



Adam Drozdek*

Apollos Baibakov and His Writings

Аполлос Байбаков и его письма

Резюме: Байбаков был епископом Православной Церкви в XVIII веке, ректором школы, известным прежде всего как автор книги о поэзии, которая имела десять изданий. Как педагог, он пробовал различные способы повлиять на своих учеников и на широкую публику: образование через литературу, через проповеди, через библейские комментарии и через перевод возвышающих произведений. В статье рассматривается его работы и комментируется их качество и важность.

Ключевые слова: православие, литература, библейские комментарии, физико-теология, Аполлон Байбаков.

Apollo Bajbakow i jego pisma

Streszczenie: Bajbakow był biskupem Kościoła prawosławnego w XVIII wieku, rektorem szkoły znanym przede wszystkim jako autor książki o poetyce, która miała dziesięć wydań. Jako pedagog próbował różnych sposobów dotarcia tak do swoich uczniów, jak i do szerszych kręgów społeczeństwa: poprzez literaturę, kazania, komentarze biblijne i tłumaczenia budujących książek. Artykuł analizuje jego prace i odnosi się do ich jakości i znaczenia.

Słowa kluczowe: prawosławie, literatura, komentarze biblijne, fizyko-teologia, Apollo Bajbakow.

Andrei Dmitrievich Baibakov was born in 1737 in Zmetaevo/Zmetnevo in the Ukraine. In 1759–1767, he was a student in the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy in Moscow and in 1768–1770 he studied philosophy in the Moscow University. From 1770, he worked as an editor in

* Adam Drozdek, Associate Professor of Computer Science McAulty College and Graduate School of Liberal Arts, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, USA, e-mail: drozdek@duq.edu

the university publisher and from 1772 he taught poetry and rhetoric in the Academy. In 1774, he became a monk and assumed the name of Apollos. In 1775, he became the rector of the Trinity seminary. In 1783, he became the archimandrite of the Zaikonospasskii monastery and the rector of the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy. In 1785, he was transferred to St. Petersburg and the next year he became the abbot (настоятель) of the Resurrection-New-Jerusalem monastery and also a member of the newly established (1783) Russian Academy in St. Petersburg. He became a bishop of the Orlov and Sevsk eparchy in 1788 and then of the Archangel and Kholmogory eparchy in 1798. He died in 1801 in Archangel.¹

Baibakov did not leave any theological treatise; however, he was an educator, the rector of a school, after all, so he wanted to educate and for him as an ecclesiastic, theological and moral education was of primary importance. He tried a number of venues: education through a literary output, through preaching, through biblical commentaries, and through translation of uplifting works. He is primarily known as the author of a book on poetics tenth edition of which came out in 1826.²

Literary works

Baibakov started to publish his works fairly late, in his 40s, and he began with his literary work. His first work was a play *Jephtah*. *Jephtah* came back from war and brings a groom, *Pobedonosn*

¹ Сергей Смирнов, *История Московской Славяно-греко-латинской академии*, Москва: В Типографии В. Готье 1855, p. 355.

² Андрей Байбаков, *Правила пиитическая в пользу юношества обучающагося в Славено-греко-латинской академии в Заиконоспасском монастыре*, [Москва:] Печатаны при Императорском Московском университете 1774. Since the third edition, Аполлос, *Правила пиитическая, о стихотворении российском и латинском*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии, у Н. Новикова 1785, the book was significantly expanded. It also includes mythological dictionary which was published separately in 1781 as *Словарь пиитико-исторических примечаний*. In his textbook, Baibakov followed closely Trediakovskii, Kantemir, and some Latin textbooks, М[ихаил] И. Сухомлинов, *История Российской Академии*, Санктпетербург: Типография Императорской Академии наук 1874, vol. 1, pp. 204–207. The work is judged as original, А[лександр] С. Курилов, К[ирилл] В. Пигарев, *Теоретико-литературная мысль в России XVIII в.*, in: П. А. Николаев (ed.), *Возникновение русской науки о литературе*, Москва: Наука 1975, p. 64, but it is also considered to be “thoroughly derivative and banal,” [Irvine] R. Titunik, Apollos Baibakov’s *Pravila piiticheskiia* and Vasilii Trediakovskii: toward an understanding of Russian humanism in the eighteenth century, in: R. Bartlett, A. G. Cross, K. Rasmussen (eds.), *Russia and the World of the Eighteenth Century*, Columbus: Slavica 1988, p. 378.

(Победоносна, VictoryBearer, or simply Victor), for his daughter Tselomudra (Целомудра, Chaste) (act 1 scene 3).³ She obediently and lovingly accepted Pobedonosn who was also happy (1:3). He had been in love with her for quite some time “stricken by her beauty” (1:3). He vowed even to die for his love, and she vowed not to have another man if something bad happened (1:3). The news came that Ammonites had invaded Israel (1:4). Before going to face the enemy, Jephthah went to the temple “to make a promise to the Lord” (1:4). Jephthah came back after defeating Ammonites and fell in despair when his daughter came to greet him (2:1). It was because of his vow to God: he had promised that after victory he would give as burning offering the person who came from the door of his house to greet him even though the elders wondered about how strange such a promise was (2:2; promise also: 3:5) and asked him to spare her (25). However, she accepted her fate and asked for two months to cry over her virginity (2:2). Afterwards, the Levites came to take her to the temple for offering. The temple was filled with many people, but Jephthah stayed at home (3:2). Having learned the news about her death, despaired Pobedonosn “falls into faintness and dies.” Holding his body, Jephthah ended the play with the words, “My beloved son! you will take away also my life” (3:5).

Baibakov gave a rather unimaginative rendering of the Biblical report on Jephthah in *Judges* 11. Baibakov added Pobedonosn to the biblical account and made him die upon learning of Tselomudra’s death. A psychologically unsettling element in the Biblical account is Jephthah’s daughter’s readiness to become an offering. In Baibakov’s account, she gladly accepted her fate because of her obedience to and love for her father. It would be more interesting if Baibakov’s Pobedonosn had been killed in battle, which would have been easier to explain why Tselomudra agreed so readily to become an offering after the death of her beloved. There are also some puzzling elements in Baibakov’s play. First, he spoke about the temple. A supposition could be made that he likely did not mean the temple (храм), but the tabernacle (скиния), since the temple was built by Solomon, after the pe-

³ Аполлос, *Иеффай: Священная трагедия, коея содержание в Библейских книгах Судей главе II к концу*, Москва: Типография Университетская 1778; Москва: В Университетской Типографии, у Н. Новикова 1782; also in *Российский феатр*, Санкт-Петербург: при Императорской Академии Наук 1787, pt. 6, pp. 241–272.

riod of judges ended. However, he spoke about the temple being full of people (3:1, 3:2), which excludes the tabernacle since access to it was prohibited, even punishable by death (Num. 1:48–51).⁴ Secondly, he said that the sacrifice was performed by Levites, even in the temple. The Book of Judges does not give any details about the offering itself. We may surmise that Jephthah did this himself. In the play, he was not up to it. However, it is questionable that Levites would ever make a human sacrifice since such sacrifice was strictly forbidden (Deut. 12:30–31, 18:10). And thus, if there was a point to this play, it is not very easy to detect it.

Jephthah is the only play Baibakov wrote. He felt better at home with allegorical novels, which came out in quick succession: *Blind Uranii, an unfortunate ruler* (1779), *Inseparable union of two brothers* (1780), *Evgeonit* (1782), and *Who is the true friend?* (1783).

