the academy*. Part 1. 256-9; Sydorenko, A. *The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century*. 61-69, also the special article on the problem of the academic legality: Khyzhniak, Z. "Kiev-Mohyla academy. The juridical status (1615-1819)". *Scholarly notes of the Kiev-Mohyla academy*. Vol. 3 (1998). 97-106.

object. Therefore I shall try to reconstruct some of the main features of the corporate culture that existed in the imagination of the Kiev-Mohyla students and teachers.

The first is the notion of student honor, which includes the way students wanted to be perceived by society, the manner they posed themselves in their regular relationship with other categories of people, and the principles by which they divided the surrounding people into categories. The student honor also included their own image of an ideal student, and the intersections of this student identity with other possible social roles imposed on the young “academics”. Besides the personal self-positioning, I would also like to reconstruct the collective identity of both the student body and the academic community as a whole. This requires the employment of two other concepts – those of solidarity and inner hierarchy, which refer on the one hand to the division inside the student collective on any grounds (social background, age, wealth, etc.), and on the other hand to principles and mechanisms of union among students, as well as, finally, their relations with professors, which included both union and opposition, depending on the situation.

Expected results

At the end of the day, it was this everyday communication system, rather than the Tsar's privileges or academic instructions, which made the Kiev-Mohyla Academy a university and Kiev a center of higher education. But for some reasons this particular aspect of the academic culture of Kiev is one of the less studied ones so far. Historians who dealt with the KMA usually worked with questions of the more global scale and more official character. The problem of the juridical status and real legal rights of this institution was previously approached from very different angles. All of the researchers of whom I am

aware regarded the Academy as a university or at least recognized that the academics conceived of themselves as a university corporation in seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The standard image of the Kiev-Mohyla Academy is that of the first (and for quite a long period the only) university in the Hetmanate and later in the Russian empire, which performed the role of an intellectual transfer point between Western educational culture and the Eastern Orthodox *socium*.⁴ Which one of the Western traditions was central in this transfer, and what were the exact models used by the Kiev academics, is still an understudied question. Some scholars tended to portray the Academy as a part of the original Orthodox or Greek-Slavic schooling tradition together with the L'viv Fraternal College and the Ostroh Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy.⁵ Others (who constitute the majority) name the Jesuit educational network as a prime example for the Kiev professors.⁶ Still other historians try to put the Kiev-Mohyla Academy into a more general context and compare it with multiple Western models including the protestant lyceums and classical universities of the Bologna type.⁷ The arguments in this discussion are mostly

4 This image and the corresponding form of the narrative about the history of the Academy were created by the author of the first special work on this topic – Bulgakov, M. *The history of the Kiev academy*. St. Petersburg. 1843. and then taken as a pattern by almost all his followers, most important of them being: Askochienskij, V. *Kiev and its oldest school the academy* (in two parts). Kiev. 1856; Titov Th. *The Emperor's Kiev ecclesiastical academy in its 300-years' existing and functioning (1615-1915)*. Kiev. 1915.; Khyzhniak, Z. *The Kiev-Mohyla Academy*. Kiev. 1970 (republished in 1981 and 2001); Sydorenko, A. *The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century*. Ottawa. 1977.

5 This view appears in the earliest works in the field, like Bulgakov and Titov (see the previous footnote).

6 Among the general narratives it is especially accentuated by Khyzhniak (see footnote 5), and this claim is the most usual in the more special works on the academic traditions and programs or on the social and political role of the Academy, for instance: Cracraft J. "Theology at the Kiev Academy during its Golden age". *Harvard Ukrainian Studies. The Kiev Mohyla Academy :commemorating the 350th Anniversary of its Founding (1632)*. 1984. Vol. 8. No 1 / 2 (June). Cambridge: Ukrainian Research Institute Harvard University. 71-80; Hajets'kyj, J. "The Kiev Mohyla Academy and the Hetmanate". Ibid. 81-92; Kotusenko, V. "Teaching philosophy in Jesuit colleges of 16th-17th centuries and in the Kiev-Mohyla academy". *Ukraine of the 17th century: Society, philosophy, culture*. Kiev. 2005. 83-107.

7 This is one of the main theses in the general history of the Academy by Sydorenko, partly shared by Khyzhniak in the later editions of her *The Kiev-Mohyla Academy* (see footnote 3), also actively propagated by Isajevych who specialized on the urban corporations and fraternities – Isajevych, J. "Educational movement in Ukraine: eastern tradition and western influences". *L'Ucraina del XVII Secolo tra Occidente ed Oriente d'Europa*. Kiev-Venezia. 1996. 114-135; Idem. *Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early-Modern Ukraine*. Edmonton, Toronto. 2006.

built on the analyses of the curriculum, the administrative system, disciplinary regulations and corporative rituals such as the student theater, the organization of vacations or graduation ceremonies. A very special value is assigned in historiography to the role of the Kiev-Mohyla Academy in the development of Ruthenian culture (theater, literature, music)⁸, in the educational and cultural politics of the Russian empire and in the intercultural exchange between Russia and the West.⁹ All these factors, as it is demonstrated by historians, made the Kiev-Mohyla Academy a real university, even though its official status was doubtful.

I would like to support the general conclusions of my predecessors in studies on KMA history by arguments based on new material, and a different approach. I am going to take the court records of the Kiev Consistory and the Academy and to look closely on the conflicts in which the students participated, to study their behavior and rhetoric in as many details as possible. The sources themselves are not unknown – almost all of them are published and somehow processed. But the works based on those are either ethnographic and have a very descriptive character (those written in the early twentieth century

8 Of the special works on this topic see, for example: Luzny, R. *Writers of the Kiev-Mohyla Circle and the Polish Culture. From the History of the Cultural Connections between Poland and Eastern Slavic Lands in 17th – 18th centuries*. Krakow. 1966.; Lewin, P. “Drama and Theater at Ukrainian Schools in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: the Bible as Inspiration of Images, Meanings, Style, and Stage Productions”. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies. The Kiev Mohyla Academy: commemorating the 350th Anniversary of its Founding (1632)*. 1984. Vol. 8. No 1 / 2 (June). 93-122; Hrabovych, G. “Towards the ideology of the Renaissance in the Ukrainian literature: “Virshy na zhalostnyj pohreb zatsnoho lytsera Petra Konashevycha Sahajdachnoho” by Kasijan Sakovych”. *L'Ucraina del XVII Secolo tra Occidente ed Oriente d'Europa*. Kiev-Venezia. 1996. 277-297. Among the aforementioned general monographs this aspect found the biggest attention in those by Askochienskiy and Khyzhniak.

9 Except the special chapters in every general history of the Academy, see, for example: Petrov, N. *The role of the Kiev-Mohyla academy in the development of ecclesiastical schools in Russia from the foundation of the Holy Synod in 1721 till the middle of the 18th century*. Kiev, 1904; Kharlampovich, K. *The Minor-Russian influence on the Major-Russian ecclesiastical life*. Kazan'. 1914; Kmet', V. and Dukh, O. “Ratio Studiorum” in the history of European and Ukrainian education”. *Ratio Studiorum. The rule of studies in the Society of Jesus. The system of Jesuit Education*. L'viv. 2008. 7-31. This is also one of the major topics in the general histories of the Ukrainian Orthodox colleges, especially well written in the most recent comparative study – Posokhova, L. *On the crossroads of cultures, traditions, epochs: orthodox colleges in Ukraine from the end of seventeenth till the beginning of nineteenth century*. Kharkiv. 2011.

immediately after the first archival discoveries)¹⁰, or have a form of a detailed case-studies concentrated on certain narrow questions (the most modern research in the fields of microhistory and history of daily life)¹¹.

So the court records did not find their place in the more global discussions on the corporate culture and academic self-fashioning or on the legal status of the Kiev-Mohyla Academy, and I aim to give them this place. Since the main focus is on the students, the large part of my task is based on the reconstruction of their identity and social positioning. And due to the specific character of the sources I will also take on the perfect opportunity to show the specificities of the everyday life and personal communications in the eighteenth century's Kiev.

Technology

My main instrument in this study is a microscope. The object put under the lens is the city of Kiev, precisely its most densely populated part – Podil (the Lower City). From a far in the eighteenth century it looked as a busy and noisy urban center with a huge market where trade and manual crafts were concentrated. Other important objects were the convent of St. Florus and Laurus, several big churches, and first of all the Brotherhood monastery – one of the richest abbeys in Kiev which also hosted the Kiev-Mohyla academy. The social pattern of Podil was rather scattered: traders, workers united in

10 This refers primarily to the series of articles by Dmitrij Vishnievskij published in the *Kievan Past* in 1896 (numbers 1,2,3) under the general title “From the daily life of Kiev students” which could be rather called a publication of the newly discovered documents in the semi-fictional form then scholarly papers – they are in fact the detailed retelling of the records with some emotional comments in-between.

11 Among these I used here four: Dziuba, O. ““Student's honor and dishonor” in the view of students and professors of the Kiev-Mohyla academy (on the material of 1730-1760th years' conflicts)”. *Kievan Academy* 2-3 (2006), 135-47; Jaremenko, M. “Woe from wit or about the Mohylianian education as a reason for honor”. *Ibid.* 4 (2007), 86-94; also his ““None has a power over me, except of his reverence”: self-identification of the Mohylianian student in the light of the 1752 year's conflict”. *Socium* 7 (2007), 231-41 and Sheliah, H. “Internal Relations in the Faculty Corporation of the Kiev-Mohyla Academy (on the Materials of the 1759 Year's Conflict)”. *Kievan Academy* 12 (2014-2015). 46-71.

guilds, priests, cossacks of middle ranks, students and different kinds of criminals concentrated around the marketplace, and all of them were the socially active groups. The students of the Kiev-Mohyla academy formed a significant part of the Podil population – their average number during the eighteenth century was approximately one-thousand – and they were the youngest and the most active dwellers of the area. While almost all professors lived on the territory of the Brotherhood monastery, students were mostly spread around Podil in rented flats or so called “schools” (a kind of dormitory) of local churches.

These young men form the lens of our microscope. They are the main heroes of this narrative and their interaction with the other social groups around them is the core of the plot. Since all materials are taken from court records, the analysis here is concentrated on the “abnormal” side of these social interactions, namely on more or less violent conflicts – mutual offenses, fights, clashes over space and property, etc.¹² Such kind of material was chosen for several reasons: firstly, because conflicts can reveal the sharpest edges of interaction and thus create some bright clear-cut pictures; secondly, because the records taken in the courts reflected the real speech of the participants and witnesses, so that the documents show us the peculiarities of their rhetoric;¹³ and finally, some of the cases can bring up the voices of those little people, who usually appear in historical narratives only as a part of the statistical data, but who actually formed the community and the society. The narrative is going to be built out of case-studies and personal histories of their participants (students, professors, and their opponents).

The cases are mostly taken from the archive of the Kiev consistory, which dealt with

12 The word “abnormal” is used here for purpose since the problem of “normality” or rather multiple “normalities” and “deviations” from them is one of the key points of this work.

13 There are pretty many documents created by the participants themselves where we can be sure of the self-reflection. In cases of the witnesses statements written down by the scribes the level of certainty is lower, yet for the purposes of this work I think it is justified to neglect their mediative role, though I indicate the fact of its existence in every case.

the conflicts that involved the Kiev-Mohyla Academy, and partly from the archive of the Kiev magistrate, which was responsible for preserving peace in the city.¹⁴ As I mentioned, most of the documents are published¹⁵ (some partly, but for those the verification by originals had been done), some are even already analyzed in separate case-studies or just described in articles. But since this work is aimed at a larger social perspective, the complex comparative analysis of a number of cases is needed.

There are fifteen affairs closely analyzed in this text of both collective and personal opposition of students to multiple other social units or individuals. They are all roughly divided by spheres of interaction which is replicated in the structure of the thesis consisting of three chapters. Chapter 1, *Academy and Church* analyses two cases of collective opposition between students and local parishes headed by their priest, two personal conflicts with monks, and a big clash inside the Brotherhood monastery between the Kiev-Mohyla faculty and the monks. Chapter 2, *Academy and City* covers the longest period – from 1701 to 1765 – but is mainly concentrated on five affairs involving burghers, one of them is a clash between the urban and the academic communities on a large scale, two are personal conflicts with development into a collective opposition and two are cases of student solidarity against a particular person. Chapter 3, *Academy from within* is looking at the inner opposition among students basing on three cases of “treason”, when a student went against the community of his fellows, and at clashes with professors, two of them personal and two in a form of collective rebellion.

14 Some cases are taken from the fonds of the Kiev and the Perejaslav-Boryspil' consistories – numbered 127 and 990 respectively in the Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kiev. The main part though makes a special fond in the Institute of Manuscript of the Vernads'kyj National Library of Ukraine entitled the Collection of the Archaeological Museum of the Kiev Ecclesiastical Academy or Fond 301.

15 I use here two series of published sources: *Acts and documents, connected to the history of the Kiev academy*. Ed. by Petrov, N. Series II and III. Kiev. 1904-1906 and *The Kiev-Mohyla academy from the end of eighteenth till the beginning of nineteenth centuries: the everyday history*. Ed. by Zadorozhna, O. et al. Kiev. 2005.

To use all these materials as a lens I not only have to sum it up as a general overview of the possible social patterns, but also to construct a kind of theoretical framework – a system of ideal social models and a mechanism of their functioning. In other words, I need to reconstruct the “ideal” student of the Kiev-Mohyla Academy the in eighteenth century. The available documents give a possibility to speak of at least four versions of this ideal student: one conceived by the students themselves, another cultivated by the professors in their disciples, the third envisaged by non-academic neighbors of students, and finally, the one formulated in the official prescriptions by the church and the government. All four overlap at certain points in contradiction to one another. In many cases one of the ideals seems to be a deviation of another. Thus we will get a number of “norms” and multiple variants of their transformations or “deviations” and use their intersections as a theoretical field. The analysis is made in such a way, that each and every individual case can be perceived as a “norm” and a “deviation” at the same time, so that in the end we see a sufficient number of behavioral models none of which has any evaluative marker. We watch the process of interaction of all these alternatives proposed by different individuals and institutions, and see how that more or less unified collective body which is known in historiography as “the Kiev-Mohyla Academy” was formed by its own members.

When we look into a lens of a microscope the studied object usually is not visible as a whole – the eye is focused on one particular area, on a concrete element, while the rest of the object is visually blurred. The level of approximation and the characteristics of a lens determine detalization and contrast of the picture. This is the way I propose to look at the population of Podil through the prism of the students' activity. The urban society is viewed here only in the interaction with the student community as a social context in which it existed and functioned. No doubt, the influence of burghers, priests or whomever the

students communicated with had a great role in shaping both their behavior and thinking, therefore we have to find a social niche that the students took in this urban environment in the first place. But what is really the focus of this research is the academic corporation.

In spatial terms it could be visualized like this: for the first two chapters the medium approximation is taken, so that we can grasp several elements – dormitories, private flats, churches – and at the same time watch the connections between them. The urban context is still more or less clearly visible here and we have two main focal points – the Brotherhood monastery with the Kiev-Mohyla Academy and the city magistrate. After this analysis, when the position of a student and of the student community in the urban society is systematized, I turn my microscope to the maximum possible approximation and fix the lens on the university and its inner life in such a way as to draw attention to the main subject – the corporation.

Chapter 1. Academy and Church

In this first chapter the Kiev-Mohyla Academy is mainly treated as a part of the local church structure, and the students – as potential members of the ecclesiastical community. We are going to look at the relationship between students and city priests, between church communities (priests, ktetors¹⁶ and parish) and the academic corporation (students and professors), and at the end on the social separation inside the Kiev-Brotherhood monastery, which included the Brotherhood monks themselves and the academics.

1.1 Local church communities vs academic community

Dmitrij Vishnievskij starts his series of articles about the everyday life of Kievan students in the eighteenth century by describing all its hardest circumstances. One of the major difficulties was connected to the accommodation, since the Kiev-Mohyla Academy was situated in the busiest and most densely populated part of the city.¹⁷ The Academy had a dormitory for its students situated on the territory of the Brotherhood monastery, but this building which used to be erected for the needs of the fraternal school was far from big enough for the Academy. Depending on the general number of students (which could differ significantly between years), the academic dormitory could host only from one fifth to one third of them. Logically, preferences in receiving a place in the dorm were usually granted to the poorest of pupils, while the rest had to look for another accommodation in crowded Podil.¹⁸

One of the accommodation alternatives was provided by local churches. Most of them had so called “schools” – a kind of hospice, where pilgrims, beggars or anyone who had no place to sleep,

16 This Slavic term of Greek origin can be roughly translated as “donator” or “founder”. In the eighteenth century Hetmanate these were the lay people or sometimes deacons who took care of a particular church and patronized its parish.

17 Vishnievskij, D. *From the daily life of Kiev students*. 1. 39-41; 2. 182-4.

18 Zadorozhna, O. *Stages of building of “the major dormitory” and daily life of students there*. 33-5.

could live, sometimes together with church servants or deacons. These schools were frequently recommended to students by their professors, who could make a corresponding agreement with the local prior.¹⁹ Since the Kiev-Mohyla Academy was under the patronage of the Kiev metropolitan and the Brotherhood monastery, it would seem natural to count it as a part of the ecclesiastical community. And it was, to a great extent: till the last quarter of the eighteenth century all teachers there were friars of different monasteries (or took their vows during teaching)²⁰, more than 30% of students originated from priestly families and most of them were supposed to make the ecclesiastical career after studies (at least those, who “survived” till the class of theology).²¹ There were occasions, when the academics posed themselves as clerics in contrast to “laics”. Literally “laics” (“лаїки”) means “laymen”, but among a number of synonyms with the same meaning (also “миряни”, “світські люди”) this one had specific connotations – it was an offensive word, which marked the laymen not only as “others”, but “lowers” in social status and in intellect (something close to “uneducated fools”).

Yet not everything went smoothly with such academy-church arrangements. Vishnievskij concentrates on two cases where conflicts appeared on this ground – the case around St. Nicolas church dormitory, which lasted for more than half of year (May – November 1741), and a conflict between students and the prior of St. Basil church, Pavlo Lobko (summer 1754). He is mostly concerned about “the tragic fate” of poor students, who unfairly suffered “losses and offenses” from priests and deacons.²² Yet both cases tell us more than that, especially if examined in comparison.

The first conflict started from the standard agreement between the prefect of Kiev-Mohyla Academy, Mykhajil Kozachyns'kyj, and the prior of St. Nicolas church of Podil, Jakov Zhurakhovs'kyj, made in May 1741. Several students moved to St. Nicolas school and at the same

19 Vishnievskij, D. *From the daily life of Kiev students*. 1. 39; II. 1. L. 258. [the second reference here is to the original source. In such references I will used a special code: the first (Roman) numeral corresponds to the number of section in the Bibliography, the second (Arabic) – to the number of subsection, next comes the original number of the document given by the scribe or by the publisher (these are also repeated in the Bibliography).

20 Data for the period of 1721-58, based on analyses of 74 professors' biographies.

21 Jaremenko, M. “Academics” and the academy. 56-9, 442-3.

22 Vishnievskij, D. *From the daily life of Kiev students*. 1. 39-54, 55-7.

time received permission to give private lessons at the same cottage they lived in (Jakov's own son became one of their first pupils). But already on the first day the students ran into radical opposition from the side of Roman Antonov, priest of the same church and the prior's brother-in-law. Almost all deacons, church servants and, what is more important, all the ktetors joined Roman in his decision to get rid of the students. They argued that St. Nicolas church was released from the obligation to host students and no “academic” had lived there for forty years. They even presented a special privilege, signed by metropolitan Varlaam (Jasyns'kyj) himself in 1699, to prove their words. But when this argument did not work (because there was no direct confirmation for their arguments in that privilege), the ktetors tried to use any possible methods to force the students out of the school. This included offenses, provocations to fights, even blackmailing, as the documents show. Prior Zhurakhovs'kyj and prefect Kozachyns'kyj made efforts to find a compromise, but in the end the conflict went beyond their authority and turned into a major court case at the Kiev consistory.²³

The interesting thing here is the motivation of Roman and the ktetors. Vishnievskij describes it as “a whim”.²⁴ Nikolai Petrov, who published some extracts of this case, indicates in a footnote that this aggressive reaction to the students could be connected to a long-standing personal conflict between Jakov Zhurakhovs'kyj and his brother-in-law, which also involved the subordinated clerics and even some people from the parish, who did care about St. Nicolas church.²⁵ Here I shall point out that in the Russian Orthodox church of that time churches and parishes could not officially be transferred by inheritance yet, but there was the possibility of the indirect inheritance through marriage. Though the priests were to be elected by the parishioners, the current prior always had the means to promote the candidate he wanted to see as his successor. In the eighteenth century, and especially from mid century onwards, family relations in clerical circles became closer and closer – priests' daughters more and more often chose to marry priests' sons or men who were going to

23 II. 1. L.

24 Vishnievskij, D. *From the daily life of Kiev students*. 1. 54.

25 II. 1. L. 259 (footnote)

become clerics. At the same time the educational requirements for the local clergy became stricter and stricter – though the folk who elected their priest did not care much of this quality, the state and the church very much did, so the priors tended to search for successors among the educated youth. Students who wanted to make an ecclesiastical career quickly and without taking the vow often used this possibility.²⁶

Roman Antonov was one of those – he got engaged to Zhurakhovs'kyj's sister and this way gained good career perspectives. Together with those he got a place in St. Nicolas school and work as Jakov's "hireling" – in fact, private servant.²⁷ They had quarrels from the very beginning: in 1733 Roman even complained to the consistory about the violent and offensive treatment he was getting from Zhurakhovs'kyj.²⁸ So when the deacons claimed that "no student has lived in our school for forty years already", prefect Mykhajil pointed out that Antonov himself lived there just in the same status, as a student of rhetoric.²⁹ So it appears that Roman himself used to suffer a situation rather similar to the one he created for his younger "colleagues". However illogical this may seem, it can make sense as his personal psychological motivation for such behavior – a kind of abstract revenge, perhaps.

