

UDC [378.016:2-475.2](477-25)(09)"18/19"

*Tetiana TVERDOKHLIB, Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences (Ph. D.), a Doctoral Student, Department of General Pedagogy and Pedagogy of Higher School H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University*

## HOMILETICS IN KYIV THEOLOGICAL ACADEMY: SPECIFIC FEATURES OF TEACHING PEDAGOGICALLY ORIENTED DISCIPLINE (THE END OF THE 19<sup>th</sup> CENTURY – THE BEGINNING OF THE 20<sup>th</sup> CENTURY)

*Тетяна ТВЕРДОХЛІБ, кандидат педагогічних наук, докторантка кафедри загальної педагогіки і педагогіки вищої школи, Харківський національний педагогічний університет імені Г. С. Сковороди*

## ГОМІЛЕТИКА В КИЇВСЬКІЙ ДУХОВНІЙ АКАДЕМІЇ: ОСОБЛИВОСТІ НАВЧАННЯ ПЕДАГОГІЧНО ОРІЄНТОВАНОЇ ДИСЦИПЛІНИ (КІНЕЦЬ ХІХ – ПОЧАТОК ХХ СТОЛІТЬ)

Based on the analysis of original sources, the changes in pedagogical component of Homiletics (Church Eloquence) in Kyiv Theological Academy at the end of the 19th century – at the beginning of the 20th century have been revealed in the article. The forms of teaching this discipline have been characterized. They were lectures, practical classes, repetitions, colloquiums, exams, students' independent extra-curriculum work, writing sermons and candidate works. Educational and methodical support of teaching has been determined. The general professional level of Homiletics lecturers (V. Pevnytskyi, M. Grossu, T. Liashchenko (Archimandrite Tikhon)) has been characterized. The article focuses on V. Pevnytskyi's contribution to development of Homiletics as a subject in Kyiv Theological Academy in the period under research.

**Key words:** lecturer, Homiletics, group work, Kyiv Theological Academy, form of teaching, pedagogical component of academic discipline.

**Анотація.** У статті на основі першоджерел висвітлено зміни, які відбулися з педагогічною складовою гомілетики (церковного красномовства) в Київській духовній академії упродовж кінця ХІХ – початку ХХ століть. Розкрито лекції, практичні заняття, репетиції,

колоквіуми, іспити, самостійну позааудиторну роботу студентів, написання проповідей, кандидатських робіт як форми навчання означеної дисципліни. Зазначено про навчально-методичне забезпечення її викладання. Охарактеризовано загальний професійний рівень викладачів церковного красномовства: В. Певницького, М. Гроссу, Т. Лященко (архімандрита Тихона). Акцентовано увагу на внеску В. Певницького у розвиток гомілетики як навчальної дисципліни в Київській духовній академії у досліджуваний період.

**Ключові слова:** викладач, гомілетика, гурткова робота, Київська духовна академія, форма навчання, педагогічний компонент навчальної дисципліни.

The aim of the study is to reveal the specific features of teaching Homiletics in Kyiv Theological Academy as pedagogically oriented discipline at the end of the 19th century – at the beginning of the 20th century.

Formulation of the problem in general terms. In modern conditions of social and economic instability, spiritual crisis, disunity and aggressiveness, the problem of youth and children's spiritual-moral upbringing is of particular importance. Joint activity of school and family in this aspect is not always effective. Spiritual mentors should also be involved in this work. Teaching staff of the educational institution, parents and a pastor of the Orthodox

Church can together oppose the negative trends of development of modern society more effectively, especially youth and children's alienation from morality, enhancement of moral relativism and spiritual fall. It is important for priests at theological educational institutions to get thorough preparation for moral-religious upbringing of congregation. In order to improve this preparation, the historical and pedagogical experience should be used creatively. In particular, the study of the specific feature of teaching Homiletics as pedagogically oriented discipline in Kyiv Theological Academy (KTA) at the end of the 19th century – at the beginning of the 20th century is relevant.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** The historical development of Homiletics as an academic discipline and science was studied by M. Grossu (he studied the activity of V. Pevnytskyi as Homiletics specialist), P. Nikolaievskyi (he investigated Russian sermon in the 15th – 16th centuries), V. Pevnytskyi (he studied the development of Church Eloquence in the Middle Ages and New time), M. Petrov (he investigated Homiletics at KTA before it was reformed in 1819) and G. Chuba (she studied the influence of Protestant Homiletics on the development of Ukrainian church preaching at the end of the 16th – 17th centuries). M. Kataiev, M. Patorzhynskyi, P. Zavediev, A. Razumikhin and other researchers carried

