

Dichek N. P.

**UKRAINIAN EDUCATIONAL BAROQUE MAN: THEOPHAN
PROKOPOVICH AND EDUCATION**

History of the Slavic Orthodox world (17th – 18th Centuries) is described as the Baroque era [24, 2] with its specific controversial combination of antiquity and biblical canons, scholasticism and ideas of humanism, hedonism, and asceticism. However, the most important feature of this period is seen in the adoption, borrowing, and creative remaking of various cultural and philosophical traditions and their subsequent introduction into the national cultural context of individual ethnic territories. The wealth of motley and contradictory ambiguity of this era had an impact on the public life, cultural development, and on the educational expansion of the Ukrainian ethnos as well.

The Baroque, as a Western cultural phenomenon, flourished in Europe at the end of 16th - mid-18th Centuries. As for the Orthodox Slavic countries, historians date Baroque period to the second half of the 17th – 18th Centuries. Thus, V. Gorsky, the Ukrainian historian of philosophy, in order to justify his point of view on the beginning of the Ukrainian Baroque, suggests that the introduction of this trend should be connected with the work of the Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium (later - Academy), the first higher education institution in the lands of eastern and the majority southern Slavs, which was founded in 1632 [2, p. 79]. Today, in the light of the movement towards renovation in the national history of methodology, the information about education in this cultural and historical epoch, though dated in the territory of Ukraine to the second half of the 17th Century, but only at the end of this period "the Ukrainian Baroque separated in its Cossack variant from the Polish-Belarusian-Lithuanian course and gained independent formal features" [15].

However, it should be emphasized that the Kyiv school literature existed already in the 1620s - 1630s, i.e. since the establishment of Kyiv Epiphany Brotherhood School (1615), whereas the foundation of Kyiv Collegium (1632) was one of the most important events in the cultural and educational life of the 17th Century, which started Baroque period in the Ukrainian lands [2, p.117]. At this time in history, ecclesiastical educational establishments were particularly influential in the expansion of the European level education among Orthodox East Slavic peoples.

The lectures and writings of the professors of Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium demonstrated their philosophical, religious, and educational views. Analysis of these texts gives reasons to believe that they reflected the uniqueness of philosophical ideas, which synthesized, in their own way, the major Western European humanitarian movements, such as humanism, the Reformation and early Enlightenment, and Ukrainian spiritual traditions based on the achievements of the Middle Ages and Orthodoxy as a continuation of the Byzantine church canon. It is the 1630s – 1640s that are considered to be the beginning of flowering of the cultural Ukrainian Baroque.

The distinguishing features of the Baroque culture were the antinomy of the perception and reflection of the world, and unique "sensuous and intellectual tension" (D. Likhachev). This historical time was characterized by the affectation and theatricalization of all spheres of the European life [25]. Literature, philosophy, fine arts, architecture and even human life were characterized by the lofty intellectualization of science and mysticism, longing for complex symbolism and tendency to naturalistic interpretation (and representation) of details. Building upon scholastic logic and rhetoric, the representatives of the Baroque period created philosophical and artistic works full of scientific and encyclopedic knowledge and didactic precepts, which, in the aggregate, represented the "assimilation energy" of Baroque cultural tendencies, which "unite the diverse" (D. Chizhevsky).

Important for our study is the fact of the expansion of philosophical ideas and scientific knowledge across national boundaries fueled by the educational traditions of

the European school and university education, in other words, the mobility of teachers/professors and students. The main requirement for obtaining education in a foreign school was the knowledge of Latin.

In order to summarize the contribution into the cultural and educational development of the Slavic peoples of Theophan Prokopovich, the Professor (since 1705), Rector (1712 - 1716) of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, church reformer, writer, educator (1677¹ - 1736) and one of the greatest representatives of the Baroque, we consider it to be important to emphasize the controversy and versatility of this figure. The sum of conflicting historical and biographical details about him and hypotheses in this regard, ambiguity (from the point of view of both *modern* morals and religion) of his actions cause contrasting appraisal and interpretation of his deeds and artistic heritage of his personality. However, this ambiguity, this opacity are not only a manifestation of individuality, but a vivid example of the Baroque Man.

In order to illustrate the personality of Theophan Prokopovich in brief, we will highlight some biographical facts, which demonstrate fluidity and greatness of his personality. Already in his juvenile years, Theophan (known in the world as Elisha or, according to other sources, Eleazar) Prokopovich was able to adjust to life challenges, when, in order to obtain further education, being a nineteen-year-old student (according to other sources he was 17 years), he left Kyiv Mohyla Collegium, where he was considered to be a gifted student, and "not having completed the course in theology, undertook a traditional for those days educational pilgrimage tour" [18, p. 14]. To continue and diversify his education, he changed Orthodox faith into Greek Catholic². This abjuration opened to a Ukrainian (Russian) the opportunity to study at the Lvov Uniate school (according to other sources, in Volodymyr-Volynsky), and, two years later, he entered the College of St. Athanasius in Rome. Having studied successfully for three years, but, again, not

¹ In the 1970s, Ukrainian historian V.Nichik et al, based on the archive findings, namely the P. Prokopovich's inter vivos biography, written by his friend, professor of history of St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences G. S. Bayer, which remained unknown for a long time, made his year of birth more accurate: not 1681, but 1677 [4, p. 361].