Blind Uranii, an unfortunate ruler (1779, 1784)⁵ intends to describe the human condition as revealed in the Sacred Scripture. The protagonist of this work, Uranii, signifies a human being in general (5, 13, 65) and his blindness indicates the blindness of reason particularly concerning salvation (6, 105). Uranus was a son of a king, the creator and the ruler of the universe. Each nation had a different image of him and different name, but none conveyed his essence, and Germans and Chinese did not even have a name nor temples believing that the divinity cannot be contained by a temple nor have a name like a man (7). Various things or phenomena were considered divine among pagans which was caused by depravation of the mind (Jer. 9:13) and various reasons led to divinization of certain people: the strong or wise were honored as divine; the flattering of great people led to their divinization; the desire of eternal fame was sometimes the reason; sometimes the desire of preserving the memory in descendants, etc. (8). The existence of God and His perfection is proven by the makeup of the world which is like a book and a mirror (Rom. 1:20); also, it is proven by the

⁴ Also, the action took place in Gilead, but the tabernacle was in Shiloh (Josh. 18:1; 1 Sam. 13, 24), the other side of the Jordan river.

⁵ Аполлос, *Лишенный зрения Ураний, несчастный государь: Священная повесть* [Москва]: Печатана в типографии Императорскаго Московскаго университета 1779; Москва: Типография Ф. Гиппиуса 1784; second edition has extensive explanatory footnotes and the pagination of this edition is used here.

agreement of nations; by the voice of conscience; and by an inborn desire of goodness/happiness (Ps. 17[16]:15); however, most of all, it is proven from revelation (12).

Uranii was the firstborn of his Father and his successor (13). Uranii was endowed with reason, the first perfection of the image of God (14). He was skillful in all sciences. His Father taught him philosophy, astronomy, natural history etc. He knew properties of plants better than Solomon, he was better than Hippocrates in medicine (15). Father brought to Uranii animals that he did not see before and asked him to tell what were these creations of nature. Uranii saw attributes of animals and answered in "the Eastern language" (in which all spoke then), for example, *gamal* (camel), i.e., avenger, since camels remember insults for a long time (16). The first man was holy, although not like God; he had a natural inclination to goodness and desired to do good (17). His reason was submitted to God, his will to his reason, and his passions and desires to the will and the body to passions, whereby the body was pure and man was a temple of the living God. A proof of this was his nakedness that did not cause shame (18). Vice arose when passions ruled over reason, not vice versa (19). In Uranii the image of God was reflected also in his body since it was immutable by being healthy. Nothing could harm it: weather, illness, tiredness, which is clear from its nakedness and God's warning in Gen. 2:17 (22). He was not afraid of death, as an image of God, he was immortal in the sense of being able not to die (23). He knew medicine and through eating of some herbs he could deal with the onset of illness, although the tree of life could preserve his health and youth. This tree was a sign of life received from God which would remind him when he ate from it (27). God made a house for Uranii, a famous castle, paradise (28). In the orchard he replanted trees, watered flowers, and collected harvest without becoming tired (29). He was in peace with animals (31).

There were some poisonous plants in the orchard (34). The Father requested that Uranii should not eat their fruits but should know their properties or use them to produce some useful things. That included the tree of knowledge of good and evil which contained not physical poison, but moral (35). This tree was to be used, but its fruits were not to be eaten (36). Kakofit (κακὸς ὄφις, evil serpent) was a servant whom the Father loved (37). He was wiser than Uranii. However, he used his powers for evil devices. He rebelled against God and was sen-

tenced to eternal slavery. Never did he think about asking forgiveness (38). He envied Uranii (39) and wanted to trick him (40) since Uranii was young and inexperienced (41). He turned himself into a serpent and hid in the poisonous tree. He made its fruit appear very alluring. He said to Uranii that the Father prohibited eating from this tree since He did not want that the glory of anyone exceeded His own (42). Although Uranii knew all goodness, he did not know “evil that flows into the practical life.” First man was without sin but he was not God. Sin arises from “confusing and imperfect concepts” (43). If he knew that his existence was perfect, why would he want more glory? Silver is good, but when compared with gold, which one anyone would want? Although he considered himself happy, Uranii wanted the glory his Father had. By such a desire Kakofit brought disaster upon himself (44). Finally, Uranii gave in and took a bite from a fruit (Baibakov did mention Eve, but only in footnotes (45, 50)). Poison took over his body and blinded him. He became tormented. Poison means here sin than blinded spiritual eyes, i.e., human reason, which affected reasoning power, memory, imagination, and conscience (46). The Father heard the triumphal cry of Kakofit and came to see his son in a lamentable state (47). The Father blamed Uranii saying that by desiring Father’s glory he made himself Father’s “insufferable enemy”: “What ruler would I be if I left evil-doing in my kingdom without punishment?” (49). Uranii was penitent and the Father was torn between vengeance and mercy (50). Uranii was expelled from his house (51) to the place full of evil and evil-doing (53). In the world full of evil some wanted overthrow the Lord of the universe, and some wanted to put Kakofit on the throne. The Lord threw all of them into the sea (the flood) and only a small number was left (65). However, evil did not stop. Now people wanted to take the palace of Uranii’s Father. Nimrod was the leader of this rebellion (68). When they were building the tower of Babel, God scattered people over the earth (70).

In search of healing, Uranii went to Egypt considered to be the capital of wisdom (73). The Father sent him a guide (74). Like the Israelites, Uranii left Egypt (78) and after crossing the Red Sea, he went through the desert where, because of many difficulties (80), many times he wanted to die. However, the Father assisted him. He did not want to forgive him too soon to magnify his desire for healing and to show him the magnitude of his sin. Uranii came close to a high moun-

tain (81). He heard the voice of his Father, climbed the mountain, and saw him for one moment (82). He also found a scroll; the guide read it: wash your eyes with the blood of the purest lamb (83). The guide took him to Greece (89), but Greek philosophers were unable to heal his blindness and Hippocrates was then in Macedonia (99). A trip to Rome was equally fruitless. Finally, they went to Jerusalem. Along the way, Uranii had several visions that included a ladder to heaven, the new Jerusalem, and figures with four faces (107). He saw a man who resurrected the dead from their graves whose names were written in a book, presumably the book of life (108). When approaching Jerusalem (109), he was attacked by robbers, and the guide fled and hid. Uranii was seriously wounded (110) and awaited death. Levites passed by him, but only a Samaritan took pity on him (111), bandaged him, and took him to an inn. This was the promised physician. He sprinkled him with living water (signifying baptism) and his eyes began to open (112) and he saw his Father (113). What happened was that Koko fit instigated people to assault the Father and kill him. "He hid under the ground for 39 hours not only did not die, but also made medicine from his blood" (114). Healed Uranii could not wait to see his Father's house. The Father prepared for him a palace (117) and came to greet him to live with the Father for eternity (118).

In this interesting novel, Baibakov used the Biblical imagery generously, presenting the sprawling vision of Biblical history of humanity and the history of redemption offered by God the Father. He presented the Father's salvific offer in a stark contrast to what the best of human wisdom had to offer, which only led to disappointing results. Human wisdom is indispensable to human life but does not by itself provide the ultimate answer to the eschatological problem of the afterlife and the ways of finding oneself on the right side of the eternity: God Himself prepared the way and His salvific path through self-sacrifice, if the only avenue.

It is interesting to notice that the magnificent epic poem of Siemion S. Bobrov, *The ancient night of the universe or the wandering blind man* (1807–1809), may have been inspired by Baibakov. There is the same idea – the search for healing, that is, salvation – which is allegorically depicted in a similar manner: spiritual blindness of the protagonist represented by physical blindness; personified reason as a guide; visiting Egypt and Greece with devilish meddling along the

way to find the healing human wisdom can offer; and the healing found in Christ. Fairly impressive as *Blind Uranii* is, Bobrov's poem is much more imaginative and is presented on a much larger scale than Baibakov's.