out retrospective studies. The historical review dedicated to Homiletics is also presented in modern textbook for Bachelors of Theology (authored by V. Burega and Archimandrite Simeon (Tomachynskyi)). The analysis of the state of scientific development of the problem gives reason to assert that the problem of teaching Homiletics as pedagogically oriented discipline in Kyiv Theological Academy at the end of the 19th century – at the beginning of the 20th century has not been sufficiently researched.

#### The main material of the study.

During the investigated period, the control over training programs had certain positive influence on the quality of substantive content of Homiletics. Programs on Church Eloquence always satisfied the commissions that monitored them. So, they revealed the subject fully and corresponded to that time level of the scientific development, as well as the tasks and aim of academic teaching.

The analysis of "Program of Readings on Homiletics and History of Preaching for the Third Year Students of Kyiv Theological Academy for the upcoming 1895–1896 academic year" developed by V. Pevnytskyi and the similar document for 1898–1899 academic year [11, p. 90–99; 12, p. 49–52] has shown that about a quarter of the educational material was dedicated to the theory of preaching. Only some themes had pedagogical orientation. They were themes about the essence and content of preaching, orientation of it ("church-biblical character", popularity), compilation, language, peculiarities of pronouncing and improvisation of preaching.

In subsequent years, the program was reconstructed, but the pedagogical component was nearly the same. The problem of relationship between preacher's personality and peculiarities of his preaching activity and the problem of the kinds of church sermons were the only to add [13, p. 52–53; 14, p. 23, 24].

The study of the programs of readings on Homiletics and History of Preaching for 1907–1908, 1909–1910 academic years [15, p. 28–31; 16, p. 7] lets us suggest that M. Grossu, their author, did not change the amount and content of the pedagogical component. It remained the same, as it was in V. Pevnytskyi's programs.

Homiletics programs drawn by T. Liashchenko remained unchanged during all the period of his pedagogical activity. They differed only in the level of detailing the description of the content of the academic discipline. The analysis of the archival materials [17, p. 88–89; 19, p. 92] indicates

very weak pedagogical orientation of the content of the programs, even less than in V. Pevnytskyi and M. Grossu's programs. It is presented in the introduction where the practical tasks of the science are revealed. It is also noted in section "Theory and Practice of Church Preaching" which covers less than 10% of all program. It is specified in the section that the main principles of Church Eloquence and requirements for preaching will be revealed in practical classes. The main part of the programs is dedicated to the history of Homiletics, in which educational orientation of activities of some preachers (for instance, Jesus Christ) is sometimes characterized.

Like during the second half of the 1880s – the first half of the 1890s, successful mastery of the content of Homiletics at KTA during the studied period was due to giving lectures, practical classes, repetitions, colloquiums, exams, students' independent extra-curriculum work, writing sermons, candidate and master's works [1]. Before introduction of the statute of Orthodox theological academies in 1910, lectures in Church Eloquence were given for the third and fourth year students annually [8, p. 409]. The new statute determined that Homiletics lecturer had to teach Pastoral Theology as well. These two subjects were taught by one department. In this case, the document provided that a lecturer had to teach "the first subject giving 5 lectures a week during one year and the second subject giving 5 lectures a week during another year. In both cases, they were lectures for students of two courses" [2, p. 420]. These 5 lectures practically included "three theoretical classes lasting 50 minutes and two practical classes lasting 100 minutes". So, in 1911–1912, 1913–1914, 1915–1916 and 1917–1918 academic years, the third and fourth year students together had 3 lectures in Church Eloquence a week [10, p. 57; 18, p. 92]. Sometimes lectures were combined with practical classes. For instance, the classes on November 29 and December 13, 1902 included analyses of students' sermons and revelation of theoretical material [14, p. 27–33]. After introduction of the statute of 1910, there was no need in such classes any longer, as the statute obliged lecturer to conduct a practical class lasting 100 minutes every week.