² The same change occurred to another outstanding alumnus of Kyiv Mohyla Collegium, Ukrainian and Russian educator Stefan Yavorsky, which, though, did not prevent him from eventually becoming the protector of the Slavic Greek Latin Academy in Moscow, Metropolitan of Ryazan and Murom, and practically the head of the Russian Church for twenty years.

having completed the course in theology in Italy, Elisha, the student-philosopher, secretly visited (1701) the territory of Switzerland, Germany, where he attended lectures at the University of Halle, and returned to his Motherland. There, in Pochayiv Lavra, he accepted Orthodox faith (1702). Having arrived in Kyiv (1704), he joined the Kyiv Brotherhood and became a monk under the name of his deceased uncle on his mother's side, Theophan Prokopovich, who was elected rector of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. So professor Prokopovich's Kyiv life began: in 1705 he taught poetry at the Academy, in 1706 - rhetoric, and in 1707 through 1709 - philosophy.

From the very beginning, the work of the young scientist was marked with the desire for innovation and change. In particular, it was through his efforts that the content of academic education was broadened by adding mathematics (arithmetic and geometry) and physics and expanding the course in logic. Guided by teachings of N. Copernicus and G. Galilei, Th. Prokopovich intended to provide natural-scientific orientation in teaching philosophy, in accordance with his outlook formed under the influence of the advanced Western European science.

While studying abroad, Th. Prokopovich had learnt foreign languages, gained new scientific knowledge and ideas of humanism, religious reformism and the Enlightenment, and, later, in his sermons, lectures, writings, he preached people to purge their minds from ghosts and superstition, professed the importance of proliferation of education for all regardless of the social status. This position was a novelty for the then society characterized by rigid social status stratification and was similar to Western humanists ideas. Belonging to the clergy and being a believer, he, at the same time, criticized religious fanaticism, blind devotion to tenets, and numerous prejudices, appealing, in the spirit of the times, to people, their common sense, and life experience. The scientist became a consistent critic of Catholicism, particularly of the Jesuits, although he owed his broad knowledge to their educational institutions. For example, in describing in the sixth book "On the Method of Writing History and Letters" of his course of lectures on rhetoric, he claimed that Catholic historians misrepresented history

to please the Pope, describing the miracles of their fictional co-religionists, justifying the affiliation of many ancient saints, Christ, and the Blessed Mother of God to the Catholic order of Carmelites and, God permitting, Pythagoras, and Cynics, and Stoics as well [17]. Summing up his opinion, the scientist wrote: "While enduring terrible conditions, heat, cold, diseases, without rest, without disgust or hatred, while day and night are quick in flight, they tell lies" [17, p. 340].

However, interpreting the personality and deeds of the thinker, it should be noted that he followed (consciously or not) moral principles in many ways similar to the ethical canons of the Jesuits. The facts of his biography give grounds to speak about his compliance with "the principle of submission" of the Jesuits. This principle supported the need of absolute submission of action, mind, and individuality (the latter was considered to be the greatest sacrifice, which person could offer) to the great aim [1, p. 363]. Thus, people's abdication and variability of convictions were considered to be a norm in those days. These similarities in moral principles become particularly obvious, if one considers the works of the scientist when in Moscow kingdom (1716 – 1736).

Th. Prokopovich belonged to the galaxy of Ukrainian scientists who were summoned by the Muscovy tsar Peter I to assist in reforming the social, political, cultural life, and the spread of literacy, knowledge, and science [13]. Russian Professor P. Morozov (19th Century), who investigated Theophan's biography, gave the following characteristics to the royal decision: "Peter I understood that the level of education of the Moscow clergy was immeasurably lower than that in Kyiv, and there was nothing but "the extreme barbarity, in all its terrible manifestations" and there were no people who would be capable of educating the clergy, taking care of schools, the process and results of teaching. For that reason he decided to appeal to Kyivan scientists in order to raise the level of education in the area" [10, p. 61].

At the time when he was invited to Moscow and had to depart from Kyiv (1716), Th. Prokopovich earned the fame of an outstanding speaker, a gifted teacher of the European educational level, the defender of Orthodoxy against Catholic expansion.

While living in Moscow, the scientist became a prominent religious and public figure, who assisted Peter I in running reforms, and the church hierarchy of the Russian Empire. We will not venture to describe everything he achieved in this period with particulars, but will, nonetheless, note that the spirit of reformism that the study in Europe inspired in him was ideologically close to the initiatives of Peter I, and such similarity of their worldview positions was a brilliant support for their alliance. It was this tandem, the tsar having supreme power in his hands and the outstanding thinker, skilful orator-conductor of new ideas, and efficient organizer, that was able to fulfill such a radical reform of the Russian Orthodox Church. There have been many disputes about the meaning of these reforms: in fact, they ruined the priority of the Church (patriarchate institute) in Muscovy, the structure of which had been determined by orthodox traditions for centuries. It was Th. Prokopovich who outlined the need to establish the power of Synod in his work "Ecclesiastical Regulation" (1721) and developed the principles of a new system of ecclesiastical education in detail, which was to perform both secular and general functions. As a religious reformer, Theophan "sought to create such a theological system that not only accepted the possibility of science, but also justified the priority of the secular principles over the church in society, especially in public life" [14, p. 229 – 230].