Inseparable union of two brothers (1780)⁶ is not a story, but rather musings about two twin brothers, Athanat/Afanat (Аѳанат/Афанат, Immortal) and Thnit/Fnit (Ѳнит/Фнит, Mortal) who loved and hated one another; what one liked, another hated, but they were always together, inseparable (5). Thereby, it is clear from the outset that Baibakov meant the soul and the body and their union, inseparable in this life and, presumably, also after the resurrection. These brothers are one human being understood generally as humanity. And thus, the brothers had different inclinations: one did things quickly, the other slowly, etc. (8). They constantly complained about one another (9). Together they were able to do anything. They traveled through seas and waves and winds served them (11). They used the services of animals. They explained their thoughts to nations and investigated the world and heaven wondering about laws governing there (12). Science and art were always helpful. They were great when acting together, prone to evil when acting separately: Thnit conducted himself worse than cattle; Athanat, like Icarus rose on wings of wax and fell down (13). With Diagoras he denied the existence of God, and sometimes with Pyrrho he doubted in everything (14), sometimes with Spinoza and Tolland he considered the whole of universe to be God. There was always something base and weak in Thnit, but when he subordinated himself to Athanat he was guided like by a wise steersman (15) through dangerous waves. Thnit by himself was like an unbridled horse, a blind man who needed Athanat as a rider to guide him (16).

Athanat and Thnit consoled themselves that their problems were short-lived and an eternal reward awaited them (26). They had helpers, Nois/Nous (Reason) and Dokii (Opinion), which is an idea that comes from logic stating that experience and reason are the source of all truth: Athanat went with Nous, Thnit with Dokii. Nous showed, Dokii acted upon it; one supported another (29). When the brothers

⁶ Аполлос, *Неразрывный союз двух братьев; Повесть излюбумудрия почерпнутая*, Москва: В Университетской типографии у Н. Новикова 1780.

followed the advice of these helpers, they loved one another and their actions were successful and grew in their perfections. When they disobeyed their helpers, they followed their own biases, preconceptions, superstition, and habits (30). Nous and Dokii were their “inner protectors and defenders.” The brothers had no better model than their father (31) whom Pythagoras called the Monad and Aristotle called the greater than virtue (βελτίων τῆς ἀρετῆς)⁷ (32). If the brothers were obedient to their father, i.e., if they loved him, nothing would happen to them (33). The brothers were losing this love for their father and grew in hate for one another (35). “How foolishly act those who abandon the source of the living water and take it from muddy sources” (36). The father blessed them even when they abandoned him; he never stopped loving them (37). “His love would be a support in their lives and a better defense against any attacks than what Nous and Dokii offered.” The brothers also used the help of (39) the subordinates: all elements were to their disposal. They could not blame anyone for the misuse of things. Wine is not to blame when one becomes drunk (40). “What more salvific is given by the Creator than sciences that by their illumination make people like God; but what cannot be used for evil? Foolish and depraved souls drink venom of godlessness from Philosophy itself. Poetry and Music enflame in them only furious love; painting with its delightful depictions enflames desires.” How much evil is caused by gold, this gift of God (41). If only the brothers observed nature, they would not have striven from the right path. The more they would study their father’s world, the more would they follow him (46). Harmony of nature when studied by Athanat with guidance of Nous and by Thnit with the guidance of Dokii would lead them to seeking not the creation but the Creator (47). Athanat did not get old; only Thnit “began to die every day,” but he did not want to talk nor hear about death (52). When the time of Thnik’s death came (70), the brothers said goodbye to one another “and parted in the hope of the union of continuous love” (71). In this, Baibakov stressed the importance of physico-theology: the keen observation of nature and its

⁷ *Magna moralia* 1200b14. Baibakov incorrectly translates it as *преизящнейший в добродетелях*, most excellent in virtues, whereas Aristotle shows in this fragment that God is above virtue; otherwise, virtue would be better than God.

orderliness brings people inevitably to the Creator and thereby to the hope of eternal life. Interestingly, Babakov, an Orthodox ecclesiastic, did not shun from referencing God as the Pythagorean Monad and the peripatetic greater than virtue⁸ without once mentioning Christ.

The *Evgeonit* (1782)⁹ is not really a literary work, but a dialog between Evgeonit, “well-created [благопроизведенный, εὖ-, well-; γίγνομαι, to be born/made; γενέτης, the begotten, son] man for his happiness in the world” and Diakris (διάκρισις, discernment/judgment), a messenger of God. This dialogue is a pretext to teach the reader about God based on observation of His creation. It is a work of popular science in which Baibakov drew on *A conversation about the plurality of worlds* by M. de Fontenelle, *Geography* by Georg Kraft, and *Letters on different subjects of physics* by Leonhard Euler.

To console Evgeonit and dispel his ignorance (12), Diakris stated that everything Evgeonit saw was created for him. Why build a house if no one should live there, and why trees would give fruit if no one would not use them? Then Diakris presented the many physical and astronomical facts about the universe. He spoke about Ptolemy’s geocentrism and about one Prussian,¹⁰ Copernicus, (21) who put the sun in the center and only the moon circled around the earth. Tycho de Brache put the earth in the center with the sun moving around it and all planets around the sun. “After he corrected the opinion of the old Egyptian [Ptolemy], people started to indisputably follow him” (22). By this statement, Baibakov seems to have taken the side of Tycho. He surely rejected Ptolemy. He stated that the sun “is incomparably larger than the earth. Therefore, the honor belongs to it so that other planets would move around it: if you wanted to warm your hands at the fire, should the fire move around your hands or hands around

⁸ In which Baibakov used Aristotle as an authority in the work in which, incongruously, he blasted scholastics for their references to Aristotle as a theological and philosophical authority contemptuously considering a scholastic to be in the category of “a schismatic [who] bases his foolishness on the foolishness of his father or grandfather” (25).

⁹ Аполлос, *Евгеонит, или Созерцание в натуре дел Божиих видимых дел*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии, у Н. Новикова 1782.

¹⁰ Copernicus was a canon in Frauenburg, as stated by Kraft, [Георг Вольфганг Крафт], *Краткое руководство к математической и натуральной географии*, Санктпетербург: при Императорской Академии Наук 1739, p. 24, which Baibakov apparently took to mean that he was a Prussian, the Polish town of Frauenburg or rather Frombork, being in Baibakov’s times in the Prussian part after partition of Poland, in which, incidentally, Russia also participated.

fire?” (19–20). This appears to be an allusion to Lomonosov’s rhetorical question asked in a short poem included in *The appearance of Venus on the Sun* (1761),¹¹ “Who saw a simpleton among cooks / Who would turn the fireplace around the roast?” In this poem, Lomonosov clearly sided with Copernicus. Fairly boldly for an Orthodox ecclesiastic, Baibakov allowed for a possibility of the existence of inhabitants of the moon (35), Jupiter (55), Saturn, and Mercury (56). If this is true that there are inhabited worlds like the earth, “how much should be wonder about the wisdom of the one who having created their innumerable amount rules over all of them?” (78). Since nothing exists in vain (53), Baibakov sometimes felt obligated to find purposes of elements of God’s creation. For example, mountains are like the bones of the earth; they protect from winds, flood, eject fire, etc.; they contains natural riches (49).¹² In any event, “this world, not being created by blind fate, proclaims the glory of God revealing to us [like] in the mirror his being, showing like in the theater his wisdom, goodness, and omnipotence” (92).

