

DEVELOPMENT OF PEDAGOGICAL EDUCATION IN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES IN THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE IN 1866-1884 (ON THE MATERIALS OF THE UKRAINIAN GUBERNIAS)

Tetiana TVERDOKHLIB

H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University, UKRAINE

Abstract. The article is focused on a specific aspect of history of men's secondary schools of the Orthodox Church – theological seminaries, which functioned in the Ukrainian gubernias of the Russian Empire. Organization of pedagogical education in theological seminaries is established to be a prerequisite for successful teaching activity of their graduates. The paper reveals the content of pedagogical education in theological seminaries, knowledge, skills and abilities that students attained there within 1866-1884. The paper focuses on arranging seminarians' teaching practice at daily, holiday and Sunday schools. The paper identifies the forms and methods of pedagogical education and requirements set up by the Holy Synod for organization of educational process in secondary theological educational institutions. The paper reveals the specific features of staffing and teaching and methodological support for teaching Pedagogy and concludes about the advantages and disadvantages of pedagogical

education in theological seminaries and the level of pedagogical education compared to classical gymnasia.

Keywords: theological seminary; pedagogy; pedagogical education; the Orthodox Church; Ukrainian gubernia of the Russian Empire; teaching practice

Introduction

There were Kyiv, Volyn, Kharkiv, Poltava, Podillia, Odesa, Tavria (since 1869), Katerynoslav and Chernihiv theological seminaries in the Ukrainian gubernias of the Russian Empire during the period under research. These educational institutions had the status of secondary theological educational institutions and were subordinated to the Holy Synod and prepared the youth for the ministry of the Orthodox Church. Both Ukrainians and foreigners attained theological education in the seminaries. Some theological seminaries were of international importance. Traditionally, many citizens of other countries studied in Odesa and Kyiv theological seminaries (Fedorchuk, 2005; Putro & Putro, 2011). For instance, 15 Bulgarians studied in Kyiv theological seminary in 1878 (CSHA, 1878).

Graduates of theological seminaries were mainly appointed to positions of priests and teachers (Statute, 1867). Priests carried out compulsory supervision of religious-moral bringing-up in educational institutions, had the exclusive right to teach God's Law and could teach other subjects at primary school with the permission of the inspector of public schools. Taking into account broad pedagogical activity of Orthodox clergy, they needed pedagogical education in addition to theological one. In 1866 the order of the Holy Synod introduced teaching Pedagogy instead of medicine, agriculture and natural history and organized Sunday schools "for students' practical acquaintance with pedagogical techniques" (Order, 1866; CSHA, 1866a). The new statute of Orthodox theo-

logical seminaries from 1867 also provided teaching Pedagogy, and they functioned according to this statute until 1884. The quality of future priests' pedagogical education largely determined the effectiveness of their teaching activity that is why the study of the content, forms, methods, staffing and teaching and methodological support of teaching Pedagogy by seminarians is of scientific interest.

The problem of pedagogical training in theological seminaries in the Ukrainian gubernias in the Russian Empire in 1866-1884 is little studied. Due to the investigation of it, the conditions for implementation of valuable experience on organization of pedagogical education in theological seminaries of the studied period in modern theological school will be created. In today's reality it is also useful to take into account the disadvantages which were inherent in pedagogical training in secondary theological educational institutions in 1866-1884.

This study is based on information gained from different sources of four kinds. They are: regulatory documents published in theological periodicals; seminary teachers and students' publications which described pedagogical education in certain secondary theological educational institutions in certain years of the period under research; archive materials (order of the Holy Synod, status report of the Kyiv theology seminary, Pedagogy teaching program); pedagogical and historical articles dated the second half of the 19th century; modern historical works on the research topic. Due to analytical processing of wide source base, the reliability and validity of scientific statements and conclusions formulated as a result of the research and presented in the paper are provided.