On the one hand, ideas of sermons and works of Th. Prokopovich caused the spread of the Reformation; on the other hand, they triggered accusations of heresy and promoting the spirit of the Lutheran faith on the part of the Orthodox supporters in Kyiv, and especially in Muscovy. It should be mentioned that the personality and work of Theophan Prokopovich for nearly three centuries (since the date of his death) have been characterized ambiguously by the descendants. Thus, historians M. Karamzin, P. Morozov et al highly appreciated the heritage of the thinker. In particular, there were the following lines in Karamzin's "History of the Russian State" (1816 – 1824): "Peter I had a passion for talented people, he was looking for them in monastic cells and in dark cabins: so he found Theophan and Osterman, who became the outstanding figures in our

history" [6, p. 1011]. By the way, one should mind that the names of German A. Osterman and Ukrainian Th. Prokopovich are put together, which means that they were both viewed as foreigners by birth.

On the other hand, while analyzing in detail the content of "Ecclesiastical Regulation", the outstanding historian M. Kostomarov did not even mention Th. Prokopovich and did not indicate that the Bishops Academy principles, proposed in this work, were a copy of the order of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy [8, p. 716 – 721]. In his thorough study "Russian History in the Biographies of its Most Prominent Figures" (1874), M. Kostomarov wrote that Theophan "was the most educated among others [assistants to Peter I - *added by N.Dichek*] and was the most successful in predicting the tsar's will", but later "[Theophan] turned, after the tsar's death, into a terrible tyrant, who did not care about the means [to get what he wanted – *note by N. Dichek*]" [8, p.524]. However, M. Kostomarov described the Russian Emperor as a bloodthirsty despot and immoral person as well, "whose dark sides could be explained by the peculiarities of his time, ... the same sides could be found galore in other contemporaries of Peter I. Undoubtedly, Peter I was much brighter and more hard-working than his contemporaries-lords, but from the point of view of morals, he was not the best among them" [ibid, p. 766]. Summarizing his considerations, the historian wrote that "all Peter's supporters who survived him floundered in their own intrigues, and while pursuing personal interests, were executed or died in exile. And the Russian citizen learned the rule, "you can do whatever is considered to be useful, even if it is immoral, justifying your actions by the fact that other nations do the same" [ibid, p. 767]. Certainly, the similarity between this policy and Jesuits' principle "the end justifies the means" proves that such ethical beliefs were common in the Baroque era.

At the same time, describing the times of Peter I, M. Kostomarov did not mention the work of the so-called Band of Academicians - a philosophical and literary circle of highly educated scientists and artists of the Russian Empire that was assembled and led by Bishop Theophan in order not to allow "Peter's deeds go to the devil", about his

efforts to establish the Russian Academy of Sciences and the care he extended to it, about the first private full board school in Russia founded by Th. Prokopovich at his own expense for boys of all social layers "whether they were orphans of impoverished nobles or plebeians. "

Another competent Ukrainian historian S. Siropolko paid attention to the congratulatory ode to Prince Menshikov, delivered by Th. Prokopovich (1709) in the church on the subject of destruction of Baturin, where "the orator's countrymen, women and even children were slaughtered with no mercy" [19, p. 151]. The historian stated that it was an example of "repulsive servility of one of the most prominent representatives of the Kyiv Academy." S. Siropolko wrote that "Theophan tried various measures to fight against his enemies" [ibid, p. 163].

The Russian researcher of his life I. Chystovych provided the following comments on Th. Prokopovich as a church hierarch and politician: "How many people he executed unjustly, tortured them to death or sent to jail to their doom, without any compassion or pity" [25, p. 342]. However, he somewhat justifies Theophan's deeds, saying that resorting to violent methods of struggle, using a nimble mind and deep knowledge, he "not only managed to survive and retain his position during constant strife which agitated the state and the church in the first half of the 18th Century, when Menshikov, Dolgoruky, Golitsyn, Osterman and many others died, but also defended Peter's reforms from the constant threat of destruction" [ibid, p. 576]. Moreover, the cruelty to enemies (religious, public, or even personal) was common in that epoch. For example, the prominent Ukrainian and Russian educator, Metropolit of Moscow, also known as Stefan Jaworsky, in his book "Stone of Faith ..." (1728) argued that that it is good and necessary to "crucify" the heretics who had departed from Orthodoxy [15, p. 513].

Grave disregard of the contribution of Th. Prokopovich and his role in reforming such important sector of society as church and faith, in the spread of the Enlightenment in Muscovy, as represented in some historical writings, can be explained only by the

subjectivity of interpretations. For example, the prominent Russian scientist V. Klyuchevsky in his historical epic "History of Russia" [7] devotes more than three hundred pages to the reign of Peter I, but, among the many aides and associates of the Tsar-Reformer, Th. Prokopovich is not mentioned.