Who is the true friend? (1783)¹³ is a rather undistinguished story about one Viofit (likely from βίος, life, φύς from φύω, bring forth) was looking for a friend since “a loyal friend is medicine of life and immortality whom those who fear only God can find” (7). He tried the friendship of cold and frugal Singenii (συγγενές, akin), of deceitful Plutos (πλούτος, riches), and virtuous Aret (ἀρετή, Virtue). Viofit was made from contradictory elements and his thought vacillated between the earthly and celestial matters (5). Drawn to the vices of Plutos, Viofit could not listen to Aret (15). Careless with his finances, Viofit was brought to court for his debts (26) and unable to pay them he was imprisoned (29). Aret came to rescue (37). He asked all lenders to forgive Viofit his debts (38). The judge also showed mercy on

¹¹ Cf. Сухомлинов, *op. cit.*, p. 213; А[льберт] И. Есюков, М. В. Ломоносов и епископ Архангельский Аполлос (А. Д. Байбаков), in: Э. Я. Фесенко (ed.), *Тебе, предтеча и пророк*, Архангельск: САФУ 2011, p. 73.

¹² Cf. Владимир Золотницкий, *Разсуждение о безсмертии человеческой души, которое утверждает особливо чрез доказательство Божияго бытия, открывающагося нам из многочисленных созданий*, Москва: [При Императорской Академии Наук] 1768, in: Т. В. Артемьева (ed.), *Мысли о душе. Русская метафизика XVIII века*, Санкт-Петербург: Наука 1996, p. 160.

¹³ Аполлос, *Кто есть истинный друг? Иносказательное со нравоучением повествование*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии, у Н. Новикова 1783.

account of Aret. He took away Viofit's chains and led him to the paradisiacal Elysian fields (39). The moral seems to be that putting the entire trust in someone akin to oneself, to another human being, or to deceitful riches of the world leads a person astray. The only hope for the paradise for the human being, the created life, offers the Creator Himself who is also the divine Virtue.

Apostle Paul's letters

Baibakov wrote commentaries on six letters of the apostle Paul: Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians.¹⁴ However, these writings are largely disappointing as commentaries since after quoting particular verses, Baibakov simply repeated what they say in a more verbose fashion. Here are some examples.

“He who gave Peter power for his mission to the circumcised gave me also power to go to the gentiles. He who made Peter an apostle for the Jews, He also chose me as an Apostle to the gentiles. And as with his mercy and miracles He gave power for his mission to the circumcised, so the same God helped me with the same mercy to have power to go to the gentiles” (Gal. 2:8). *“You are no longer a servant but a son, and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ. Whoever you are, you don't live here under protection and you are not a servant, nor you are separated from heirship, but a son who has the full right and lived in your freedom; and if you are a son, then the direct heir of the kingdom, an heir of God. And this heirship, this sonship, is given to you through Christ to whom you are connected by faith through His merits like a branch to a tree”* (4:7).

Salvation is by faith *“not of works lest any man should boast. Not of some previous virtues of yours that are gained, according to some philosophers, through longlasting habits and exercises, but suddenly, without any of your effort through the abbreviated path of faith. Lest*

¹⁴ Аполлос, *Послание святого апостола Павла ко ефесеям со истолкованием*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии, у Н. Новикова 1785; *Два послания святого апостола Павла к филиппийцам и к колоссянам со истолкованием*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии, у Н. Новикова, 1785; *Первое [и второе] послание святого апостола Павла к солунянам со изъяснением*, Москва: Типография Компании типографической 1786; *Послание святого апостола Павла к галатам*, Москва: В Типографии Компании типографической 1787.

any man should boast. May anyone not dare to ascribe honor to his mind, resourcefulness and efforts. Justification followed by good works flow from God. All richness of river waters should be ascribed to the source" (Eph. 2:9). "*The spiritual fruit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth.* The fruit of the Holy Spirit from whom you received your illumination in baptism and anointment and who led you from darkness to light *is in all goodness* and not in the works of darkness, verse 10 [should be 11]. He is opposed to unfruitful works and relies on good works which are called fruits. *Goodness* is opposed to anger and mercilessness, *righteousness* to deception and vice, *truth* to the lie" (5:9).

Paul prays for the Philippians that they "*be filled with the fruits of righteousness which are by Jesus Christ unto the glory and praise of God.* I pray so that you be *filled* with fruits of righteousness that includes all other virtues and good works: so that you could bring fruits, like a fruitful tree, not to yourself but also to others, and these fruits we can bring through righteousness *of Jesus Christ*, being *filled* with His grace and Spirit. And then, they will serve *unto the glory* and praise of God; since all works of people who were impure and turned to God by faith will serve unto the glory of God which is nothing else but your own gain" (Phil. 1:11). "*Brethren, be like me and look at those who walk just as an example that you have in us.* And so, follow all those who agree with me and who want imitate me, *you also be like me!* and *look at* those who live in brotherly love in mutual peace without any foolishness and in the life of holiness, consider me as *an example*" (3:17).

"*We give thanks to God the Father and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ praying always for you.* For your faith and for love as for an excellent gift of the Holy Spirit, *we give thanks* to God who is the first person of the Holy Trinity, the Father *of our Lord Jesus Christ* entreating for the mercies of God for us, *praying always for you*" (Col. 1:3). "*You are dead and your life is hidden with Christ in God.* You are dead to the world, sin, and all sinful activities; you have begun to take off the old man in baptism. And new kind of your spiritual life *and your life is hidden* from the world that considers you foolish and most contemptible. This life, stamped *with Christ*, your head, has its beginning from the source, [and is] *hidden in God*, whom the world does not see" (3:3).

"*You became like us and like the Lord having received the word in much affliction with the joy of the Holy Spirit.* And the effort in our preaching was not in vain. We see its fruit, since in magnanimity, pa-

tience and persecution *you became like us and the Lord*, the suffering Christ: since you became like us when misfortunes came *having received the word in much affliction with the joy* that is cause by the Holy Spirit” (1 Thess. 1:4). “*God has called us not to impurity, but to holiness*. Since God called us to faith, from darkness to light, He did not do it so that we live impurely, wantonly, in depravity or that we give ourselves to lust, but *to holiness*, so that, as Christians, we would live in holy, chaste way and serve the living and true God” (4:7).

“*It is just for God to repay with harm those who harm you*. If God gives to all their due, then it is appropriate and *just* for God to *repay* everyone with a proper reward, then *it is just for God to repay* in the future life those, who were harmed by insult here; as to the lawless, *it is just to repay with harm those who harm you*” (2 Thess. 1:6). “*Faithful is the Lord who fortifies you and protects from evil*. And although there are such ones who want to demolish or destroy your faith, you should not fear, since the one who in His words and promises *is faithful*, the *Lord* almighty, fortifies you with His mercy and therefore He *will fortify you and protect from evil* devil and from all evil people who are like him, Mt. 6:13” (3:3).

Paul’s letters include some statements which would require some theological clarification, but such clarification is not forthcoming from Baibakov. For example, when Paul mentions the principality, power, might, and dominion, Baibakov one time says that perhaps Paul meant here philosophers’ understanding of heaven or the gods of ancient poets (Eph. 1:21) at another time that these are demonic powers or angelic powers: seraphim, cherubim, archangels, and angels (Col. 1:16). He did not refer to a discussion of angelic hierarchy what was widely discussed in the Western church particularly after Dionysius of Areopagite, but also in Eastern tradition to mention Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, and John of Damascus.¹⁵

Baibakov only quotes Paul’s statement that he fills in his body what is lacking in afflictions of Christ (Col. 1:24) not commenting at all on what these lacking things could be.