Content of pedagogical education in theological seminaries

At secondary theological educational institutions, the content of education was determined by the Holy Synod. The training programs in all subjects were developed, and they were compulsory for seminaries of the Russian Empire (About the State, 1878; Excerpt, 1869; Statute, 1867, Holy, 1867). Teaching Pedagogy was carried out according to two programs. The first program was

introduced in 1866, and according to it, seminarians had to learn that the purpose of education in broad pedagogical sense is “to bring up a person who is renewed by the grace of God and to make a man of the previous formation disappear” (CSHA, 1866b). Thus, the nearest practical purpose of education was balanced development of all forces of a pupil. Training course on the program was divided into two equivalent parts: theory of upbringing and theory of learning. The former was general and special doctrine of upbringing. The general doctrine included information about special features of upbringing of children at different age periods, teacher’s authority, children’s individual peculiarities, requirements, supervision and example as methods of upbringing, discipline. The special doctrine revealed the directions of upbringing, namely: physical, intellectual (formation of cognitive abilities), aesthetic (upbringing of heart), moral (formation of will) and religious upbringing. It was emphasized that moral and religious upbringing complemented each other and were inseparable, as “religious upbringing is inseparable from moral upbringing like the good is inseparable from the sacred” (CSHA,1866b).

The program part dedicated to didactics (theory of learning) was broad as well. It should be noted that there were some contradictions in it. For instance, the purpose of learning was determined at the beginning of this part and it was confined to providing children with information. Despite this, the necessity of upbringing function of it was substantiated further in the program, and the peculiarities of learning process and teacher’s personal characteristics, which had to provide interconnection of learning and upbringing, were determined. It is important that the program also described the methods of learning. There were two groups of them, namely: methods that coincide with the methods of science and special-pedagogical methods. The first group of methods included analysis and synthesis. The second group of methods included visual instruction, repetition, exercises, questions, tasks, exams. Moreover, the program depicted the specific features of organization of primary school and methods of teaching subjects in it. Special focus was on teaching God’s Law. The program determined

the aim of teaching this subject which had to provide for “not only knowledge but also moral spiritual strengthening and improving of pupils, confession of faith with mouth and heart” (CSHA, 1866b). The second program was developed some time later after introduction of the statute of theological seminaries in 1867. By this program, in the seminaries, reformed according to the new statute, the training course called Pedagogy and Didactics was taught. In comparison with the previous program, the part dedicated to the theory of upbringing was significantly reduced, and the authors of the program focused mainly on didactics. The purpose of the training course was “through teaching didactics, the most significant part of pedagogy, to familiarize the seminarians with new learning methods that are the easiest for both teachers and pupils, for teaching peasant children” (K-skiy, 1876). Though there were new program themes concerning home and national upbringing, they should have been studied briefly. The document also noted that only “general concepts about physical, intellectual, aesthetic, moral and religious upbringing” should have been studied, determining the tasks of upbringing “in all mentioned directions” (K-skiy, 1876). The previous program provided almost one third of the training course for studying them. The material dedicated to didactics almost did not change, but it was restructured in some places.

Besides knowledge, seminarians acquired practical skills in pedagogy, as starting from 1866, a school was established at every secondary theological educational institution (Dmitrevskiy, 1871a; Ekzempliarskiy, 1866; Fedorenko, 2008; Kudrinovskiy, 1867; CSHA, 1866a). These schools continued their activity even after introduction of the new statute of theological seminaries in 1867, though they were not mentioned in this document (Dmitrevskiy, 1871a; Istomin, 1869; Myropolskyi, 1870; Statute, 1867). There were Sunday, holiday and even daily schools (in Kharkiv and Chernihiv) on the territory of Ukraine during the studied period (Excerpt, 1869). Both children and adults went to these educational institutions. In general, they studied writing, reading, God’s Law, arithmetic and church singing. If adults were literate, their education was directed to

religious education. At the end of the investigated period, nearly all schools at seminaries were converted into Sunday schools, where mostly boys between the ages of eight to fifteen gained knowledge (Istomin, 1869; Addition, 1867; Meshkovaya, 2004). Due to these educational institutions, the educational level of the poorest city people increased. However, the main mission of these institutions was to give opportunities to seminarians to have teaching practice.

The idea of organizing teaching practice of students of secondary theological educational institutions was new, that is why during the second half of the 1860s and the first half of the 1880s the search for optimal forms and methods of organization of teaching practice was conducted. The analysis of sources, where the experience of Kharkiv, Chernihiv, Poltava, Kyiv and other seminaries is given, suggests that seminarians were involved in individual work with schoolchildren and conducting classes in micro-groups of 2-3 children at the beginning of the studied period (Ekzempliarskiy, 1866; Note. 1883; Sunday School, 1866; Addition, 1867; Meshkovaya, 2004; Present State, 1867; About the State, 1868). Starting from the middle of the 1870s, mass forms of educational work prevailed at most schools at secondary theological educational institutions and seminarians began to conduct lessons.