As for the alliance with ktetors, there are several possible reasons behind it. Roman needed them to shift the responsibility in case of accusation or incriminating questions. He emphasized in his answers that he did not forbid students to live in the school "but only if the ktetors are in favor".³⁰ This cooperation gave a legal status to their common will – this became a will of the majority, which could even call itself a community. Looking for an official reference Antonov cites a fresh regulation issued by the Holy Synod in 1735 that gave the right of making important decisions in

26 See: Posokhova, L. "Marriage strategies of the Orthodox colleges alumni and formation of the clerical strata in the 18th century Ukraine". *Siverian Chronicle*. 2008. 4. 108-116.

27 There were quite a number of students working as private servants for different people, including their own professors, we will see more of them in our stories.

28 Vishnievskij, D. *From the daily life of Kiev students*. 2. 182-3 (footnote). Unfortunately, the scholar makes no reference to the original source.

29 *II. 1. L.* 264-5.

30 "я їм студентам не запрещаю в школі жити, білі би ктитори похотели" *I. 1. 301/749 II. 3. 73R.*

terms of church life to the council of priests and deacons.³¹ For the ktetors who acted as both the official representatives and defenders of the flock's interests, the possibility to legalize their actions through the status of a council must have been very appealing. First of all it could be used to satisfy their material interests: students used the place, furniture, food, firewood, etc., which otherwise would all go to deacons and their servants³². Many quarrels occurred due to simply the division of goods provided by the church. Another point of economic disagreement was connected to teaching. At least one of the deacons, Theodor (maybe others as well – documents are not explicit enough at this point), had a number of pupils whom he taught to read in Ruthenian and write in Cyrillic, and they have regularly had classes in the school. Some of the students (presumably, the older ones) intended to give Latin lessons in the same building. Once several of Theodor's pupils put up a fight with the Latin disciples, and students claimed those were provoked by the deacon himself. Probably, this was not the only precedent of such kind. Besides domestic inconveniences, the factor of competition could play its role here, especially if students were better teachers (which seems very likely).³³

Under the ktetors' resentment toward students there could be non-material reasons as well. The available documents tell us less about those, but they still include at least one bright expression. Among other students' complaints there is such: one of the deacons used to come drunk to the school in the evenings and boast in front of the students that he was their only master there. When academics tried to remind him that there are authorities over him, the deacon denounced both the prefect of the Academy and prior Jakov, and claimed to be the only authority within St. Nicolas school.³⁴ This detail shows that through alliance with the official opposition to the prior set up by father Roman and his “council” the deacons could feel more authority inside the church. The protection offered by Antonov gave them more freedom to claim their rights, even though this

31 *I. 1. 301/749 II. 3. 72V.*

32 Two of four students involved in the conflict lived in the school together with their own private servants, referred to as “boys”

33 *II. 1. L. 262.*

34 *II. 1. L. 262-3.*

freedom was strictly limited and fictional in practice. In other words, the ktetors and the deacons used students to show off their power on the level of the local community.

To be fair, students themselves were neither easy victims, nor peaceful neighbors. They also tried to defend their rights in the common space of the school and sometimes used violent methods as well. As follows from the deacons' testimonies, when offended by abusive language the students did not hesitate to reply in kind, and the deacons used to be beaten severely in the fights (even in the ones they provoked themselves).³⁵ There was a precedent, when the students organized a collective revenge on a sexton who insulted them and gave him twenty-five lashes. They were even punished for this by the prefect, who usually took the side of his pupils in conflicts. But father Zhurakhovs'kyj gave a sanction to this act, which could be perceived as its legalization on the level of the church community³⁶.

Here it is important to emphasize that the way students treated deacons was quite similar to the way deacons treated students. Both sides were fighting for their own space in a material sense as well as a symbolic one, and they both made use of the opposition between the two local authorities (Roman and Jakov) to legalize their own claims. As an additional argument I can point out the attitude of both opposing groups to the pupils who had classes in their school. The deacons complained that the students scared away all their disciples. The answer was: the pupils interfered with the student's own studies and their Latin teaching. The same worked with the church servants – the deacons did not want their opponents to use “the school's boys” (*школьних хлопців*) for their private purposes. There could be the practical reasons for it, like a lack of workers in the church affairs, but rather it was again connected to the separation of power – the division of subordinates.³⁷

Now we shall turn to the second mentioned case – the conflict with Pavlo Lobko, which is particularly interesting in for the problem of space separation and social distinction between

35 I. 1. 301/749 Л. 3. 84R-85R.

36 I. 1. 301/749 Л. 3. 105R. The student tribunal is a special topic we are going to come back to in a special place – see Chapter 2.

37 II. 1. L. 265; I. 1. 301/749 Л. 3. 84R-85R, 95V-96R.

academics and local clergy. Pavlo Lobko was a prior of St. Basil church in Podil. This church had a big school, preserved mainly for hosting students, and even the senior of this dormitory was elected from among students of the higher classes. Although not only academics lived there, the competition for place and power which we saw in St. Nicolas school would not have been so relevant here. In 1754 the residence of St. Basil school consisted of ten students of different classes and one deacon. The conflict (or rather its violent phase) started, when father Pavlo came to the school with a task for the deacon. Since the deacon was not there at that moment, Lobko asked Mykhajlo, a pupil of syntax, to do this job for him. The task was to prepare some documents, which the student did not know how to do. Lobko tried to force Mykhajlo to work by beating him, which provoked a fight between the prior and the school senior, Stefan. In the end Lobko threw out all the students' belongings and forced them all to move out from the dormitory.³⁸

In contrast to the previous case, here we see much less of the practical reasons for the controversy. There were of course the purely material concerns on both sides, but the sources are more focused on the symbolic and psychological side – the competition between authorities. Senior Stefan had one main argument: the prior cannot force a student to do any work, because the students are not under his command. This seems to be the thing which infuriated Lobko. He claimed that his authority must be regarded by the students as long as they live on his ground, and after Stefan mentioned the power of the Academy's prefect, he answered: “you are the son of a rascal, and your patron is a rascal, too”, and threatened to flog the students unless they left the school.³⁹ All the witnesses here were pupils, who were interested in dramatizing the situation, which make our source in some respect unreliable. Yet the disdainful attitude towards students is more than evident from Paul's own answer to the collective complaint made by all the dwellers of St. Basil school after this occasion. As the Kiev consistory recorded, he refused to come in front of the court, because he was sued not by the equals, but by the boys, whom he himself had brought up. He also

38 Vishnievskij, D. *From the daily life of Kiev students*. 1. 54-7; II. 2. XLIX.

39 “як ти сукін і канальській син, так і той, хто тебе заступає, каналія” II. 2. XLIX. 127.

mentioned that had the prefect himself challenged him, Lobko would come and answer.⁴⁰

This was not the only case when Pavlo Lobko tried to impose his power on the academics, and in other precedents he shows a very similar rhetoric. For example, just a month earlier Lobko had a conflict with another student of the Kiev-Mohyla Academy, who came in front of the household near St. Basil church to sing (it was a usual practice for poorer students to earn money by singing in the streets).⁴¹ The prior accused the boy of begging and punished him with lashes. When the student claimed his rights, Pavlo answered that he has an instruction from Her Majesty the Empress to interrogate such suspicious persons and send them to the court, and then again declared that the academic authority meant nothing for him.⁴² What he appealed to here was a real instruction given in the name of the Empress, however it was not a personal privilege granted to Lobko, but a part of the general regulations which put order of the parish under the control of the main parish church's prior.

These cases show how father Pavlo claimed his authority over students. From the point of view of the student's honor his attitude caused even more offense to it than that of Roman Antonov. In St. Nicolas church the academics were regarded as aliens, but they were definitely equal in status to their opponents, even though had less rights, while Lobko treated the students as inferiors. It is not only about the formal authority and official hierarchy – Pavlo presented himself as a master, a patriarch for the pupils, who were just “children” and did not even have the right to claim their rights. He seems to have had an ambition for authority equal to that of the Academy's prefect. It is even more evident from some later precedents.

In 1767, thirteen years after the analyzed conflicts, we find another one, where Lobko shows even more insolence. The student of *infima* Theodor Stefanovych lived in Pavlo's house as a servant. Theodor was among the worst pupils in his class and at the end of the academic year he

40 “когдаби-де отецъ префект на мене подал доношеніе, то я би против оного отвѣтствовать мог, а против доношенія сих студентов, которыхъ я почти воспиталъ і пелюшки било очищаю, отвѣтствовать не хочу” II. 2. XLIX. 128.

41 See: Askochienskij, V. *Kiev and its oldest school the academy*. Part 2. 177-178; Sydorenko, A. *The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century*. 98-101.

42 II. 2. XLVII.

was not promoted to the next level. Lobko was offended by this fact and wrote an angry letter to the teacher of *infima*, accusing him of injustice and poor pedagogical skills. Theodor was promoted to the class of grammar, but after this he did not even appear at the lessons. When the teacher of grammar sought a reason, he also received a letter from father Pavlo, which declared that his servant had a will to decide for himself whether to attend the academic classes or to learn from his master.⁴³ The last claim was fair enough – formal education at that period was compulsory only for priestly sons, while children of laics could choose any way to receive knowledge, including private tuition⁴⁴ (and Lobko accentuated specially that Stefanovych was not a priestly son). But the way the local cleric addressed the university professors, especially in the first letter (to the teacher of *infima*) poses a big problem.

He could become a teacher for his servant and force him under his own authority. One could agree that he could claim full power over the residents of St. Basil dormitory, he had an argument at least – the students lived on “his” territory (though not private). But here he gives advice to the teacher on how to teach, and this advice is formulated very much as an instruction. He does not ask, but gives an order to promote his *protégé*. There were only two people who had a legal right to treat any of the academic teachers in such manner – the rector and the prefect (plus the Kiev metropolitan, but he did not usually interfere in academic life at this level).⁴⁵ From the side of a local priest (not even a prior already at that time) this was a direct insult to all the academic administration, and had the metropolitan wanted to blame him in disobedience to the church authority, he could have.

Unfortunately, I do not have information about the results of this last conflict. As for the series of clashes between Lobko and the students, there we have a resolution of the Kiev consistory. Father Lobko was reduced from prior to a simple priest and received a strict warning that in the case of any further misunderstandings he should turn to the authority of the prefect or any other professor

43 II. 3. XLIV.

44 See for example the Holy Synod's special regulations from 1738-1739: II. 2. CXXXV and CXXXVI.

45 *The Academical Instruction 1764*. Chapter 18. Paragraphs 2, 3, 7, 9. (II. 3. XII. 101-102, 104)

instead of acting as a judge himself. More than that, the students of St. Basil school obtained official permission to escort Pavlo to the academic court directly (usually such things had to be arranged by the prefect or rector in the consistory before initiating a trial).⁴⁶ This did not have a big effect on Lobko if in thirteen years he engaged into an even more provocative controversy with the academics. Yet what is really interesting is the position of the consistory in this case. In the final decision they directly called Paul's actions the result of “simple stubbornness and disdain of the superior command”.⁴⁷ Then they that “... for students living in St. Basil school everything should be arranged by Academic Instruction, and Lobko should not have any command over them”.⁴⁸

Perhaps for this case we could agree (as the judges did) with Dmitrij Vishnievskij, that one of the basic underlying reasons for the conflict was the whim of one person. Pavlo Lobko was an ambitious and arrogant cleric, who struggled to show off.⁴⁹ Still there was a group of people who made concrete material use of his conflict with students – namely, the deacons and part of the parish of St. Basil church. When the students made a collective complaint on Lobko, the deacons and “the parish” (without names) produced the answer, where the violations performed by the students in the church school were listed. The eight points of this list can be summarized in two main accusations: firstly, the students ignored all the church authorities (even the prior, not to speak of the vicars), and secondly, they did not help the clergy in the church work which the complainants regarded as their mutual business. In contrast to St. Nicolas church here the laics did not want to get rid of the students in their school, but to have a specific selection of those, hosting whom would give advantages to the church. Particular accent was made on the ability to say prayers and to sing during liturgies. The authors also repeated several times through the text, that there were some students whose families were rich enough to rent a flat for them, and those should be excluded from the

46 II. 2. XLIX. 129.

47 “по единому своему упрямству і висшой команди презренію” II. 2. XLIX. 128.

48 “... и поступать їм за силу академиськой інструкції, а ему Лобку над ними студентами никакой команди не іміть” II. 2. XLIX. 129.

49 He had conflicts with the deacons, with other priests and with his parishioners as well, the index of the Kiev Consistory Archive (Fond 127 in Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kiev) has more cases with his participation.

church school.⁵⁰ Logically, what the church community wanted to have on their territory was a cooperative and obedient labor force, while what they got in the face of students was a community that ruled in *their* space by *its* own rules. One of the points of accusation stated, that students hosted their mates or pupils in the school and made some rebuilding in their cells without the prior's permission.

Senior Stefan Hryhorovych wrote, that one of Lobko's arguments for ejecting students was that “there was no any profit for the church from such residents”⁵¹, which shows that the prior himself also seemed to have had similar practical concerns, even though they could be minor comparing to his ambitions for power. Professor Petrov supposed that the named collective complaint was initiated by Lobko as well,⁵² but there is no hard evidence for this, and from the general view of his behavior this seems unlikely. Rather, we again have a situation where the personal interest of a man who happened to be the local authority correlates with some collective concerns of a very different kind. Roman Antonov's specific attitude towards the academic community (and the students in particular), as well as Pavlo Lobko's peculiar manner of earning respect, aroused from the personal reasons, but gained legality through defending the common material interest of people who surrounded them.

Both priests tried to solve their self-positioning problems through opposition to the academics, rather than through the alliance with them, even though the friendly relations with the educated men might have affected their status better than enmity towards them. The reasons of their choice of social position is not of primary interest here, but the line of separation that we see as its result is important. We speak of division of space, authority and responsibility between two communities, both of which are under the institutional supremacy of the Church in the face of the Kiev consistory. The position of the consistory seems clear – in both cases the final decision is made in favor of the students. And here the argument of prefect Mykhajil, that prior Antonov helped the laics against the

50 II. 2. XLIX. 129-30.

51 II. 2. XLIX. 127.

52 II. 2. XLIX. 129.

ecclesiastical community, covers only a part of the possible reasoning. The ktetors were secular people, tightly connected to the church, just as the students were. None of the disciples of the academy had a formal right to count themselves among clerics; even those priestly sons who were obliged to study theology still had a possibility make a secular career afterwards. One could say that ktetors were the laics who financed the church, while students were laics who were financed by the church. But then what is the logic from the point of view of the consistory to oppose those who brought money to their institution?

I think that the position of the higher officials here shows an important feature of the academic community of that time. The group of people concentrated around the local church, as I intended to show, was to a large extent the occasional society, brought together by concrete permanent interests (not necessarily material). The students in contrast are treated as a part of a larger union, very stable and strong one – the academic corporation. In their complaints against Pavlo Lobko several students emphasized that the priest scolded all the academics, sometimes even professors together with pupils.⁵³ In the final decision on St. Nicolas dormitory case Antonov and two deacons were sentenced to a public punishment, “so that no more such offenses would be made to the pupils and the teachers”, even though there was no direct offense to the teachers from any of them⁵⁴ (not like from Lobko later). The students here act as representatives of a collective subject that unites them with their teachers and fellows from the other classes, namely the university. And its corporal identity is not fictional – it carries a symbolic capital which has a real meaning for the imperial ecclesiastical administration on the level of the city.

The separation inside this strong academic community will be dealt with further. Here, where we speak about the consistory, I would rather expand the wholeness of this community to the level of a network. In 1740s – 1750s, when the analyzed cases took place, around 40 % of the consistorial officials in Kiev were recruited from the Kiev-Mohyla Academy (though the specific relations

⁵³ II. 2. XLIX. 125, 127.

⁵⁴ “даби таких продержностей на учащихся і учителей не происходило” II. 1. L. 266.

between those alumni is not fixed in documents).⁵⁵ As for the juries of the consistorial court – they were elected among the priors or abbots of the city monasteries, the educated monks, who usually took at least part of their studies in this university (the rector and Brotherhood abbot was also a regular member of this institution, but not in the cases where KMA was a direct actor). This does not mean that the students won those processes thanks to nepotism, but that they were a part of an intellectual network formed around the Academy by both personal and collective connections, and by the common cultural sphere. As I mentioned already, there is quite a lot of literature about the “Mohylianian” cultural network in the Russian empire, and these cases, taken from an everyday life of the little people, show how this network actually worked. The most essential thing that enabled the emergence of such a collective identity and helped to build up such a social network was education.

1.2 Laics, clergy and educated monks: the war of statuses

If we turn back to our two cases now, we shall see the difference between them in the line of separation which lay behind the conflicts. In the case with Roman Antonov there were two sides – clerical and lay. We can say that Roman, himself an alumnus of the Kiev-Mohyla Academy, went against the educated academic society, of which he was supposed to be a natural part, on the side of semi-taught laics. It was not a very unusual situation, when the student (or former student, as here) opposed the community, and a couple of such will be analyzed in the third chapter. As for Pavlo Lobko, his case shows a division inside the ecclesiastical community between educated and non-educated clergy, very typical for that time. As this division means a lot for the social position of students and professors, I propose here a number of other, more bright illustrations for it.

There is a rather late case from the Kiev-Vydubychi monastery with a very telling rhetoric. On 29 October 1784 the abbot of this monastery, Ijeronim Blons'kyj, sent a letter of complaint to the

⁵⁵ Prokopiuk, O. *Kiev-Mohyla academy graduates in the office department of Kiev ecclesiastical consistory*. 161-2.

metropolitan, where he described the “inappropriate behavior” (“негідну поведінку”) of two monks. One of them, named Enoch, was a former student of the Kiev-Mohyla Academy, he studied in the higher class (philosophy or theology, no clear information) in the 1764/5 academic year. Even though having been excluded from the school with a great scandal (we will have a chance to look at it closer later)⁵⁶, he still posed himself as a part of the academic network and as an educated man, which distinguished him among the other monks in his view. Father Ijeronim claimed that this “arrogant academic” (“високомірний академік”) did not want to participate in the control over building works, under the motivation that “there are enough more simple people in the monastery for such kind of work, so no need to bother a person with an academic education”. This was not a single occasion – Enoch frequently offended other brothers by emphasizing that they had not received a proper schooling, as he had.⁵⁷

Till now we were speaking about the conflicts between the academics and representatives of other ecclesiastical communities. Those could be related not only to the general social separation, but to the relations between these particular collective bodies. The Academy was under the protection of the Kiev-Brotherhood monastery, a rich and influential one, that had a lot of economic ambitions and a number of permanent conflicts connected to them⁵⁸. But the line of separation between educated and non-educated monks, or between monks and academics shows up in the relationship inside the Brotherhood monastery as well. Let us look at the case where a student demonstrates academic ambitions.

In January 1749 a student of theology, Theodor Ol'shans'kyj, came to the house of Iakynth Khranovs'kyj, a Brotherhood monk who worked as a factor of one of the monastery's villages called Karpylivka. The witnesses said that the student came in the company of a deacon, they were both drunk and were up to ask Iakynth to continue drinking together. But the factor was not at home, so

56 The connection between monk Enoch and student Josef Klenhyns'kyj, who was an actor of the scandal in 1764, was found out by Maksym Jaremenko and described in: Jaremenko, M. “Woe from wit or about the Mohylianian education as a reason for honor”. *The Kiev Academy* 4 (2007), 86-94.

57 “*есть в монастыре подлейший за него, тех би я употреблял в досмотр за работниками, а не его, учившагося в Академії*” II. 4. 155.

58 See for example: Petrov N. Introduction. II. 1. PP. XIX-XXII.

the guests were met by his servant, who refused to let the boozy company into the building. Then Ol'shans'kyj claimed that he had a right to enter this house at any time, and even to kick the owner out and live there, because Karpylivka was granted not to the monastery and its monks, but to the academy's dormitory and its dwellers⁵⁹. In fact this village was granted to the abbey by the cossack military administration in 1688 as a compensation for estates lost as a result of the Eternal Peace of 1686. The person who claimed this compensation, was the abbot and the academy's rector (these two positions were almost always in one hand), but whether there was any special indication for the usage of this lands was not specified. They could have been used for both the monastery's and the academy's benefit.⁶⁰ Here the question of ownership seems to be a purely rhetorical figure that the student used to show off his honor. Together with that he demonstrated the power or the pretension for power of the Academy by placing the Brotherhood monks under the authority of any academic, even a student.