¹⁵ Apparently, the problem of angelic hierarchy did not come up even during his lecture on angels, С[ергей] Смирнов, *История Троицкой лаврской семинарии*, Москва: Типография В. Готье 1867, pp. 268–270.

The theologically difficult problem of Christ's kenosis is mentioned as the fact that Jesus "belittled himself" by "being born and lived in poorer condition" by taking a form of a servant and a man (Phil. 2:7). The original is stronger and speaks about becoming empty rather than little, which raises important theological problems concerning the dual nature of Christ. Baibakov addressed none of it.

Paul opened a possibility of the tripartite understanding of the human being: the spirit, soul and body; Baibakov avoided the problem by stating: "*spirit*, i.e., grace and gifts of the Holy Spirit that should be preserved," the soul is endowed with reason that should rule over feelings; the body the tool of the soul (1 Thess. 5:23); human spirit is the gift of the Holy Spirit? Elsewhere he called the gifts of the Holy Spirit to be the stamp put on believers distinguishing them from idolaters and Jews (Eph. 1:14). Does it mean that the latter have no gifts of the Spirit, and that they don't have spirit?

Paul said, "you know what restrains" the arrival of the last judgment, Baibakov avoided the discussion of what this restraining power could be only saying "I don't want to clarify precisely to you since He will be preceded by dispersion of Judea and destruction of the Roman monarchy" (2 Thess. 2:6), which is hardly helpful.

Interesting is Baibakov's remark that indecency (στυγερὰ ἄσελγεία) "consists in shameless actions, in uncontrollable motions of the body, in kisses, in embraces, in [singing] shameful songs etc." (Gal. 5:19), although it seems that Baibakov's picturesque "uncontrollable motions of the body" would require some explanation.

Moreover, Paul urged Thessalonians "to know" those who labor among them, take the lead of them, and admonish them. Baibakov interpreted this as meaning "shepherds and fathers and servants of Christ sent for salvation ... bishops and presbyters" (1 Thess. 5:12); they should also be esteemed, which Baibakov, expressed as a command, "submit to the shepherds" (5:13), in which spoke Baibakov the ecclesiastic who demanded obedience from his flock.

Some of his remarks may not be quite justified. For example, when Paul wrote that Christ descended and then ascended "to fulfil all" (Ἄρα ἰσπολνἰτ ἄσἰελγεία) (Eph. 4:10), Baibakov took it to mean: to fulfil all that was prophesied about Him; however, it appears that the phrase seems to say "to fill all [with His presence]" rather than "to fulfill all [prophecies]" (ἵνα πληρώσἰ τὰ πάντα), although, admittedly, both

Greek πληρώω and Russian исполнять can mean both “to fulfill” and “to fill.” Also, possibly on reflection, Baibakov would not have said that the wife is “the tool (орудие) of the husband in bringing up children, in maintaining the house, etc.” (Gal. 5:28); a tool?

In sum, reading Baibakov’s renderings of Paul’s letters is hardly illuminating. For the most part, it is watering down Paul’s statements whereby they lose their power. In effect, it is much better to read Paul’s own words without Baibakov’s unhelpful additions. Incidentally, it is the same with Psalm 104 which Baibakov retold in the conclusion of the *Evgeonit* (94–112) with

his words inserted between the words of the psalm adding nothing of significance to them.¹⁶

Translation work

Baibakov did also some translation work that includes the translation of some of Gellert’s spiritual songs.¹⁷ In this translation, Baibakov was concerned more about the form than the content: he followed the rhythm and rhyme of the original exactly to the detriment of the content so it is rather fair to say that his translation of Gellert was mechanical.¹⁸ Frequently, the entire stanzas had to be reshuffled, many words changed with stronger or weaker meaning than the ones in the original to accommodate the poetic form, but the spiritual accents have been often shifted. For example,

Gellert: “When I have / Calm conscience / Then as for me, while others have to fear, / There is nothing fearful in nature” (120).

Baibakov: “When my / Thought is calm, / All the attack of evil in nature isn’t enough / That I could tremble” (6).

Gellert: “He, our friend, / United with us, / Since for some time we’ve been His enemies, / He became like us, / To reveal the kingdom of God / And His love in flesh” (28).

¹⁶ There is an interesting detail here: in the Septuagint, recognized as the sacred version of the Bible by Orthodoxy, this is psalm 103. A similar departure from Septuagint’s numbering of psalms is also in *Who is the true friend?*: psalm 143 instead of Septuagint’s 142 (26–28).

¹⁷ Х[ристиан] Ф[юрхтеготт] Геллерт, *Песни духовныя*, Москва: При Университетской типографии 1778; [Christian Fürchtegott] Gellert, *Geistliche Oden und Lieder*, Zürich: Bürgkliche Truckerey 1761.

¹⁸ Сухомлинов, *op. cit.*, pp. 209–210.

Baibakov: “Of [His] love with you / [He] such pledge / Made, when we were his enemies, / The Lord of Heavens / Would take [upon Himself] the body / So that we can live for ages under his protection” (11).

Gellert: “Up, Christians, who trust Him, / Don’t let any danger scare you; / The God who looks from heaven, / Will surely protect us” (97).

Baibakov: “Blessed and loyal slave of Christ! / Stop being afraid, / God is ready to give help, / Stop being afraid of everything” (25).

The most significant translatorial work of Baibakov is his translation of Thomas Browne’s *Religio medici*, the religion of a medic. It appeared for the first time in 1642 in an unauthorized version; the first authorized version was published the next year. The book was very popular and in the 17th century alone it was published some 20 times in several languages. Baibakov said in the preface that he found a copy of the book in the lavra library and it was almost certainly its Latin translation.¹⁹

Religio medici is a personal and ardent presentation of Browne’s own understanding of Christianity which agrees in major points with mainstream Christian dogmas. It is not a systematic presentation of Christian theology; in fact, sometimes there are abrupt changes of topic. However, Baibakov tried to turn it into a manual of sorts of what Christian life should be. To that end, he excised many parts that didn’t agree with Orthodoxy or were very strongly and controversially stated. He also modified some phrases and sentences beginning with the mode of presenting the narrative. Browne’s original is written in the first person singular: “I did this...,” “I thought that...” which is retained in the Latin version. However, the sparkling prose of the English original is tamed and somewhat more formal in the Latin version and even more so in Baibakov’s rendering which is presented in the third person singular or plural: “A Christian should do this...,” “people should do that...,” “people ought not to this...,” or first person plural, “we should do this..... To give one example, “True Christian is not afraid of hell” is a rendering of “I thank God, and with joy I mention it, I was

¹⁹ Thomas Browne, *Religio medici*, London: George Bell and Sons 1898; modernized spelling is used here for the text from the 1643 edition. Thomas Browne, *Religio medici*, translated into Latin by Iohann [John] Merryweather, Lugd[uni] Batavorum apud Franciscum Hackium 1644. [Томас Броун], *Вера, надежда и любовь, учения богословскаго состав*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии у Н. Новикова 1782.

never afraid of hell” (78/92/163).²⁰ The book ends with a short prayer which is the only place which is translated in the first person singular: “Give me, God, peace of conscience in his world,” etc. (128/241/140). This is thus a free translation, heavily edited and in that sense in can also be considered a representative of Baibakov’s own views although given in Browne’s own or modified words.