In the aspect of transformation of forms and methods of organization of seminarians' teaching practice, the experience of primary school for boys in Chernihiv theological seminary is indicative. In the first years of the school, when it functioned as a daily school, all seminarians were divided into groups, and all groups had individual classes on particular subjects. Ideally, a trainee had to visit different groups and gain experience in teaching all subjects. In practice, seminarians had opportunity to teach not all subjects (Dmitrevskiy, 1871b, Dmitrevskiy, 1872; Project, 1867; Holiday, 1867; Excerpt, 1869). Gradually, forms and methods of organization of teaching practice diversified and improved. In 1874-1875, when a daily school was converted to Sunday school, all seminarians conducted lessons in various subjects, took part in discussions of other trainees' classes, kept a book of observations for children's behaviour.

Great importance was attached to the formation of seminarians' habit to prepare properly for conducting lessons (Dmitrevskiy, 1876a;1876b;1876c;1876d).

It was difficult for Pedagogy teachers to organize seminarians' teaching practice. In the first years of the studied period, there were a lot of failures and shortcomings, and the effectiveness of such schools was often overestimated. Gradually, most seminaries managed to create conditions under which all seminarians were able to gain experience in teaching all subjects of primary school. Conducting individual, group classes and lessons were considered to be the most widespread forms of teaching practice (Belenkiy, 1869; A Few More, 1867; Report, 1869).

Unfortunately, Sunday primary school could give neither full initial education to children nor sufficient opportunities for formation of pedagogical skills and abilities to seminarians of secondary theological educational institutions. Nevertheless, the fact that seminarians had teaching practice was already an achievement. Starting from the middle of the 1870s, many people told that seminarians were the best teachers of public Schools (Meshkovaya, 2004).

So, the content of pedagogical education in Orthodox theological seminaries was unified and determined by the programs. At these educational institutions, there was a tendency to limit the scope of educational material concerning the theory of upbringing and expanding the scope of educational material concerning didactics. Providing opportunities for seminarians to have teaching practice was an important achievement for men's secondary educational institutions of the Orthodox Church. In spite of all shortcomings in organization of teaching practice, most graduates of these educational institutions had certain pedagogical skills and abilities.

Forms and methods of pedagogical education

The main forms and methods of teaching Pedagogy in seminaries were lessons, homework, oral presentation and talks. During the investigated period, the activity of the Holy Synod and Educational Committee, which existed at it,

was aimed at increasing their effectiveness, the best adaptation to age peculiarities of students of secondary theological educational institutions. Replacing lectures with lessons was one of the most important steps in this regard. Before the introduction of the statute in 1867, seminarians had two-hour lectures and 75-minute lessons after them. During the investigated period, there was a tendency towards reducing the duration of classes at secondary theological educational institutions, and this tendency could be observed further (Tverdokhlib, 2016). The statute enshrined the main requirement for all lessons in seminary: “they should promote proper development of natural abilities and provoke child’s mental activity so that his memory was not burdened without need and did not take anything without mind” (Statute, 1867). The orders and instructions, appeals from the Chief Procurator to the Holy Synod were made in order to overcome the spread of cramming and dictating in the mentioned educational institutions and to promote seminarians’ intellectual development (Excerpt, 1869; Holy, 1868; School, 1869).

Based on the analysis of primary sources and sources of literature, we can assert that from 1866 to the reformation of seminaries according to the new statute, there was only one Pedagogy class a week for two and a half academic years (Fedorchuk, 2005; Fedorenko, 2008; CSHA, 1866a; Meshkovaya, 2004; Statute, 1867). The statute provided one Pedagogy class a week for students of form 5 and form 6. Under pressure from the Holy Synod and administration of secondary theological educational institutions, Pedagogy teachers tried to avoid oral presentations and catechetical talks in classes, though it was difficult taking into account seminary traditions. They sought to make optimum use of “narrative” method, catechetical and heuristic talks.

Seminarians’ homework included reading additional pedagogical literature. Teacher often recommended seminarians to read articles about the necessity of teacher self-education, works on school administration and methods of teaching subjects at primary school (Dmitrevskiy, 1876a).