These famous historians, who worked in the early 19th Century through the first third of the 20th Century, are only a small part of the researchers who turned to the description and interpretation of the events of the 17th – 18th Centuries, though their opinions are regarded as the most common view on the role of Th. Prokopovich in the spiritual, political and cultural development of the Russian, Ukrainian, and Slavic peoples in general. It should be emphasized that quite often the researcher can admire some deeds of a certain historical figure and, at the same time, condemn other actions in the same work. This ambivalence of opinions is typical for Kostomarov M., S. Siropolko, I. Chystovych, P. Kapteryeva et al.

In our opinion, the situation with the interpretation of the figure of Th. Prokopovich in national history comes about through several reasons. Firstly, the thinker made a significant contribution to the ecclesiastical, political, cultural, and educational spheres of life, thus his heritage is rather versatile. Secondly, any reformism is characterized by the ambiguity of evaluative feedback, and Th. Prokopovich tried to change and renew all spheres of life. Finally, he was a bright example of the Baroque Man traditionally associated with the "unity of the incompatible", and this fact should be taken into account by researchers.

Most of the reproaches, addressed to the scientist-hierarch, were connected with his desire to change the traditions of the Russian Orthodox Church, to legitimate imperial authority in his writings "The Ecclesiastical Regulation" and "The Truth about Tsar's Will". Thus, the Russian scientist P. Morozov noted that the advocates of old traditions called Th. Prokopovich a "Lutheran," "impious heresiarch" who, with other like-minded people, "decided to openly fight the Holy Church, destroy all its tenets and introduce and enroot the impious Lutheranism and other heresies. ... And then people

suffered from them a lot, as any devout Christian's deed or word were considered to be heresy ..." [10, p. 266 – 269]. Ukrainian historians accused the scholar of the deviation from the national interests [19, 3]. In this regard, there is one more interesting fact to cite: already as Bishop of Pskov and Novgorod, Th. Prokopovich published the essay "In Praise of the Dniro" (1733) in Ukrainian. And this was done despite the fact that, after the decree banning publishing in Ukrainian (in 1720), there aggravated the Russification policy of the imperial power with the purpose of "not letting the people of Rus' Minor honor themselves differently from the people of Great Rus'" [23, p. 76].

P. Kapteryev, the famous Russian expert in history of education, in the first half of 20th Century suggested the periodization of education in the Russian Empire. He divided its development into two periods: the first period was referred to as ecclesiastic pedagogy, and the second period that began in the times of Peter I and continued until the reform of 1861 was called the period of state pedagogy [5]. Despite the fact that the scholar did not take into account the development of education and culture in that historical period, including the Baroque, he, however, on an intuitive level, was able to reveal the duality of the world view of the most prominent social and cultural leaders of the Baroque era of Peter the Great (Th. Prokopovich, I. Pososhkov, V. Tatishchev), whose works made an impact on education.

P. Kapteryev believed that, among Th. Prokopovich's works that had educational value, the most important was "Ecclesiastical Regulation" (1721). The scientist commended the ideas about education contained in this work, whereas the author's views on religion were given ambiguous appraisal. Thus, citing lines from the second part of the work, which refers to the obligations of the newly introduced Synod, namely, the simplification of customs, revelation of superstitions and false miracles, the Russian scientist, humanist and advocate of the educational reform in his work "History of Russian Pedagogy" (1915) criticized the avidity of Th. Prokopovich in implementing radical innovations: "Let us suppose that Prokopovich was essentially right, much of what he exposed was superstitious and unnecessary, but we should not forget that he

was talking about relics, wonder-working icons, services and akathist hymns, about lives of saints, the provision of alms, and about the entire way of church and everyday life – foregone, respected, given by our ancestors. So, all these were scarified by a scientist from Rus Minor. Has it been long time since Rus Minor's Orthodoxy in Moscow was considered to be doubtful and had to be tested? There does seem a bit of Lutheranism in that work" [5, p. 189 - 190]. And then P. Kapteryev made an important conclusion that "Ecclesiastical Regulation" is a new world outlook, critical and rational" [ibid]. The opinion of the scientist, who lived in the first half of 20th Century, is, at the same time, similar to that of a pre-Peter orthodox believer: many Russian scientists see Theophan both as a prominent Russian public figure and as a Rus Minor heretic.

As for the pedagogical content of "Ecclesiastical Regulation", P. Kapteryev argued that, "as a defender of the supremacy of the state over the church, Prokopovich recognized the need for education for the clergy and direction for the ordinary people, but he had a different from his predecessors idea as for its implementation. The religious aspect was seen as less important in his projects, whereas secular and pedagogical interest was in the foreground" [ibid].

In order to objectify a number of contradictory views of various scientists on Th. Prokopovich, let us turn to the works of Dmytro Chyzhevsky, the founder of the studios devoted to the Ukrainian Baroque period. With the help of his scientific research "Ukrainian Baroque culture was placed in the context of Slavic and European Baroque culture" [11, p. 338]. In the thorough three-volume work "Baroque in the Ukrainian Literature" (1941 - 1944) he, for the first time, outlined the features of the Baroque literature in the Ukrainian lands "precisely among the Orthodox authors, not among the Uniates, who were closely associated with the Catholic world" [ibid].