It is unclear what happened after the described dialog – the documents from the two sides give different information. The witnesses for Khranovs'kyj, two clerks from the local military office, said that the student refused to leave the factor's yard until the master came. When Khranovs'kyj heard the story, he asked the young man to show his passport, and having found out he had no documents, punished him as a vagabond and drove him out into the street.⁶¹ Theodor presented a totally another picture: he left Karpylivka right after the conversation with the servant and went to the dormitory to sleep (he did not deny being drunk). But the next morning four of Iakynth's servants came to his room and took him by force back to the factor's yard, where he was lashed and then forced to work in the cellar for several hours. Moreover, he claimed, that Khranovs'kyj took most of his clothing and some money, and then not only threw him out of the yard, but commanded the servants to chase him through the streets with a great noise⁶². Which of these versions is closer to the truth is an open

59 II. 1. LXXXVII. 389.

60 Mukhin N. *The Kiev-Brotherhood Academical monastery*. 107-10.

61 I. 1. 301/749 II. 7. 188V.

62 I. 1. 301/749 II. 7. 191V-192V, 197V-197R.

question. Two historians, who published and analyzed these documents, Nikolai Petrov and Dmitrii Vishnievskij, are more willing to believe Ol'shans'kyj, at least for the reason that his belongings and money were really taken from him, and in the end the factor had to give those back⁶³.

Yet whether we are to trust the student or not, his accusations contain some rhetorical elements which are of importance for the study of the student honor. One of them we have already seen in one of the previous cases, this is the issue of forced labor. Pavlo Lobko tried to force a pupil to make some writings for him, here Iakynth Khranovs'kyj forces Theodor to do physical work on his behalf. What this really implies is, not so much the work itself, but the demonstration of power over a student. Forced labor was also one of the legal ways to punish people for minor crimes, frequently used at that times, especially by the consistory (as well, as lashing). So this action of priests could have been perceived as a violation of the presumption of innocence, which was a big offense. Here another common motive should be noted: both Lobko and Khranovs'kyj claimed that they took the students for vagabonds, whom they had a right to try and punish. This was a kind of power demonstration (though Iakynth did not appeal to Her Majesty's privilege, he only mentioned the order by the Kiev regimental office, which gave him a responsibility over “people without documents and other improper men”⁶⁴), but this could be a way to prevent the accusation of injustice at the same time.

The other characteristic detail is the motive of chasing. The student was not just kicked out from the factor's house, but in such a manner that everyone in the village could notice it. Moreover, before that Iakynth had taken Theodor's clothing, namely coat, jacket, belt, warm trousers, cap and boots, and left him in his underwear. Besides that the student must have felt very cold, he had to run through the village, in front of quite a number of households, in such clothes, followed by a couple of servants, who shouted things like: “Beat him harder! He will not come back to Karpylivka any more!”⁶⁵ This would be a great shame, and a definite public offense for Ol'shans'kyj. Was it a truth,

63 II. 1. LXXXVII. 390; Vishnievskij, D. *From the daily life of Kiev students*. 2. 188-94.

64 “безпашпортних бродяг і других непристойних людей” I. 1. 301/749 Л. 7. 188V.

65 “бейте [его] добре, чтоб больш не ворочался в село Карпилівку” Vishnievskij, D. *From the daily life of Kiev*

or a fantasy of the appellant, this reveals a sphere where the reasons of this conflict mostly are: we are again speaking about the opposition of honors, both private and institutional. The monk was insulted, when the estate he was managing was assigned to the student community and his own authority was put under the will of the academics. Theodor, of course, had a concrete material motive to initiate the trial – to return his belongings and money, which were stolen. But when the cathedral court of the Brotherhood monastery gave all these things back to the student, he was still not satisfied, he even did not take them back until Khranovs'kyj was forced to confess his injustice in front of the consistory and to pay thirty-eight rubles compensation for the offense.⁶⁶ This shows that the material reasons were comparatively less important for him, the student strove for justice and defense of his honor in first place.

Theodor Ol'shans'kyj was not an educated monk yet, but he, most probably, was going to become one rather soon (as a student of theology he could even be a novice in one of the local monasteries, probably, not the Brotherhood). Still as a representative of an academic community he engaged in the opposition with a “simple” monk and expressed great ambitions, which the university had in this sphere. And Iakynth Khranovs'kyj in his turn shows how strongly these ambitions were rejected by the monastic community. This opposition is more evident in another conflict, which took place in 1759. Although this case did not include students, I consider it important to analyze here in short, because it gives additional examples for several relevant questions.

The material of this case consists of a series of complaints and answers to them. On the one side the professors of the Academy claimed that they are constantly being cheated by the monks, who are in charge of providing them with food and other material goods. On the opposite side, the monks accused the professors of greediness and overuse of the common funds. The teachers said that they receive much less provision than their colleagues have had under the previous abbot, and

students. 2. 191-2.

66 *I. 1. 301/749 II. 7. 191V-191R, 195V.* To imagine how much 38 rubles were worth, I should mention, for example, that the Brotherhood monastery received material support from the Military Office of the Hetmanate at those times, which constituted 35 rubles annually.

that monks were trying to gain control over the academic special budget (there was a number of donations restricted “for the benefit of science”, but distributed through the common monastery's treasury⁶⁷). The monks were dissatisfied with quite a number of things, the main of those being: the professors had a separate kitchen and their own chef; they constantly demand food and alcohol in such enormous amounts, the monastery's economy can not provide; they can take the horses and leave the monastery at any time, without even informing the abbot; they refuse to assist the monks during the church services; they receive money from a great number of sources, but still preserve the restriction of the “academic fund”, while the brotherhood feel a much more urgent need for money, than they do.⁶⁸

From the first sight this conflict can be perceived as a purely economic one, as it actually was by the documents' publisher, Nikolai Petrov, judging from the title he gave them. One may say that this is how the brothers try to present the situation – they constantly call their economy “poor”, “ruined”, “deplorable”, etc.⁶⁹ But there seems to be another level of misunderstanding here, caused by the inequality in status between the groups of the Brotherhood monastery's dwellers. The professors were not simply richer, they had a number of privileges inaccessible to the other monks. This includes not only material goods, but a higher level of independence as well. The teachers did not want to share money, work and even a table with the other monks, which made them a separate community within the monastic society. They used the space and the finances of the monastery, but refused to pay back for it. By the way, less than 18% of the KMA professors were recruited from the Brotherhood monastery⁷⁰ (as for the actors of this particular case – at least three-quarters of them were from the other abbeys, for the rest there is no information available). So, the Brotherhood monks were not happy with the obligation to take care of almost a dozen people who alienated themselves from the community and made an interaction to flow in one direction only.

67 “на благо науки” II. 1. PP. 110–6, 179–82, 188–91.

68 II. 2. XCVI.

69 II. 2. XCVI. 289-292.

70 Data for period 1721-58.

The same motive can be seen in the professors' claims – when accusing the Brotherhood managers of cheating, they in fact express their fear of being cheated (for no hard facts are pointed out), and therefore ask to reduce their dependence on the monastic authorities. Maybe, they even did not care whether the monks were cheating or not, but what they were concerned of is their own economic independence. The same goes for the power of the abbot. The monks and the abbot himself accused the professors of disobedience in several aspects (including using horses and taking food to their personal cells), while the professors blame abbot David for having too much ambition for control over them.

Davyd Nashchyns'kyj was in a tough position being an abbot and a rector at the same time. These two positions were traditionally combined, and he was obviously not the only person to face such a problem, but his choice here was exceptional – he stood on the side of the Brotherhood monks, in opposition to the faculty corporation. In the eyes of the professors such behavior could be viewed as an act of treason, and so Davyd was treated as a renegade by his colleagues. This also overlapped with a personal clash around him – the current prefect Samujil Myslavs'kyj, who headed the professors' opposition, had been his main competitor in the rector's elections which took place only a year earlier (in 1759). Most of the teachers were in favor of Myslavs'kyj (he was one of the best recent alumni of the KMA and a very talented speaker), but Nashchyns'kyj was supported by the monastic community who saw a good abbot in him (he already had an experience of managing several other monasteries). We could say, that Davyd was more an abbot, than a rector, therefore the professors actively undermined his authority over the academic corporation. And in the end they won – he was transferred to the other abbey and his place was taken by Samujil Myslavs'kyj⁷¹.

As for the separation between the educated and the non-educated in the ecclesiastical society, it is very evident from this case. The professors posed themselves not only separately from the “simple” monks, but above them, and logically wished their life not to be under the control of such

71 For the more detailed analyses of this case see: Sheliah, H. “Internal Relations in the Faculty Corporation of the Kiev-Mohyla Academy (on the Materials of the 1759 Year's Conflict)”. *Kievan Academy*. 12. 46-71.

people. Davyd himself expressed is in a very bright manner: “[and I also ask to guarantee] that the prior will not suffer those reproaches, offenses, swears and insults from the teachers, which he gets as a simpleton (who did not study the wise Latin)”.⁷²

Now I wish to draw a brief conclusion of this overview of the interaction between Academy and Church. So, the place of KMA in the ecclesiastical society was significant, because it gave plenty of human resources to the Church and received support from it. As a part of the local institutional and social ecclesiastical network, the academy faced confrontations with a number of neighboring communities, including the closest one – the Kiev-Brotherhood monastery. These conflicts usually lay in the sphere of daily relationship and had both concrete material reasons (separation of space and economic resources) and symbolic ones (struggle for authority, power over different subjects, defense of personal and collective honor). Two major lines of separation defined the academic community in these relations – it represented clerics in opposition to laics, and educated clergy in opposition to the uneducated.

And now let us turn to where we started – the accommodation problem the students suffered. In connection to the St. Nicolas school case the privilege by metropolitan Varlaam Jasyns'kyj was mentioned. It did not contain any special prescriptions for St. Nicolas church, but the ktetors tried to justify their pretensions using this point: “and as for the students, who make filths to the people, those should not live in the church places, for they have a special dormitory in their schools, and can stay in the burgers' houses, if they want”.⁷³ The last stated alternative – the burgers' houses – was used by the students not less actively, and provoked no fewer problems, than the one analyzed above. And this makes the subject of the next chapter.

72 “он наместник не мог би страдать таковых от учителей чинимих поприканій, презрениій, руганій і конфузій, каковым простачок (то есть не учащий мудрой латині) от них обременяется” II. 2. ХСVI. 310

73 “і студентам, когда они творят пакости людям, в церковних жилищах не вели жити, зане могут-де бити при школах во особних домах, и у міщан стоять, где кому придасться” Published in: *Kievan Past* 9 (1885). 140-4.

Chapter 2. Academy and City

Unfortunately, there are no statistics which would show how many students lived in the private flats and what part of the student body those made. But there are several criteria that limited the availability of this type of accommodation for students. If the academic dormitory and church schools were theoretically open for every Kiev-Mohyla pupil, the only limitation being the physical space, flats in the city could be occupied only by a specific group of students. Obviously, the first category in this group will be Kievans who lived in their own houses with their parents or relatives. In the middle of eighteenth century those made approximately 15% of students in average.⁷⁴ It is possible, that such students will appear in this text, because sometimes the characteristic “who lives in the flat” does not give a clear idea whether this is his private flat or a rented one, but they will not be in the main focus of this chapter. Much more attention is on the students who rented their accommodation from the burghers, since this practice made a specific type of social relation.

One way for a student to get a place in the private home was simply to pay a regular rent. The Academy did not provide money for such purposes, so the payment was mostly covered by parents or other relatives. Some students shared the rented space with their mates, which reduced the price for each of them, but even then both had to have relatively solvent families. As our materials show, these were predominantly the noblemen or the military elite (cossacks). For the poor students there existed another possibility for living in the city – to become a private teacher (“inspector”). The inspectors were selected among the students of the higher classes – theology and philosophy, rarely rhetorics, by the level of knowledge and “reliability” (“*благонадежность*”) approved by their teacher. They usually lived in the home of their pupils and received money, food or both for their work from the pupil's parents⁷⁵. Yet the rich students who rented the flats and hired servants by their

⁷⁴ Jaremenko, M. “*Academics*” and the academy. 70, 73, 452.

⁷⁵ The prescription of 1754 which obliged to hire an inspector for every pupils of the “lower classes” stated that if the family was too poor to pay their children's tutor, than they have to provide his living by natural means (accommodation, food, clothing). II. 4. 99-101.

own means (or rather the means of their parents) also struggled to receive the *conditiones*, as the inspector's places were officially called. This leads to the thought, that the economic support was not always the main point of this practice as some historians tend to show⁷⁶. It also had an important symbolic meaning being granted to the best students as an award for their hard work and good behavior. At least this is how it was meant in theory. In reality the inspectorship became so common that eventually most of the senior students received the *conditiones*, but their special status was still recognized to some extent. I will analyze this problem in more details in the next chapter when speaking about the inner hierarchy in the academic community⁷⁷.

2.1 Academic traditions vs urban laws

But first let us deal with the burghers. This generic title in fact covers a very mixed social group, but the detailed differentiation within it is far too complicated for the purposes of this work, therefore I will use the term “burgher” as a synonym to “the citizen of Kiev” or even “the dweller of Podil”. However, I will explain the specificities of status of the particular people who appear in the cases when it is sufficient for our analysis and when the relevant information is available. Yet for our first precedent such a distinction is unnecessary – this is an exemplary case of collective opposition where both the burghers and the academics act as solid social entities.

The affair itself is quite unclear: it is mentioned in the documents only briefly that on 24 February 1701 a group of several dozens of students caught a “traveling Jewish merchant” near the pub, beat and robbed him. The real clash started when this merchant went to the city magistrate to claim his robbed belongings back. The city chancellors headed by the mayor (*boŭm*) decided to use his complaint as a pretext to expose all the troubles caused by the students. *The Report about the Conflicts between Students of the Kiev-Mohyla Academy and the Kiev Burghers* sent to the royal

76 For example see: Posokhova, L “Students of the orthodox colleges of eighteenth-century Ukraine as teachers in cossack officers' families”. *Kievan Past* 5 (2008), 3-18. (though this article is based on the material from the other Orthodox colleges where this practice slightly differed from that in the Kiev-Mohyla academy).

77 See Chapter 3.

chancellery immediately after this case (on 29 February) included five other witnessed cases of robbery and debauchery committed by the Kiev-Mohyla pupils. It also appealed to “constant” violations of the city regulations: the students organized noisy drinking parties and hang around the city center at night, put up fights in the streets, stole the firewood from the city guard, and disobeyed both civil and military authorities. They even mentioned one massive battle that took place just the same February between the guard who tried to prevent a robbery and “almost two hundreds of students armed with sabers and sticks” (that is how is stated in the document, though I suppose it is an exaggeration). The main sense of all these accusations could be summarized into two main points – violation of the common rules and disobedience to the city authorities, therefore the request of the city chancellery was to force the students under the full control of the magistrate.⁷⁸

In the late days of April (no precise date identified) the reaction on this report arrived to the office of the Kiev metropolitan who was officially responsible for the Academy. This document is a rare example of the collective voice of the whole academic corporation – it was signed by the representatives of both the faculty and the student community. The letter did not defend the students or deny their blame, but asked the higher patron to remind the Kiev mayor and magistrate, that the Kiev-Mohyla Academy was under his own authority and that of the Holy Church, and therefore was not obliged to consider the will of any other officials. A special emphasis was made on the existence of the academic court headed by the rector and confirmed by the metropolitan where the students were to be judged (not in the city court where to they were usually taken by the guards). Shortly speaking, the academics asked to protect their legal autonomy appealing mainly to the old university traditions (established by Petro Mohyla around 70 years earlier) and to the social significance of the Academy as an educational center.⁷⁹

Metropolitan Varlaam (Jasyns'kyj) as a good patron forwarded this letter to his colleague

⁷⁸ II. 4. 8.

⁷⁹ II. 4. 9.

metropolitan of Riazan' and Murom Stefan (Javors'kyj) who was one of the most influential ecclesiastical authorities of Russia at that time, and asked him to present the Academy's interests to the Tsar.⁸⁰ On 26 September of the same year Peter I issued a privilege that confirmed that “the schools in Kiev” receive the official name of the Academy (although this name was already in use when Kiev was under Polish rule).

As I mentioned in the Introduction, the question whether this document had a real effect on the legal status of the Academy was asked already in the end of the nineteenth century and is still debated.⁸¹ For the purpose of this text the precedent of 1701 is more of interest as a local conflict in the city which reveals a general character of relationship between the two groups of the urban society. As the documents were written for the higher authorities the view expressed in them is overgeneralized. It presents the Academy and the City as two monolithic entities which were in a relations of strict opposition. It is important in terms of self-fashioning that the university wanted to be seen as a professional corporation united by common rules, laws and traditions, which in the legal terminology of the urban bureaucrats must have been called a guild.

Not less sufficient for this community was its ecclesiastical status – in this case not as a matter of honor, but as a legal category. The patronage of such a powerful institution as the Church and the protection of the Brotherhood monastery could give certain guarantees to the academic autonomy. At least, this is what the professors and student representatives had a hope for, temporarily “forgetting” about their secluded position within the ecclesiastical community. How much these claims were really counted on in practice even after the privilege was issued can be seen from a number of cases from the later periods.

For example, almost the same words as in the aforementioned letter to Rev. Varlaam were repeated by the Kiev-Mohyla prefect Mykhajil Kozachyns'kyj in a very similar document addressed

⁸⁰ II. 4. 10-11.

⁸¹ To take some examples from different centuries: Bulgakov, M. *The history of the Kiev academy*. 1843. 13, 103-104; Sydorenko, A. *The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century*. 1977. 61-69; and the article precisely concentrated on this privilege – Jaremenko, M. “Was the year 1701 a turning point for the Kiev-Mohyla academy in view of its professors in the 18th century?”. *350-Lecie Unii Hadziackiej* / Red. T. Chynczewska-Hennel. 2008.

to his successor metropolitan Rafajil (Zaborovs'kyj) in June 1744.⁸² This letter concerned a rather trivial case: three dormitory students went singing in the street, as they frequently did, and burst into an angry woman who cursed them and accused them of illegal business.⁸³ The woman's son Mykhajlo Romanov Riznyk came to defend his mother, more students entered the quarrel, and so it turned into a fight. In the end a couple of pupils were beaten and Riznyk even captured one of them, Ivan Duchyns'kyj, and turned him into the city jail accusing him of provoking violence. Since we know the situation only from the words of the prefect, who is retelling the testimonies of his students, the picture here is very subjective (it is hardly believable that a company of five young men was defeated by one burgher and his elderly mother), but this is not the main concern here.

Much more interesting are the references the prefect used to defend his pupils: he quotes a passage from the privilege of 1701 which stated: "... was gratefully ordered, that the mayor and burghers must not offend and oppress the students in any way, and in case of any troubles [caused by the students] ask for the judgment of the Academy's rector or prefect" and a confirmation of the same norm in Empress Elizabeth's charter of 1742.⁸⁴ He also appeals to a number of other recent cases (years 1735, 1739, 1740, 1741 and early June 1744) when the burghers ignored these prescriptions and instead of the academic court took the students to the magistrate, which then could either "screw up" the evidence in a way to excuse the citizen and make the academics guilty, or simply "freeze" the prosecution.⁸⁵

To somehow confirm that Kozachyns'kyj's words showed not an invented problem I propose to look closer at the most tragic and one of the most characteristic of the mentioned precedents – the affair of student Hryhorij Makovets'kyj. Formally it is listed under the dates 30 October 1739 – 24 February 1740, but in fact it refers only to the primary investigation, after which it was repeated at least once in February 1741 and still was never closed. This affair also started with a street fight

82 II. 4. 29.

83 She called them thieves (*бopу*), which could equally refer to beggars. Begging was criminal in the Russian empire, but the poor dormitory students had an unwritten permission to earn money by singing or even by asking directly "for the sake of education" (See the reference here: Chapter 1)

84 See the privilege by Elizabeth, where the confirmed document of 1701 is also directly quoted – II. 1. LX.

85 II. 4. 29. 64-5.

between two students of philosophy, Hryhorij Makovets'kyj and Iosyf Jaroslavs'kyj with two Iosyf's disciples, and a group of Podolian craftsmen. It is unclear who initiated violence, but it is known that they met late in the evening after both groups spent some time in different bars. In the end the students realized that there were too many people against them and decided to surrender. Makovets'kyj was taken to the house of burgher Nechypor Pavlov, while the rest of his mates managed to run away before being captured. The next day Jaroslavs'kyj (who lived in the Resurrection Church school together with his pupils) came to the academic dormitory to ask whether Hryhorij came back last night, but he had not. After that Jaroslavs'kyj with the senior of the dormitory Iosyf Hrechanovs'kyj and several other students were looking for their lost fellow. And on Saturday he was announced to be found by the fishers near the village Ploske (approx. 4 km. from Podil) – his body with a broken head floated from under the ice of river Dnipro.⁸⁶

In this case the city magistrate was the only institution to turn to – no local tribunal could deal with a murder. The investigation pointed on three main suspects: the first was, logically, the owner of the house where a crime took place, shoemaker Nechypor Pavlov, then his son Theodor, who preserved a single glove, a pair of which was on the victim's hand, and certain Petro Morozenko from the fishermen's guild, who came home on the exact night the murder happened in a new red hat which was recognized by the students as belonging to the descendant. All three were told against by the students and the evidence was given by their servants (“boys”) and by the barmaid called Korotka (“the short one”, most probably a nickname).