Examinations and repetitions were the main forms of control in seminaries. Repetitions were not described in the statute that is why they were not spread at the beginning of the investigated period. The assessment of educational achievements of students of secondary theological educational institutions caused a lot of difficulties, as the activity of each seminarian should have been assessed every month (Seminary, 1872). Pedagogy teachers were in a particularly difficult situation. They had to assess objectively the educational work of all seminarians in a form for 4-5 classes. There were about 55 seminarians in a form, as this number of senior class seminarians was determined by the statute (Statute, 1867). Then, the points for these monthly attestations were added and the grade was scored. This grade should have been considered at exams. Such system of control was unreasoned, so teachers of educational institutions of the Orthodox Church criticized monthly attestations. They were replaced with repetition system. According to it, there were no time limits but students were offered “to start general repetition at the end of learning the significant part of science” (Indication, 1871). With the aim of control, revision and systematization of knowledge, individual or group talks on certain topics were held at repetitions.

Unlike the first half of the 19th century, when examinations were held in seminaries twice a year, during the period under investigation teachers commissions organized examinations once a year (at the end of academic year). The rules for examinations were made by administration of each seminary and approved by the diocesan bishop (Statute, 1867). These rules were alike at different secondary theological educational institutions, so let us consider the rules that were made by pedagogical meeting of Board of Podillia theological seminary. The analysis of primary sources indicates that Pedagogy Examination Commission, like examination commissions on other subjects, included teacher of subject (Pedagogy) and two other teachers (Exam Schedule, 1871; Rules, 1871; 1873). A student had to answer the questions of examination card after thinking a while. Having listened to the student answer, teachers had the right

to ask additional questions. A student usually had to answer the questions of one examination card, but if he did not answer them, he could take another examination card. There were some students who “were known for their inequality in knowledge in classes during academic year”, and if they showed good knowledge on questions of examination card, they were also asked questions of additional examination cards (Rules, 1873). According to the results of the exam, students could get a grade on a scale: grade “5” meant excellent result, grade “4” meant very good result, grade “3” meant good result, grade “2” meant satisfactory result and grade “1” meant poor result. Certain students who got unsatisfactory results had an opportunity to retake the examination.

Apparently, lessons and homework were the main forms of teaching Pedagogy in theological seminaries. As for the methods of education, they were confined to oral presentation and different kinds of talks. Besides, examinations and repetitions were held with the aim of control and assessment. The requirements of the Holy Synod, prevalence of repetitions and heuristic talks contributed to the fact that pedagogical process at men’s secondary educational institutions of the Orthodox Church was based on the principle of awareness, activeness and independence in the process of acquisition of knowledge, the principle of durability of mastering knowledge, skills and abilities, the principle of systematicity in learning.

Teaching and methodic literature on pedagogy

Besides forms and methods, the quality of teaching and methodic literature influenced the effectiveness of teaching Pedagogy at theological educational institutions. The situation with teaching and methodological support for teaching Pedagogy was difficult in seminaries. During the studied period, a textbook, which would have fully correspond to the program and been recommended by the Educational Committee at the Holy Synod, was not published (K-skiy, 1876). Such situation could have sad consequences for students of sec-

ondary educational institutions. Even though “Guidelines for Primary Education” by M. Zaitsev, I. Malyshevskiy and I. Ekzempliarskiy corresponded to the seminary program in Pedagogy (1866), it was published only in 1869 and got into consideration of the Educational Committee in 1870, when a new program had already been introduced. In spite of certain disadvantages, this work was highly estimated and recommended as a schoolbook on pedagogy and didactics (Excerpt, 1871; Holy, 1871b).

Besides the work of M. Zaitsev, I. Malyshevskiy and I. Ekzempliarskiy, the Educational Committee at the Holy Synod also recommended to use other books as schoolbooks. Among them, there were: “Course of General Pedagogy with Supplements” by P. Iurkevych (1869), “Essay on the Main Practical Positions of Pedagogy, Didactics and Methods, Applied to Subjects of Primary Education” by P. Roshchin (1873). These books were at seminary libraries, but they did not correspond to Pedagogy program in seminaries and were not intended for them (Report, 1870; Holy, 1871a; Holy, 1874).

