

LIETUVIŲ ATGIMIMO ISTORIJOS STUDIJOS

14

*Vytautas Jogėla.
Vilniaus Romos katalikų
dvasinė akademija
1833 – 1842 metais:
organizacija ir veikla*

1997

LIETUVIŲ
ATGIMIMO ISTORIJOS
STUDIJOS



Skiriu Mamai

LIETUVIŲ ATGIMIMO ISTORIJOS STUDIJOS

14

*Vytautas Jogėla.
Vilniaus Romos katalikų
dvasinė akademija
1833–1842 metais:
organizacija ir veikla*

VILNIUS

Eugrimas

1997

UDK 947.45

Li-191

REDAKCINĖ KOLEGIJA:

Antanas Kulakauskas
Česlovas Laurinavičius
Raimundas Lopata
Egidijus Motieka (vyriausiasis redaktorius)
Vladas Sirutavičius
Darius Staliūnas
Giedrius Subačius
Antanas Tyla

*Autorius dėkoja Lietuvos Respublikos
švietimo ir mokslo ministerijai,
Lietuvių katalikų mokslo akademijai,
Lietuvos istorijos institutui,
prelato Juozo Prunskio fondui,
prisidėjusiems prie knygos išleidimo*

© Vytautas Jogėla, 1997

© Lietuvos istorijos institutas, 1997

© Lietuvių Atgimimo istorijos studijos, 1997

ISSN 1392-0391

ISBN 9986-752-23-X

TURINYS

PRATARMĖ	8
ĮVADAS	10
Istoriografija	11
Šaltiniai	13
Atsiminimai	14
Archyvai	15
RUSIJOS VALDŽIA IR KATALIKAI XVIII AMŽIAUS PABAIGOJE -- XIX AMŽIAUS PRADŽIOJE	17
Rusijos aristokratija ir katalikybė	17
Valdžios siekiai	19
Katalikų Bažnyčios valdymas	21
Katalikų apibūdinimas	24
AKADEMIJOS ĮSTEIGIMAS	26
Universiteto uždarymas	26
Akademijos pradžia	33
Dėstytojų parinkimas ir mokslo disciplinos	43
Mokslo vardų ir laipsnių suteikimas	53
Patalpos	54
Pirmieji mokslo metai	57
AKADEMIJOS PERSONALO KAITA	61
Rektoriai	62
Profesorai	66
Adjunktai	69
Kalbų dėstytojai	74
Inspektoriai ir jų padėjėjai	76
Dvasios tėvai, arba kapelionai	78

AKADEMIJOS ALUMNAI IR JŲ STUDIJOS	80
Įstojimas	81
Akademijos klierikų gyvenimo sąlygos	84
Studijos	91
Klierikų kilmė	93
Tautinis klausimas	96
MOKYMAS IR MOKSLAS	100
Mokymas ir jo programos	100
Šventojo Rašto katedra	102
Dogminė, moralinė ir pastoralinė teologija	105
Bažnyčios istorija ir kanonų teisė	106
Homiletika	109
Logika ir moralės filosofija	110
Lenkų literatūros istorija	111
Visuotinė ir Rusijos istorija	112
Rusų literatūra ir kalba	115
Lotynų literatūra ir graikų kalba	116
Hebrajų kalba	117
Prancūzų kalba	117
Vokiečių kalba	118
MOKSLINIAI DARBAI	119
Dėstytojų moksliniai darbai	121
Vadovėlių rengimas	123
Pamokslų rinkinių rengimas	124
Straipsniai	125
Mokslo laipsnių suteikimas	126
Daktaro laipsnio suteikimas	129
AKADEMIJOS REFORMOS	134
Akademija ir seminarijų reformos	134
Akademijos iškėlimas į Peterburgą	140
Sudie, Tėvyne	144

IŠVADOS	148
PRIEDAI	150
Akademijos klierikų sąrašas	150
Akademijos personalo sąrašas	176
ŠALTINIAI IR LITERATŪRA	180
Naudoti archyvų ir bibliotekų rankraščių fondai	180
Skelbti šaltiniai	182
Literatūros sąrašas	183
TRUMPINIAI	190
SUMMARY	191
STRESZCZENIE	205
ASMENVARDŽIŲ RODYKLĖ	219
VIETOVARDŽIŲ RODYKLĖ	230

Vytautas Jogėla

**VILNIUS ROMAN CATHOLIC THEOLOGICAL
ACADEMY, IN 1833-1842: ORGANIZATION AND
ACTIVITY**

SUMMARY

The studies of the history of Vilnius Catholic Theological Academy (VCTA) are important both from a scientific and a political point of view. They help to better perceive the process of education of the Catholic Church elite and the general level of research and education in the complicated period after the popular uprising. The history of the Academy reflects the aspirations of Russian power and its policy with regard to the Catholic Church as well as the role of Academical alumni in preserving Catholicism in the Russian empire.