However, the court called the witnesses unreliable due to their young age, and the material evidence was considered not enough to prove the suspects guilty, so all three were assigned to take an oath of innocence. It was a well established practice that the accused side made such a oath which then had to be proven by at least three uninterested persons. Also the general “reliability” (“неподозрительность”) of the suspects and witnesses should have had a written confirmation from their family or any community they belonged to. In this case the letters about the “reliability”

86 II. 1. XLIV. 239-42.

were provided by the two guilds to which our characters belonged – the cobblers and the fishers. Student Jaroslavs'kyj and senior Hrechanovs'kyj also took an oath to confirm that their claim was just, and that the only reason why it was made only on the seventh day after the murder was their previous unawareness of the crime⁸⁷.

After this procedure the investigation should have been continued, but instead it was just “frozen”. In the early November 1740, a year after the murder, the newly promoted Kiev-Mohyla rector Syl'vestr Kuliabka received a collective letter signed by the representatives of each and every class (three pupils from each, 24 in total) in which they asked him to renew the investigation. The rector sent requests to the Kiev metropolitan and to the central chancellery of the Kiev diocese. Then the magistrate revised the materials of the case, called the suspects and the representatives of both guilds and of the Academy to the court again,⁸⁸ but, as we saw, another four years later the murderers were still not found and not punished.

Obviously we can not fully rely on the available sources – we do not have any material that would represent the burghers' side except the formal descriptive protocols of the actual court procedure. But what we have fully confirms the claims of prefect Kozachyns'kyj about the preconceived and unjust character of the prosecution. More than that, the case of Hryhorij Makovets'kyj can not be called representative, it is one of the few exceptionally serious affairs. Of course, it is far from the 1701 precedent in scale, but the level of responsibility and official authority presented here is still rather far from the everyday life. Most of the conflicts between students and burghers (including all those mentioned by Kozachyns'kyj in his complain except this one) ended with a more or less severe fight and more or less dishonorable oral offenses. This does not necessarily mean those were taken less seriously by the participants, but the procedure differed sufficiently.

At the same time this exceptional case gives us a very clear picture of that strict social and legal

87 II. 1. XLIV. 242-3.

88 II. 1. XLIV. 248.

separation of the Academy and the City. Here we see that it existed not only in the overgeneralized discourse of the state-level authorities, but also corresponded to the real situations, at least some of them. The two definite communities are in front of the magistrate – the academics and the workers' guilds. Both letters of complaint (the initial one and the requests for revision) are collective demands signed by a certain number of representatives in the name of the whole community and approved by its senior. The fact that the second one went through the rector's office was important in terms of the academic hierarchy: officially the prefect was responsible for all affairs concerning the students and it was quite rare that the pupils turned to the authority of the rector himself.⁸⁹ In this case the involvement of the highest in the university administration even emphasizes the communal opposition – it was not about the students and the burghers, but about the academic corporation and the guilds. The latter are also very clearly visible in the text: although they do not have any documents signed by them, the magistrate in the final verdict makes an accent on the letters of reliability which were the expressions of the guilds' care of their members. It also gives references to “the regulations and instructions of the Magdeburg rights” and to “the Polish Book of Saxon rules”, both of which are classical models of the urban communal law.⁹⁰ These rules directed both of the sides during the process, in this case no appellations to the academic regulations or the authority of the church were made.

We could argue that in this prosecution process the academic corporation was treated formally as a guild. The same regulations were to be used in case of opposition between any urban professional corporations. Though the reason under that seems to be very simple and technical – this was the only form of rules used by the magistrate – it marks the official place assigned to the educational institution by the city, the place that was never seen as appropriate by the Academy. It was not only the ineffectiveness or subjectivity of the city court that offended the academics, but the mere fact

89 Among all the cases used in this work there are only three more that were lead by the rector and in two of them the prefect himself is an accused side.

90 II. 1. XLIV. 245. “The Polish Book of Saxon rules” (“книга Саксон полська”) here most probably means one of the Polish translations of the *Speculum Saxonum*.

that the urban authority tried to get over them and treat their corporation just as any other workers community of the city. The examples drawn out by Kozachyns'kyj are not always negative – he mentions two precedents, years 1735 and 1741, that were solved in favor of the students, but those still caused troubles for the honor and status of the Academy in his view.⁹¹

All these cases reveal an interesting general picture: the Kiev-Mohyla community being somehow out of reality. The city authorities claimed and used their rights over the students as over any other citizens and treated the academy as a guild of scholars under their territorial jurisdiction⁹². The church in the face of local priests and monks, as we saw in the previous chapter, perceived it as an ecclesiastical school that is meant to prepare the qualified clerics. The attitude of a Kiev metropolitan towards his protégé depended on their personal relationship: throughout the whole eighteenth century this place was occupied by the the Kiev-Mohyla alumni (some of them were also former teachers), so it was connected to their own previous experience. Not every metropolitan was willing to defend the academical autonomy as Rev. Varlaam did. For example, Tymofij (Shcherbats'kyj), Kiev metropolitan in 1748-1757, disregarded it very much and approached the university in the authoritative manner: he fixed the strict control over the curriculum, demanded the annual reports from the teachers, supported the Brotherhood monastery in its economic control over the Academy and interrupted the elections of the professors⁹³. So, there was a number of authorities who could and did claim their legal power over the Kiev-Mohyla Academy. But the academic community recognized none of them fully.

It is important here that except the Tsar's or Emperor's privileges they also made references to the old traditions, the “rules of the fraternal schools”, and mentioned metropolitan Petro Mohyla as the founding father.⁹⁴ In the eighteenth century the Kiev Fellowship no longer existed, and general

91 II. 4. 29. 64-5.

92 For example, in the 1701 case the chief of the Kiev garrison (not even a proper city authority, but only a military one) claimed that he “does not have the power over the burghers, but over the schools I do [therefore I have a right] to take the pupils to the prison” - II. 4. 9. 31. The same claims were repeated by mayor Vasyl' Balabukha when he was asked to release the pupil of *infima* imprisoned in St. Nicolas dormitory case in 1741 – II. 1. L. 264.

93 See: Grajevskij I. *The Kiev metropolitan Timothy Shcherbats'kyj*. 227-237.; Petrov N. Introduction. // II. 2. 14-24. By the way, this metropolitan had the same authoritative attitude towards the monastic communities as well.

94 Example in 1701 case – II. 4. 10. 33-34.

social and political realities of the Russian empire did not make an appropriate environment for a autonomous intellectual corporation (as it was showed in the Introduction). But it seems, that the academics still tried to pose themselves in the same way their predecessors did in the college when they were under the patronage of the cossack elite and shared the same legal space with the Jesuit schools and classical Western universities. By the way, this could be the precise reason why the mentioned Tsar's privilege of 1701 did not change much in the social position and, what is more important, self-positioning of the academic community, as it is argued in the modern research.

2.2 Student tribunal – a symbol of autonomy and corporative solidarity

The academical court and an exclusive authority of the prefect and rector over the students, that we discussed in both of the chapters, made one of the features of the fellowship autonomy. And even though the academical tribunal was never established as an official legal institution, it nevertheless worked, sometimes more effectively than any of the available alternatives. I have already mentioned a case of appellation to this semi-official organization in the case of father Pavlo Lobko – there, in the year 1754, the Kiev consistory confirmed the possibility of using it⁹⁵. The functioning of the academical tribunal, also called “student” or “dormitory” tribunal (*студенческий* or *бурсацький суд*) was started by a case of burgher Baranovych, which took place in 1746 and had become an exemplary precedent already for some of its contemporaries. For instance, just the same year a pupil accused of some minor issue mentioned it in front of the magistrate: “You should know that lately one of yours [burghers] was beaten heavily by our students, it may be that he won't be the only one [to go through this].”⁹⁶ The same case was used much later, in 1752, by a student to threaten his landlord, he said: “We [I and my brother] will do to you the same thing they once did to Baranovych”.⁹⁷ This “case of Baranovych” became almost a

95 II. 2. XLVIII. 129. See Chapter 1.

96 II. 4. 42. 82.

97 “Ми-де тобі зділаєм то, что Барановичу зділано [було]” - II. 4. 78. 126.

symbol of the student tribunal that performed the collective justice over the enemy.

The affair itself started in April 1746 as quite an ordinary personal conflict between the burgher named Jevstratij Baranovych and a student of philosophy Stefan Dimara who rented a house from him. Stefan was an inspector, his disciples lived together with him and they also had common servant (maybe several servants, but we know of one). We have already faced the matter of division of the servants and authority over them⁹⁸. In this case, it seems, the inspector and the landlord had a similar argument. Baranovych came to the KMA prefect Mykhajil Kozachyns'kyj and complained that Dimara could not provide his pupils with a good servant or keep the servant in discipline. The prefect forwarded this matter to the professor of philosophy, Stefan's direct supervisor, who promised to discuss it with his student. Almost immediately after that Stefan also came to the prefect to speak of the same boy whom Baranovych treated with an unfair cruelty. He said that the “guy” gave the burgher dirty clothing (maybe he did not wash it properly) and was beaten for this minor fault so severely that now he is “hardly alive”. In a reply father Mykhajil suggested that Stefan should take this issue to the magistrate as a witness, for this made a non-academical case (neither Baranovych nor the offended servant were under the university rule). Therefore Dimara with one of his mates Theodor Pozharevs'kyj, who also saw the servant's wounds, completed a letter of complaint and delivered it to the magistrate.⁹⁹

From this moment on the affair turned from a private misunderstanding to a legal case. But the city court was reluctant with the prosecution – either they were in favor of Baranovych (for which we do not have any direct evidence, but which the prefect and the students tended to believe¹⁰⁰), or they simply did not want to bother themselves defending such a “little figure” as a private servant. Whatever the reasons, the judges rejected the complaint, sent the witnesses out of the court and released Jevstratij from any accusations. The students got indignant of such a decision, and

⁹⁸ See Chapter 1, P. 16.

⁹⁹ II. 4. 40-44. 75-78.

¹⁰⁰ Kozachyns'kyj states it directly in his letter that the magistrate's decision was “just an indulgence” [“*єдина поблажка*”] - II. 4. 40-44. 78.

especially of the fact that they were not even listened to in the court, so was the prefect when being informed of it.

To make it worse, after the process Baranovych went to the bar, got heavily drunk and having come home late at night tried to make a revenge on Dimara. He got into the inspector's room, woke him up by beating and then threatened him with a pistol shouting: "I'll show you how to make complaints!"¹⁰¹. The next morning the burgher came to the Academy to see father Mykhajil again – he wanted Dimara and his pupils out of his house and asked the prefect to move them. As the prefect witnessed, he had already been told about the night's incident by Stefan's mate Pozharevs'kyj, so he asked Jevstratij to confirm on that matter. Baranovych confessed his guilt and asked for pacification, then Kozachyns'kyj promised to find another accommodation for the students and finish the conflict at this point.

But it was not completed so smoothly, because on the way back home in the monastic graveyard the burgher burst into a group of students of philosophy, Stefan Dimara's co-pupils, who did not know (and did not care much) about this peace arrangement. It is quite possible, that no such arrangement in fact ever took place, for the prefect told the story this way only afterwards, when he had to answer for the whole affair and explain his personal role in it¹⁰². But in any case, what the students were certain about was the double offense their fellow received – once from the city court, second time from Baranovych at night. And they decided to achieve justice by their own means. So, seven men took the burgher to the academic dormitory's back yard, where more students stood waiting, there he was forced to confess his guilt in front of them and then was stripped and leashed.¹⁰³

The most interesting thing in this confused story is the fact that it was recognized by the urban authorities, even by the chief of them, the general-governor of Kiev, and so it made a precedent and an academical legend. None of the students were arrested or taken to the city court after this act of

101 "познаешь-де как целобитствовать!" - II. 4. 40-44. 79.

102 II. 4. 40-44. 80.

103 II. 4. 40-44. 77-78.

revenge, although Baranovych tried to initiate a process against them. General-governor Michail Leontjev asked the Kiev-Mohyla prefect for explanation and trusted the prosecution to his authority – quite unlike the cases listed previously, even though the affair started as a non-academic one and tackled the interest and the honor of a Kiev citizen¹⁰⁴.

Baranovych did not deny being guilty, but he demanded satisfaction for the offense of his honor by the public punishment. As it was formulated in the claim, he regarded this act as fair, but illegal and inappropriate for his age and status, because only the “little schoolboys” (“*малолітніе школьники*”) could be publicly stripped and beaten in such a way¹⁰⁵. The rule to provide satisfaction this time was found not in the codex of urban law, but in the Code of Law (Sobornoje Ulozhenije – sometimes named without translation in English) which functioned in the Russian state from the year 1649. It stated that for a crime of such kind the offender must be punished with the same act as he did to the victim,¹⁰⁶ therefore, those seven students who took active participation in the revenge were to be lashed in the academical yard. This decision matched exactly with the academical regulations and traditions¹⁰⁷, and the performance of this punishment was totally in hand of the university administration. Three representatives of the magistrate and captain of the city police were present at the execution as witnesses. The Kiev metropolitan also does not take an active part in this case, he only received the general report on the matter and the final decision.

So, in terms of the separation of authorities and the legal references used this process was somehow unusual. The possible reasons for this non-standard procedure are, unfortunately, unclear. We know nothing about Jevstratij Baranovych except that he owned a house in Podil near St. Nicolas church and lived there together with his mother. Had he been a member of a certain guild or of military elite, the magistrate might have taken a more principled position in defending his honor in front of “the schoolboys”. It is more likely, however, that Leontiev's inclinations in favor of the

104 II. 4. 40-44. 74-76.

105 II. 4. 40-44. 82.

106 II. 4. 40-44. 83.

107 II. 1. XXXVI. Paragraphs VIII, XXII.

academic administration, as well as his special attention to this case, was connected to the peculiar status of the involved students. All seven accused pupils were “from the Polish lands” (“польської області”) as stated in the documents, foreigners who came to study in Kiev. It seems from the general-governor's letter addressed to the Academy's prefect, that for him it was of a special concern for political reasons. On the one hand, he asks to punish the students severely enough, for otherwise they could “after coming back to Poland retell there, how in Kiev they beat the Russian burghers, talk big of themselves, and dishonor the Russian empire in vain”, but on the other hand, he did not want to make a huge scandal¹⁰⁸. This shift of responsibility to the Academy could even be interpreted as a way to secure the city administration and his own authority just in case. But of course, this is more of the theoretical speculations.

Whatever are the concerns under it, the Kiev-Mohyla Academy received a legal point of reference to use in any similar situation. The notion of the university's self-governance and its own tribunal became much closer to reality from this moment. The other question is how this precedent was used in the legal practice. For the next twenty years there is no evidence of another case processed by the student tribunal. We only spot appellations to this one case mostly in form of threats, and to some extent such threats worked, as we would see in one of the further affairs. So, “the case of Baranovych” was important as a kind of symbolic weapon in opposition with the offenders, burghers on the first place. It also played sufficient role in the self-positioning of the academic community as a full corporation or a fraternity, as they would more likely call themselves.

The real legal activity was performed by the student tribunal only once after that – in winter 1764 – and this turned into a huge and tragic scandal. The actual documents of this case are preserved badly¹⁰⁹, therefore the initial point of the conflict is uncertain. It is certain, that at one of

108 II. 4. 40-44. 83. The quotation is a precise formulation by Leontjev - “... *отишед по времени обратно в Польшу, будут там хвастать, что вони в битность в Києві російських міщан били, отчего Россійской империи напрасное послѣдует безславіе.*” after which he also adds such a characteristics: “*самі ізволите битъ извѣстни, какіе они самохвали*” (“you should know yourself what braggarts they [the Poles] are”).

109 Today the original documents are not preserved at all, so here I have to rely on the partial publication by Prof. Petrov – II. 3. XXV. and on the detailed analytical description by Prof. Titov (under the pen-name Ks. Tsybul'skij) - “Fatal declamation of psalter (from the daily life and nature of students of the old Kiev)”. *Kievan Past* 2 (1884). 336-342.

the burghers' homes in Podil the child have died and its father Sydor Klymov hired a student of poetics Kondratij Pidhors'kyj to read the night prayers over the deceased. What happened at night is unknown: the historians who dealt with the scattered evidence tend to believe, that instead of reading the Psalter Kondratij started to flirt with Klymov's wife, the student himself told, that he woke both burghers up by accident while searching for his stuff in the dark. In any case, as a result Pidhors'kyj was beaten and kicked out of the burgher's house without his coat and book. When his mates at the dormitory found out about such an offense, they decided to go and demand satisfaction from Klymov, at least they wanted to return Kondratij's belongings. But Sydor was a poor man and a drunkard, so he was not able to pay any satisfaction, he even could not give back the Psalter, because he had already sold it to the barkeeper.

So, the student tribunal took its real function – Klymov was taken to the dormitory back-yard and leashed. The dormitory senior Josef Klenchyns'kyj, who was in charge of the discipline there, tried to stop the execution and advised his younger fellows to make an official complaint to the magistrate or at least to inform father prefect of the situation, but the students did not listen to him. After the execution Klymov was thrown out into the street so that he could go home, but since he was rather severely injured and a bit drunk, and it was in the end of December, which in Kiev is a cold and snowy time, he did not manage to reach his house and froze right in the street. This is how the academic tribunal ended. Half of the dormitory students ran away from Kiev immediately¹¹⁰, the half that left and made witnesses was punished by the academic rules. The city court provided prosecution over only one of the main participants whom the city guard managed to catch – student of philosophy Vasyl' Kozachyns'kyj. The story we have is actually what he said in front of the court¹¹¹.

After this case I do not know about more references to the student tribunal. What is peculiar

110 One of them, namely the dormitory senior Klenchyns'kyj, returned to Kiev many years after this case and became a monk in the Vydubychi monastery (he was mentioned in the first chapter, with a reference to the secondary source), the fate of the rest is unknown.

111 *II. 3. XXV. 237-240.*

about this precedent in comparison with the Baranovych case is the absolute autonomy of the students. If in 1746 the prefect was aware of his pupils' act, he was even accused of guiding them though he denied this accusation, here with Klymov the students conscientiously did not inform any of the professors. They most probably realized that despite a couple of precedents (if to count Baranovych and Lobko) the legality of their deed was still more or less fictional, and that from the point of formal law they were doing wrong, so the reaction of the academic chiefs would not necessarily be positive. So, in this way they also went against the academic regulations and authorities.

The academic solidarity against the alien enemy, a burgher, was here combined with the inner-academic opposition between the student collective and the administration. Even the separation inside the student community is evident here, when senior Klenchyns'kyj tried to go against the will of his fellows. As Kozachyns'kyj reported, after his vain affords to take the leashes from the executors Josef said: "I will not prevent those who will [to make an execution], but if anything happens, then each [of you] is in response for himself"¹¹². In this way the senior, metaphorically speaking, washed his hands, and turned his inferiors into the direct opposition to the prefect (or in this case the rector).

This is not to say, that the academic corporation was not a solid community. It was, as we saw from its behavior in quite a number of situations. But from now I suggest we move to the next level of approximation on our microscope and look at this community from within. Our point of departure to this new problematic field will also be connected to the interaction of academics and Kiev burghers, and partly to the question of accommodation, with which we started. But the focus now will be on some particular students who in these complicated relations decided not to choose the side of the academic community.

112 "Я того не бороню, ... но когда что сділається, тогда ті й отвѣтствовать будуть." - II. 3. XXV. 238.

Chapter 3. Academy from within

If the material used for the previous chapters told us more about some general academic issues, the collective interests and the interactions on the higher administrative level, now we are going to deal more with individuals and their personalities. The only principle of choosing these persons is technical – I can analyze those who left some traces in sources. In the previous two chapters we saw either the most active part of the community (as in cases of the student collective violence) or the people who happened to be in some tough situation (like the accommodation problem).

If we speak about the conventional “norm” of academic behavior, these men could be taken as an example of one of the possible “norms”. Even though their way of social interaction did not match the official rules, it was at least common for quite a number of people and seemed not to be absolutely unusual, which gives us the right to speak about the semi-official or unwritten rules that determined it. As for the following cases they look much more like the “deviations”, than like the alternative “norms”, at least from the point of view of the academic society. My task here is to figure out why could such “deviations” occur and why were they regarded by the KMA corporation in such a way.

3.1 Student community against renegades

We have already tackled the topic of renegades or “traitors”, as they might have been called in their own community – the students (or in one case the professor¹¹³) who went against the will of their fellows for a certain reason. In the situation with Josef Klenchyns'kyj, he tried to stop the act of the student tribunal. Being the dormitory senior he simply performed his formal duties in this way, especially concerning the fact that he appealed to the authority of the academic

¹¹³ See Chapter 1 with footnotes for the relevant secondary literature. Here I will not take this case into account, since it is not connected to the student community, though I have to mention, that the corporal mechanisms the professors used against their inner enemies were very close to those used by the students.

administration.¹¹⁴ No one could say that Josef went against the academic community, just that the place he took inside this community seems to have dissatisfied his fellow-pupils. It could be not only out of rage and thrust for revenge that his mates sent him to the devil (“до дѣбла”) with his disciplinary norms¹¹⁵, but also because in their eyes he was rather a representative of the academic power, than the equal member of a student collective, his reaction on the students' decision was more appropriate for a younger professor, than for an elder student. Unfortunately, this conclusion is highly speculative since no source give us the direct evidence of such an attitude towards Klenchyns'kyj, but still the direct opposition inside the student group is evident here and this kind of reasoning seems logical. And this was not the only one, and even not the most radical case when a certain student tried to pose himself not as a disciple, but as something else. I have found three more examples of such a way of behavior and here propose to analyze them one by one drawing out some parallels. We should start with the most complicated and, probably, the most bright one – the case around Vasyl' Zarudnyj.

