

Київська Академія 20 (2023): 275–278.
doi 10.18523/1995-025X.2023.20.275-278
<http://ka.ukma.edu.ua>

Iannis Carras

Ivanov, Andrey V.
***A Spiritual Revolution. The Impact of Reformation
and Enlightenment in Orthodox Russia* (Madison:
The University of Wisconsin Press, 2020), xv, 363 pp.**

Andrey V. Ivanov's «A Spiritual Revolution. The Impact of Reformation and Enlightenment in Orthodox Russia» (University of Wisconsin Press, 2020) is a work on the impact of the Reformation and the Enlightenment across Russian imperial lands during the long 18th century. Expanding on the narrative schemes proposed by Georges Florovsky (1893–1979) and adopted by Gregory Freeze, «A Spiritual Revolution» argues that Reform paved the way for Enlightenment. Both Reform and Enlightenment constituted stage posts in Russian imperial modernization. At the same time the Russian 18th century broke with previous patterns of thought and ideologies. Ivanov's work therefore challenges the conception that religious developments in the Russian Empire were of a different kind to those taking place further West.

The subheading of the first chapter of «A Spiritual Revolution» reads, quite appropriately: 'The Ukrainian Context, 1654–1712'. Educated Ukrainians were to play the leading role in Russian Church history of the latter half of the 17th and 18th centuries. Stephan Iavorskii (1658–1722) — raised near Nizhyn — was one such. Alongside much else, his philo-Catholic *Kamen' very* («The Rock of Faith») set out a variation of the 'two swords' doctrine, which demarcated the authority of the Church from the authority of the Monarch. Following Iavorskii's variation on this doctrine, the Church was characterised by 'two swords', which accorded it power over both the spiritual and secular spheres. The Church should therefore be headed by a Patriarch ruling alongside the Tsar. One of the

consequences of commencing «A Spiritual Revolution» around the turn of the 18th century is that philo-Protestant thinkers are accorded greater significance than their philo-Catholic counterparts. Whether philo-this or philo-that, one constant was sermons by the hierarchs of the Church delivered in a Ukrainian accent. If the work had commenced, let us say, in 1654, might it not have carried the subtitle: «The Impact of Ukrainian Humanism and Enlightenment in Orthodox Russia?» To what extent might such a subtitle have altered the author's overall understanding of the relative importance of Reformation *per se*?

The much re-interpreted life and work of the Ukrainian Theophan Prokopovich (1677–1736) was undoubtedly central to the influence of the Reformation in a Russian imperial context. Prokopovich had studied in the Pontifical Greek College in Rome (more might be made of such syncretism), in other words as a young man he had embraced the Union, but, changing tack, was to preside over the philo-Protestant ecclesiastical reforms of Peter I's reign, hence the titles of the second and third chapters of «A Spiritual Revolution»: «Escape from Rome» and «A Russian Luther». It was not primarily the Protestant aesthetic or asceticism that seems to have appealed, but rather Protestant theological works which contributed the necessary arguments for reform. Prokopovich's catechism was to become the principal work of theological instruction throughout the 18th century. Even more significant was Prokopovich condemnation of the doctrine of the 'two swords'. Prokopovich's theology served as basis for the establishment of the Swedish synodal-consistorial system that took the place of Moscow's Patriarchate. These reforms set the Monarch as a High Priest at the Church's symbolic head. They perfectly complemented Peter I's understanding of the modernization of the Russian state and its transformation into a European Empire.

The fourth and fifth chapters entitled 'A Struggle for Orthodoxy' and 'The Fledglings of the Petrine Nest' follow Prokopovich's struggles in the post-Petrine period — including the on-going dispute over restoration of the Patriarchate. The pendulum swung both ways. Indicatively, in 1728 the Holy Synod republished Iavorskii's *Kamen very*, but Court intrigue would reestablish Prokopovich and his philo-Protestant acolytes by the time of Prokopovich's death in 1736. The ongoing influence of Prokopovich's theology after his death is accorded due attention, including the universities that students would graduate from before entry into the highest positions of Church and state. Gone was the Jesuit scholasticism

of by-gone years, this being now a Church “Protestant in substance but Orthodox in form”. As the sixth and seventh chapters ‘Enlightening the Church’ and ‘Light from the Pulpit’ relate it was philo-Protestant actors that were to serve as agents for the introduction of early Enlightenment ideas. Particularly interesting here is Ivanov’s discussion of the Orthodox Church as the first institution in Russia to offer a critique of serfdom, with the serfs of the Church emancipated by 1762.