During the entire 19th century the history of the Academy was never investigated, content with short encyclopedic data. No more active were studies of the history of the Academy after World War I, because most of the necessary archives remained in Soviet Russia. An individual who presented data about the eviction of the Academy to Petersburg was Arnoldas Endzinas. The Polish historian Aleksy Petrani meanwhile made a brief investigation into the Academy's curriculum of canon law.

Published sources about the VCTA considerably outnumber works of research. Published sources include the nominal lists of alumni (if not very precise) and speeches made by teachers at the inauguration ceremonies. Some scanty reminiscences were written by the priests Tadas Dobševičius, Adomas Stanislovas Krasinskis and Stanislovas Jundzilas. Most archival documents about Vilnius Academy are stored in Russia. Therefore, this paper is based mostly on those materials available abroad. The principal archive of the Academy is stored in Petersburg (Central State Historical Archive in Petersburg; F. 46). This archive includes documents about the VCTA, the journals of board sittings, etc. Besides the above archives, the following stocks of the Russian State Historical Archive were used in this work: F. 821, 822, 826, 1263, 1266. The first three (Department of the Affairs of Different Believers, Petersburg Theological College of Roman Catholics, and the Roman Catholic Metropolitan Bishop's Office in Russia) reflect the system of governing the Catholic Church in the Russian Empire. They store the most abundant materials on the status of the Catholic Church between 1833 and 1842. The last two stocks are designed mostly for investigations of the policy pursued by representatives of supreme power in the Western provinces. The materials of Department No 3 (or Gendarme Corps) at the czar's office are stored at the Russian State Historical Archive (F. 109) and the Lithuanian State Historical Archive (F. 378. PS; 419). The documents from these stocks reveal the mechanisms of spying on and checking Academy teachers and students. For investigation of relations between the Russian government and the Holy Throne, materials are stored at the Russian Archive of Foreign Policy (F. 190). The diaries of the supreme power officials stored at the Petersburg Department archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences (F. 100, 764) made it possible to understand the essence of secret policy pursued by the government. Stock of manuscripts (F.R-KA) at the library of the Petersburg Department of Russian Academy of Sciences contains some manuscripts of books written and published by Academy teachers. Abundant materials about the works of bishop Andrius Klungevičius are available at the Vilnius diocese consistory stock (F. 694) of the Lithuanian State Historical Archive. In a stock of manuscripts (F. 315) at the library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences one can find theses by Academy students which are helpful for investigation of the history of theological sciences. The materials available at the Žemaičių Seminary Stock (F. 90) of the Department of Manuscripts at the Martynas Mažvydas Library provided an opportunity to reveal the peculiarities of the Lithuanian national identity. However, the author failed to find any notes of lectures, diaries or letters written by the teachers. For this reason, this work mostly reflects the official activities of the Academy.

The loss of state self - dependence led to a weakening in the creative power of all strata of society. Such transformations most painfully effected the elite in society. Its life entered a new stage of loss, conformation and resistance seeking to preserve the national identity and traditions. The main desire and aim of those who belonged to social elite was to return the lost state of self - dependence. However, all attempts in

the 19th century failed and the former elite of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania (GDL) had to endure for a long time the yoke of the Russian empire. In the course of time optimism faded away, notwithstanding that every generation made a new attempt to change the situation. Thus, the tradition of resistance born by force in the years of occupation obtained a stability in the consciousness of elite. However, it is to be noted that while comparing the actions of the elite in the GDL and in the Kingdom of Poland we must acknowledge that in the latter they were rather more radical. All uprisings started in Poland and came to an end in Lithuania. During the 19th century not one spontaneous radical resistance began in Lithuania. The passive behaviour of the elite in the GDL can be accounted for by the different degree of dependence or sovereignty of these countries, religious and national diversity and different forms and means of self-expression as well as the different level of influence of Russian power.

One of the principal aspirations of the GDL elite was to preserve for a longer time the cultural and political status quo and prevent from putting government intentions into practice. Such an attitude was no secret for the Russian government. Czar Nicholas I who visited Vilnius in 1837 addressed the gentry with the words that "... your future depends upon their submission and getting rid of poor hopes to preserve the national identity".

Thus, the elite had to face the following alternatives: the self - determination of a free - willed man and citizen, cherishing cultural and political tradition, or compliance to the imperial power. Most representatives of the elite had to combine both. Representatives of the nobility knew that the only way to guarantee their existence was to preserve and cherish cultural heritage. Only by bearing in mind such an attitude is it possible to understand their often contradictory actions.