We should also mention the work called “Course of Pedagogy, Didactics and Methods” by V. Tihomirov. This work appeared at the beginning of the 1880s and was intended for seminaries. Its content fully corresponded to the educational program. V. Tihomirov submitted his work for consideration to the Educational Committee at the Holy Synod twice, but the Committee was not satisfied with its quality. The Committee imposed such requirements to textbooks as simplicity, accessibility and sequence of presentation, scientific character and objectivity of educational material, availability of different examples. Even the second review on “Course of Pedagogy, Didactics and Methods” given by the Educational Committee noted the difficulty of presenting information in certain places and the existence of unreasonable and controversial statements. Taking into account all the disadvantages, V. Tihomirov’s work was recommended as a manual for theological seminaries, not as a textbook (About Book, 1883; Holy, 1881).

It should be noted that both theological educational institutions and secular educational institutions had problems with educational literature of low quality. There was almost no experience in creation of high-quality textbooks in the Russian Empire. The example of S. Meshkovaia can prove this. In 1864, under conditions of reformation of secular educational institutions, a contest for compilation of textbooks for primary education was announced. Among 48 works submitted to the contest, there was no work considered as satisfied or deemed to meet the necessary criteria (Meshkovaya, 2004).

In the absence of textbooks, Pedagogy teachers in seminaries prepared their own notes of lessons, analyzing schoolbooks, monographs and journal articles. In order not to return to dictating in classes in seminaries, the Holy Synod allowed to use teachers' lithographed notes on the subjects that were not provided with textbooks. Previously, such notes were submitted for consideration to the rector of secondary theological educational institution, and he gave permission for lithography (School, 1869; Meshkovaya, 2004).

Apparently, in 1866-1884 at secondary theological educational institutions, teaching Pedagogy was organized using manuals developed both for seminaries and for secular educational institutions. The Educational Committee at the Holy Synod worked hard at increasing the quality of teaching and methodic literature and rejected questionable manuals. Despite the efforts, Pedagogy textbook for seminaries was not published within the period under investigation.

Staffing of pedagogical education

In development of Pedagogy as a new subject in theological seminaries, a significant role was assigned to pedagogical cadres. The increase of teachers' professional level was noted during the studied period. In our opinion, the main reason for it was the organization of training for teaching activity at theological academies, increasing the requirements for applicants for positions of teachers at secondary theological educational institutions. According to Chapter 6 "On Teachers" of a new statute of Orthodox theological seminaries, an applicant for

position of seminary teacher should have had not only Master's degree or a degree of candidate of theological academy but a compulsory preliminary test "with three trial lessons on relevant subjects" (Statute, 1867). Sometimes worthy academy graduates who had not managed to attain the degree for some reasons were allowed to teach (Statute, 1867).

Pedagogy teacher was one of the busiest teachers in seminaries. During the period before the transformation of secondary theological educational institutions under the new statute, Pedagogy teacher had to teach Pedagogy to seminarians, organize their teaching practice and manage a school at seminary. After reformation of seminaries he also had to teach Psychology and review of philosophies (CSHA, 1866a; Statute, 1867). In the absence of Pedagogy textbook, he had to make own notes of the subject. In most cases Pedagogy notes were of high quality and rectors allowed their lithography. For instance, such situation was with M. Strahov's lectures in Kharkiv seminary.

Pedagogy teachers often had a duty not only to teach in secondary theological educational institution and organize teaching practice but to arrange the whole educational process in school at seminary and even to act as a primary school teacher. Not all teachers could cope with such a load especially when salary was lower than in gymnasiums. Thus, in Chernihiv theological seminary in the period from September 1867 to October 15, 1869, Pedagogy teachers were constantly changing: the rector of the seminary, archimandrite Ievgeniy, taught Pedagogy from September 1866 to February 1867, then D. Lebediev taught Pedagogy from February 1867 to February 1868, then again the rector taught Pedagogy from February 1868 to February 1869 and N. Dokuchaiev taught Pedagogy from February to October 1869 (Dmitrevskiy, 1871b). So, Pedagogy teachers' great round of duties, besides teaching Pedagogy, made it impossible to random people to teach it. All who did not have pedagogical vocation quickly gave up teaching, and only real professionals were left. Such pedagogues as I. Ekzempliarskiy, H. Istomin, S. Myropolskiy, M. Strahov and others were among these professionals.