This case consists of a bunch of conflicts in which the student of philosophy Zarudnyj happened to engage during the last days of January 1752. One was the usual misunderstanding with the landlord: Vasyl' and his elder brother Joann, who studied theology in KMA, did not pay their rent for several months and eventually they were asked to move out. Joann found another accommodation for himself, but Vasyl' refused to move until the next vacations, meaning the summer break, so he wished to stay for free during the next four months. When his landlord Semen Jurchenko promised to complain to the academic authorities, Vasyl' threatened to initiate the student tribunal against him or simply to slay him¹¹⁶. This was probably a culmination of the longstanding material conflict of a kind we have already seen with the other tenants among students.

The other conflict which occurred almost simultaneously began with a silly joke: Vasyl' and a couple of his co-pupils chased a puppy in the street making a lot of shout and laughter. They were

114 See in the latest version of the Academic Instruction – II. 3. XII. 107.

115 This is the actual phrase recorded in the documents directly – II. 3. XXV. 238.

116 II. 4. 74-83. 118-119, 124-131.

seen by the professor of philosophy Heorhij Shcherbats'kyj, and later Zarudnyj was punished by him for both the noisy fun in the street, which he found “indecent for a student of philosophy”, and the threats in the address of Jurchenko. Though the punishment itself was not so strict, just a private notation on the ethical behavior, the student's reaction was very harsh – he wrote the letter of protest to the Kiev metropolitan and accused his teacher that by the rude words used in his notation he “insulted his own honor and the honor of his family”¹¹⁷. In this way already being a participant of the conflicts with two burgers – his landlord Jurchenko and the owner of the mentioned puppy Jakov Pavlovs'kyj – Vasyl' also provoked the clash with his own mentor. After the complex investigation of all these issues the academic court – a committee of all teachers and professors headed by the Kiev metropolitan as the highest patron of the Academy – decided that Zarudnyj is to be publicly lashed in the academic yard “so that the rest [of the students] having seen this did not dare to denigrate their teachers any more” and then excluded from the Academy for his aggressive and conflicting behavior¹¹⁸.

Vasyl' Zarudnyj is an important character not only because of his hot temper that provoked such a huge process around him¹¹⁹, but also due to a very specific rhetoric he used which is preserved very well in our sources (his own letters form most of the material of this investigation). On the one hand, he used several expressions that could be taken as distinctive for a student. I have already mentioned his threat with a student tribunal, where he made the direct appellation to the famous precedent of Baranovych¹²⁰. In his complaint on professor Shcherbats'kyj Vasyl' used a couple of traditional phrases connected to the academic sphere. One was a description of a good teacher who should punish his disciples in the appropriate cases, but “not the way masters do with their servants

117 *II. 4. 74-83. 119-124.* In his answer the teacher did not deny that he used the disgraceful words to his pupil (namely, called him a swine), but argues that it was totally justified by the rude manner in which Zarudnyj replied on his objurgations – *Ibid.* 123.

118 *II. 4. 74-83. 132-135.*

119 Besides the evidence of his behavior, we also have the characteristics made by Vasyl's brother Joann: he once recommended Semen Jurchenko “not to irritate” his brother because he has a hot temper and is able of “who knows what things” – *II. 4. 74-83. 129.*

120 *II. 4. 74-83. 126, 128.*

or the slaves they bought, but as fathers do with their sons”¹²¹. The second was meant to characterize himself as a good student who “studies for the sake of his fatherland and in service to the state by his own will”¹²². Both of these citations seem to be well-known and not rarely used, we are going to see at least one more example where they sounded during a conflict between the students and their mentor.

But the major part of Zarudnyj's rather puffy rhetorical figures are borrowed from a totally different language, namely from the manner of speaking used by the cossack elite of that time. As Maksym Jaremenko shows in his article dedicated to this complex case, Vasyl', being a son of the cossack regimental captain¹²³, made use of most of the common language patterns which the people of his social rank used in courts. The aforementioned accusation of insult which affected not only his personal honor, but also “the honor of his whole family” is one of these standard phrases, and it is repeated in several of his letters. Even more telling is his answer to Semen Jurchenko who promised to use the academic authority or the city military forces to move him out of the flat. The student said: “No one has a power over me, except of his reverence” and then “and should you ask students or soldiers of the city chief [to deal with me], I will slay or cripple you and all of them”¹²⁴. Under “his reverence” here the hetman is meant, but this appellation is not literal, but rather symbolic; all the letters of complaint were addressed to the metropolitan, not to the hetman who was an inaccessible power for a cossack son without any rank at that time, but reference to the army commander's authority in the speech could be used as a marker of social status.

The references to legal norms and regulations made by Zarudnyj in different instances do not include any academic instructions or traditions, with the exception of Baranovych precedent he mentions either the privileges and rights given by the imperial power, or the statutes used by the military elite. When Jurchenko found a saber in his room and tried to accuse him of keeping it

121 “... однак не как господа подданих і куплених рабов, но как отци синов...” - II. 4. 74-83. 121.

122 “... мне в пользу отечества і в прислугу государственную добровольно обучающемуся...” II. 4. 74-83. 121.

123 Полковий осавул, which was the third highest rank on the level of a regiment.

124 “До мене-де ніщо не мають власти, кромь ясневельможного” and then “... а буди-де пришлються студенти або солдати од стольника з тобою, то-де я і їх і тебе або заколю, або окалічу” - II. 4. 74-83. 126-127.

illegally, Vasyl' could have objected on the grounds of the Academic Instruction which prohibited taking any weapon into the school, but did not forbid to own one. But instead he argued, that he is a cossack and therefore has a right to hold an appropriate weapon¹²⁵. Even in the end of his letters he did not write “Vasyl' Zarudnyj, student of philosophy” as all of his fellows in all other cases did, but preferred to sign as “son of the captain of Lubny regiment”¹²⁶.

All of these seemingly little details indicate that Zarudnyj wished to be seen as a son of a cossack, rather than as a student of the Kiev-Mohyla Academy. Such a kind of self-fashioning could be explained by his personal ambitions. After exclusion from his studies he made a good career as a military chief. Most probably, he was not even planning to stay in the Academy longer then studying philosophy took him. In the end, the status of a cossack at that time was formally equal to that of an aristocrat, which made the title “cossack's son” sound glorious. In his relationship with professor Shcherbats'kyj and with the prefect Heorhij Konyss'kyj, who was in charge of the inner-academical conflicts, this type of rhetoric could pass as relevant due to the fact that both these professors had the same social background. But they did not count on this fact, as Vasyl', perhaps, expected them to do – for them Zarudnyj was a student of philosophy, whatever he wished to be regarded.

Accepting the representatives of all the social strata was one of the strongest principles of the Kiev-Mohyla Academy grounded in the traditions of the Fraternal school¹²⁷. This tradition also implemented the idea that the status of a student should have dominated over the alternative types of social ranking. But, as we see from this case, this did not always work. I have seen one precedent when in a conflict between two students the social background was taken into consideration as an important factor. This case took place in 1751, when the student of rhetoric Pavlo Navrots'kyj was beaten rather severely by his co-pupil Ivan Jarmolyns'kyj and two of his mates from outside the

125 See the detailed analyses of all the attributes of a “cossack identity” of Zarudnyj in Jaremenko, M. ““No one has a power over me, except of his reverence”: self-identification of the Mohylianian student in the light of the 1752 year's conflict”. *Socium* 7 (2007), 231-241.

126 In fact, this full version of the signature appears only in one of our documents – II. 4. 75., in all the rest Basil Zarudnyj simply put his name, but he never mentions that he is a student of philosophy.

127 See: II. 1. XXXVI. Paragraph I.

academic community. The reason of their attack was a ridiculous mistake, so the offenders confessed very quickly, but the verdict made by the Kiev Consistory is still of interest¹²⁸. Even though the main participants were both students, so that the conflict could have been treated as the inner-academical, they based their decision on the part of the Lithuanian Statute dedicated to crimes against noblemen. Pavlo Navrots'kyj had to receive a compensation of forty kops (*kopy*) – a standard sum for a physical offense against a noblemen (*szlachcicz*), because, as is directly stated in the documents, he “is counted as a *szlachcicz*, because he is a cossack's son”¹²⁹.

Maybe, Zarudnyj could look at this case as a precedent in hope that his social status would play a role in the trial over him. Unlike the case of Baranovych which was hardly more than the academic legend for that time, this affair he could remember personally – in 1751 Zarudnyj had to be in the same class with Navrots'kyj and Jarmolyns'kyj or one class higher¹³⁰. But it is more likely, that “a student” was a kind of framework social status only theoretically. In most of our cases it proved to be irrelevant for this or that reason, mainly because in all of those we have seen in the two previous chapters the students acted as a collective body, even more – the Academy worked as a corporation in which students could be taken as a whole with the professors. On the inner-academical level the social background mattered, it was one of the lines of separation inside the community.

Ivan Jarmolyns'kyj was a bursary student (*бурсак*), so poor that he was not able to pay his part of the compensation and therefore was excluded from the Academy¹³¹, while for Zarudnyj shortage of money meant the need to find a less spacious flat in the center of Kiev. Such economic and social differences between students seem obvious and natural, but they rarely appear in the documents, especially in those students write themselves. Navrots'kyj did not accentuate that his father was a cossack, it was the Consistory who found this information and decided to use the appropriate type of law¹³². Zarudnyj tried to play on his non-academic status, but it played against him, no one

128 II. 2. VII.; I. 1. 301/749 JI. 14.; Vishnievskij, D. “From the daily life of Kiev students”. 2. 199-201.

129 “*считается за шляхтича, потому что сын казачий*” - II. 2. VII. 15.

130 This can only be counted by the years of studies, though I do not have the clear documentary prove that Zarudnyj did study in the Kiev-Mohyla Academy in 1751, but this is highly probable.

131 II. 2. VII. 15.

132 I. 1. 301/749 JI. 14. 258V; 262V-262R. Navrots'kyj used the common notions of honor and dishonor, but for him

reacted on his appellations to the Lithuanian Statute and the Laws Used to Judge among the Minor-Russian People, he was judged in the academic court by the academic regulations. One could suggest, that precisely because he tried to present himself as a “cossack's son” instead of a student, to deny his student identity in favor of the alternative one, the verdict was so harsh. This is why in the beginning I have called Zarudnyj a “traitor”. This is my own term, neither professors, nor Vasyl's fellows used it in the documents, and I do not think they could, but this word seems to express their attitude towards his behavior.

As I already mentioned, Vasyl' was not an absolute exception, I have got one more similar case from the Kiev-Mohyla Academy which occurred two years later (in 1754) and another one from the Perejaslav College (year 1766). These two are very similar to each other and they are both around the students who could have been called “traitors”, though neither of them is so complicated and they do not contain such a splendid rhetoric. Yet, if the documentation of Zarudnyj case is mostly focused on the personality of the main participant and his self-fashioning, these two give less information about the initiators of the conflict, but provides more details on the reaction inside their community, which is almost invisible in the former one¹³³. So, let us take these two cases one after another and speak more about how the renegades were accepted by their fellows and mentors.

We would start with the Perejaslav case since it is better documented and has already been subjected to attempts of analysis¹³⁴. So, Emeljan Khodosovs'kyj, as student of rhetoric in the Perejaslav college who worked as an inspector for the children of the local cossack chief Jakov Iskra, stopped attending lectures without any explanations. On the 18 December 1766 his teacher Danylo Adamovych, who was also the prefect of the college, sent a group of students to Iskras'

they were only personal categories, as in many similar appellations we saw throughout almost all of the cases, but he never mentioned “the honor of a family”, which was a specific marker of a noble rhetoric of that time peculiar for the social elite.

133 Though Maksym Jaremenko in his article tries to reconstruct the reaction of Vasyl' and two other minor figures from students who appear in the material, even these few people's position in the conflict remains unclear – Jaremenko, M. ““No one has a power over me, except of his reverence”. 240.

134 Under the attempt I mean a thesis for a bachelor degree which introduces the general analyses of the case and provides some interesting ideas, but it did not develop into any further research – Nevzorova V. *Identity of the students of the Perejaslav college (based on the example of an episode from the year 1766)*.

house, where Emeljan lived together with his pupils, to clarify the situation. They found out that Khodosovs'kyj was not going to continue his studies. He claimed that from now he is not a student any more, but a teacher (meaning inspector), and the prefect's authority means nothing for him.

When asked to come back to the school Emile violently resisted, but after a couple of fights with different groups of students he was finally brought to the college by force. There he surrendered, begged his pardon, was forgiven by Adamovych and then continued in the college as a student, but he was deprived of the work of inspector. It is interesting how Jakov Iskra tried to return the inspector back to his children and after receiving the negative answer asked the bishop of Perejaslav, who was the patron of the college, to fire Adamovych and find another prefect¹³⁵. Of course, this claim was not fulfilled, but the attempt itself is important for the question of academic status and the power of local authorities.

The Perejaslav college was organized by the Kiev-Mohyla alumni as a kind of a colony of the Academy and used the same basic principles and rules. The class of rhetoric was the highest one at that time and the professor of rhetoric combined the duties of prefect and rector, so in fact father Danylo was the head and the only member of the college's administration at the moment of the conflict. Jakov Iskra held a post of a *subcameralius* (нідкоморний) – a prestigious position in the local juridical authorities traditionally preserved for the elite (initially exclusively held by the *szlachta*)¹³⁶. His ambitions to interfere with the business of the college and spread his authority over the educational institution could be interpreted as a power competition with the Perejaslav bishop. This reminds of the ambitions of the local prior Pavlo Lobko to undermine the authority of the prefect in the Kiev-Mohyla inner-academical affairs¹³⁷, but on the higher level. In this power struggle Emile Khodosovs'kyj took the side of Iskra when he claimed in front of the other students that “neither his pupils, nor himself are under the command of the prefect” and announced his

135 The original materials are in *I. 2. 990. 1. 581*.

136 This office together with the title came to Hetmanate from the Great Duchy of Lithuania as a part of the Lithuanian Statute. By the sphere of responsibility a *subcameralius* was the chief executive for the land laws in a district, but the prestige associated with this position was special due to both the strict social qualification and the long legal tradition connected to it.

137 See Chapter 1.

decision to stay in Iskras' home¹³⁸. In a way he became a part of this home, as both his own words (at least the reflection of those in the witness reports, the direct records are not preserved) and the wish of Iskra to return him show.

Except the purely personal reasons such relationship could be grounded on some more or less “objective” interests, one of them material – the *subcameralius* was a rich man and living in his house must have been rather comfortable, besides that he could pay an inspector additionally in cash which was a usual practice among the rich pupils' parents¹³⁹. This work also had a perspective of a long-term contract since Jakov had four sons and the youngest of them would have required a tutor for at least ten more years¹⁴⁰. As well as in the case of Zarudnyj, the social background could matter here – Khodosovs'kyj was from the cossack family, though his father had a lower rank than Iskra did, and most probably he was not so rich.

Victoria Nevzorova focuses specially on this aspect in her brief analysis of the case, she also makes accent on the social difference between Khodosovs'kyj and the students who came to him by the prefect's order: she managed to identify five of them and they are all sons of the priests or deacons¹⁴¹. This argument is rather weak due to the lack of sources – these five are only the half of those students whose names appear in the documents, not to speak about the rest part of the group marked as “and their other fellows whom they can name”¹⁴² – but the idea under it could be relevant. If it was, then we could even consider it as one more precedent of the strict separation between clerics and laics, the rich cossacks with their ambitions for an aristocrat honor and the poor priestly children protected by the college professors (though in that period the number of lay teachers was increasing, especially in the colleges, clerics still constituted more than 60% of the group¹⁴³).

138 “... не в его [префекта] команде ониі дети и сам он Ходосовський состоять” - I. 2. 990. 1. 581. 8V.

139 Posokhova, L. “Students of the orthodox colleges of eighteenth-century Ukraine as teachers in cossack officers' families”. 9-11.

140 Nevzorova V. *Identity of the students of the Perejaslav college*. 21-22.

141 Nevzorova V. *Identity of the students of the Perejaslav college*. 37-38, 43-45.

142 “з прочими їм вестимими товарищу” as is written under the list of nine students whom Iskra recognized in the first group that came for Emile - I. 2. 990. 1. 581. 6V.

143 See the statistics in Posokhova, L. *On the crossroads of cultures, traditions, epochs: orthodox colleges in Ukraine*

Still another explanation for the choice of side Emile did was his status of an inspector. As I have already mentioned, it not only brought the material benefit, but also played a symbolic role as an award for the best or at least the good students¹⁴⁴. Only the pupils of the highest classes had a right to take this job, which made it a part of a symbolic demarcation line between the younger pupils (“школяри”) and the mature students (“сnyдeй”). This difference was reflected in the other traditions as well, for example, the unwritten rule concerning the corporal punishment stated that to the students of any class higher than poetics lashing (especially public) was to be applied only in the exceptional cases, because such an act undermines their honor, while the executors were chosen only among the pupils of the grammatical classes. The status of the inspector could be special in one other aspect – it was a kind of mediator state, the person who took it was a disciple and a teacher at the same time. This is what, I believe, may have motivated Emeljan Khodosovs'kyj not less than their common social background with Iskra – in his house he was a teacher and Iskra's children were under his own authority, so there out of the subordinate of the prefect he became a commander over his four pupils.

Whatever Emeljan's motives were, his behavior was counted as an act of “treason” by both the college's administration in the face of prefect Danylo and his fellow-pupils, and their decision was to bring “the lost sheep” back into their community and to break his connections with Iskras. An interesting fact is that the pupils in the groups sent to Iskra's house were mixed by classes – there were at least three students from the same class with Khodosovs'kyj and all the rest were from the lower stages of studies starting with *infima*, one of the first elementary classes¹⁴⁵. As they testified, Khodosovs'kyj despised all of them by the rude words, provoked them to fight with his servants and even tried to force some of them to work for him, in this way demonstrating his supreme power over them¹⁴⁶.

from the end of seventeenth till the beginning of nineteenth century. Kharkiv. 2011. 383-384.

144 See Chapter 2.

145 *I. 2. 990. 1. 581. 6V.*

146 As they claim, some of the students were forced to chop the firewood and then Khodosovs'kyj ordered his servants to kick them out from the yard - *I. 2. 990. 1. 581. 8V.*

Unlike in the case of Zarudnyj, who had his brother and one of the co-pupils defending him¹⁴⁷, here the fellows only make accusations against the renegade. We do not have the direct testimonies signed by the students, only the record of these made by the prefect who might have corrected the reality a bit. More than that, one could suppose that these particular students formed a group especially loyal to their master and not all the pupils would have supported them. But still the picture we see in the documents seems rather clear-cut: Emeljan Khodosovs'kyj puts himself in the opposition to the college community and the representatives of this community answer him by the organized collective act. I think the term “solidarity” is appropriate here. If in many of the previous cases we saw the solidarity of students, sometimes together with the professors, against the outer “enemy” (a priest or a burger), this one illustrates how the academics could come together to deal with the “inner enemy”.

The same issue can be illustrated by one more precedent, this time taken from the life of our main institution, the Kiev-Mohyla Academy. This one took place earlier, in March 1754, but looks very similar is the sequence of actions. One student of philosophy Pashkovs'kyj (his given name is not mentioned in any of the documents) went to live in the house of a certain burgher Illia Pavlovs'kyj and stopped attending his lectures; the academic prefect Davyd Nashchyns'kyj sent a group of students to clarify the matter; they ran into a violent opposition from the side of Pashkovs'kyj, the burgher's wife and his brother, but managed to take the “traitor” to the Academy where he was punished¹⁴⁸. But the reasons and motivations here are completely different: Pashkovs'kyj was not an inspector and he moved to Pavlovs'kyj's house mainly because of his wife – as he confessed during the execution he “was knowing her for a long time”¹⁴⁹. As the pupils sent by the prefect stated, Mrs. Pavlovska was very active in her attempts to keep the young man with her. She tried to hide him in the storeroom, proposed one of the pupils a bribe, even threatened to

147 II. 4. 74-83. 128-130.

148 I. 2. 127. 1020. 2506.

149 “давно з женою его Павловського знається” - I. 2. 127. 1020. 2506. 9V.

call the city police and to kill the prefect for his orders¹⁵⁰.

In comparison to the preceding two cases, that included the battles over authorities and honors, this affair seems simply funny. But what really matters for us is the position of a disobedient individual and of a reaction of a community, which are evident in this affair brightly. We again see a big group of students from different classes (at least two are mentioned in the documents, both lower than philosophy which Pashkovs'kyj attended) who perform the collective violence over their fellow by the order of the academic leader. The ending part of the story is also interesting: Pashkovs'kyj was forced to confess and then lashed in the prefect's office in front of a closed commission consisting of three professors – the prefect himself who was also a professor of philosophy, the professor of rhetoric and father Constantin Kryzhanivs'kyj who taught modern languages¹⁵¹.