After the popular uprising for 1830 – 1831 the Russian government started a fundamental reorientation of values of the former GDL elite both in the institutional and cultural sense. It was anxious to see the results as soon as possible. Czar Nicholas I was confident. Officials were drastic and active in this situation. The main actions were directed against the secular elite. In 1832 Vilnius University – the main, centre, for the education of the nobility – was closed. This was a crucial turn in the process of raising intellectuals.

It is amazing that both academic and secular society accepted this act of government without any resistance. Only the following statement has survived: "a sad last sitting of the University Council took place". The atmosphere of complete loss and hopelessness predominated. After the closing of this centre of education a wide perspective opened for the government in the process of raising intellectuals and extinguishing traditions. In such a situation family and Church remained the only teachers of the young generation. The Catholic Church and hierarchy remained throughout the 19th century the most conservative structure in the society of the GDL with respect to the policy of the Russian empire. In its strange existence the Church found strength in itself as well as political and intellectual insight. Such a situation was preconditioned by popular attitudes towards belief, positions taken by clergy and the ability to

combine the possibilities of the Church with the aspirations of secular people. Besides, there existed a common aim – resistance against Russian power. Although the secular elite was sometimes at odds with the confessional elite, it always resisted attempts to change the Catholic belief. When the priest Liudvikas Adomas Jucevičius for personal reasons abandoned his priesthood and adopted orthodoxy even the closest friends and relatives called him “the new Judas”.

Notwithstanding the ambiguous legal position of the Church in the Russian empire, when according to the canon law all actions of secular government were non-canon, priests had to reckon with decrees issued by the czar and other officials. The practical realization of the orders of government depended mostly on ordinary priests and, especially, on the attitude of the confessional elite and its ability to manoeuvre within the existing situation. Many contemporaries characterized the bishop's activity in the following way: “...he was not a puppet in the hands of government?”. When in other West European countries the hierarchy of the Catholic Church sought the support of secular government or tried to reduce the influence of the Holy Throne, the Catholic Church in the Russian empire, on the contrary, did its best to isolate itself from the government. However, this was not a simple process. The institutions of imperial government established to control the Church demanded tributes and compliance to the state. The most important role in pursuing this goal had to be played by the Roman Catholic College in Petersburg and the diocese hierarchy. The attitude of this stratum towards its mission varied from compliance and indifference to open hostility. However, among the clergy there have never occurred any doubts about changing belief or the Pope's preeminence bearing in mind a common knowledge that some Catholic bishops in Greece had for over ten years been applying to and demanding the Russian government permission to unite with orthodox believers.

Therefore, after the popular uprising and under conditions of constant pressure on the part of government the responsibility of the clergy increased. In the years 1832 – 1842 the country endured more repressive reforms than ever before. However, the Catholic Church was less subject to such reforms than secular institutions. Even after the uprising it preserved its all main structures. Of course, Russia did not follow the principles of good nature. It simply had not forgotten the lessons of the French Revolution. Thus, a contemporary European vision of traditional control of the Church was chosen and adapted to the orthodox-imperial variant. To put it in other words, a new evolution model of governing was chosen, the main motto of which was to raise a new generation of priests, compliant to the government.

This task had to be fulfilled by a new theological school. Russia could not remain without a centre for the Catholic elite, something that was understood by all officials of Russian supreme power.

After the uprising the function of Church control was taken from the Ministry of Education and given to the Ministry of Internal Affairs. This meant that the government was inclined to pursue a stricter policy and stronger control. However, even so