In practical classes in Homiletics, lecturers organized the analysis of homiletic works, "led students" in preaching, taught them to read sermon well and gave them opportunities to practice proclaiming sermons learnt by heart and speaking impromptu [2, p. 427]. At the end of the 19th century – at the beginning of the 20th

century, in practical classes the lecturers started to pay more attention to students' proclaiming sermons and their further analysis. While analyzing student's speech, the lecturer paid attention to the content of sermon (its educational orientation), purity of language and future preacher's pedagogical technique [18; 19, p. 92]. So, starting from 1911–1912 academic year, practical classes in Church Eloquence had greater pedagogical component than lectures.

The analysis of original sources [4, p. 58; 10, p. 58] has shown that there were no peculiar changes in writing sermons by students. They had to prepare one sermon every year. It took them a month to write it.

Writing candidate and master's works remained the important form of teaching Homiletics in the period under research. Unfortunately, after V. Pevnytskyi's dismissal, the quantity of KTA students' thesis on Church Eloquence decreased several times. Despite this fact, from 1895–1896 academic year to 1914–1915 academic year, there were more thesis on Church Eloquence than on Pedagogy and Pastoral Theology. These works mainly had pedagogical component, but there were work without it. For instance, M. Khoroshylov's thesis "Russian Church Preaching of the second half of the 19th century in its Struggle against Materialism and Socialism" did not have pedagogical component. The student determined such tasks of his work as: "to collect and combine rich polemical material (against materialism and socialism) and to highlight, if possible, its scientific value" [3, p. 600]. There were three chapters in this thesis. In the first chapter M. Khoroshylov made a brief essay about development of Russian materialism and socialism in the second half of the 19th century. In the second chapter, the author revealed how preachers had struggled against the fundamental principles of materialism, and in the third chapter he described how preachers had shown the falsity of the ideas of socialism. In the second and third chapters, M. Khoroshylov cited the relevant quotations from preaching literature for each question against which the preachers were. The quotations were mainly from sermons of Right Reverend Ambrose Kharkivskyi, Ioann Smolenskyi, Nikanor Khersonskyi, archpriest I. Sergiievskyi, Professor V. Pevnytskyi [3, p. 601–602].

There were some educators' works which had the largest pedagogical component. These were the works of G. Ivanov ("Sermons of Stefan Iavorskyi"), A. Ielchukov ("Feofilakt Rusanov and his

sermons"), M. Golubtsov "St Gregory Palamas and his sermons", I. Paslavskiy ("Peter Chrysologus, Archbishop of Ravenna and his sermons"), O. Sapozhnikov ("Metropolitan Philaret (Amphiteatrov) as a preacher"), A. Simanovich ("Gideon Krinovskiy and his sermons"), Ie. Ergardt ("St Demetrius of Rostov. His homiletic ideas and preaching") and some others. Basically, these chapters, which presented teaching and dogmatic sermons of church leaders, had pedagogical orientation. For instance, in I. Paslavskiy's work, there was pedagogical component in chapters 2, 3 and 4 of the second part which presented teaching and dogmatic sermons and pedagogical skills of Peter Chrysologus while proclaiming a sermon [5]. In O. Sapozhnikov's work, chapters 3 and 4 are pedagogically oriented; the content of teaching and dogmatic sermons is revealed in these chapters [6].