According to the original concept of D. Chizhevsky, the Baroque should be considered not only as "a style in sculpture, but also in music, literature, ... philosophy and the entire culture of the Baroque era" [25, p. 339 - 340]. Scientists advocated the idea that the Baroque was the last artistic style that was able to leave its mark on the

entire culture; it was the last "global, wide-spread, versatile and synthetic style." Along the same lines, the author substantiated the conclusion that "the creator of the Baroque culture had the same stylistic elements as the entire culture did" [ibid].

Describing the "Baroque Man", D. Chizhevsky argued that it was not an artificially created phenomenon, but scientifically meaningful concept, because it united "creativity of the Baroque period, and the perceptions of the cultural values intrinsic to the people of that era" [ibid, p. 349]. According to the philosopher, the most typical feature of the "Baroque Man" was *fluidity*. In order to prove this conclusion, the scientist gave biographical examples of J. A. Comenius, who moved from Moravia to Germany, Poland, Holland, England, Sweden, and Siebenbürgen³; Th. Prokopovich, who fate brought him to Rome, Germany, and St. Petersburg; H. Skovoroda, who traveled to Hungary, Vienna, Moscow, and St. Petersburg, and many other Ukrainian "students" who traveled all over Europe. D. Chizhevsky wrote that it was difficult to say whether Baroque men moved abroad following their own free will or had to flee from storms and misfortunes. The researcher considered those points of view on the baroque culture that originated from "the tastes of other eras ... and led to the sharp condemnation of the Baroque culture, its "remoteness from the people's interests", "detachment from life" and "lifelessness" not to be historically-relevant. Only treating the Baroque Man with a human touch, considering his needs, tastes, and creative tendencies could lead us to the true understanding of the Baroque culture" [ibid].

Emphasizing that the diversity of the Baroque was synthesized by the leading principle of the combination of the opposites, the connection of antitheses and their play, the Ukrainian philosopher concluded that the ambiguity of the Baroque was not just a play that belongs to numerous stylistic ornaments, but the element of the **outlook** [ibid, p. 344].

According to D. Chizhevsky, there was another peculiar feature, even "the threat" of those days: "play", "illusionism", when something obvious hid something quite

³ Transylvania

shadowy, and it was believed that "everything perishable is nothing but a symbol" [ibid, p. 350]. According to the historian, the play took part in all reforms in the world, so numerous in that period, and even in projects of church reformation. In our opinion, this idea by the scientist can be extrapolated into the work of Th. Prokopovich. The same goes about another conclusion by D. Chizhevsky, who, justifying the existence of other personality traits of the Baroque culture, wrote, "This is not an exhausting list of the internal threats of the Baroque Man, who often remains standing on the border between a great reformer and a dangerous adventurer" [ibid, p. 351].

Referring to the contribution of Th. Prokopovich into the educational Baroque, his work as a professor at Kyiv-Mohyla Academy should be mentioned as well. Following his famous predecessors, professors J. Kononovich-Horbatsky and J. Halyatovsky, he prepared his own lectures on poetics "The Art of Poetry ..." (1705) and on eloquence "On the Rhetorical Art" (1706), which made a huge impact on the further development of theoretical thought and brought up many followers [23, p. 78]. The philosopher's ideas were not a mere reproduction of Western theories, they bore relation to "Poetics" by Aristotle, and to the Baroque poetry of the Italian Renaissance, and, which is of particular importance, to the practice of creating the Ukrainian poetry, including syllabic poetry and drama works.

Th. Prokopovich wrote the first Ukrainian tragicomedy based on the story of the nation's history "Vladymer (Volodymyr)," which was staged by the students of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (1705). The play, in a spirit of those days, glorified Hetman Ivan Mazepa⁴ depicted as the medieval ruler. It also celebrated Kyiv, ridiculed ignorance of the clergy and praised the enlightened monarch. Moreover, beyond specifically literary innovations (using colloquial language, diversification of poetic forms), which were a step forward in the development of the Baroque drama, the tragicomedy also contained one of the facets of the intrinsic to the Baroque era "play" (which was earlier defined by

⁴ The modern Ukrainian researcher V. Trygubenko believes that the author drew a parallel between the grand prince Volodymyr and Peter I [22].

D. Chizhevsky). Accordingly, the theatricalization of reality penetrated even strict monastic order, reflecting life preferences of the then people. Rich in allegories (trope typical for the period of Baroque), the play enjoyed not only approval, but a sharp criticism from those who would recognize themselves in the greedy priests and religious hypocrites and write denunciations that Theophan propagandized heresy in Kyiv" [22, p. 175].

As for a series of lectures on rhetoric, one cannot but emphasize two positions. Firstly, the lectures developed over three hundred years ago are still of topical significance and can be used, because they contained universal and useful ideas. Secondly, written in Latin, they were updated by the author in the spirit of classicism and met the many practical demands of the life in those days. For example, during traditional philosophical debates, Th. Prokopovich advised students to "take care of the quality of speech, avoid anything that makes your speech obscure and ambiguous," "not to overuse high-flown tropes⁵, because the truth can only be revealed by simplicity and sincerity," "strictly and carefully examine your own thesis for validity and for mistakes", etc. Among the drawbacks of grandiloquence, the scientist named poor imitation, indifference, irrelevance, and pompousness [17, p. 106].