powerful a ministry had to reckon with the existing situation. In many cases the 'rosy' dreams of the minister and the czar himself would not come true due to the ability of the Catholic hierarchy to protect the interests of Church and believers. One of the main aspirations of Russian power was to select for the new Academy reliable and loyal professors and teachers. Both interested parties took part in this process: Vilnius bishop Andrius Klungevičius and minister of internal affairs Dmitrij Bludov. Carrying on the university tradition the bishop suggested to the minister to confirm all professors of the former Vilnius Principal Theological Seminary with the exception of Simonas Žukovskis (on his own refusal) and Aloysius Cappelli whose critical attitude towards the sources of the history of Church was unacceptable to bishop Klungevičius. However, the minister had a different opinion about Cappelli. On December 8, 1833 the minister confirmed the following professors: Jonas Skydelis, professor of Holy Script, archeology and hermeneutics; Angelas Daugirdas, philosophy and logic; Leonas Borovskis, homiletics and history of Polish literature; Antanas Fijalkovskis, dogmatic moral and pastoral theology; A. Cappelli, canon law and Church history; Stanislovas Grinevičius, Latin and Greek languages and literature; Ivan Lobjka, Russian language and literature and Pavel Kukolnik, universal and Russian history. According to the Academy's statute, teachers and adjuncts of languages had to work besides professors. Their selection and confirmation took some time because the biographical data of the candidates were scrutinized. Eventually the following persons were appointed as teachers: Janas de Nève, French language; Wilhelm Bierfreund, German; and Vilnius Bernardine monk Didakas Pazdzierskis, Hebraic. Kasparas Borovskis, Jonas Narkevičius and Dionyzas Pacevičius became the first adjuncts of the Academy. Professor Karol Edward Eichwald from the Medical – Surgery Academy gave lectures on hygiene to undergraduates or third – year students. During the ten years the rotation of professors and teachers was rather intensive. Daugirdas, Skydelis, Pazdzierskis, Cappelli, De Nève and Narkevičius passed away. Especially great changes occurred in 1839 – 1841 when a new generation of teachers came into the Academy. Some former teachers left because of poor health and a small salary, whereas Narkevičius and Pacevičius were dismissed by the College's decision. Lectures on philosophy and logic were given by prior Kazimieras Lenartavičius and later Feliksas Ustrzyckis; Holy Script, Adolfas Bagenskis; canon law and Church history, K. Borovskis; Russian language and literature, Michail Michailovski; Latin and Greek languages and literature, Zigmantas Bartaševičius; Hebraic, Aleksandr Ellenbogen; French, Joseph Guerard.

In 1839 the course of studies was extended and the number of adjuncts increased. Some adjuncts became professors. The new rector A. Fijalkovskis invited the best graduates of the former Vilnius Principal Theological Seminary and Academy, Antanas Jakubelskis, Motiejus Valančius, Aleksandras Vazinskis, Liudvikas Zdanavičius, Antanas Kitkevičius, Stanislovas Bialas and Liucijonas Godlevskis. For ten years the Gregorian chants and rites were taught by doctor of theology Vincentas Lipskis. The chaplain or padre took care of the state of mind of the students. Padre also conducted the practical course of faith. Trinity monk

Romanas Kačanovskis was the first padre later replaced by pior Liudvikas Lunkevičius.

Judging from the Academy statute its governing recalled that of the Vilnius Principal Theological Seminary. All major decisions on governing the Academy were passed by the Board. The latter included a rector, an inspector, two professors and a manager. The professors had to be seculars. Usually, the Russian government would propose professors of Russian literature and history. As the professor of Russian history was not confirmed L. Borovskis and I. Lobjka became members of the Board. All decisions were passed by a majority of votes. In cases when votes halved the rector had the casting -vote. The rector was the principal voice in the Academy. The state administration sought that rectors were outstanding scientists and loyal to the government. The Emperor himself took part in the confirmation of the candidates. However, attempts to find such a loyal person in Vilnius failed. During the ten years there was a succession of three rectors. The candidacies were proposed by bishop A.Klongevičius. The czar confirmed doctor of theology Aloyzas Osinskis as the first rector. At the end of 1838 he was replaced by professor Antanas Fijalkovskis and the latter, in his turn (1842), by Vincentas Lipskis.

The inspector was the second most important person at the Academy. This post was usually taken by some senior professor of the Academy. The inspector's duties included: control of lectures and practical classes, the state of mind of the future priest and his behaviour within the walls of Academy, communication with the students and visiting their rooms. Until 1835 Jonas Markevičius the former regent of the Vilnius Principal Theological Seminary occupied the post of inspector. He was replaced by doctor of theology canon Jokūbas Gonsovskis and the latter, in his turn, by V. Lipskis in 1840. As problems were likely to occur while training both Academy and Seminary alumni the rector would appoint inspector's assistants from among the alumni of senior courses. Only in 1839 at the bishop's and rector's request the College fixed two salaries for inspectors' assistants or censors. The Academy graduates Anupras Bujka and Bonifacas Lukaševičius occupied these posts.

The manager was in charge of domestic, financial and economic matters. Until 1836 the priest Aleksandras Stanevičius occupied the post of manager and was replaced by Adomas Vaitkevičius.