During the second half of the 1880s – the first half of the 1890s, students' independent extra-curriculum work included only reading books on the subject. However, during the period under research, it was diversified. It was due to students' involvement in club work. In April 1904, preaching club started to work at KTA. The main tasks of this club at the initial stage of its functioning were: extension of students' knowledge on the theory and history of Homiletics and preaching the word of God in churches in Kyiv. In order to enrich students' knowledge on Church Eloquence, some members of the club were suggested to give talks at club meetings. For example, during 1908-1909 academic year, four talks were given. The topics of the talks were the following: "About reviving the spirit of preaching", "Homiletic material in St Tikhon Zadonsky's work "Spiritual Treasure Collected from the World", "About influence of Catholicism on the Russian sermon", "Ambrose Kharkivskiy and his "Living word". The organizers of the club asserted that "theoretical foundations, which were determined by means of historical-theoretical study of church preaching, were used by club members in their real sermons" [8, p. 420]. The club members preached in Kyiv churches. For instance, they proclaimed 192 sermons in 1906–1907 academic year and 150 sermons in 1909–1910 academic year [7, 432]. When the club was headed by N. Gross, weekly meetings on Fridays started to be held in order to improve preaching. At these meetings, students who were going to proclaim sermons on Sunday read their sermons. If sermons were not ready, students and a lecturer determined their main ideas, the ways to express them etc.

Starting from 1910–1911 academic year, the tasks of the club narrowed, and the club members were only engaged in preaching in Kyiv churches. It has been found out that they proclaimed 153 sermons in 1912–1913 academic year and 154 sermons in 1914–1915 academic year.

As for the repetitions and colloquiums, it should be noticed that they were not conducted in Homiletics classes in some years. The analysis of the archival materials [14; p. 18] has shown that there were no Homiletics repetitions and colloquiums in 1902–1903 and 1913–1914 academic years. Certainly, it had negative influence on the quality of teaching Homiletics.

As before, no Homiletics textbooks for KTA students were published in the studied period. In order to expand and deepen knowledge gained at lectures, students had an opportunity to use V. Pevnytskyi's numerous works on history and theory of preaching. Also, students could use Church Eloquence textbooks and tutorials published by lecturers of other academies in the second half of the 19th century – at the beginning of the 20th century. There were a lot of these books at KTA library.

Unlike the second half of the 1880s – the first half of the 1890s when Homiletics was taught only by V. Pevnytskyi, in the studied period three mentors taught this subject alternately. V. Pevnytskyi continued his pedagogical activity at Homiletics Department till 1906. Teaching Church Eloquence from 1862, Vasyl Fedorovych Pevnytskyi managed to maintain a high level of teaching this discipline just like it was in times of Ia. Amphiteatrov and N. Favorov. During the studied period, V. Pevnytskyi managed to combine optimally the work of a lecturer, scientist, administrator and scientific advisor of students' research works. Students always respected him and spoke about him and his pedagogical skills with enthusiasm. They told: "The specific features of his lectures in Homiletics were general erudition, deep and subtle analysis, artistic presentation and high enthusiasm. Vasyl Fedorovych both taught theory and history of preaching and proclaimed sermons in churches. Like his lectures, the sermons of Vasyl Fedorovych had elegance of presentation and high inspiration - they were the examples of oratory, attracted general attention and, as a result, the author was called Zlatoust of Kyiv" [9, p. 488].

After V. Pevnytskyi's retirement, M. Grossu, the priest, candidate of theology and a lecturer at Kyiv theological seminary, took the vacant position, according to the decision of KTA Council on 31st August, 1906 [7, p. 403]. In June 1908, he attained the scientific degree of Master of Theology

and took the position of Assistant Professor. Though he succeeded in his own scientific work, he was not able to involve students in writing candidate theses as actively as Vasyl Fedorovych did it. M. Grossu's important achievement was establishment of preaching club at KTA. Gradually, the lecturer gained experience at KTA, and in 1910 he was appointed to the position of Extraordinary Professor. Unfortunately, M. Grossu did not have opportunities to develop as Homiletics lecturer. In 1910 he left the department and started to work at the Department of History of Greek Eastern Church [9, p. 499].

According to the order of the Holy Synod on the 1 of December 1910, T. Liashchenko, the priest, candidate of Theology, was appointed to the post of a lecturer at the Department of Pastoral Theology with Asceticism and Homiletics. He started his pedagogical career at KTA in the position of acting Assistant Professor. When going to the academy during 1905–1909, T. Liashchenko spent much time studying the works of holy fathers and teacher of the church. He dedicated his activity mainly to Patristics when he was professorial scholar in 1909–1910 academic year. In M. Grossu's opinion, due to deep knowledge of heritage of the holy fathers, T. Liashchenko "is able to cope with scientific difficulties" of the Department of Pastoral Theology with Asceticism and Homiletics [3, p. 650]. Timofyi Ivanovych managed to become a part of the department and had great success in teaching Homiletics at KTA up to the date of liquidation of the educational institution in 1919. During this period, he defended master's thesis, acted as acting Assistant Professor and Extraordinary Professor (from 1913). In 1914 T. Liashchenko took monastic vows, got name Tikhon and was elevated to the rank of Archimandrite. So, he became the only monk who taught Homiletics at KTA. Adoption of monasticism made it possible for Tikhon to take the post of inspector of the academy in 1914. From this moment, he combined administrative work with teaching activity [10, p. 31; 19].