Usually we do not have any concrete information about the academic court, its membership, procedure, even the exact limits of its rights are not fixed in the official documents, and its verdicts are signed by all the professors or by the rector and prefect with a note “as all the teachers decided”, sometimes also confirmed by the Kiev metropolitan. Here we probably have the rare sketch of how this semi-official institution actually worked. Among the cases taken for this work the same mentioning appears in only one another – at one of the stages of the Baranovych case, which preceded the most famous violent phase. There the minor misunderstanding between Baranovych and Dimara was solved by the commission of the prefect, the professor of philosophy, the professor of rhetoric and two persons from the burger's side¹⁵².

3.2. *Student solidarity vs professor's authority*

The examples we have seen so far present the individual cases which, as I indicated in the

150 I. 2. 127. 1020. 2506. 2V-4R.

151 I. 2. 127. 1020. 2506. 9V-9R.

152 II. 4. 40-44. 87.

beginning of this chapter, are exceptional rather than typical. From the reaction the described acts provoked in the Academy it is evident that such a behavior was considered abnormal not only by the academic authorities who stuck to the formal regulations, but also by the significant part of the students. The murder of Sydor Klymov is also an exceptional case in this regard: there senior Klenchyns'kyj went against the collective will of his fellow-pupils, but he was on the side of the formal rules and academic administration. Here the obedient student suddenly became a kind of a renegade in the eyes of his colleagues.

This brings us even closer to the maximum approximation level of our microscope – tensions and cleavages inside the academic community itself. The way the academics treated students like Zarudnyj or Pashkovs'kyj could be taken as the struggle against the “outer enemy” in a way, although this enemy had originated from inside the community. In contrast to these the Klymov case shows how the students could take different sides even in the process of dealing with the common adversary. What the senior must have proposed (unfortunately, we do not have his own voice reflected in the documents) was to act together with the teachers and the prefect, which would exactly match our pattern “Academy versus City (or citizen)”. But what students performed instead was an act of double opposition – violence against the burgher and disobedience to their chiefs at the same time. Most probably, had Klymov not died after the execution, the punishment would be still unavoidable for the students, who did not even notify the administration about the work of their tribunal.

The disobedience towards the professors was one of the most common misdeed the students made. Usually such cases are not even recorded, since they were regulated privately and did not require an official procedure. Some rare precedents found in our source base are either made public by the students themselves, or they are especially violent and rude, or the disobedience is collective. The pupils sometimes wrote the letters of complaint if they considered a certain act of the professor unjust or offensive. We have already seen two examples: Theodor Ol'shans'kyj and Vasyl' Zarudnyj.

The first was dissatisfied with the way the rector solved his conflict with the village factor, so he complained to the consistory and requested the revision of his decision¹⁵³. There are a couple of other such examples¹⁵⁴. Zarudnyj found his honor offended by his mentor, and therefore made a complaint.

There were some cases when the professors were disgraced by their students and initiated an official public process against them. Such was a case with Petro Janovs'kyj, a student of theology who after receiving the accusation in not such a crucial violation (he has beaten one younger colleague from poetics) refused to come to the prefect to be judged. Such a refusal was in itself another crime, so the prefect decided to take this double case to the academic court. Peter came to stand in front of the commission of all the professors, but instead of a confession made “a speech full of disrespect, disdain and of offensive waspish dirty words, aimed at the undermining of the authority of the prefect and all the teachers”¹⁵⁵. By the initial verdict Janovs'kyj had to be publicly lashed in the academic yard and excluded from his studies for such an “insolence”, but in the end since he confessed and asked each of the professors for forgiveness, he was just flogged in the prefect's office¹⁵⁶.

The modern Ukrainian scholar Olena Dziuba analyzes this case in details together with those of Zarudnyj, Ol'shans'kyj, Navrots'kyj and a couple of others in order to investigate the notion of “student honor”. She divides this notion into two inseparable elements: corporate honor and personal one. The first element is mostly based on the students' rights and legal status, including the exclusive authority of the academic chiefs over any student; its main manifestation is the student solidarity. As for the personal honor, Professor Dziuba does not go into details on the conflicts of identities (like what Zarudnyj experienced), she is more interested in finding the features common

153 I. 1. 301/749 Л. 7. 191V-192V. Also mentioned in Chapter 1.

154 One very bright is a fight between a student and the rector's servant: the rector tried to hush up the case, but the student wrote to the metropolitan demanding a satisfaction – II. 1. XCVI.

155 “... з крайнім непочтєнням, презрїєм і другими непристойними поступками, ругательнїї, язвительнїї і єдинственно к уничтоженію власти префектовської і всіх вообщє учителей касающієся проїзносив річи.” - II. 3. XX. 191.

156 II. 3. XX. 193.

for most of the pupils. She takes the story where Ol'shans'kyj was chased through the streets of the village Karpylivka and several cases with the public corporal punishment of the students to illustrate that usually the things which the academics called the “offenses of their honor” mostly goes into the category of general ignominy, any free-born man would take such a thing as a dishonorable act¹⁵⁷. The case of Janovs'kyj shows very clearly the difference between a punishment itself and a public punishment from the point of view of this honor discourse: it is specially accentuated that due to his sincere confession Petro is to be lashed in a closed office in presence of the teachers only, not in the academic yard where any student of any class could watch him. The information about all his misdeeds and the penalty he received was to be announced to all his fellows as a kind of warning (which was also a standard procedure), but his body was not to be displayed in public¹⁵⁸.

One of the important elements here is the connection between the personal honor and the class attended by a student. I have already mentioned the existence of the informal rule that recommended not to inflict corporal punishment on the elder pupils, especially publicly. Basing on this case and on some more general discussions on the topic held in the Kiev-Mohyla Academy at the same period, Professor Dziuba argues that the amount of student's honor grew together with his level of studies and age. She draws a kind of demarcation line between the classes of poetics and rhetoric – only the pupils of rhetoric, philosophy and theology enjoyed the full status of a student, the “poets” and “grammarians” were still at a lower level in the community¹⁵⁹.

This tendency is visible in many of our cases, for example the costume and appearance “appropriate for a philosophy student” as a marker of his status is mentioned in the complaint by Roman Antonov on his patron prior Jakov¹⁶⁰ and in the quarrel between Vasyl' Zarudnyj and his

157 Dziuba, O. ““Student's honor and dishonor” in the view of students and professors of the Kiev-Mohyla academy (on the material of 1730-1760th years' conflicts)”. *Kievan Academy* 2-3 (2006), 135-47.

158 II. 3. XX. 193-194; Dziuba, O. ““Student's honor and dishonor”. 143-144.

159 Dziuba, O. ““Student's honor and dishonor”. 136-138.

160 Antonov claims that his master does not give him enough money to order a costume appropriate for his status of a philosophy student – Vishnievskij, D. *From the daily life of Kiev students*. 2. 182-3 (footnote).

teacher¹⁶¹. Even in the case of murder the fact that Vasyl' Kozachyns'kyj “had already reached the class of philosophy” and was a good student provided an official pretext to release him from the highest measure of punishment¹⁶².

It is necessary to note here that the correlation between the level of studies and the physical age was rather unstable in those times – in proceeding from one class to another a student could make a pause for several years, skip a class or two or spend more time than prescribed in one of them¹⁶³, the age of entering the academy was not exactly fixed. Besides, age itself was a quite blurred notion for most of the people, so what we see in the student lists or matriculation forms is usually a rough estimate by appearance¹⁶⁴. Therefore the groups of students in all classes were mixed in the age and the dispersion could be rather significant¹⁶⁵, but still the categories of “boys” and “adult pupils” were used according to the named “demarcation line”.

When writing about these distinctions in the amount of honor between the students and about the student solidarity as a part of the “corporative honor”, Olena Dziuba also mentions the cases of collective disobedience to the professors which occurred as a reaction on the unfair (by the students' judgment) punishment.¹⁶⁶ There are two such precedents fixed in the sources, Dmitrij Vishnievskij spent a special chapter to describe those, where he gave them a general name of “philosophical rebellions” (“*философские бунты*”)¹⁶⁷. Since the material is rich and gives information on several important topics from the student life and the inner-academical relationships, I propose to analyze it here in more detail than both of the named authors do.

The first rebellion, which took place in the year 1733, is scarcely known, it is not documented

161 There the teacher refers to both Basil's noisy behavior and his dress as “improper for a philosophy student” - II. 4. 74-83. 123.

162 II. 3. XXV. 240. (the case analyzed in the Chapter 2).

163 In the Kiev-Mohyla academy the class of poetics was the favorite among the students – it took one year by the program, but there were many pupils who spent two or even three years there.

164 On the age of students and the ways of making its statistics see: Jaremenko, M. “Academics” and the academy. 38-40, 60-66 (on the materials from the Kiev-Mohyla academy).

165 As the statistics from the Perejaslav college shows the difference in age inside one class could reach up to 12 years – see Nevzorova V. *Identity of the students of the Perejaslav college*. 26. (statistics is the strongest feature of this work).

166 Dziuba, O. ““Student's honor and dishonor”. 140-143.

167 Vishnievskij, D. “From the daily life of Kiev students”. 3. 309-33.

itself, but the verdict appears in the later materials as a point of reference.¹⁶⁸ However, the rebellion against prefect Orlovs'kyj, that happened thirty years after it (in 1763) is exclusively well documented – the Kiev Consistory left a detailed record of all the witnesses testimonies which gives a bright picture of what actually happened and what was said during the culmination of this conflict.¹⁶⁹ Vishnievskij made a juicy reconstruction of those events by systematizing the pieces of information scattered over the testimonies of all the sixty participants of the affair, so I would rather make references to his article as a source of facts (they have all being verified by the original archival material). Yet what is lacking in his article is the scholarly analysis, he rather provides a composite description of the sources. Besides that neither he, nor professor Nikolaj Petrov who published some excerpts of this case pays attention to the first phase of the conflict around Melchizedek Orlovs'kyj which took place a year earlier (1762)¹⁷⁰. So that is what we shall start with.

The letter of complaint that reached the Kiev metropolitan's office on 17 October 1762 was in fact a report about the long-term conflict and reflected general dissatisfaction of the elder students with the recently-elected prefect Orlovs'kyj.¹⁷¹ The pretext for writing it was rather down-to-earth – the prefect, who was in charge of distributing the *conditiones* for inspectorship, gave the majority of the places to the students of philosophy and rhetoric while the highest class received almost none. There were no official regulations which controlled the selection of inspectors, but the traditional hierarchy of the students played a big role in this process, as is evident from this case. Besides that, the “theologians” claim that Orlovs'kyj does not reply to their requests, ignores their demands and so neglects his duties of the prefect towards them. More than that, he speaks to them in a very rude manner, threatens to exclude them from the university or kick out from the dormitory and often berates them publicly.

Some phrases are worth citing directly (especially since the document has never been published):

168 Such references are found in at least two later cases: *II. 3. VI. 32-33; II. 3. XX. 192.*

169 *I. 1. 301/749 II. 21.*

170 In the publication by prof. Petrov there is only a brief note of the existence of this case – *II. 3. VI. 36.*

171 Melchizedek Orlovs'kyj taught philosophy for three years already, but he became a prefect only in 1761.

the prefect calls the theology students “slackers”, “dawdlers”, “fools” and “people worth nothing”, claims that “it was already a mercy for such the unworthy men to receive places in the dormitory [not to speak of the *conditiones*]”, publicly “examines them in the elementary part of *Alvarez* in front of the children [meaning the pupils of grammar classes]” and in this way “reveals it to the whole community that he counts us for the waste of all the academic society”.¹⁷² All these accusations shows vividly the students' understanding of their collective honor and the place of the theologians in the student community. When speaking about the inspectorship itself they mention that there are more opportunities of earning for life available, like singing in the streets for instance, but those are “rather disgraceful and makes too much destruction to our studies”.¹⁷³

Another important fact for the inner hierarchy is a repeated appellation to the rector's personal authority. As it is stated in the letter, this confusion with the *conditiones* and the wave of aggression from the side of Orlovs'kyj was possible only because the rector father Samujil Myslavs'kyj, whom the students call “our merciful patron”, was out of the city at that time.¹⁷⁴ Usually the duties of a prefect in the Kiev-Mohyla Academy were delivered to the professor of philosophy while the rector (and at the same time the abbot of the Brotherhood monastery) taught the four-year course of theology. Formally all the pupils were under the authority of a prefect, he was responsible for the student discipline, for all their administrative and material issues, and for managing their conflicts with the teachers as well. But at the same time each of the professors had a personal authority over the disciples of his class.

In this way, since the professor of theology was higher than the prefect in both administrative and academic hierarchies, the students of theology enjoyed a special position in the academic society. Their level of knowledge and age supported this privileged status. In addition to that the

172 “... називаєть леженями і бездільниками ... дураками при том і ні к чему не годними людьми.”, “... еще для вас і те милість, що дав місто в бурсі...”, “Альварових рудиментів пред дітьми екзамінуєть”, “... да з тим сему обществу дав знать, что он почитаетъ уже нас за непотрібніиших із всього академіческого собранія.” - I. 2. 127. 157. 94. 1R-2V.

173 “... нісколько предосудительно, а паче что великая трата ученію од того пребиваєть.” - I. 2. 127. 157. 94. 1R.

174 “милостивий наш покровитель” - this is how he is called two times in the letter - I. 2. 127. 157. 94. 1R, 2V.

students of the last years of theology could already hope not only for an inspector's place, but also for a faculty membership – roughly a quarter of the teachers started their pedagogical career before finishing their studies.¹⁷⁵ All these circumstances made the theologians a very special group inside the Academy. Curiously enough, they comparatively rarely engaged in any violent conflicts, at least in the available sources such cases are exclusive, most of the affairs involve students of philosophy, sometimes of rhetoric.

All the cases of collective opposition were organized by the philosophers – they performed the procedures of the student tribunal, they initiated rebellions against their professors, which could also be regarded as a kind of a tribunal. Both of the known “philosophic rebellions” were aimed at the restoration of justice and looked like acts of revenge. For the precedent of 1733 we only know the general way of things. The student of philosophy Pantelejmon Charnets'kyj was punished by the prefect Stefan Kanynovs'kyj, neither the reason nor the kind of punishment used is known, but it is clear that the student counted it as unjust and begun to argue with the executor. This resistance invoked the doubling of his guilt in the eyes of the prefect, so Charnets'kyj was also lashed for disobedience. When the other philosophers found out about such a severe sanctions against their fellow they organized a boycott of the prefect's lectures and wrote a letter of complaint to the metropolitan.

At that time there were no existing precedents and no special rules for such cases, this is why this case, later marked as the first student rebellion, became an official point of reference, as well as the case of Baranovych made a common allusion of a student tribunal. In 1733 all the rebels were punished – the most active ones (probably, those whose names appeared under the complaint) were flogged publicly, all the rest privately in the office, and Charnets'kyj as the main provoker was excluded from the Academy.¹⁷⁶ What is more important, after this case metropolitan Raphajil initiated the creation of the first special official instruction for the Kiev-Mohyla Academy – the

¹⁷⁵ 24% are confirmed by the source material (data for period 1721-58, based on analyses of 74 professors' biographies).

¹⁷⁶ *II. 3. VI.* 32-33.

Leges Academicae that were established the following year and became the main manual for managing the inner-academic life for the subsequent thirty years.¹⁷⁷

Yet when the academic administration faced with the new philosophic uprising a simple reference to the paragraph XI of this Instruction dedicated to the “rebellions against the teachers” (“*rebelliones contra magistros*”) was not enough. The flow of the story proves to be quite close to that of the first riot, but here we possess much more details. It started during the night of 17 to 18 February 1763, when a big group of philosophy students decided to spend time with fun. As they described during the trial, they visited each other's homes one by one (all of them lived in rented flats in Podil) and organized a party in each of them throughout the whole night. The next day all came to their classes without any difficulties.

The problems started when the landlady of one of these houses complained to the prefect about the noise made by the drunk company and the rude words one of the students used to her. She also reported that after that occasion she could not find half of her firewood in place. Prefect Orlovs'kyj sent for the thirteen people from the company and made them an oral reprimand in his office. Most of them begged pardon and were released, but four argued that the lady slandered them, the argument turned into a quarrel, both the students and the professor got angry and in the end two of the stubborn students were severely lashed and two others deprived of their disciples. On the nearest lecture all the philosophers instead of listening to their teacher stood up and tried to interrogate him for the “unjust and tyrannic reprise” over their fellows. The dialog in which the students made many accusations and Orlovs'kyj struggled to defend himself is reconstructed in full by Vishnievskij, based on the witnesses statements.¹⁷⁸

The main points of argument were slander, tyranny and inspectorship. First of all the students were outraged by the fact that their mentor believed the words of a “stupid townswoman” without any proof and did not even try to defend his pupils against her “senseless accusations”. No one

177 II. 1. XXXVI. By the way, this publication also has a short description of the 1733 precedent attached – pp. 219-220.

178 Vishnievskij, D. “From the daily life of Kiev students”. 3. 309-333.

denied that they had a banquet at night, but the suggestion that any of them had anything to do with the stolen firewood sounded not only unbelievable but also dishonorable. We have already seen these motives: the punishment without a proper investigation which is a violence against both the notion of honor and the rule of the presumption of innocence,¹⁷⁹ the accusation of theft as a great offense for a person of status¹⁸⁰ (in this case the students refer to both their academic status and the background in the noble families¹⁸¹). Besides that the landlady turn us back to the two types of conflicts we have already dealt with – the separation of space in the rented accommodation and the opposition to the other, here the burgher's widow.¹⁸² The prefect as a member of the academic community should have taken the side of the students here, but he did not. Another point where he subverted his academic duties (by the opinion of the philosophers) was the “tyrannic” punishment – this went against both the formal law and the traditional image of a “good teacher”. Here the pupils used the same reference Vasyl' Zarudnyj have used in his conflict with professor Shcherbats'kyj¹⁸³ – they kept repeating “not like a father, but like a tyrant” about the prefect's verdict.¹⁸⁴

Finally, the story with the distribution of the inspector's places from 1762 was refreshed there – Orlovs'kyj reminds the philosophers how he “defended them against the theologians” and even “let his own honor suffer” because of that.¹⁸⁵ It seems that for the prefect this was the main point of accusation and the main reason why he got so angry with this nightly affair. Just a year before he really engaged into an opposition to the academic administration and into a conflict with the most mature part of the student body due to his attempts in making his own students inspectors. All his colleagues were on the students' side and in the end he was forced to “empty” as many places as were demanded to satisfy all four classes of theology.¹⁸⁶ One should imagine that those philosophers

179 See the case of Ol'shans'kyj with factor Khranovs'kyj – II. 1. LXXXVII. - and its analyses in Chapter 1.

180 See among others the complaint by student Il'nets'kyj in II. 2. XLVIII. and its analyses in Chapter 1.

181 The punished students were told to be “gentlemen” or “nobles' sons” (“паничи” or “діти господські”) - Vishnievskij, D. “From the daily life of Kiev students”. 3. 324.

182 See the treatment of these problems in two previous chapters.

183 II. 4. 74-83. 121.

184 “не по-отеческу, но по-тиранськи” - this phrase appears in every of the witness statements, it seems it was repeated several times by different people, possibly even in chorus – see Vishnievskij, D. “From the daily life of Kiev students”. 3. 324-326. and the original source – I. 1. 301/749 Л. 21. 23V-43R, 77R-82V, 91R-229R.

185 Vishnievskij, D. “From the daily life of Kiev students”. 3. 326.

186 I. 2. 127. 157. 94. 9V.

who were left with their *conditiones* had been flattered a lot by their mentor as he persuaded the rest of the faculty to preserve such a privilege for them. After that what he must have expected of these students is to be the exemplary inspectors, quite like those described in the *Leges Academicae*. A number of the participants of that banquet had pupils, not only those two deprived of them in the end, and of this group Orlovs'kyj could say that they let him down.

Olena Dziuba mentions this case in her article as an “honor competition” between students and a professor. She means mainly the competition between two different notions of a “student honor”: the philosophers defended what they counted as their own honor, while father Melchizedek stood on the side of what he thought to be the student honor, namely obedience, humility and high level of morality.¹⁸⁷ At the same time we could also speak about the “competition of honors” in a sense of mutual offenses and self-defenses. It can be especially well applied to the quarrel in the prefect's office where a lot of disgraceful words were said by both sides.¹⁸⁸ One of the phrases that particularly hurt Orlovs'kyj was this: “maybe, your grace yourself used to revel at night in your times”¹⁸⁹. One of the pupils of syntax who were there in the role of executors reported that after these words the prefect “got very furious”.¹⁹⁰ Unfortunately, I cannot tell whether this could be an appellation to any concrete case from Orlovs'kyj's past, maybe, the student himself did not know, but this was certainly a greater offense for him than abstract curses.

The same competition of honors was performed during the boycott that came after the philosophers' demonstration on the lecture. This boycott was mutual – the prefect did not want to make lectures for the rebels, as he wrote, out of both offense and fear,¹⁹¹ and the students refused to attend the classes of such a cruel teacher who treats them, the normal loyal citizens, as criminals.¹⁹² It lasted three weeks – from the 21 February when the demonstration took place till the 13 March

187 Dziuba, O. ““Student's honor and dishonor”. 140-143, 146.

188 These very words were reported by the prefect in his letter to the metropolitan after a warning note “may your blessed years forgive these [words]” (“да простять сіє освященніи уши”) - II. 3. VI. 34.

189 “*може й Ваше високопреподобіє своїх времен по ночам броживали*” - II. 3. VI. 34; Vishnievskij, D. “From the daily life of Kiev students”. 3. 319.