The Academy had students from all six Catholic dioceses of the empire. At the end of 1833 the minister of internal affairs fixed the number of vacancies for students from each diocese. The Mogiliov diocese had 9 reserved vacancies; Vilnius, 9; Minsk, 6; Kameneč Podol, 6; Žemaičių, 5; Luck-Žitomir, 5. The right to enter the Academy was also given to Armenian and Georgian Catholics: 5 from Georgia and 2 from Podol province. However, the hierarchy of the latter would not send their students to Vilnius. External students could also attend lectures at the Academy. The greater part of such students came from abbeys. According to statute only the graduates of seminaries could be accepted to the Academy. However, this

principle was not followed strictly. Graduates of seminaries took entrance exams in the subjects which were included in the seminary curriculum. All students except the external ones received full boarding. The living conditions and rules of student life were predetermined by the status of the Catholic educational institution and standards of behaviour by the Board, rector and bishop. Already in 1834 the board decided on working out the regulations for student behaviour. These were supplemented every year with new items. The students were expected to be devoted to prayer, study well, be modest and orderly, wear priest's clothing and avoid alcoholic beverages and pipe smoking, as well as not to play guitar or cards. Not always did the future priests keep strictly to the rules. The Board provided penalties for disobeying the rules. The highest penalty was dismissal from the Academy. Such decisions were usually passed by bishop Klongevičius. Smaller penalties were inflicted by inspector or rector.

Until 1839 the course of studies lasted for three, later four, years. Theological disciplines were lectured in Latin and first year students had many problems. The second official language was Polish. The history of Polish literature and homiletics were taught in it. Besides, according to the regulations it was allowed to study and pray in local languages and dialects. Unfortunately, this principle did not become the standard of life. The third official language was Russian. Russian language and literature as well as universal and Russian history were taught in the Russian language. Lectures lasted for an hour as in Austrian seminaries. The classes started at 8 a.m. and before noon the students had four of them. The dinner break lasted for two hours, the afternoon lessons ended at 6 p.m.. Lectures were given on all days of the week except Sundays. For students maintained by the state all lectures were compulsory, whereas external students could choose with the rector's permission which lectures to attend. However, even the students maintained by the state often missed lectures. The lectures of L.Borovskis were the most actively attended. Twice a year the students had to take exams. According to the marks the students were divided by the Board into three classes. The first class included the best, the second, good students; and the third, mediocre students. Usually, the students of the senior courses received the best marks. Yearly accounts which were sent to Petersburg almost always contained the news that the students of the Academy were learning well.

Those who wanted to enter the Academy had to produce a certificate of social origin along with other documents. Before the uprising the Russian administration virtually ignored the social origin of future priests. After the uprising it strengthened control. However, for the Academy's administration and bishop Klongevičius the social origin of students was of little importance. The bishop even mocked those priests who tried to humiliate colleagues who originated from peasants. He used to ask such priests, "Would St. Peter or St. Paul have become saints if they had been asked for high descent?". Doubtlessly, the majority of students were children from gentry families. We can only wonder whether they really were gentry or somehow managed to obtain certificates of high descent. We

managed to identify the social origin of students who came from the Žemaičių diocese most thoroughly. Only two of the 25 – Tadas Juzumas and Ignotas Kulvinskis – originated from peasants. A similar situation could be observed in the Vilnius diocese. It is difficult to get a precise view about the origin of future priests, because every second student from Mogiliov, Minsk, Kamenec Podol and Luck-Žitomir diocese produced certificates of high descent. According to the contemporary tradition of the Academy one could assume that those who did not produce such certificates were peasants. Monks and external students did not have to produce certificates of social origin. Thus, considering incomplete archival data we can determine the following social background of the Academy: 98 noblemen, 5 peasants, 1 merchant and 123 persons of undefined origin.

The Church canons and specific position of priests decreased national differences and brought forth the values of Christian universalism.

Two trends stood out in the first half of the 19th century: the preservation of political and cultural traditions in the GDL and the strengthening of ethnosocial or provincial separatism. The Catholic Church as a constituent of society could not have missed these tendencies.

Within the walls of the Academy these trends were best reflected in the works of rector A. Osinskis and the student Liudvikas Adomas Jucevičius. However, somewhat more exhaustive data on the national identity of students are so far missing.

The archive of the Žemaičių seminary is, without doubt, very promising in this respect. Its registration book contains information about student nationality (*Jakiej nacyi. Pol.*). In neither the Vilnius seminary nor the Academy registration books could such entries be found. Before the uprising of 1831 the reply was “*Žemaičių Duchy*”. Only after the uprising did the word “*Žemaitis*” appear, indicating nationality. Students who came to the Varniai seminary from the Vilnius diocese were called “*lietuviai*” (Lithuanians) or “*iš Lietuvos*” (from Lithuania). These data prove that “*Žemaičiai*” were aware of their national identity, i.e. difference from Lithuanians. Such awareness of national identity manifested itself not only in the first half of the 19th century. In the second half of the 18th century the following characteristics of priests in the visitation acts of churches prevailed: “*lietuvis*” (Lithuanian), “*žemaitis*” (Samogitian), “*lenkas*” (Pole).