On major theological points there is nothing controversial in the original and translated version of *Religio medici*. This is a Trinitarian theology where the mystery of the Trinity cannot be fathomed by the human mind. The thought of the afterlife should preoccupy every human being and the only guarantee to be on the blessed side of the afterlife is the trust in Christ and the forgiveness of sin offered through His self-sacrifice. The source of theological authority is the Scripture, when it is silent – the church – when both are silent – reason. Baibakov agreed with the first two, but left out the third, reason as the source of authority (iii/21/10).

He apparently agreed with Browne that we should carefully deal with people who disagree with us since some time in the future we will disagree with what we accept today, but Baibakov dropped the reference to the pope to whom “we owe the duty of good (*humanitatem*) language” (iii/22–23/11).

Baibakov had nothing against the peripatetic doctrine of four causes when he included in his translation the statement that there is one first cause of existence of everything and four secondary causes. First matter has no form. There is a reason for each creation that depends on God’s providence (9/49/26).

We learn theology from two books, one written by God, another by His servant, nature; those who did not see the first book could read the second (13/53/28). The doctrine of the two books was very popular in Western Europe and gained also wide acceptance in Russia. When Browne stated that God is “an excellent artist” (14/55/29) and that “nature is the art of God” (17/58/31), Baibakov agreed even to the point to include a somewhat puzzling consequence that there is no deformity in any kind of creature (15/56/30). Even in monstrosity there is a kind

²⁰ The first number is a page of Baibakov’s translation, the second – a page of the Latin translation, the third – a page of the English original.

of beauty (16/57/30). “God is the true cause of all” (24/67/36) and thus nations rise and fall according to God’s design (20/92/22) and also human life is determined by God’s providence (64/137/76).

At one point Browne stated that beggars recognize by some traits of people’s faces whom to ask for money; that is, beggars can read people. This is because “the human face has, in fact, secret [mystical] signs, manifestations of soul itself” (90/188/107). There are also on the hand some secret [mystical] lines which have some meaning since “the pen which does nothing in vain drawn them” (90/189/108). Baibakov left out “mystical,” but, still, he came very close to endorsing palmistry.

Baibakov removed from his translation many parts of Browne’s book that he did not consider appropriate for the Russian Orthodox readership. There are too many of them to list all of them; here are some examples.

The large section that presents three heresies, death of the soul and then its recreation, universal salvation (Origen’s heresy), and the prayer for the death, is left out, the last part for an obvious reason: it is part of the Orthodox doctrine (26–32/13–16).²¹

Browne stated that doubts raised by science should be combatted not by force but on knees (26/37/69), but Baibakov did not include examples of such doubts, namely some miracles described in the Bible: healing through the means of the brazen serpent, of miracle of Elijah of the burning altar drenched in water; of the destruction of Sodom, and of the manna (37–38/69–70). Was he afraid that these examples may raise doubts in the mind of the reader? For this reason he removed the confession: “I would gladly know how Moses, with an actual fire, calcined or burnt the golden calf into powder,” since gold melts in fire, but it does not burn (89/154). Also, the statement that natural fire would vitrify the world, turning it into glass (90/155) did not make it into translation because it casts doubt on the universal conflagration of the last days.

Being too positive about pagan philosophers is not acceptable and thus, statements “I have often admired the mystical way of Pythagoras, and the secret magic of numbers” (22/42), and “Hermes [Trisme-

²¹ When only two numbers are used, the first is a page from the English original, the second – from the Latin version.

gistos], that this visible world is but a picture of the invisible” (23/43) are omitted. The statement that “Those that heretofore denied the divinity of the Holy Ghost have been condemned but as heretics; and those that now deny our Savior, though more than heretics, are not so much as atheists: for, though they deny two persons in the Trinity, they hold, as we do, there is but one God” (38–39/71–72) is left out; it would be too much for Baibakov to consider Unitarians as believers almost on equal footing with the Orthodox.

Browne wrote, “I confess there are, in Scripture, stories that do exceed the fables of poets, and, to a captious reader, sound like *Garagantua* or *Bevis* (*poetarum fabulas*). Search all the legends of times past, and the fabulous conceits of these present, and it will be hard to find one that deserves to carry the buckler unto Sampson; yet is all this of an easy possibility, if we conceive a divine concourse, or an influence but from the little finger of the Almighty. It is impossible that, either in the discourse of man or in the infallible voice of God, to the weakness of our apprehensions there should not appear irregularities, contradictions, and antinomies: myself could show a catalogue of doubts, never yet imagined or questioned, as I know, which are not resolved at the first hearing; not fantastic queries or objections of air; for I cannot hear of atoms in divinity. I can read the history of the pigeon that was sent out of the ark, and returned no more, yet not question how she found out her mate that was left behind” (40/75), or if Adam was a hermaphrodite, or in what season the world was created (41/76); all of it is left out since it likely sounded to Baibakov too bold, too irreverent, even impertinent. Similarly with the statement, that “there are other assertions and common tenets drawn from Scripture, and generally believed as Scripture, whereunto, notwithstanding, I would never betray the liberty of my reason.” For example, it is believed that Judas hanged himself although it can be shown from the Scriptures that this was not the case (43/80). “These are no points of faith; and therefore may admit a free dispute” (44/81); examples and this overly bold conclusion are left out. The statement that “there are many (questionless) canonized on earth, that shall never be saints in heaven” is not quite acceptable since it may put in doubt the Orthodox doctrine of canonization (49/91).

I believe in miracles, said Browne, but I “have no confidence in those which are fathered on the dead. And this hath ever made me

suspect the efficacy of relics, to examine the bones, question the habits and appertenances of saints, and even of Christ himself. I cannot conceive why the cross that Helena found, and whereon Christ himself died, should have power to restore others unto life" (52/96); it goes without saying, this statement is left out as it contradicts the Orthodox doctrine.

Browne asserted is belief in changlings, spirits that can assume various corporeal forms. But not in that the "Antichrist should be born of the tribe of Dan, by conjunction with the devil" (55/101); this is left out as the belief that the antichrist comes from the tribe of Dan was quite widespread in Russia." But he apparently agreed with Browne that there are spirits, there are witches (39/99–100/54). Many mysteries were revealed to us by [good and bad – in Browne] angels discovery of which we ascribe to our own reason (40/103/56). However, "those apparitions and ghosts of departed persons are not the wandering souls of men, but the unquiet walks of devils" who do that to deceive people (68/122) – that was not included.

"I am sure there is a common spirit, that plays within us, yet makes no part of us; and that is, the spirit of God; the fire and scintillation of that noble and mighty essence, which is the life and radical heat of spirits, and those essences that know not the virtue of the sun; a fire quite contrary to the fire of hell. This is that gentle heat that brooded on the waters, and in six days hatched the world" (57/104–105); that was too much for Baibakov, so he left it out as he did for the same reason a somewhat theologically convoluted statement that "I was not only before myself but Adam, that is, in the idea of God, and the decree of that synod held from all eternity. And in this sense, I say, the world was before the creation, and at an end before it had a beginning. And thus was I dead before I was alive; though my grave be England, my dying place was Paradise; and Eve miscarried of me, before she conceived of Cain" (101/179).

Because the human body falls apart into elements that are absorbed by plants, the plants that we may eat, it can be said that "we are what we all abhor, anthropophagi, and cannibals, devourers not only of men, but of our selves" (67/121), which sounded too harsh for Baibakov who left this statement out.

"Let us speak naturally, and like philosophers. The forms of alterable bodies in these sensible corruptions perish not; nor, as we

imagine, wholly quit their mansions; but retire and (85/152) contract themselves into their secret and inaccessible parts; where they may best protect themselves from the action of their antagonist” (86/152); seemingly, this is too controversial and is omitted. Where are these forms preserved? Could that be the mind of God?