So, organization of training for teaching activity and increasing the requirement for applicants for the positions of teachers in seminaries were the main factors that contributed to the enhancement of professionalism of pedagogy teachers. At the same time, low pay and much workload of Pedagogy teacher were obstacles to attracting competent pedagogues to teaching Pedagogy in secondary educational institutions of the Orthodox Church.

Conclusion

So, the results of the scientific research have shown that the content of pedagogical education in theological seminaries in the studied period included mainly knowledge on the theories of upbringing and training, methods of teaching subjects of primary school, as well as skills and abilities to make notes of lessons, conduct individual and group classes and lessons. The basic forms and methods of teaching Pedagogy in theological seminaries were mainly lessons, homework, oral presentation and different kinds of talks. Examinations and repetitions were held in order to control and assess seminarians' achievements. Based on the analysis of the essence of certain forms and methods of pedagogical education and peculiarities of their implementation, it has been proved that secondary theological seminaries arranged their activity, complying with the principle of awareness, activeness and independence in the process of acquisition of knowledge, the principle of systematicity in learning, the principle of durability of mastering knowledge, skills and abilities and the principle of connection of learning with practice.

Increasing the Holy Synod's requirements for quality of educational process in theological seminaries, the growth of teachers' professionalism and introduction of teaching practice promoted the development of pedagogical education in these educational institutions. However, low salaries of teaching staff in theological seminaries, low quality on teaching and methodic literature on Pedagogy, the limitations of seminarians' teaching practice from 1866 to the middle of the 1870s, insufficient financing of schools at secondary theological

educational institutions influenced the effectiveness of pedagogical training negatively. The determined disadvantages indicated the low level of pedagogical training in theological seminaries that functioned in the Ukrainian gubernias of the Russian Empire in 1866-1884. It was the initial stage of development of pedagogical education when the experience was gained, the mistakes were analyzed and specific measures and steps, which had to be realized to ensure the quality of pedagogical education in future, were determined.

However, introduction of Pedagogy and teaching practice in seminaries led to the fact that secondary theological educational institutions in organization of pedagogical education were far ahead of men's classical gymnasiums – secular educational institutions, which in many respects were the model of reformation of men's secondary theological educational institutions in 1867. Pedagogy was not taught in these gymnasiums though their graduates were also involved in pedagogical activity.

REFERENCES

- About Book [About book “Course of Pedagogy, Didactics and Methods” by Tihomirov, Journal of the Educational Committee about the Mentioned Book]. (1883). *Hersonskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti*, 5, 161-171 [In Russian].
- About the State [About the state of the seminary and theological schools in Poltava Diocese according to the excerpt form the report of Ober-Procurator of the Holy Synod, Earl D.A. Tolstoy, on the Department of Orthodox Confession in 1876]. (1878). *Poltavskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel neofitsialnyi*, 7, 353-358 [In Russian].
- About the State [About the state of Sunday school at Poltava seminary]. (1868). *Poltavskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel neofitsialnyi*, 4, 111-120 [In Russian].

- Addiction [Addition to the previous information about Sunday school at Kyiv seminary]. (1867). *Kievskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel vtoroi, 19*, 592-602 [In Russian].
- A Few More [A few more words about Sunday school at Kyiv seminary]. (1867). *Kievskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel vtoroi, 3*, 90-100 [In Russian].
- Belenkiy, T. (1869). Report on classes at Sunday school of Poltava seminary *Poltavskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel neofitsialnyi, 21*, 579-597 [In Russian].
- CSHA [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv]. (1866a). Case on termination of teaching medicine, agriculture and natural history and on introduction of pedagogy and Sunday school. File 141, inventory 3, fund 712 [In Russian].
- CSHA [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv]. (1866b). Appeal of Theological-Educational Board at the Holy Synod with the program for teaching pedagogy in seminaries. File 114, inventory 3, fund 712 [In Russian].
- CSHA [Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine, Kyiv]. (1878). On report about training and upbringing work in Kyiv theological seminary and schools for the 1877-1878 academic year. File 80, inventory 3, fund 712 [In Russian].
- Dmitrevskiy, F. (1871a). Sunday school at Chernihiv theological seminary (brief essay on the past). *Chernigovskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Chast neofitsialnaia, 21*, 585-590 [In Russian].
- Dmitrevskiy, F. (1871b). Sunday school at Chernihiv theological seminary (brief essay on the past). *Chernigovskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Chast neofitsialnaia, 23*, 622-633 [In Russian].
- Dmitrevskiy, F. (1872). Sunday school at Chernihiv theological seminary (brief essay on the past). *Chernigovskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Chast neofitsialnaia, 4*, 45-55 [In Russian].