**Conclusion and perspectives of further research.** So, at the end of the 19th century – at the beginning of the 20th century, Homiletics at KTA was an important subject which provided students' training for moral-religious upbringing of congregation. The peculiarity of the content of this academic discipline was significant reduction in pedagogical component that was presented at lectures. Homiletics practical classes had greater pedagogical component than lectures. The innovation

of the studied period was students' involvement in club work, which provided gaining experience in preaching the word of God and contributed to the expansion of students' knowledge on theory and history of Church Eloquence. The other peculiarities of development of Homiletics in the studied period were: infrequent use of repetitions and colloquiums as forms of control over students' educational activity, lack of Homiletics textbooks for KTA students, reduction of quantity of theses on Church Eloquence after V. Pevnytskyi's retirement, teaching this subject by the monk. The perspective topic of further research may be the study of the content of seminarians' training for moral-religious upbringing of congregation at the end of the 19th century – at the beginning of the 20th century.

## ЛІТЕРАТУРА

1. Высочайше утвержденный устав православных духовных академий. 1884. Полное Собрание Законов Российской Империи: Собр. 3 (1.03. 1881–1913). СПб.: Гос. тип. Т. 4: 1884. С. 232–243.

2. Высочайше утвержденный устав православных духовных академий. 1910. // Полное Собрание Законов Российской Империи: Собр. 3 (1881–1913). СПб, 1913. Т. 30: Отделение 1. 1910. С. 414–431.

3. Извлечение из журналов Совета Киевской духовной академии за 1909–1910 учебный год. *Труды Киевской духовной академии*. 1911. № 1. С. 593–639.

4. Извлечение из протоколов Совета Киевской духовной академии 1, 3, 26 сентября 1897 года // *Труды Киевской духовной академии*. 1898. Т. 2. С. 33–64.

5. Інститут рукописів Національної бібліотеки України ім. В. І. Вернадського. Ф. 304. Спр. 1865. 1905. 185 с.

6. ІР НБУВ. Ф. 304. Спр. 1916. 1906. 155 с.

7. Отчет о состоянии Киевской духовной академии за 1906–1907 учебный год. *Труды Киевской духовной академии*. 1907. № 11. С. 396–438.

8. Отчет о состоянии Киевской духовной академии за 1907–1908 учебный год. *Труды Киевской духовной академии*. 1908. № 11. С. 390–426.

9. Отчет о состоянии Киевской духовной академии за 1910–1911 учебный год. *Труды Киевской духовной академии*. 1911. № 11. С. 479–533.

10. Отчет о состоянии Киевской духовной академии за 1911–1912 учебный год. *Труды Киевской духовной академии*. 1913. № 1. С. 1–75.

11. Центральний державний історичний архів України м. Київ (ЦДІАК України). Ф. 711. Оп. 3. Спр. 2304. 236 арк.

12. ЦДІАК України. Ф. 711. Оп. 3. Спр. 2469. 152 арк.

13. ЦДІАК України. Ф. 711. Оп. 3. Спр. 2722. 144 арк.

14. ЦДІАК України. Ф. 711. Оп. 3. Спр. 2760. 75 арк.

15. ЦДІАК України. Ф. 711. Оп. 3. Спр. 2983. 109 арк.

16. ЦДІАК України. Ф. 711. Оп. 3. Спр. 3188. Программы преподавания в академии на 1909–1911 учебный год. 1909–1918 годы. 136 арк.

17. ЦДІАК України. Ф. 711. Оп. 3. Спр. 3398. 128 арк.