In the time of Th. Prokopovich, rhetoric was prized as a universal science about the Word, queen of arts, because, by means of eloquence, it is possible to "drive fear away, give hope, encourage people, and, at the same time, instigate war" [ibid, p. 108]. The thinker believed that "the player is not able to handle the ball as perfectly, as the speaker can handle the human soul." As if foreseeing the great impression that he would subsequently make on Peter I with his sermons, Th. Prokopovich said: "The orator can simultaneously hurt and wound people with the same weapon. It is really unbelievable: there is a crowd of literate and illiterate people, commanders and the most valiant heroes, and yet they care about the words of the one person and they blanch and blush.

⁵ This remark in Th. Prokopovich's works developed into the tendency to avoid scholastic grandiloquence typical for sermons and lectures, which complicated their comprehension.

And even the kings themselves become the slaves of the speaker; in spirit, they follow his speech and allow the orator to take them wherever he wants. What can be stronger than this art?" [ibid, p. 109].

One of the examples of the consistent implementation of Enlightenment ideas was the textbook "The First Lesson of a Lad" (1720) written by Th. Prokopovich. It should be noted that, in the first half of the 17th Century, pedagogy did not exist as an individual science, and the process of education had a distinct ecclesiastic focus and was provided and directed by the clergy. The only purpose of the "bookish learning" consisted in "strengthening the faith." Therefore, the ABC book written by Th. Prokopovich was an elementary-level textbook teaching literacy by means of religious texts as the basis of the necessary knowledge. But an essential didactic difference of this book was a specific approach that shaped it: Christian commandments and teachings were not proposed as a list of tedious dogmas, but with a profound explanation to each one.

Addressing parents and those caring for children in the preface, Th. Prokopovich discussed the importance of education, criticized its improper organization and underestimation in Muscovy. Reflecting on the level of elementary education, he concluded that basic moral principles were brought up in the childhood: "Since the early years, like from the root, the good and the bad flow through your life" and, then, "moral principles learnt in the childhood will stay throughout life: the adult is what the youth was" [15, p. 500]. The thinker concluded that the people that provided "admonition for children" would prosper [ibid]. Thus, he was a harbinger of the ideas of the Enlightenment in Russia, according to which training and education were considered to be the key to social welfare. If placed in the context of the pre-Peter Russia, when education was provided by the church and clergy, and science was seen as a superfluous luxury or even heresy, the ideas of the Ukrainian thinker appear to be extremely courageous and far-reaching, who, even with a monk's cowl on the head, was aware of and preaching the value of knowledge.

Another important educational idea of the author of the ABC book was the statement that the ability to read and write was not literacy proper, but rather a means of learning. If teaching is not accompanied by bringing up moral values, it creates "the book smart" who lack morals but know how to read and write. They use these skills as a means of grudge, writing complaints, libels and destroying records, agreements, religious writings... " [ibid, p. 501].

A distinguishing feature of the ABC books of 17th – first half of 18th Century was the pompousness of speech, and it was difficult for children to understand the idea of the written text. As a result, pupils "remained without proper upbringing [education – *note by N. Dichek*]." This was the reason why the author of "The First Lesson..." simplified the language of his book in order to make it understandable to children, so that they receive clear and simple interpretation of Christian principles of faith and morals, truth and precepts, which they should follow in everyday life. Th. Prokopovich knew that, according to the educational tradition in Muscovy, pupils would thoughtlessly learn prayers and moral precepts by heart and, essentially, remained of little culture. To overcome this, he provided a simple interpretation of what he was teaching. Comparison of the ABC book by Th. Prokopovich with preceding editions makes it obvious that the former was intended for the lower class children in order to give them at least primary education and thereby improve their social welfare. Similar expectations were typical for the people of the Enlightenment period, the basis for which had been laid in Russia by the Tsar-reformer and his associates, including Th. Prokopovich.

The most significant innovation of Th. Prokopovich in the practice of creating textbooks was the presentation of teaching material in simple words, understandable even for peasant children. This has been the first time in the history of Slavic textbooks when the availability principle was implemented. The ultimate goal of the author was to develop elementary reading skills in children, so that they could learn the most important religious texts and prayers. In other words, Th. Prokopovich considered the ability to read only as an instrument of religious and moral education. Hence, it was the

educational value of the textbook that the scientist was giving prominence. We can assume that "The First Lesson ..." was, to a degree, an example of the textbook that fosters not only intellectual, but also moral development, which were considered identical in those days. This was the position of, for example, J. A. Comenius, the founder of the new educational system (17th Century) based on the ideas of humanism, the guiding principle of which was the idea of "education according to nature". It is possible that Th. Prokopovich was familiar with the ideas of the Czech scientist. There were scientific works of J. A. Comenius in his huge library, in particular, the first in the history of the European educational thought illustrated textbook "The Visible World in Pictures" [4, p. 437].