- Dmitrevskiy, F. (1876a). Information about Sunday school at Chernihiv theological seminary for 1874-1875 academic year. *Chernigovskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Chast neofitsialnaia*, 2, 45-56 [In Russian].
- Dmitrevskiy, F. (1876b). Information about Sunday school at Chernihiv theological seminary for 1874-1875 academic year. *Chernigovskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Chast neofitsialnaia*, 4, 114-121 [In Russian].
- Dmitrevskiy, F. (1876c). Information about Sunday school at Chernihiv theological seminary for 1874-1875 academic year. *Chernigovskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Chast neofitsialnaia*, 5, 148-153 [In Russian].
- Dmitrevskiy, F. (1876d). Information about Sunday school at Chernihiv theological seminary for 1874-1875 academic year. *Chernigovskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Chast neofitsialnaia*, 6, 175-182 [In Russian].
- Excerpt [Excerpt from the report of Ober-Procurator of the Holy Synod, Earl Tolstoy, on the Department of Orthodox Confession in 1867]. (1869). *Volynskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Chast neofitsialnaia*, 17, 680-699 [In Russian].
- Excerpt [Excerpt no. 44, dated March 23, 1870, from the Journal of the Educational Committee at the Holy Synod]. (1871). *Podolskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel ofitsialnyi*, 5, 95-104.
- Exam Schedule [Exam schedule for students of Podillia theological seminary for 1870-1871 academic year]. (1871). Exam schedule was drawn up at pedagogical meeting of administration of Podillia theological seminary and approved by Reverend Leontiy, Bishop of Podillia and Bratslav. *Podolskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel ofitsialnyi*, 9, 206-212 [In Russian].
- Ekzempliarskiy, I. (1866). About establishing pedagogy class and Sunday school at Kyiv seminary. *Kievskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel vtoroi*, 20, 619-626 [In Russian].

- Fedorchuk, O.O. (2005). *The development of the orthodox culture in the South of Ukraine (the end of the 18th century – the beginning of the 20th: thesis*. Donetsk: University of Donetsk [In Ukrainian].
- Fedorenko, S. (2008). Special features of organization of educational process in secondary theological institutions in the 19th century – at the beginning of the 20th century (experience of Poltava seminary). *Lavrskiyi almanakh: Kyievo-Pecherska lavra v konteksti ukrainskoi istorii ta kultury*, 22, 78-84 [In Ukrainian].
- Holiday [Holiday and Daily schools at Chernihiv seminary]. (1867) *Chernigovskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Pribavleniie*, April 15, 351-357 [In Russian].
- Holy [The Holy Governing Synod Order no. 34, dated August 29, 1867, on appointment of the deadline for submitting seminary and school training programs to the Educational Committee at the Holy Synod]. (1867). *Volynskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Chast ofitsialnaia*, 5, 165-166 [In Russian].
- Holy [The Holy Governing Synod Order no. 57, dated December 28, 1867, on methods of teaching in theological seminaries and schools]. (1868). *Volynskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Chast ofitsialnaia*, 12, 354-356 [In Russian].
- Holy [The Holy Governing Synod Order no. 47-m, dated August 11, 1870, on Prof. Iurkevych's book 'Course of General Pedagogy']. (1871). *Podolskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel ofitsialnyi*, 5, 94-95 [In Russian].
- Holy [The Holy Governing Synod Order no. 40, dated July 4, 1874, on Mr Roshchin's book 'Essay on the main practical positions of pedagogy, didactics and methods, applied to subjects of Primary Education with Journal no. 77 of the Educational Committee at the Holy Synod]. (1874). *Volynskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Chast ofitsialnaia*, 19, 497-529 [In Russian].