190 I. 1. 301/749 Л. 21. 70R, 85V.

191 II. 3. VI. 34-35.

192 This fact was also considered infamous by the philosophers – II. 3. VI. 27-28.

when the Consistory ordered father Melchizedek to proceed with teaching. The court procedure took much longer and we do not have the final verdict in the records, we only know that the classes were renewed, none of the “rebels” was excluded (though some kind of the less strict punishment could have place), and that in the end of November the same year Melchizedek Orlovs'kyj was transferred to St. Cyril monastery in Kiev.¹⁹³

And what is most interesting is that after this second “philosophic rebellion” the metropolitan and the Kiev-Mohyla administration decided to work on the second version of the academic instruction. The process of creating this new official document took a year. The preparatory period started with the investigation of the conflict (late April 1763) and the final edition was confirmed by metropolitan Arsenij on 1 May 1764. *The Instruction for the Kiev Academy*, as it was called, can be divided into two main parts, the first includes the program for each subject and the general timetable, the second is dedicated to discipline and its control.¹⁹⁴ Already during the trial on the rebellion case rector Samujil Myslavs'kyj collected a number of excerpts on the disciplinary issues from multiple legal models: the *Regulations of the Spiritual Collegium* (*Регламент Духовной Коллегии*) established by the Holy Synod in 1721, three imperial privileges for the Kiev-Mohyla Academy, the Instructions and Regulations of the Halle-Wittenberg and Magdeburg universities, and the previous *Leges Academicae*.¹⁹⁵ The new Instruction has references to all of these documents (some of the articles are directly inserted there), to the examples from Jesuit and Piarist colleges, and to some of the precedents that took place in the Academy.

Among the problems I have tackled in our criminal stories those of the accommodations outside the academic territory, managing conflicts with burghers and the city magistrate, the relations between students and teachers, and the inspectorship found a special attention. Different paragraphs include appellations, and in a couple of cases even direct quotations, from the verdicts of at least

193 II. 3. VI. 29, 36.

194 The publication of this Instruction is in II. 3. XII., several preliminary and the final versions included.

195 II. 3. VI. 29-33.

five of the analyzed affairs: the collective conflict with the city community in 1701,¹⁹⁶ the case around St. Nicolas dormitory (1741),¹⁹⁷ the case of Zarudnyj (1752)¹⁹⁸ and both conflicts with prefect Orlovs'kyj (1762 and 1763),¹⁹⁹ though many others could have been mentioned as well²⁰⁰.

The new Instruction made all things clear: the management of accommodation and relations with the landlord/lady were regulated; the authorities of the academic court, the metropolitan and the city magistrate strictly separated; the hierarchy inside the academic community and the control over both the students' and the professors' behavior fixed under the authorities of prefect and rector; the inspectors found an official status and all the procedures connected to it were set out in many details. On paper everything was almost ideally solved, yet how much did this ideal influence reality and how long did the process of its implementation take is another problematic question.

For this chapter the unofficial side of the social interaction mattered much more, than the legal state of things. We were looking at the personal problems, private concerns and individual psychological characteristics of the people who formed that academic corporation, which could interact with the other collective authorities. In the end one shall wonder, how such a diverse community separated from inside by such problematic relations could come together as a whole. There were constant tensions between collective and personal, between solidarity and individuality in the identity of the academics. However paradoxically it may sound, the inner conflicts played not less a role in the creation of the common corporate identity than the opposition to any common outer enemy did. And finally all of these conflicts of different levels helped to create and to legalize the university community, and to make the surrounding people and institutions to take it seriously.

196 II. 4. 8-11. 33-34. Direct reference in paragraph 14 of the second part of the *Instruction*.

197 II. 1. L. 261. Indirectly mentioned in paragraph 29.

198 II. 4. 74-83. 133-135. Quoted literally but without a reference in paragraph 15.

199 All the paragraphs concerning the aim of the inspectorship, its meaning for the academic life and the process of electing the inspectors (paragraphs 17-21) are taken directly from the verdict in the case with theologians - I. 2. 127. 157. 94. 9V-10V.

200 Just one more example: the clash between the students who earned by singing in the streets and some of the Podolian deacons which happened on Christmas 1734 found its place in the *Instruction for students, who live in the schools of Kiev-Podolian churches*, issued in 1750 – II. 1. XXXVIII; II. 1. XCIII.

Conclusions

Why was it so important to go into the details of all these personal stories, to look at all these people under the microscope? This perspective was initially chosen due to its originality for the subject – the Kiev-Mohyla Academy was not so much studied in this way previously. Yet the main reason is not technical, but methodological. First of all, this approach gives word to the real historical persons instead of the personified collective actors, such as “the Academy”, “the Church”, “the State”. When one writes “the State decided” or “the Corporation wanted” the reader must understand that each and every member of the named collective body were thinking in the same way. But, as we have seen, this was not always the case. One could say, that the will of each individual did not affect the final result and so it is not so important to take it into account and for the researches that are focused on the results of some historical events this may be justifiable to some extent.

But this story is about the *process*, not its result, and not even so much its goals. In the process of formation of the academic corporation each and every its member played his role, and any person who engaged into a contact with these people also had a certain impact on shaping of their identity, collective, as well as personal. Therefore, I can not work with the unified social bodies, but have to look at as many individuals inside them as are available to our view. Only if we look at the Academy under the microscope we can see how diverse it was in fact, and how many variants of its collective identity there could have been.

For the social historian, just as for the sociologist, there always exists a certain “norm” or “ideal model” which operates in his or her work as a measuring instrument. Such models are usually based either on the statistical majority or average, or on what was left after the process of social selection. Yet those who want to study how the “normal” corporation came into being have to look at the diversity of preliminary alternative examples which used to be rejected at some point of its

development. In a way such analyses undermines the notion of “norm” itself, for you immediately notice how “norms” and “deviations” could exchange places for several times depending on the situation, and how a concrete model might be “normal” and “criminal” at the same time for different members of a single society. At some point you simply get lost in the diversity of individual identities and complexity of their interactions.

And this is the moment when we put aside our microscope and look at the whole picture. Now we can get to the collective bodies – the Academy, the City, the Church, the State would be our main actors. But now we imagine (though we can never know clearly) what they consist of and how complex they are inside. This view not only sheds light on the exceptions and emphasize their importance, it gives us the better understanding of those models we use today in the narratives on more general topics. We can see when, how and why such and not the other patterns of social behavior became regular and usual. We can catch the main alternatives which existed and watch how and why they failed to become legalized, how some of them were forgotten and others remained in the opposition to the major trends. One should imagine how easily due to a minor change of circumstances the things we have got used to speak about may have got an absolutely different form. To create a metaphor, it is rather possible that had Sydor Klymov not sold the student's Psalter, the student tribunal would have functioned normally and never been associated with the criminal practices, it could have even been legalized at some point. But the “norms” were shaped as they were, so now let us look at their main components basing on the results of our detailed microanalysis.

First of all this is a work about a **corporation**, a closed community of teachers and pupils with its own traditions, norms and regulations, code of honor, collective identity and memory. None of these features has been written down in a special set of documents, but they were realized and used by the actors, as the precedents from the daily life shows. The old **academic traditions** usually appear in

historiography in connection with some rituals and commemorative practices performed by the academics, which were important in terms of the shaping of collective identity, but their role was merely symbolic. Here we saw the appeals to the “ancient traditions of our Brotherhood” in the legal context. In most of the cases such appeals did not really work in front of the court, but the fact that such references were used by the academic leaders proves that the notion of fraternity and its rules was not purely ritualized, they still believed in its reality and practicality. What was implied under these “old traditions” was a special status of the university community – an autonomous social body in which some rather diverse people are united by the common enterprise, namely education (or “teaching and learning” as it was called then).

Education was that thing which was meant to consolidate the people of different social background and economic condition, both clerics and laymen, under a single identity – the educated, or the university men. Today we are called “the mohylianians” (могилянці). Back then the word did not exist, but the notion did, and the academic connections made a special social network, though this part of the topic is beyond the scope of my research. What is important here is that education also worked as a factor of social segregation and made the academic community somehow closed. The line of separation between the scholars and the “simple people”, be they priests, uneducated monks, burghers or even members of the military elite, is one of the most frequent motives in the conflicts.

Along with it goes the issue of **honor**. Corporate identity implicated such a thing as collective honor, which in the case of the Academy was mainly based on education. We could also speak about the reputation of the scholarly community and the educational institution that had to be supported by their members. This is where the “norms” and “ideals” comes into the play – the “appropriate” and “honorable” (“належна” and “пустойна”) behavior of both students and professors, especially in public, constituted the most essential part of the corporative academic honor. The difficulties started inside the academic community when the personal honor of a certain actor did

not match the “ideal” expectations of his surrounding, or when the “norms” appeared to differ in the eyes of students and professors for example.

Most of the actors were the members of several groups and had several different identities each of which carried its own notion of honor and appropriate behavior. All of these identities and honors had to be put in a priority line, where they could move depending on the personal characters and on the circumstances. This is another reason why I always put the words “**norm**” and “**deviation**” in the quotation marks. Otherwise I would have to specify in each and every case who exactly considered this concrete type of behavior normal or abnormal and for what reasons. And it seems from our evidence that for the academics the traditional image of “honorable” was more important in measuring “normality” than the requirements of the formal rules.

Most of the conflicts analyzed here can be interpreted as “**games of honor**”. Judging by the rhetoric used in the documents it is rather plausible that the participants themselves would agree with such a term. It does not mean that the practical motives and material interests did not matter for the opposing sides, but the symbolic part seems to be not less, and in some of the cases even more important. These games started on the individual level, sometimes due to the misunderstandings between different “ideals”, more rarely because of the intentional offenses. These were personal conflicts, which could, however, provoke a rather huge scandal, as we saw in some of our examples. Yet when the common “enemy” appeared in front of the academic community, collective honor seems to take precedence over the personal for most of its members.

As a result, another important corporate value came into play, namely **solidarity**. It was not so much based on the academic traditions, rather it served as a ground to maintain them. The period I am focusing on is a time when many relatively serious clashes arose around the Academy and its members. Besides the affairs analyzed in this text (and one can find much more of a similar type) there was a number of conflicts on the institutional level: for instance, processes against several monasteries over the disputed lands and households or debates with the church authorities about the

curriculum and the teaching methods. The university was engaged in a constant struggle for its rights, authority and honor, and in this process the feeling of solidarity arose in this rather closed community quite naturally. Conflicts with the city dwellers or the parish of a local church evoke solidarity on the academic level, which forced the whole corporation to operate as one for the defense of the honor of a university.

But there could be some inner enemies as well, against whom a certain group could come together, such as a company of students of one class, or a collective led by a teacher. In such cases the group seemingly caused separation inside the academic community, but in fact such acts reveal the process of the development of the corporation and cementing of the corporate values. The inner enemy became an obstructive element, and collective action against him served as a uniting force in the community.

Another important thing about solidarity is that it complemented the academic traditions as an instrument of *legalization* for the university corporation. Such seemingly criminal actions as collective revenge or boycott sometimes turned into semi-official alternatives to the existing legal institutions. More than that, after several precedents they could form new official norms. On the level of official institutions the games of honor did work, and sometimes they mattered a lot in fact, but for the formal language of the legal documentation a different kind of rhetoric had to be used. If the Academy wanted to be seriously regarded as an educational institution by the local powers and the state, the old traditions had to be codified as regulations of jurisdiction, and corporate honor had to be expressed through the administrative authority. I doubt whether for the people who lived there back then, participated in all those conflicts (or witnessed them) and used that specific rhetoric habitually, it really made any difference.

But on the level where the powers of the state and the church (or the state of which the church was a part) were engaged, we should speak about the *wars of jurisdictions and authorities*, which partly replace and partly overshadow the local games of honor. In the city which possessed the

Magdeburg rights, the jurisdictions were strictly divided among four main powers: the community of the citizens whose interests the magistrate defended, the cossack military administration, the imperial administration headed by the general-governor, and the ecclesiastical power in the face of the metropolitan see. Throughout its history, the Academy was under the jurisdiction of two of them – the city and the church, and it is interesting how in some of the problematic cases it balanced between them. Because of this double subordination and the vagueness of the legal norms inside the university itself (just to remind, that the more or less full academic instruction appear only at the end of the period considered here) the informal and even symbolic rules were mostly used in the conflict situations. Many of them were provoked by this jurisdictional ambivalence and aimed at resolving it.

As a result, the formal regulations that were produced by the Academy so that it could defend its rights in front of the authorities were mostly based on the precedents taken from its real history, on those precedents I analyzed in this work. This is how from personal offenses and private quarrels we have come to the legal status of the academic corporation and its struggle for its rights in the state which refused to take into account the university traditions.

The picture described here seems to be very typical. This is the usual story of the rise of a university. It starts as an educational (sometimes also scholarly) organization created by a group of volunteers, either those who want to teach or those who want to receive knowledge. At first it looks for any sources of financial support and patronage available. In many cases there are several of them, and the organization makes use of each. It receives a place in the city, a number of buildings, usually in the center, and establishes its own jurisdiction there. A curriculum is developed, together with some basic regulations, and certain rules of the “club”. The more intellectuals are attracted to this place, the more complex the program becomes, and the stricter the code of honor gets for them. At some point in this story we arrive to the situation in which we have caught the Kiev-Mohyla

Academy here: the number of students is so high that they are forced out of the secluded university territory, the corporative traditions are fully formed but not yet codified as a set of laws, the community is strong enough to show its honor and claim for a special status in the urban society, but still lacks strength to protect its rights in front of the older local authorities.

Problems of accommodation, drunken brawls in the streets, fights with the burghers, arguments with the local priests, institutional clashes over the limits of the academic jurisdiction, complaints sent to the state and ecclesiastical authorities, student riots and acts of collective revenge, violent arguments inside the academic community – all these things are typical for the early history of the universities. Young men showing off their education and privileged status of a student, rhetoric of honor, contempt for the “simple laics” by the “wise academics” are also usual for the university in its attempts to become legalized as a corporation.²⁰¹

However, there is one peculiarity in this story: it is not medieval. Such a picture would be typical for the twelfth century in France or England, or for the fifteenth century in the Polish Crown, but we are looking here at the eighteenth century. This story takes place in the early modern imperial state, partly in the period when the enlightened absolutism was at blossom. In most of the European universities at that time the cases we have seen here would appear in the form of a carnival. Demonstrations of academic honor and claims for a special status were already ritualized and symbolized in the old university cities, the corporate culture there became an integral part of the urban culture.²⁰² In the Russian Empire it was otherwise, and so it remained.

In the Empire in the period of its modernization and centralization the conservative behavior was

201 Among the most explicit works on this topic see, for example: Boran, E. “Town and Gown: the Relations of Trinity College and Dublin, 1592-1641”. *History of Universities*. Vol. XIII (1994). ed. Denley P. 61-86. Cobban A.B. “Medieval Student Power”. *Past and Present*. 53 (1971). 28-66; Karras, R.M. “Sharing Wine, Women and Song: Masculine Identity Formation in the Medieval European Universities”. *Becoming Male at the Middle Ages*. Ed. Cohen J. and Wheeler B. 1997. 187-202.

202 On the process of development of the academic culture through violence and its changes towards the early modern period see, for example: Kagan, R. L. *Students and Society in Early-Modern Spain*. 190-195, 226-227; Kiku, V. “The Jesuit university in L'viv (1758-1773), or defence of “the truth of the law””. *Socium* 4 (2004), 101-113; Kirwan, R. “Urban Space and Academic Identity in the Early-Modern Germany”. *Die Erschliessung des Raumes: Konstruktion, Imagination und Darstellung von Raumen und Grenzen im Barockzeitalter*. 523-544; O'Day, R. *Education and Society 1500-1800*. 90-99, 260-265; and especially Midgley, G. *University Life in the Eighteenth Century Oxford*. 66-73, 105-106, 130-157.

a way to preserve autonomy and individual identity. This is why the KMA was so attached to the old traditions based on the medieval notions of community and honor. To some extent it is a reflection of the general politics of the Hetmanate – the cossacks posed themselves in a very old-fashioned manner by repeating the models the Polish nobility (*szlachta*) used a couple of centuries earlier. This was their way to oppose the trend of unification which went hand in hand with the modernization of the Empire. I think it would be too bold to call the Kiev-Mohyla Academy a center of the anti-imperial intellectual movement: judging by the active participation of its alumni and professors in the educational programs all over the state, they were hardly anti-imperial in their minds. Yet the Medieval-like conservatism could be quite justifiably interpreted as a part of the struggle for autonomous rights.

P.S.

In 1775, ten years after the last precedent analyzed in this work which provoked the reworking of the Academic Instruction, the autonomy of the Hetmanate was destroyed together with the cossack military and social structure. In less than another half century (in 1817) the Kiev-Mohyla Academy was reformed and turned into the Theological or Ecclesiastical Academy (*Духовная Академия*), a high school for clergy under the full jurisdiction of the Holy Synod. The university corporation failed to survive as a “normal” phenomenon, it was marginalized, turned into an “irregular exception” and finally “normalized” in the imperial fashion.

Bibliography

I. Manuscripts in the archives:

- 1) Vernads'kyj National Library of Ukraine. Institute of Manuscript [IR]:
 - Fond 301 (Collection of the Archaeological Museum of the Kiev Ecclesiastical Academy). Document 749 JI.
- 2) Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine in Kiev [TsDIAK]:
 - Fond 127 (The Kiev Consistory). Index 157. Document 94.
 - Fond 127. Index 1020. Document 2506.
 - Fond 990. Index 1. Document 581.

II. Published sources:

- 1) *Akty i dokumenty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Kievskoi akademii*. [Acts and documents, connected to the history of the Kiev academy]. Ed. by Petrov, Nikolai. Series II (1721-1795). Vol. 1 (1721-1750). Part 1. Kiev. 1904.:
 - XXXVI. Leges Academicae Docentibus et Studentibus Observandae (7 Oct. 1734). 214-220.
 - XXXVII. Ob obstojatelstvakh slavlennia Khrista studentami Kievskoi akademii, prozhyvavshymi v Kievo-Podol'skoi Vasilievskoi tserkovno-prihodskoi shkole, po prikhody vmeste s prihodskim diachkom [On the circumstances, in which students of the Kiev academy, living in the school of Kiev-Podolian church of St. Basil, praised Christ together with the parish cantor] (1734-1735). 220-2.
 - XLIV. Delo ob ubitom meshchanami studente Kievskoi akademii shkoly retoriki Grigorii Makovetskom, kharakterizuiushchee vzaimnyie otnoshenia mezhdru studentami i meshchamami, Kievskoi akademije i Kievskim magistratom [The case of Hryhorij Makovets'kyj, the student of rhetoric at the Kiev academy, who was killed by burgers, which characterizes relationships between students and burgers and between Kiev academy and Kiev magistrate] (30 Oct. 1739 – 24 Feb. 1740). 239-48.
 - L. O vodvorenii neskol'kikh studentov na zhytelstvo v Kievo-Podol'skuiu Pritisko-Nikol'skuiu prihodskuiu shkolu i vznikshykh po etomu povodu smytakh mezhdru dvumia nastojateliami etoi tserkvi i rikhozhanami i mezhdru Kievskoi akademije i Kievskim magistratom [About settling several students in the school of Kiev-Podolian parish church of St. Nicolas and troubles, which appeared between two priors of this church and the parish, and between Kiev academy and Kiev magistrate, as a result of this act] (13 May – Nov. 1741). 258-66.
 - LX. Zhalovannaja gramota Imperatritsy Elizabety Petrovny, dannaja Kijevo-Bratskomu uchilishchiu v podtverzhdenije prezhnikh gramot, pozhalovannykh emu Tsariom Ioannom Aleksejevichiem i Imperatorom Petrom I, s poveleniem otpuskat' na sodержanie Akademii po 200 rublej ezhegodno iz Vojskovogo Skarba [The privilege by Empress Elizabeth for the Kiev-Brotherhood college that confirms the previous privileges issued by Tsar Johann and Emperor Peter I, and orders to give the Academy 200 rubles annually from the Army's Treasury]. (11 Dec. 1742). 301-3.
 - LXXXVII. Delo po zhalobe studenta filosofii Theodora Ol'shanskogo na gorodnichego karpilovskogo monakha Iakintha Khranovskogo za prichenennyye im Ol'shanskomu poboi i ubytki [On the complain by student Theodor Ol'shans'kyj on the factor of Karpylivka village Iakynth Khranovs'kyj for drubbing and offenses] (January, 1749). 389-390.