The textbook by Th. Prokopovich can be viewed as a transitional link in the evolutionary transition from the spelling primers of scholasticism, written in the Church Slavonic language, to the secular textbooks of the Enlightenment, which makes this textbook so meaningful for the history of the national textbook. Among the modern national researchers who study the life and legacy of Th. Prokopovich, the most successful are Petrov L. (Russia), Nichyk V., Ivan'o I. Interesting conclusions are contained in the articles by Ogorodnik I.V., Rusyn M. J., Tryhubenko B. et al. However, the majority of these works, to our mind, do not take into account the Baroque context, which complicates the understanding of the identity of the ideas put forward by the famous educator. The modern research into the scientist's biography produces quite controversial interpretations of his ideological legacy. The description of the Th. Prokopovich's contribution into Ukrainian history sometimes contains invective generalizations, motivated by his laudatory speeches devoted to Peter I, his devotion to Peter's reforms, renunciation of Ivan Mazepa [3, p. 2353]. In general historical studies devoted to the 17th – 18th Centuries, the name of Th. Prokopovich, though mentioned, is not given the deserved prominence among other historical figures. His creative heritage is seen through the lens of his contribution to, almost exclusively, the

development of academia and humanities, such as literature, poetry, and, more rarely, pedagogy [9].

We believe that the personality and, especially, works of Theophan Prokopovich, many of which were found only in the 1970s in the archives by the Ukrainian scientists V. Nichyk, M. Rohovych, V. Litvinov et al., but remained under-analyzed in the context of their educational value, should be thoroughly studied and presented in the history of Ukrainian education of the Baroque period. It will facilitate the establishment of "influences and inter-connections among adjoining epochs" (D. Chizhevsky), genetic relationships between the Ukrainian pedagogical tradition and the European one, and will deepen the knowledge about the Ukrainian contribution to the world culture. The coverage of the period of the 17th – 18th Centuries, the importance of which in history can hardly be overestimated, provides material for the establishment of the positive continuity of ideas in the history of pedagogy as in the uninterrupted continuum (Suhomlinska O.). Based on the scholastic logic and rhetoric, the representatives of the Ukrainian Baroque enriched its cultural heritage with philosophical and literary works, which, taken as a whole, represent the "assimilation energy" of the Baroque cultural tendency, which "unites the diverse" [25, p. 340].

Briefly summarizing the contribution of Th. Prokopovich into the development of the Slavic cultural Baroque, we should note that it lies in spreading and sustaining the ideas of the importance and value of educating people, about the significance of scientific knowledge; of expanding the content of academic education; of writing poetry, which became the basis for further development of syllabic, i.e. innovative as compared to the metric, poetry, which influenced the development of the Ukrainian and Russian poetry; of wide introduction of new forms of poetry; and of the development of textbooks.

A distinctive credo of the thinker, which is relevant for the modern day, can be found in his words addressed to the professors of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy on the occasion of his departure from Ukraine (1716): "One should follow not only the paths

that have been trodden by other scientists, but also sustain independent scientific views, which, creating genuine erudition, form the experts and not the hucksters of science" [9, p. 151].

References

1. **Год Б. В.** Виховання в епоху європейського Відродження (сер. XIV – поч. XVII ст.) / Б. В. Год. – Полтава : АСМІ, 2004. – 464 с.
2. **Горський В. С.** Філософія в українській культурі: (методологія та історія) / В. С. Горський. – К. : Центр практичної філософії, 2001. – 236 с.
3. **Енциклопедія** українознавства / гол. ред. В. Кубійович. – Л. : «Молоде життя», 1970. – Т. 6. – С. 2353 – 2354. – Репринтне перевидання.
4. **Життєпис** Ф. Прокоповича // Прокопович Феофан. Філософські твори : в 3-х т. – К. : Наук. думка, 1981. – Т. 3. – С. 361 – 372.
5. **Каптерев П. О.** Історія русскої педагогії / П. О. Каптерев. – 2-е изд., пересм. и доп. – Петроградъ : Книжный склад «Земля», 1915. – 746 с.
6. **Карамзин Н. М.** История государства Российского / Н. М. Карамзин. – М. : Изд-во Эксмо, 2005. – 1024 с.
7. **Ключевский В. О.** Русская история / В. О. Ключевский. – М. : Изд-во Эксмо, 2005. – 912 с.
8. **Костомаров М. И.** Русская история в жизнеописаниях ее главнейших деятелей / М. И. Костомаров. – М. : Изд-во Эксмо, 2005. – 1024 с.
9. **Микитась В.** Давньоукраїнські студенти і професори / В. Микитась. – К. : Абрис, 1994. – 288 с.
10. **Морозовъ П.** Феофанъ Прокоповичъ какъ писатель / П. Морозовъ. – СПб., 1880. – 281 с.
11. **Мних Р.** Літературно-теоретичні та компаративістичні розвідки Дмитра Чижевського / Р. Мних, З. Петрухіна // Славістика : зб. наук. праць. – Дрогобич : Коло, 2003. – Т. 1. – 446 с.