It is difficult now to determine the content of these expressions but it is likely that the political shock and suffering inflicted by the loss considerably speeded up the formation of national identity. This is proved also by a simple change of terms. The rarely encountered expression “*Žemaičių Duchy*” implied the notion of “*resident*”, whereas the term “*žemaitis*” revealed a considerable modernization or, in other words, an essential turning point in the development of the national identity of the elite. A more complete expression of consciousness set in, the elements of which manifested themselves in modern though not always easily perceivable norms. The realization of new standards of culture prompted by national identity started in everyday activities.

The first solitary attempts gradually converted into ever more universal and modern cultural identity. What did this notion imply? It seems that the major traits of this phenomenon were language and territory. Such an assumption is also proved by data from different sources.

According to its statute the Academy had the right to confer scientific student's, candidate's, master's and doctor's of theology degrees. The Academy kept to the old system of conferring degrees at the Theological faculty. Only in 1839 did the minister of internal affairs Aleksandr Stroganov confirm the rules for conferring scientific degrees. Following the statute scientific degrees had to be conferred by the Academy conference which included all professors and adjuncts. The conference was presided by the bishop or, in case of his absence, the bishop sufragan or the rector. To receive a scientific degree alumni had to take exams. Third – year students who got excellent marks in major subjects and satisfactory marks in the remaining ones had to take a special exam at the conference and write a research paper in Latin. If they succeeded they were conferred a candidate's degree. Those alumni who got good marks were conferred a student's theology degree. This degree was also conferred to all alumni who successfully graduated from the Academy. The fourth year students who had candidate's degrees at the end of the academic year could seek a master's degree. Teachers of Church sciences would provide the exam questions in advance, whereas the conference would fix the themes of theses in Latin and Russian. Most alumni graduated from the Academy as students of theological science (up to 1839). The first to maintain theses for a master's degree in 1839 were A. Bagenskis and K. Lenartavičius. The first alumnus who maintained a thesis for master's degree was Liucijus Godlevskis from the Vilnius diocese (1841). Only four alumni received master's degree as students of the Academy. Most priests and monks were conferred this degree only after graduation. Before 1842 the conference had conferred master's degrees to 28 persons.

After 1839, when the rules of obtaining scientific degrees were confirmed, many priests and monks applied for them. Doctor's degrees could also be conferred by the conference. A person could apply for a doctorate only if he had already been conferred master's degree. The main thesis had to be written in Latin. Besides, it was compulsory to write a paper in Russian on the adaptation of canon law to issued state orders. The regulations provided for the privilege to obtain a doctor's degree without exams or a thesis for successful lecturing on major and supplementary subjects or for written books. According to this privilege the conference conferred doctor's degrees on June 19, 1842, to Academy teachers S. Bialas, A. Jakubelskis, A. Kitkevičius and M. Valančius. In 1840 – 1842 16 doctor's degrees were conferred, including 6, to Academy teachers. The decisions of the conference were confirmed by the minister of internal affairs. This was only a formal act for there was not a single case when the minister had not confirmed the Academy's decisions.

It is a common opinion that the greatest crisis and decline for theological science occurred at the end of the 18th century. In most cases all trends and philosophies are mentioned which contributed to that decline. The ideas of the Age of Enlightenment

stroke a crucial blow to the authority of Church. A characteristic feature of the considered period was the attempts of European countries to subjugate the Church to their interests. A regalism prevailed in all large European states. France faced the manifestation of Gallikanism; Austria, Jozefinism; Germany, Febronianism. The same tendencies were characteristic of the Russian empire. However, at the beginning of the 19th century Europe started to turn its face back to religion. "Dry" rationalism failed in the course of time to satisfy the requests of society. Romanticism came into being as an antagonism to rationalism and the romantic way of thinking exerted a considerable influence on the Catholic world. Forces ripened which renovated the Church and theology. The process was slow. Not once did the interests of state and Church hierarchy cross. However, such a conflicting epoch did not prevent Joseph II to take advantage of his power and create a Church loyal to the state and a corresponding system for the education of priests. As, apparently, many monarchs of larger states dreamed about a similar system it rapidly spread in other states taking different forms. Thus, Austria is a classical state of the period under study. As interference too active by the state into Church affairs caused discontent, especially among the lower ranking clergy. Such a position of priests was supported by secular people. The new movement gave both spiritual and intellectual force to the renovation of Church life. There were many who felt discontented about the existing situation but old traditions hampered the manifestation of the full force of the new movement. Different attitudes were expressed not only by states but even by the Holy Throne and Church innovators. Relations between the Pope and monarchs which became too close slowed down the process of modernization. Popes watched the manifestations of democratization with anxiety and tried to isolate themselves from them by supporting monarchs. However, this process was not uniform either. The increasing consciousness of society demanded ideas which would answer its aspirations both in secular and religious life. European Catholic theologians started to establish faculties of theology at universities which created the fundamentals for a new concept of life and theology. Similar changes, though at a slower rate, took place in the Kingdom of Poland ruled by Russia and in the Russian empire itself. (An especially strong decline in science during the decade in question was observed in the Kingdom of Poland). Besides, the intellectual forces of the Church were very scattered and scanty. The traditional centres of intellectual life gradually fell into decay under Russian oppression. The educational system in the Vilnius Principal Theological Seminary and the Academy was similar to that in Austria. The latter newly established educational institution did its best to keep pace with time. Of course, the Russian administration sought to create in it a system of education which would be based on at least the spirit of Jozefinism. Teaching Russian language and history had to serve this purpose. However, the secular administration had almost no possibility of controlling the teaching of theological science. Everything in this field depended on the personal attitude of the professor or adjunct and their