Arguably, the strongest statement Browne made is that “there is no salvation to those that believe not in Christ” (94/167). Strangely, it is left out, which is probably because this is an opening sentence of the section in which Browne discussed the problem of the dead before birth of Christ concluding that in hell there may be limbo for those worthy souls of people who died before the incarnation (95/168). Actually, since Orthodoxy admits the gradation of both blessed life and the life of the damned, this statement could be acceptable for Orthodoxy.

Browne discussed the problem of the universality of the church, concluding that “those who do confine the church of God either to particular nations, churches, or families, have made it far narrower than our Savior ever meant it” (98/172–173); this is, of course, left out since it could possibly mean that the Protestants and Catholics could be considered as belonging to the church of Christ which for an Orthodox ecclesiastic is an anathema.

“They that endeavor to abolish vice destroy also virtue; for contraries, though they destroy one another, are yet the life of one another” (113/198), which is of ethically dubious value since it may encourage at least a passive behavior toward vice; thus, the statement was rejected.

When Baibakov found Browne’s statement to be not Orthodox enough, he rectified it. “Not a threat [of hell] should divert us from sin, but love of virtue. One should love God more than be afraid of [Him]” is not in Browne and it replaces “I fear God, yet am not afraid of him; his mercies make me ashamed of my sins, before his judgments afraid thereof” (79/92/163). “That we receive heaven and celestial happiness is not caused by our good works, but we are saved by grace” replaces “That I obtain heaven, and the bliss thereof, is accidental, and not the intended work of my devotion; it being a felicity I can neither think to deserve nor scarce in modesty to expect” (82/94/167). “No one was born to collect riches and what we want for ourselves, this should be done to others” renders “I was not born unto riches...” (122/136/236).

Baibakov exonerated himself as a translator in his translation from Latin of Italian cardinal Giovanni Bona's book, *A guide to heavens*.²² He followed very closely the Latin text, used the same chapter and section numbers.²³ He only allowed himself to, fairly often, make once Russian sentence out of two or three Latin sentences. No excising was needed here since the book, although written by a Catholic cardinal, does not make any reference to anything specifically Catholic, such as priestly hierarchy, the purgatory, or the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. The book is very ecumenical, so ecumenical, in fact, that it does not mention the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, and the sacraments. Biblical quotations are used very sparingly; there are only a few references to personages or events described in the Bible and some twenty references to Christ on over 200 pages. It focuses on sin as the obstacle barring people from their way to heaven and on virtues as the way to it. There are a dozen references to Christians and the message is undoubtedly Christian, although not limited to a particular confession.

Education

For Baibakov, an educator, the rector of an academy, education was of paramount importance. Basing his precepts on the idea of the day (Baibakov listed Louis-Antoine Caraccioli, Israel Gottlieb Canz,²⁴ and Joachim Lange), Baibakov laid out an educational curriculum in *A general method of teaching necessary for free people of all ranks*.²⁵ At the age of 6, the young person should enter public school, where he will find friends for life (10). He should have little contact with his parents to learn how to live using his own reason. He should learn how to play an instrument, learn dancing, fencing, shooting, drawing, and appre-

²² Joannis Bona, *Manuductio ad caelum*, Romae: apud Angelum Bernabo 1658; Иоанн Бона, *Христианская философия, или Руководство к небесам*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии у Н. Новикова 1782.

²³ A rare slip: Ostentation is not "a Lycaeo, vel a Porticu" is translated as "from salvific promises nor from temples," which should rather be "from Lyceum [peripatetics] or Porticus [Stoics]" (6.6).

²⁴ It is unclear why Canz was mentioned since there is difficult to see what material Baibakov used from his theologically rich book, I[srael] Th[eophilus] C[anzius], *Philosophiae Leibnitianae et Wolfianae usus in theologia*, Francofurti 1728.

²⁵ Аполлос, *Общий способ учения для всякаго состояния свободных людей нужный*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии у Н. Новикова 1781.

ciate purity of language (11). Moreover, ancient history, mathematics (i.e., arithmetic, geometry, optics, astronomy), physics including names of plants, minerals, trees, animals, mechanical instruments should be taught (12). Between ages 12 and 18, a boy should get more freedom by tutors being his friends rather than teachers. He should know better mysteries of nature, mechanics, international trade, some medical knowledge, anatomy, properties of plants (13) used to make medicine, elements of dogmatic theology, the makeup of the government (14) and its laws, also of other governments. Knowledge of French, Italian, but also Greek and Hebrew to understand the Old and New Testament better was encouraged. Public speaking, participation in plays was promoted (15). The young man should not live at home to benefit from the company of others (16). Beginning at the age of 18 (17) or 20, a young man should travel abroad taking care of his health and paying attention to customs and industry. He should take notes and try to acquaint “great men” (18) who are known to foreigners, particularly ministers and secretaries in embassies (19). In all this, the education of girls was never mentioned. In this context it is worth mentioning that the director of the Academy of Arts wrote 17 years earlier about education of both sexes²⁶ and that Catherine II issued an ukase (#12323) in 1765 ordering opening a school “for education of underage girls.”

It must be remembered that Baibakov was an ecclesiastic and yet the presence of a religious aspect is barely mentioned. The role of Greek and Hebrew languages is mentioned, but this seem better to fit his general idea that the knowledge of languages is indispensable. He did mention teaching elements of dogmatic theology, particularly those “that include foundations of faith, since from the ignorance of Divine law comes such evil, carelessness in [fulfilling] obligations, groundlessness in thoughts, immoderation in [pursuing] happiness, indecisiveness, weakness, or despair in distress and unhappiness in life, but this is not a place to discuss it.” Interestingly, he did not mention Orthodoxy; also, religious education appears to be important

²⁶ Иван И. Бецкой, *Генеральное учреждение о воспитании обоого пола юношества конфермованное ея императорским величеством 1764 года марта 12 дня*, [Санктпетербург 1764].

only for social and personal reasons. No mention was made of eschatology or sin. It almost looks like for Baibakov religion has primarily if not solely of social and psychological importance with hardly any religious component.

Baibakov, a scholar himself, valued accomplishments of science very highly and stressed the necessity of scientific knowledge in education. Languages, important as they are, are just tools, so it is necessary to learn sciences. "Illumination of the mind comes not from languages, but from sciences: from Poetry, rhetoric, Mathematics (26), jurisprudence, Philosophy and Theology" (27). As mentioned, in the *Inseparable union* he exclaimed, "what more salvific is given by the Creator than sciences that by their illumination make people like God." In his *Entertaining puzzles* he also said that "Science fills all souls with food, / It makes those who love it to be like the Creator. / It makes animals/cattle from those who despise it. / Blessed is who illuminated his mind with learning!" (13).²⁷ Theology is listed here as almost an afterthought. This is in stark contrast to Caraccioli whose book has a very strong religious component that may be summarized in his statement that the upbringing process should "proceed by degrees; it is appropriate that the knowledge of God should precede the knowledge of oneself and that [this knowledge should precede] the knowledge of others."²⁸ This sentiment is missing in Baibakov's general method of teaching.

Enchanted as Baibakov was by the science of his days, it did not become for him the ultimate source of knowledge, certainly not in theological matters. In fact, as stated in one of his sermons, the more man knows, the better he sees his ignorance.²⁹ In the same *Entertaining puzzles* in which he extolled science, Baibakov also wrote that "The powers of our mind are too weak in us / Desiring to know the makeup of all events and of the world, / We barely know ourselves" (10) and although "The

²⁷ [Аполлос], *Увеселительная загадки, со нравоучительными отгадками, состоящая в стихах*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии, у Н. Новикова 1781, p. 13; The identity of the author is given in form of a puzzle: a teacher in the Trinity monastery and the author of the *Uranii* and *The union of two brothers*, pp 3-4.