- 12. Ничик В. М.** Феофан Прокопович / В. М. Ничик. – М. : Мысль, 1977. – 192 с.
- 13. Огієнко І.** Українська культура / І. Огієнко. – К. : Вид-во «Книгарні Є. Череповського», 1918. – 272 с. – Репринтне відтворення 1991.
- 14. Огородник І. В.** Українська філософія в іменах : навч. посіб. / І. В. Огородник, М. Ю. Русин. – К. : Либідь, 1997. – 328 с.
- 15. Покровскій В. И.** Историческая хрестоматія / В. И. Покровскій. – М. : Типографія Э. Лисснера и Ю. Рома, 1894. – Вып. X. – 778 с.
- 16. Прокопович Феофан.** Духовний регламент // Хрестоматія з історії вітчизняної педагогіки / Феофан Прокопович ; за заг. ред. С. А. Литвинова. – К. : Рад. шк., 1961. – С. 70 – 77.
- 17. Прокопович Феофан.** Про риторичне мистецтво / Феофан Прокопович // Прокопович Феофан. Філософські твори : в 3-х т. – К. : Наук. думка, 1980. – Т. II. – С. 101 – 256.
- 18. Рогович М. Д.** Передмова / М. Д. Рогович // Прокопович Феофан. Філософські твори : в 3-х т. – К. : Наук. думка, 1979. – Т. 1. – С. 11 – 17.
- 19. Сірополко С.** Історія освіти в Україні / С. Сірополко. – К. : Наук. думка, 2001. – 912 с.
- 20. Сухомлинська О. В.** Історико-педагогічний процес: нові підходи до загальних проблем / О. В. Сухомлинська. – К. : А. П. Н., 2003. – 68 с.
- 21. Тригубенко В. В.** Освіта і педагогічна думка в Києві за тисячу років / В. В. Тригубенко, Л. С. Нестеренко. – К. : Тов. «Кадри», 2002. – 366 с.
- 22. Тригубенко В.** Прокопович Феофан / В. Тригубенко // Українська педагогіка в персоналіях : у 2 кн. / за ред. О. Сухомлинської. – К. : Либідь, 2005. – Кн. 1. – С. 170 – 179.
- 23. Хижняк З. І.** Історія Києво-Могилянської академії / З. І. Хижняк, В. К. Маньківський. – К. : Вид. дім «КМ Академія», 2003. – 184 с.

24. Чижевський Д. Культурно-історичні епохи / Д. Чижевський // Українське літературне бароко. – К. : Вид-во «Обереги», 2003. – Передрук 1941 – 1944 рр.

25. Чижевський Д. До проблеми бароко / Д. Чижевський // Славістика : зб. наук. пр. – Дрогобич : Коло, 2003. – Т. 1. – 446 с.

26. Чистовичь И. Феофанъ Прокоповичъ и его врѣмя / И. Чистовичъ. – СПб., 1868. – Т. 4. – 605 с.

27. Яковенко Н. Нарис історії України з найдавніших часів до кінця XVIII ст. / Н. Яковенко. Режим доступу : www.history.franko.lviv.ua/Jakovenko.pdf.

Dichek N. P. Ukrainian Educational Baroque Man: Theophan Prokopovich and Education

This article covers the contribution of Theophan Prokopovich, the professor, Rector of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, church reformer, writer, and educator, into the innovative cultural and educational development of the Slavic peoples. A number of conflicting historical and biographical data about him, hypotheses in this regard, and the ambiguity of his actions led to the controversial evaluation and interpretation of the deeds of this historical figure. On the one hand, the ideas of sermons and works of Th. Prokopovich gave rise to the reformist movement and, on the other hand, caused the accusations of heresy and propaganda of Lutheran orthodoxy.

Key words: Theophan Prokopovich, reformer, the Baroque.

Дічек Н. П. Людина доби українського освітнього бароко: Феофан Прокопович і просвітительство

У статті узагальнено новаційний внесок у культурно-освітній розвиток слов'янських народів одного з найвидатніших представників бароко – професора, ректора Києво-Могилянської академії, церковного реформатора, письменника, просвітителя Феофана Прокоповича. Сукупність суперечливих історичних і біографічних відомостей про нього і пов'язаних з цим гіпотез, неоднозначність

його вчинків спричиняють контрастні оцінки й тлумачення діяльності і творчої спадщини цієї історичної особи. Ідеї проповідей та праць Ф. Прокоповича, з одного боку, спричинювали поширення реформаційних настроїв, а з другого – викликали звинувачення в єресі й пропагуванні лютеранського духу від прихильників православ'я.

Ключові слова: Феофан Прокопович, реформатор, бароко.

**Дичек Н. П. Человек эпохи украинского образовательного барокко:
Феофан Прокопович и просветительство**

В статье обобщен новационный вклад в культурно-образовательное развитие славянских народов одного из самых выдающихся представителей барокко – профессора, ректора Киево-Могилянской академии, церковного реформатора, писателя, просветителя Феофана Прокоповича. Совокупность противоречивых исторических и биографических сведений о нем и связанных с этим гипотез, неоднозначность его поступков вызывают контрастные оценки и толкования деятельности и творческого наследия этого исторического лица. Идеи проповедей и трудов Ф. Прокоповича, с одной стороны, вызвали распространение реформаторских настроений, со второй – обвинение в ереси и пропагандировании лютеранского духа от сторонников православия.

Ключевые слова: Феофан Прокопович, реформатор, барокко.

This is to confirm the receipt of the article by the Editorial Office 16.01.2012

This is to confirm that your article has been put into print 27.01.2012