ability to take advantage of the existing situation. The attitude of the administration of the Russian empire towards theological science remains obscure. In our opinion teachers could freely choose teaching aids. Even in their teaching programs some teachers would not indicate the textbooks according to which they were going to lecture. On the request of bishop Klungevičius in 1837, czar Nicholas I released the Academy from custom's fares for imported books. Thus, there were no strict requirements. Academy professors and adjuncts along with their lecturing work carried out scientific research. In their opinion the Academy had to become not only the centre of education but also of scientific research. By such aspirations Academy teachers strived to preserve and continue university tradition. This assumption can be proved by the fact that teachers investigated not only theological but civic sciences as well. The spirit of intellectualism prevailed at the Academy. One man who was especially active in the preservation and fostering of this spirit was A. Osinskis. Still another field entirely of the teacher's activity was the preparation of textbooks. Imported books most likely did not meet the requirements of the Academy. Many professors used textbooks written by their colleagues. In as early as 1835 J. Skydelis wrote a textbook of homiletics which L. Borovskis used while teaching the fundamentals of homiletics. J. Skydelis' pupil A. Bagenskis wrote a textbook in the history of the Holy Script. Academy professors not only wrote scientific papers and textbooks but also organized the publication of the manuscripts of their dead colleagues. By the efforts of rector professor A. Fijalkovsky the religious works of A. Daugirdas were published. By the order of the minister of internal affairs, J. Skydelis and A. Fijalkovskis prepared in 1833 collections of sermons of preachers Jesuit Andrius Filipeckis and bishop Martynas Bialobžeskis in eight volumes. However, due to the lack of means many manuscripts remained unpublished or disappeared altogether. Rector A. Osinskis even had the idea to obtain a printing house but this worthy undertaking remained unrealized because no sponsors appeared. Although most manuscripts did not see the world, the Academy became the most prominent scientific centre both in the GDL and the Kingdom of Poland. Any research work adopted a quiet and stable course.

The secular administration suspected and controlled the Academy, but it had no choice. It decided that it was high time the students of this higher school were to be used for its own purposes. Thus, in as early as 1839 minister of internal affairs D. Bludov encouraged bishops to reorganize the seminaries. The bishops did not respond to this advice. The situation changed, however, when a new minister Aleksandr Stroganov speeded up the events. In his opinion the Academy's teachers had to change the process of the education of priests in its essence and occupy an elite position in the structures of the Church hierarchy. Younger teachers had to replace the old generation of priests which was so distrusted and disliked by the administration. In this way the administration hoped to steer the The Catholic Church in a new and favourable direction.

In 1840 the minister submitted his proposals to the czar on the question of the reorganization of catholic seminaries in the Vilnius province. The main idea was to

unify the programs of the seminaries and the Academy. And the main aim, of course, was to replace all seminary teachers with graduates from the Academy. The unification of programs was quietly accepted but the replacement of teachers was energetically refused by all bishops. Such a united and open resistance by the bishops against the administrative power was a rather rare phenomenon in the years under study. Most categorically against Academy teachers was Žemaičių capitulus and bishop Simonas Giedraitis. However, the imperial power ignored such attitudes of bishops. Academy graduates were appointed as teachers at the seminaries. Besides, Nicholas I ordered the minister of internal affairs to see that all first and second class deans and teachers of religion were graduates from the Roman Catholic Theological Academy. By the czar's wishes, Academy graduates became an exclusive caste among priests. Theoretically, the Russian power put the fate of the Church into the hands of Academy graduates. In practice this process was slow. But in the course of time Academy graduates took all the major posts in the Church hierarchy of Russia.