Yet even among the Episcopate, the dividing lines between philo-Protestant and philo-Catholic, not to mention Enlightened and less so, were not always unambiguous. Bishops such as Platon Levshin (1737–1812), whose Catechism, as Ivanov shows, mirrored the Larger Westminster Catechism of 1648 also accepted military orders. But this occurred only after vigorous protest. Nor is it evident that Levshin took an open stance against serfdom per-se. Further, Levshin himself emphasised that one of his favourite works of theology was none other than Iavorskii’s *Kamen very*. In his *Treatise on Melchisedek* published in 1765, Levshin attempted a theological demarcation of the spiritual and the secular, albeit with the Monarch understood as a Great High Priest uniting the two spheres. It may also be worth noting Levshin’s role in developing patristic studies. And also in the revival of monasticism, perhaps surprisingly in places such as the Monastery of Optina Pustyn with monasticism in a hesychast form, as transferred from Mount Athos to the Russian Empire through the translations of the Poltavan born Paisii Velichkovskii (1722–1794).

Finally, Ivanov’s understanding of Levshin’s views on Napoleon, based on conversations with Reginald Heber (1783–1826), fit poorly with the accrued evidence, including the actions of the hierarch himself during 1812. The closing chapter of Ivanov’s work is titled «Spiritual Napoleons», with the «Awakening» — connected to biblical translation and the growth of secret societies — again mirroring spiritual movements further West. Here Ivanov’s discussion of Orthodox ecumenism is particularly rewarding. Platon Levshin’s support of the Mason Nikolai Novikov (1744–1818) notwithstanding, the hierarch nonetheless constitutes just one instance when the complexity and inconsistencies of characters and their thought-processes seem to have been overwhelmed by Ivanov’s powerful argumentation.

Andrey Ivanov ends by asking for the reasons why «the clerical opponents of Western influence enjoyed such swift success» following on from the events of 1825. He provides many good reasons. But throughout the

book there is a constant downplaying of discussions and contradictions within Enlightened Orthodoxy itself. His distinction between the Russian Orthodox experience which “ushered in religious reform of revolutionary magnitude” and other parts of the Orthodox world seems peculiar, given the interface between religion and Enlightenment and their contribution to the revolutions in Southeastern Europe during precisely this period. Further, the direction of Enlightenment in Ivanov’s schema comes across as very much North-West to East, fitting oddly with conceptions of a multiplicity of Enlightenments. And though justified as a research topic in itself, there is a danger in focusing on bishops. For these hierarchs seems strangely cerebral, peculiarly unsacramental. Sermons seem to exist outside the context of the liturgy, bishops appear almost without a flock. Throughout the text the question of the degree to which the hierarchs who constructed this world were or were not “pawns of the monarchs’ whims” remains in balance. But the point at which Reformation ends and the organisation of Empire commences cannot be resolved without further examination of the Episcopate in relation to other segments of imperial society.

Questions such as these inevitably remain, but there should be no doubt that this work constitutes a fine example of the ways in which a «turn to theology» with an emphasis on doctrinal concepts can contribute to our understanding of ideological aspects of Russia’s transformation into an imperial power following Western prototypes. What is more, Andrey Ivanov’s meticulous research and beautifully written work constitutes a scholarly tour-de-force. All subsequent thinkers in the field will have to think through this «ktema es aei». Following Ivanov, there should be little doubt concerning the influence of the Reformation and — connected to it — the subsequent Enlightenment on the hierarchy of the Orthodox Church.