- Holy [The Holy Synod Determination no. 1353, dated April 22, 1881, on V. Tihomirov's work 'Course of Pedagogy, Didactics and Methods' with Journal of the Educational Committee]. (1881). *Volynskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Chast ofitsialnaia*, 21, 504 [In Russian].
- Holy [The Holy Synod Order no. 49-m, dated August 20, 1870, on 'Guidelines for Primary Education' developed by Malyshevskiy and Zaitsev, professors of Kyiv theological academy, and Ekzempliarskiy, a teacher of Kyiv theological seminary]. (1871b). *Podolskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel ofitsialnyi*, 5, 95.
- Indication [Indication of pedagogical measures and techniques for correct organization of educational process in theological seminaries and schools]. (1871). *Harkovskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti*, 9, 427-430 [In Russian].
- Istomin, G. (1869). Note on the state of Sunday school at Poltava seminary *Poltavskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel neofitsialnyi*, 10, 254-271 [In Russian].
- K-skiy. (1876). Status of teachers of theological seminaries. *Pravoslavnoie obozreniie*, 11, 581-600 [In Russian].
- Kudrinovskiy, N. (1867). Establishing pedagogical class and Sunday school at Poltava theological seminary. September 27, 1866, and December 4, 1866. *Poltavskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel neofitsialnyi*, 1, 5-18 [In Russian].
- Meshkovaya, S.I. (2004). *The secular component of orthodox church schooling system of Russian empire (1857-1884): thesis*. Kharkov: Kharkov University.
- Myropolskiy, S. (1870). Kharkiv Sunday school in 1868-1869. *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia*, 150, 224-253 [In Russian].
- Note [Note on the state of Kyiv theological seminary for 1882-83 academic year]. (1883). *Kievskiiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel neofitsialnyi*, 28, 473-476 [In Russian].

- Order. (1866). On some steps to promote people's education by the clergy.
Duhovnyj vestnik, 13, 573-574.
- Present State [Present state of Sunday school at Poltava theological seminary].
(1867). *Poltavskiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel neofitsialnyi*, 7,
255-272 [In Russian].
- Project [Project of practical classes of students at Chernihiv seminary]. (1867).
Chernigovskiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Chast ofitsialnaia, 6, 200-205
[In Russian].
- Putro, O.I. & Putro A.O. (2011). *Foreign students in Kyiv theological academy
and seminary (19th century – the beginning of 20th century)* Kyiv: Na-
tional Academy of Leading Cadres in Culture and Art [in Ukrainian].
- Report [Report on classes at Sunday school of Poltava seminary, the report
was made by Grigoriy Karpovich, a Seminarian in the same seminary].
(1869). *Poltavskiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel neofitsialnyi*, 9,
220-239 [In Russian].
- Report [Report on state of Theological Student Library in Podillia theological
seminary for the second half of 1868-1869 academic year]. (1870). *Po-
dolskiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel ofitsialnyi*, 4, 66-76 [In Rus-
sian].
- Rules [Rules for testing students of Podillia theological seminary at the end of
1870-1871 academic year and ranking them]. (1871). *Podolskiie ie-
parhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel ofitsialnyi*, 9, 202-205 [In Russian].
- Rules [Rules for testing students of Podillia theological seminary at the end of
1872-1873 academic year and ranking them]. (1873). *Podolskiie ie-
parhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel ofitsialnyi*, 11, 152-155 [In Russian].
- School [The School Department Order no. 3-m, dated January 19, 1869, about
lithography of lectures for students of theological seminaries]. (1869).
Podolskiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel ofitsialnyi, 7, 91 [In Rus-
sian].

Seminary [For seminary pedagogy: about comparative assessment of students' achievements and writing exercises]. (1872). *Pravoslavnoie obozreniie*, 6, 877-896 [In Russian].

Statute [Statute of Orthodox Theological Seminaries]. (1867). *Volynskiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti*. 3, 76-125 [In Russian].

Sunday School [Sunday school at Kyiv seminary]. (1866). *Kievskiie ieparhialnyie vedomosti. Otdel vtoroi*, 24, 749-758 [In Russian].

Tverdokhlib, T. (2016) Forms of teaching pedagogical disciplines in orthodox religious educational Institutions of Ukraine (the end of 19th - the beginning of 20th century). *Int. Lett. Soc. & Human. Sci.*, 71, 40-46.

✉ Dr. Tetiana Tverdokhlib
. Higher School at H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv
National Pedagogical University.
Alchevskykh Street, 29, Kharkiv, Ukraine
E-Mail: tst.khnpu@gmail.com