18. ЦДІАК України. Ф. 711. Оп. 3. Спр. 3747. 61 арк.

19. ЦДІАК України. Ф. 711. Оп. 3. Спр. 3836. 113 арк.

20. Pastushenko L. Kyiv Theological Academy Professors at the Beginning of the 20th Century: At the Intersection of Cultures. *Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal*. 2018. № 5. P. 97–116. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.18523/kmhj150407.2018-5.97-116>

## REFERENCES

1. Approved by Emperor Statute of the Orthodox Theological Academies. 1884 // *Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossijskoj Imperii: Sobranie tret'e* (1.03.1881 – 1913 gg.). SPb. T. 4: 1884. S. 232–243.

2. Approved by Emperor Statute of the Orthodox Theological Academies. (1910) // *Polnoe Sobranie Zakonov Rossijskoj Imperii: Sobranie tret'e* (1881–1913 gg.). SPb. T. 30: Otdelenie 1. 1910. S. 414–431.

3. Extract from registers of the Council of Kiev Theological Academy for the 1909-1910 academic year // *Trudy Kievskoj duhovnoj akademii*. 1911. № 1. S. 593–639.

4. Extract from registers of the Council of Kiev Theological Academy September 1, 3 and 26, 1897 // *Trudy Kievskoj duhovnoj akademii*. 1898. T. 2. S. 33–64.

5. Institute of Manuscripts of Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine, fund 304, file 1865, Paslavskyi Ivan. Peter Chrysologus, Archbishop of Ravenna and his sermons, 1905 year, 185 p.

6. Institute of Manuscripts of Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine, fund 304, file 1916, Sapozhnikov Aleksandr. Metropolitan Filaret (Amphiteatrov), as a preacher, 1906 year, 155 p.

7. Report on the state of Kyiv Theological Academy in 1906–1907 academic year // *Trudy Kievskoj duhovnoj akademii*. 1907. № 11. S. 396–438.

8. Report on the state of Kyiv

Theological Academy in 1907–1908 academic year // *Trudy Kievskoj duhovnoj akademii*. 1908. № 11. S. 390–426.

9. Report on the state of Kyiv Theological Academy in 1910–1911 academic year // *Trudy Kievskoj duhovnoj akademii*. 1911. № 11. S. 479–533.

10. Report on the state of Kyiv Theological Academy in 1911-1912 academic year // *Trudy Kievskoj duhovnoj akademii*. 1913. № 1. S. 1–75.

11. Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv, fund 711, inventory 3, file 2304, Teaching programs in Academy for 1895–1896 academic year, 236 ark.

12. Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv, fund 711, inventory 3, file 2469, Teaching programs in Academy for 1898–1898 academic year. April 26, 1899 – November 17, 1899, 152 ark.

13. Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv, fund 711, inventory 3, file 2722, Teaching programs in Academy for 1902–1903 academic year. January 7, 1903 – October 1, 1903, 144 ark.

14. Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv, fund 711, inventory 3, file 2760, Class register of the third year students on all subjects for 1902–1903 academic year, 75 ark.

15. Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv, fund 711, inventory 3, file 2983, Teaching programs in Academy for 1907–1908 academic year. April 26 – December 31, 1908, 109 ark.

16. Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv, fund 711, inventory 3, file 3188, Teaching programs in Academy for 1909–1911 academic year. 1909–1918, 136 ark.

17. Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv, fund 711, inventory 3, file 3398, Programs of the academic course. April 26 – December 17, 1911, 128 ark.

18. Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv, fund 711, inventory 3, file 3747, Class register of the fourth year students on compulsory subjects for 1913–1914 academic year. September 9, 1913 – March, 26, 1914, 61 ark.

19. Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv, fund 711, inventory 3, file 3836, Programs of the academic course for 1915–1916 academic year. March 7, 1915 – March 4, 1916, 113 ark.

20. Pastushenko L. Kyiv Theological Academy Professors at the Beginning of the 20th Century: At the Intersection of Cultures / L. Pastushenko // *Kyiv-Mohyla Humanities Journal*, 2018. № 5. P. 97–116. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.18523/kmhj150407.2018-5.97-116>

Стаття надійшла 16.03.2019 р.