The strange trust towards the Academy and its graduates did not prevent the imperial power from destroying GDL traditions and Vilnius as the centre of intellectual and cultural life. Russian officials missed in Vilnius manifestations favourable for the Russian spirit and in the short run many new suggestions were made to the czar. The idea of moving the Academy to Petersburg was first made as early as 1837. An anonymous author proposed to establish in Petersburg a new theological Academy. The Vilnius Academy was accused of being in the centre of Polish provincialism and teaching in Polish. At that time the general governor of Vilnius Nikolaj Dolgorukov and former general governor of Kiev count Aleksandr Gurjev tried to defend the Academy. The new general governor of Vilnius Fiodor Mirkovič – a loved and respected nobleman of Vilnius – proposed in 1841 to move the Vilnius Academy into the heart of the empire. As such a proposal came from the leader of a local government, Nicholas I agreed without further consideration. “I am of the same opinion”, approved the czar. Mirkovič hoped in this way to change the prevailing spirit in the Academy and strengthen control. The imperial power desired to educate a new generation of priests which would be indifferent to its country. Minister Lev Perovskij announced only in 1842 to the College: “The sovereign emperor has deigned to move the Roman Catholic Theological Academy from Vilnius to Petersburg”.

This order did not come as a surprise to Academy professors. The same had happened to the Vilnius Medical-Surgery Academy. Rector A. Fijalkovskis was sure that the whole staff of the Academy and its alumni would move to Petersburg. Unfortunately, the fortune was unfavourable. The imperial government made a successful move. On September 4, 1842, Nicholas I addressed the clergymen who visited him in Carskoe Selo with the following words: “It is to your knowledge that I ordered the Academy to move from Vilnius to Petersburg, seeking to control it personally. I had reason to be dissatisfied by its state of affairs. It fostered harmful tendencies.” Valerij Skripycin, Director of the

Vilnius Department of Different Believers was in charge of moving the Academy. A special board made all preliminary preparations: inspector V. Lipskis, Prof. L. Borovskis and manager A. Vaitkevičius. Skripycin regulated who would move to Petersburg and who would remain in Vilnius. Teachers and alumni were divided into four groups. The superiors of every group were: Bonifacas Lukaševičius, Prof. Adolfas Bagenskis and adjuncts Motiejus Valančius and Antanas Jakubelskis. 39 alumni left together with the teachers. Later on Prof. K. Borovskis, inspector V. Lipskis, manager A. Vaitkevičius, clerk Cezaris Ibianskis, secretary Antanas Potockis and office worker Labutis as well as a cook, a baker, a waiter and a duty man of the office also moved to Petersburg. Thus, all secular teachers remained in Vilnius. Their place in Petersburg was taken by loyal people who had to essentially change the state of mind of future priests. The Academy took up its quarters in a poor house of the merchant Lokotnikov which stood on Vasilij isle and was separated from the Winter Palace by the Neva River.

CONCLUSIONS

1. After the closing of Vilnius University the influence of the secular intelligentsia diminished. In the stages of its decline and reorientation of the values the influence of the Catholic Church on society considerably increased. Notwithstanding the consequences of all reforms, the Catholic Church preserved its major structures. The integration of the confessional elite with the government took place under the conditions of drastic force and had rather a formal character, whereas among the secular elite this process was more rapid.

2. The Roman Catholic Theological Academy established in Vilnius in 1833 became the main educational centre for the confessional elite in the Russian empire. This exquisite position was strengthened by czar Nicholas I himself who gave the permission to establish such a school in the old centre of the GDL.

3. The Academy continued the University tradition and remained at the same time the most outstanding centre of theological science in both the GDL and the Kingdom of Poland. The Academy concentrated rather strong intellectual forces. Teachers and professors, most of whom came from the University, not only gave lectures but also were involved in theology research.

4. In establishing the Academy the Russian power sought to educate loyal state priests. The main precondition of this loyalty had to be the indifference to the culture and traditions of one's own country. In other words, priests had to abandon "Polish provincialism". Another precondition was the division of secular and religious activity. Teaching Russian language and literature as well as Russian history had to serve this purpose.

5. Academy alumni became an exclusive caste among priests but remained loyal to the canons of the Catholic Church. Although the government supported the Academy alumni it rarely received a favourable reciprocative action.

6. From the national point of view the Academy represented a small model of the former “nation of the GDL”. Alumni from its all lands studied there.

7. Both parties were aware of the temporary character of such forced loyalty. The government of the Russian empire was suspicious towards the staff and alumni. The strict selection of teachers and professors did not help to strengthen the image of reliability. This is proved by the rotation of rectors and the permanent control of the Academy.

8. Seeking to change the prevailing tendencies and atmosphere of the Academy, the Russian government decided in 1842 to move it to Petersburg. The decade following the popular uprising was characterized by the annihilation of GDL tradition. Russia strived to consolidate its position in the former GDL. The final expression of this aspiration – complete integration with the Russian empire both in the institutional and spiritual sense.

Translated by Ada Jurkonytė