- XCIII. Instruksia nokhodiashchimsia po shkolam pri tserkvakh Kievo-Podol'skikh studentam, v akademii Kievskoi 1750 fevralia 8 dnia sochinennaia [The Instruction for students, who live in the schools of Kiev-Podolian churches, composed in the Kiev academy in 1750, the 8th of February]. 407-9.
 - XCVI. Zhaloba uchenika retoriki Antona Gontkovskogo, zhyvshogo v usluzhenii u Kievo-Bratskogo kliuchnika ierodiakona Kirilla, na rektorskogo kelejnika Dorosha za obidu i uv'echie iz-za monastyrskogo piva i miodu [The complain by the student of rhetoric Anton Hontkovs'kyj who lived with the Brotherhood housekeeper Kyrylo as his servant on the rector's servant Dorosh for the offenses and loses he made him because of the beer and mead for the monastery] (27 October 1750). 422-423.
- 2) *Akty i dokumenty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Kievskoi akademii*. [Acts and documents, connected to the history of the Kiev academy]. Ed. by Petrov, Nikolai. Series II (1721-1795). Vol. 2 (1751-1762). Kiev. 1905.:
- VII. Opređenje Kievskoi dukhovnoi konsistorii po isku uchenika retoriki Pavla Navrotskogo s syna Kievo-Podol'skogo protopopa Lubenskogo za poboï, bezchest'je i ubytki [Decision of the Kiev ecclesiastical consistory on the claim by student of rhetoric Pavlo Navrots'kyj on the son of Kiev-Podolian archpriest Lubenski for beatings, dishonor and damages] (7 Jun. 1751). 12-5.
 - XLVIII. Delo po zhalobe bursaka Konstantina Il'nitskogo na oskorblenia i obidy ot sviashchennika Kievo-Podol'skoi Vasil'jevskoi tserkvi Pavla Lobko [On the claim by student Constantin Il'nets'kyj about insults and offenses, made to him by priest of the Kiev-Podolian church of St. Basil Pavlo Lobko] (4 Jun. - 4 Jul. 1754). 124-6.
 - XLIX. Delo po zhalobe studentov Kievskoi akademii, prozhyvavshykh v Kievo-Podol'skoi Vasil'jevskoi prikhodskoi shkole, na oskorblenia i obidy ot togo zhe sviashchennika Pavla Lobko [On the claim by students of the Kiev academy, who lived in the school of the Kiev-Podolian church of St. Basil, about insults and offenses, made to them by the same priest Pavlo Lobko] (4 Jun. - 7 Jul. 1754). 126-30.
 - XCVI. Prerekaniia arkhimandrita Davida Nashchinskogo i bratii Kievo-Bratskogo monastyrja s professorami Kievskoj Akademii iz-za material'nogo soderzhaniia i obezpecheniia poslednykh [The quarrel between archmandrite Davyd Nashchyns'kyj with monks of the Brotherhood monastery and professors of the Kiev academy because of the material provision for the latter ones]. (16 Jan. - 12 Oct. 1759). 288-311.
 - CXXXV. Ukaz Sv. Sinoda Kievskomu arkhiepiskopu Rafailu Zaborovskomu o vol'nosti obucheniia studentov Kievskoi akademii [Edict of the Holy Synod to the Kiev metropolitan Rafajil Zaborovski about free studies for students of the Kiev academy] (16 Sept. 1738). 444.
 - CXXXVI. Ukaz Sv. Sinoda Kievskomu arkhiepiskopu Rafailu Zaborovskomu o neperepisi sviashchenno- i tserkovno-sluzhytel'skikh detej shkol'nogo vozrasta i o nepostavlenii vo sviashchenstvo neuchionnykh v shkolakh liudej mimo uchionnykh [Edict of the Holy Synod to the Kiev metropolitan Rafajil Zaborovs'kyj on the questions of matriculation of the priests' and deacons' sons of the schooling age and of the ordination of the educated people in favor of the uneducated]. (16 Sept. 1739). 445.
- 3) *Akty i dokumenty, otnosiashchiesia k istorii Kievskoi akademii*. [Acts and documents, connected to the history of the Kiev academy]. Ed. by Petrov, Nikolai. Series II (1721-1795). Vol. 3 *Tsarsvovanie Ekateriny II* [The Reign of Catherine II] (1762-1796). *Kievskij Mitropolit Arsenij Mogilianskij* [Kiev Metropolitan Arsenij Mohylians'kyj] (till

1770). Kiev. 1906.:

- VI. O vozmushchenii studentov filosofii Kievskoi akademii protiv prefekta ieromonakha Mel'chisedeka Orlovskogo [About riot of students of philosophy at the Kiev academy against prefect hieromonk Melchizedek Orlovs'kyj] (21 Feb. - Apr. 1763). 24-37.
 - XII. O sostavlenii i utverzhdenii instruktсии dlia Kievskoi akademii [On composing and affirmation of instruction for the Kiev academy] (Sept. 1763 – 1 May 1764). 50-112.
 - XX. O nakazanii studenta bogoslovii Kievskoi akademii Petra Janovskogo za ego proderzosti [About punishment of theology student of the Kiev academy Petro Janovs'kyj for his imprudence] (14-16 Apr. 1764). 191-4.
 - XXV. Ob izbienii bursaka Kondratija Podgorskogo magistratskim sluzhutelem Sidorom Klimovym i o tiazhkykh poboikh, nanesennykh poslednemu bursakami [About the fight between student Kondratij Pidhors'kyj and clerk of the Kiev magistrate Sydor Klymov and severe walloping, made to the latter by students] (22 Dec. 1764-1765). 237-42.
 - XLIV. Pis'mo prefekta Kievskoi akademii ieromonakha Ruvima Petulinskogo Kievo-Podol'skomu protopopu s zhaloboi na sviashchennika Kievo-Podol'skoi Vasil'jevskoi tserkvi Pavla Lobko s preprovozhdeniem ego paskvil'nykh pisem [Letter by prefect of the Kiev academy hieromonk Ruvym Petulinski to Kiev-Podolian archdeacon with the complain on priest of the Kiev-Podolian church of St. Basil Pavlo Lobko, with addition of the latter's libels] (30 May 1767). 353-4.
- 4) *Kyjevo-Mohylians'ka akademiia kintsia XVII – pochatku XIX st.: povsiakdenna istoria* [The Kiev-Mohyla academy from the end of eighteenth till the beginning of nineteenth centuries: the everyday history]. Ed. by Zadorozhna, Oksana et al. Kiev. 2005.:
- 8-11. Doklad pro konflikty studentiv Kyjevo-Mohylians'koji akademiji z Kyjivs'kymy mishchanamy, skladenyi na pidsavi svidchen' Kyjivs'koho vijita, vojevody i burmystra ta pidriachykh ta karaul'nykh stril'tsiv [Report about conflicts between students of the Kiev-Mohyla academy and Kiev burgers, based on witnesses of Kiev mayor, governor and burgomaster and also church clerks and guardsmen] (1701). 29-34.
 - 29. Donesennia prefekta Kyjevo-Mohylians'koji akademiji ijeromonacha Mykhajila Kozachyns'koho Kijivs'komu mytropolytu Rafajilu pro pobytta Kijivs'kym mishchanynom Mykhajlom Romanovym Riznykom studenta Kyjevo-Mohylians'koji akademiji Ivana Duchyns'koho [Report by prefect of the Kiev-Mohyla academy hieromonk Mykhajil Kozachyns'kyj to Kiev metropolitan Rafajil about beating, made by the Kiev burger Mykhajlo Romanov Riznyk to the student of the Kiev-Mohyla academy Ivan Duchyns'kyj] (1744, Jun. 22). 60-5.
 - 40-44. Pro konflikt mizh mishchanynom Jevstratijem Baranovychem ta studentamy Kyjevo-Mohylians'koji akademiji [On the conflict between the Kiev burger Jevstratij Baranovych and students of the Kiev-Mohyla academy] (1746, Apr. 23 – May 15). 74-88.
 - 74-83. Pro nehidnu povedinku studenta filosofiji Kyjevo-Mohylians'koji akademiji Vasylia Zarudnoho, pro joho zitknennia iz professorom filosofoji Kyjevo-Mohylians'koji akademiji Heorhiem Shcherbats'kym ta Kyjivs'kymy mishchanamy Myhajlom Kopachem j Semenom Jurchenkom [About the improper behavior of student of philosophy at Kiev-Mohyla Academy Vasyli' Zarudnyj, and about his conflicts with professor of philosophy at the Kiev-Mohyla academy Hryhorij Shcherbats'kyj and with Kiev burgers Mykhajlo Kopach and Semen Jurchenko]

(1752, Jan. 28 – Feb. 9). 118-35.

- 155. Donesennia ihymena Kyjivs'koho Vydubys'koho monasturia Ijeronima Blons'koho Kyjivs'komu mytropolytu Samujilu pro nehidnu povedinku ijeromonakhiv Dorymedonta ta Jenokha, vykhovantsia Kyjevo-Mohylians'koho akademiji [Report by abbot of the Kiev Vydubychi monastery Ijeronim Blons'ky to the Kiev metropolitan Samujil about improper behavior of hieromonks Dorymedont and Enoch, the latter of whom is an alumnus of the Kiev-Mohyla academy] (1784, Oct. 29). 250-1.

III. Articles on cases:

- 1) Dziuba, Olena. ““Chest' i bezchestia students'ke” u spryjniatti studentiv ta professoriv Kyjevo-Mohylians'koho akademiji (na materialy konfliktiv 1730-1760ykh rokiv)” [“Student's honor and dishonor” in the view of students and professors of the Kiev-Mohyla academy (on the material of 1730-1760th years' conflicts)”. *Kievan Academy* 2-3 (2006), 135-47.
- 2) Jaremenko, Maksym. “Hore z rozumu abo pro Mohylians'ku navchenist' jak pidstavu dla honoru” [“Woe from wit or about the Mohylianian education as a reason for honor”]. *Kievan Academy* 4 (2007), 86-94.
- 3) Jaremenko, Maksym. ““Do mene-de nikhto ne imiet vlasti, krom' jasnevelmozhnoho”: samoidentyfikatsia Mohylians'koho studenta kriz' pryzmu konfliktu 1752 roku” [““No one has a power over me, except of his reverence”: self-identification of the Mohylianian student in the light of the 1752 year's conflict”]. *Socium* 7 (2007), 231-41.
- 4) Ks. Tsybul'skij “Rokovoe chtenie psaltyri (iz byta i npravov starykh Kievskikh spydeev)” [Fatal declamation of psalter (from the daily life and nature of students of the old Kiev)”. *Kievan Past* 2 (1884), 336-42.
- 5) Sheliakh, Hanna. “Korporatyvna solidarnist' professoriv Kyjevo-Mohylians'koho akademiji (na prykladi konfliktu 1759 roku)” [“Internal Relations in the Faculty Corporation of the Kiev-Mohyla Academy (on the Materials of the 1759 Year's Conflict)”. *Kievan Academy* 12 (2014-2015). 46-71.
- 6) Vishnievskij, Dmitrij. “Iz byta Kievskikh studentov” [“From the daily life of Kiev students”]. *Kievan Past* 1 (1896), 32-57; 2 (1896), 177-208; 3 (1896), 309-33.

IV. Secondary literature:

- 1) Askochiens'kij, Viktor. *Kiev s drevnieishym ego uchilishchiem akademiieiu* [Kiev and its oldest school the academy] (in two parts). Kiev. 1856.
- 2) Boran, Elizabethanne. “Town and Gown: the Relations of Trinity College and Dublin, 1592-1641”. *History of Universities*. Vol. XIII (1994). ed. Peter Denley. 61-86.
- 3) Bulgakov, Makarij. *Istoriia Kievskoj akademii*. [The history of the Kiev academy]. St. Petersburg. 1843.
- 4) Cracraft, James. “Theology at the Kiev Academy during its Golden age”. *Harvard Ukrainian Studies. The Kiev Mohyla Academy: commemorating the 350th Anniversary of its Founding* (1632), ed. by Pritsak, Omelian and Shevchenko, Ihor. Vol. 8. No 1 / 2 (June, 1984), 71-80.
- 5) Cobban, Alan B. “Medieval Student Power”. *Past and Present*. 53 (1971). 28-66.
- 6) Grajevskij I. *The Kiev metropolitan Tymofij Shcherbats'kyj*. [Kievskij mitropolit Timofej Shcherbatskij]. Kiev. 1912.
- 7) Jabłonowski, Aleksander. *Akademia Kijowsko-Mohilanska. Zarys historyczny na tle rozwoju ogolnego cywilizacyi zachodniej na Rusi* [The Kiev-Mohyla Academy. An essay of its history in the context of development of the western civilization in Rus']. Krakow. 1899-1900.

- 8) Jaremenko, Maksym. "Akademiky" ta akademija: sotsial'na istorija osvity j osvichenosti v Ukraini XVIII st. ["Academics" and the academy: social history of education and enlightenment in eighteenth-century Ukraine]. Kharkiv. 2014.
- 9) Jaremenko, Maksym. "Chy buv 1701 rik rubizhnym dlja Mohylians'koji akademiji u spryjniatt'i Kyjivs'kykh professoriv XVIII st.?" ["Was the year 1701 a turning point for the Kiev-Mohyla academy in view of its professors in the 18th century?"]. *350 years of the Hadiach Treaty [350-Lecie Unii Hadziackiej]* / red. T. Chynczewska-Hennel et al. Warsaw. 2008.
- 10) Hajets'kyji, Jurij. "The Kiev Mohyla Academy and the Hetmanate". *Harvard Ukrainian Studies. The Kiev Mohyla Academy: commemorating the 350th Anniversary of its Founding (1632)*, ed. by Pritsak, Omelian and Shevchenko, Ihor. Vol. 8. No 1 / 2 (June, 1984), 81-92.
- 11) Hrabovych, George. "Do ideologiji Renessansu v Ukrajins'kij Literaturi: "Virshy na zhalostnyj pohreb zatsnoho lytsera Petra Konashevycha Sahajdachnoho" Kasjana Sakovycha" ["Towards the ideology of the Renaissance in the Ukrainian literature: "Virshy na zhalostnyj pohreb zatsnoho lytsera Petra Konashevycha Sahajdachnoho" by Kasijan Sakovych"]. *L'Ucraina del XVII Secolo tra Occidente ed Oriente d'Europa [Ukraine of the 17th Century between the West and the East of Europe]*. Kiev-Venezia. 1996. 277-297.
- 12) Isajevych, Jaroslav. "Osvitnij ruch v Ukraini: skhidna tradytsija ta zachidni vplyvy" ["Educational movement in Ukraine: eastern tradition and western influences"]. *L'Ucraina del XVII Secolo tra Occidente ed Oriente d'Europa [Ukraine of the 17th Century between the West and the East of Europe]*. Kiev-Venezia. 1996. 114-135.
- 13) Isajevych, Jaroslav. *Voluntary Brotherhood: Confraternities of Laymen in Early-Modern Ukraine*. Edmonton, Toronto. 2006.
- 14) Kagan, Richard L. *Students and Society in Early-Modern Spain*. London. 1974.
- 15) Kahamlyk, Svitlana. "Intelektual'ne seredovyshche mohyliantsiv u Kyjevo-Pechers'kij lavri (XVIII st.)" ["The intellectual milieu of mohylianians in the Kiev Caves monastery (eighteenth century)"]. *Kievan Academy* 2-3 (2006). Issue. 177-96.
- 16) Karras, Ruth Mazo. "Sharing Wine, Women and Song: Masculine Identity Formation in the Medieval European Universities". *Becoming Male at the Middle Ages*. Ed. Cohen J. and Wheeler B. 1997. 187-202.
- 17) Kearney, Hugh F. *Scholars and Gentlemen: Universities and Society in Preindustrial Britain, 1500-1700*. London. 1970.
- 18) Kharlampovich, Konstantin. *Malorossijskoe vlijanie na Velikorossijskuju tserkovnuju zhyzn'*. [The Minor-Russian influence on the Major-Russian ecclesiastical life]. Kazan'. 1914.
- 19) Khyzhniak, Zoja. *The Kiev-Mohyla Academy*. Kiev. 1970.
- 20) Khyzhniak, Zoja. "Kyjevo-Mohylians'ka akademija. Pravovyj status (1615-1819)". ["Kiev-Mohyla academy. The juridical status (1615-1819)"]. *Naukovi zapysky Kyjevo-Mohylianskoji akademiji [Scholarly notes of the Kiev-Mohyla academy]* Vol. 3 (1998). 97-106.
- 21) Kiku, Veronika. "Jezujits'kyj universytet u L'vovi (1758-1773), abo zakhyst "istyny zakonu"" ["The Jesuit university in L'viv (1758-1773), or defense of "the truth of the law""]. *Socium* 4 (2004), 101-13.
- 22) Kirwan, Richard. "Urban Space and Academic Identity in the Early-Modern Germany". *Die Erschliessung des Raumes: Konstruktion, Imagination und Darstellung von Raumen und Grenzen im Barockzeitalter*. 2014. 523-544.
- 23) Kmet', Vasyl' and Dukh, Oleh. "Ratio Studiorum" v istoriji Evropejs'koji ta Ukrajins'koji osvity ["Ratio Studiorum" in the history of European and Ukrainian education"]. *Ratio*

- Studiorum. Uklad studij Tovarystva Isusovoho. Systema Jezujits'koho osvity* [Ratio Studiorum. The rule of studies in the Society of Jesus. The system of Jesuit Education]. Ed. by Paran'ko R., Masliukha A. L'viv. 2008. 7-31.
- 24) Kotusenko, Victor. "Vykladannia filosofiji v jezujits'kykh kollehiumakh XVI-XVII st. ta Kyjevo-Mohylians'kij akademiji" ["Teaching philosophy in Jesuit colleges of 16th-17th centuries and in the Kiev-Mohyla academy"]. *Ukrajina XVII stolittia: Suspil'stvo, filosofija, kul'tura*. [Ukraine of the 17th century: Society, philosophy, culture]. The scientific collection in memorial of professor Valerija Mykhajlivna Nichyk. Kiev. 2005. 83-107.
 - 25) Lewin, Paulina. "Drama and Theater at Ukrainian Schools in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries: the Bible as Inspiration of Images, Meanings, Style, and Stage Productions". *Harvard Ukrainian Studies. The Kiev Mohyla Academy: commemorating the 350th Anniversary of its Founding (1632)*, ed. by Pritsak, Omelian and Shevchenko, Ihor. Vol. 8. No 1 / 2 (June, 1984). 93-122.
 - 26) Luzny, Ryszard. *Pisarze Kregu Akademii Kijowsko-Mohylanskiej a Literatura Polska. Z Dziejow Zwiazkow Kulturalnych Polsko-Wschodnioslowianskich w XVII-XVIII Wiekach*. [Writers of the Kiev-Mohyla Circle and the Polish Culture. From the History of the Cultural Connections between Poland and Eastern Slavic Lands in 17th – 18th centuries]. Krakow. 1966.
 - 27) Midgley, Graham. *University Life in Eighteenth-Century Oxford*. Yale University Press. 1996.
 - 28) Mukhin, Nikolaj. *Kijevskij Bratskij Uchilishchnyi monastyr': istoricheskij ocherk*. [The Kiev-Brotherhood Academical monastery: the historical outline.] Kiev. 1893.
 - 29) O'Day, Rosemary. *Education and Society 1500-1800. the Social Foundation of Education in Early-Modern Britain*. London / New York. 1982.
 - 30) Orlovskij, Piotr. *The legend of the blessed Raphael, the metropolitan of Kiev*. [Skazanije o blazhennom Rafaele metropolite Kievskom]. Kiev. 1908.
 - 31) Petrov, Nikolaj. *Znachenije Kijevskoj akademii v razvitii dukhovnykh shkol v Rossii s uchrezhdenija Sv. Sinoda v 1721 i do poloviny XVIII veka* [The role of the Kiev-Mohyla academy in the development of ecclesiastical schools in Russia from the foundation of the Holy Synod in 1721 till the middle of the 18th century]. Kiev, 1904.
 - 32) Posokhova, Liudmyla. *Na perekhresti kul'tur, tradytsij, epokh: pravoslavni kollehiumy Ukrainy napryk'ints'i XVII – na pochatku XIX st.* [On the crossroads of cultures, traditions, epochs: orthodox colleges in Ukraine from the end of seventeenth till the beginning of nineteenth century]. Kharkiv. 2011.
 - 33) Posokhova, Liudmyla. "Shliubni strategii vypusknikov pravoslavnykh kollegiumiv ta formuvannia stanu dukhovenstva v Ukraini XVIII st." ["Marriage strategies of the Orthodox colleges alumni and formation of the clerical strata in the 18th century Ukraine"]. *Siverians'kyj Litopys*. [Siverian Chronicle]. 2008. 4. 108-16.
 - 34) Posokhova, Liudmyla. "Vchyteljuvannia studentiv pravoslavnykh kollehiumiv Ukrainy XVIII st. u rodynakh kozats'koho starshyny" ["Students of the orthodox colleges of eighteenth-century Ukraine as teachers in cossack officers' families"]. *Kievan Past* 5 (2008), 3-18.
 - 35) Prokopiuk, Oksana. *Vykhovantsi Kyjevo-Mohylians'koho akademiji v kantseliarii Kyjivs'koho dukhovnoho konsystoriji* [Kiev-Mohyla academy graduates in the office department of Kiev ecclesiastical consistory]. *Kievan Academy* 2-3 (2006). 147-63.
 - 36) Sydorenko, Alexander. *The Kievan Academy in the Seventeenth Century*. Ottawa. 1977.
 - 37) Titov, Theodor. *Imperatorskaja Kievskaja dukhovnaja akademija v eje trekhvekovej zhyni i dejatel'nosti (1615-1915)* [The Emperor's Kiev ecclesiastical academy in its 300-years' existing and functioning (1615-1915)]. Kiev. 1915.

- 38) Zadorozhna, Oksana. “Etapy budivnytstva “velykoji bursy” ta pobutovi umovy prozhyvannia v nij studentiv” [Stages of building of “the major dormitory” and daily life of students there]. *Naukovi zapysky Kyjevo-Mohylianskoji akademiji* [Scholarly notes of the Kiev-Mohyla academy] Vol. 35 (2004). 33-45.