²⁸ [Louis-Antoine] Caraccioli, *Le véritable mentor, ou l'éducation de la noblesse*, Liège: Bassompierre 17592 [1756], p. 86. It goes without saying that Baibakov did not include the answer to a question, what religion the mentor should espouse: "Catholic, no doubt," p. 28.

²⁹ Аполлос, *Дар для благодетелей и друзей состоящий в поучениях*, Санктпетербург: При Императорской Академии наук 1786, p. 15.

Creator leads all things to something better; / But we cannot penetrate the general plan” (15). Science is useful to show the orderliness of the universe, but only theology is able to state that the harmonious makeup of the world is due to God’s creative power. The world thus should be viewed in terms of this orderliness rather than disorder. The latter is the result of the weak perceptive powers of human rather than part of the nature of the world. Therefore, “When [people] would say that accident rules over all here, / That we lose here [our] mind or [our] friends and [our] life, / You [should] see in this sacred providence. / We are the cause of everything, [even] when we don’t know it; / And we shouldn’t then grumble against God: / Plague, famine, woes or earthquakes / Have their causes: but we shouldn’t know them” (10). It is only “people of little education” who see this world as the result of “a blind accident.”³⁰ Illuminating as science could be, Baibakov could very well subscribe to Browne’s statement that “reason has to be submitted in obedience to faith since all revelation is above reason,”³¹ which is the traditional Orthodox position. Baibakov, an ecclesiastic of the Enlightenment age, recognized the scientific accomplishments of his age, but he did not relinquish his trust in the Orthodox principles. He did not consider science to be an enemy of the doctrine of his church; he just enlisted science in the service of the church in the spirit of physico-theology. Thus, being at the same time a bishop and a member of the Russian Academy, it was not the Academy member who happened to be a bishop, but a bishop who happened to accept induction in the Academy.

Bibliography

- Joannis Bona, *Manuductio ad caelum*, Romae: apud Angelum Bernabo 1658.
 Thomas Browne, *Religio medici*, London: George Bell and Sons 1898.
 Thomas Browne, *Religio medici*, Lugd[uni] Batavorum apud Franciscum Hackium 1644.
 I[srael] Th[eophilus] C[anzius], *Philosophiae Leibnitianae et Wolfianae usus in theologia*, Francofurti 1728.
 [Louis-Antoine] Caraccioli, *Le véritable mentor, ou l’éducation de la noblesse*, Liège: Bassompierre 17592 [1756].

³⁰ Аполлос, *Евгеонит*, р. 79.

³¹ [Броун], *Вера*, р. x/37/20.

- [Christian Fürchtegott] Gellert, *Geistliche Oden und Lieder*, Zürich: Bürgkliche Truckerey 1761.
- [Irvín] R. Titunik, Apollos Baibakov's *Pravila piiticheskiiia* and Vasilií Trediakovskii: toward an understanding of Russian humanism in the eighteenth century, in: R. Bartlett, A. G. Cross, K. Rasmussen (eds.), *Russia and the World of the Eighteenth Century*, Columbus: Slavica 1988.
- Аполлос, *Иеффай: Священная трагедия, коея содержание в Библейских книгах Судей главе II. к концу*, Москва: Типография Университетская 1778; Москва: В Университетской Типографии, у Н. Новикова 1782.
- Аполлос, *Лишенный зрения Ураний, несчастный государь: Священная повесть* [Москва]: Печатана в типографии Императорскаго Московскаго университета 1779; Москва: Типография Ф. Гиппиуса 1784.
- Аполлос, *Неразрывный союз двух братьев; Повесть излюбомудрия почерпнутая*, Москва: В Университетской типографии у Н. Новикова 1780.
- Аполлос, *Словарь пиитико-исторических примечаний*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии у Н. Новикова 1781.
- Аполлос, *Общий способ учения для всякаго состояния свободных людей нужный*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии у Н. Новикова 1781.
- [Аполлос], *Увеселительныя загадки, со нравоучительными отгадками, состоящая в стихах*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии, у Н. Новикова 1781.
- Аполлос, *Евгеонит, или Созерцание в натуре дел Божиих видимых дел*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии, у Н. Новикова 1782.
- Аполлос, *Кто есть истинный друг? Иносказательное со нравоучением повествование*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии, у Н. Новикова 1783.
- Аполлос, *Правила пиитическия, о стихотворении российском и латинском*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии, у Н. Новикова 1785.
- Аполлос, *Послание святаго апостола Павла ко ефесеим со истолкованием*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии, у Н. Новикова 1785.
- Аполлос, *Два послания святаго апостола Павла к филипписием и к колоссаем со истолкованием*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии, у Н. Новикова, 1785.
- Аполлос, *Дар для благодетелей и друзей состоящий в поучениях*, Санкт-петербург: При Императорской Академии наук 1786.
- Аполлос, *Первое [и второе] послание святаго апостола Павла к солуняном со изъяснением*, Москва: Типография Компании типографической 1786.
- Аполлос, *Послание святаго апостола Павла к галатом*, Москва: В Типографии Компании типографической 1787.
- Андрей Байбаков, *Правила пиитическия в пользу юношества обучающагося в Славено-греко-латинской академии в Законоспаском монастыре*, [Москва:] Печатаны при Императорском Московском университете 1774.

- Иван И. Бецкой, *Генеральное учреждение о воспитании обоего пола юношества конфермованное ея императорским величеством 1764 года марта 12 дня*, [Санктпетербург 1764].
- Иоанн Бона, *Христианская философия, или Руководство к небесам*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии у Н. Новикова 1782.
- [Томас Броун], *Вера, надежда и любовь, учения богословскаго состав*, Москва: В Университетской Типографии у Н. Новикова 1782.
- Х[ристиан] Ф[юрхтеготт] Геллерт, *Песни духовныя*, Москва: При Университетской типографии 1778;
- А[льберт] И. Есюков, М. В. Ломоносов и епископ Архангельский Аполлос (А. Д. Байбаков), in: Э. Я. Фесенко (ed.), *Тебе, предтеча и пророк*, Архангельск: САФУ 2011.
- Владимир Золотницкий, *Разсуждение о безсмертии человеческой души, которое утверждаетя особливо чрез доказательство Божияго бытия, открывающагося нам из многочисленных созданий*, Москва: [При Императорской Академии Наук] 1768, in: Т. В. Артемьева (ed.), *Мысли о душе. Русская метафизика XVIII века*, Санкт-Петербург: Наука 1996.
- [Георг Вольфганг Крафт], *Краткое руководство к математической и натуральной географии*, Санктпетербург: при Императорской Академии Наук 1739.
- А[лександр] С. Курилов, К[ирилл] В. Пигарев, Теоретико-литературная мысль в России XVIII в., in: П. А. Николаев (ed.), *Возникновение русской науки о литературе*, Москва: Наука 1975.
- Сергей Смирнов, *История Московской Славяно-греко-латинской академии*, Москва: В Типографии В. Готье 1855.
- С[ергей] Смирнов, *История Троицкой лаврской семинарии*, Москва: Типография В. Готье 1867.
- М[ихаил] И. Сухомлинов, *История Российской Академии*, Санктпетербург: Типография Императорской Академии наук 1874.