



Sermons and Sermonizing in 18th-Century Russia: At Court and Beyond*

Проповедь и проповедничество в России XVIII века: при дворе и вне двора

Ekaterina I. Kislova

Moscow State University

**Екатерина Игоревна
Кислова**

Московский государственный
университет им. М. В. Ломоносова

Abstract

This paper is devoted to the question of the spread of court sermons in 18th-century Russian society. The author describes three types that had been formed by the 1740s: court, seminary, and parish homilies. The main question is how and by what means did the court homilies in Elizabeth Petrovna's time spread the cultural models, thoughts, and ideas created by court preachers throughout Russian society as a whole? Did these texts penetrate traditional culture and how were they adopted? Who read the court sermons, apart from members of the court? To answer these questions, the author describes how court homilies were published and sold, and how they entered the manuscript tradition. The analysis of archival and published materials allows the author to conclude that in the second half of the 18th century, the court sermon was only beginning to penetrate the "traditional" culture. The genre spread primarily in the seminaries, where texts by court

* Работа выполнена на средства гранта Президента РФ по государственной поддержке молодых российских учёных — кандидатов наук МК-1573.2013.6, проект "Церковнославянский язык и его место в церковном дискурсе XVIII века". Обсуждение представленной работы состоялось на конференции "IX International Conference of the Study Group on Eighteenth-Century Russia" (Leuven, 2014), участие в которой стало возможным благодаря поддержке Германского исторического института в Москве (проект "Семантика социального").

preachers functioned as a “library” of panegyrical and theological elements to be used by students and teachers in their own compositions. With few exceptions, the court tradition does not intersect with texts originating from Old Russian and classical theological traditions, although all such texts are called *slovo* (literally ‘word,’ i.e., ‘sermon’). However, by the end of the 18th century, the new genre became more widely disseminated, following the spread of seminary education and the increase in the number of priests educated in this tradition.

Keywords

homily, preaching, publishing, Russian 18th century, seminary, Russian court

Резюме

Статья посвящена вопросу распространения придворных проповедей в русском обществе XVIII века. Автор описывает три типа проповеди, сформировавшихся к 1740-м годам (придворную, семинарскую и приходскую проповеди). Основной вопрос заключается в том, как придворная проповедь эпохи Елизаветы Петровны распространяла культурные модели, образы и идеи, сформированные придворными проповедниками, в русском обществе, какие именно способы этого распространения использовались. Проникали ли эти образы и модели в традиционную культуру и каким образом они адаптировались? Кто читал придворные проповеди вне придворного круга? Для ответа на эти вопросы автор описывает, как придворные проповеди публиковались, продавались и как они входили в рукописную традицию. Анализ архивных и опубликованных материалов позволяет автору сделать вывод о том, что во второй половине XVIII в. придворные проповеди только начинали проникать в традиционную культуру. В основном они были распространены в семинариях, где тексты придворных проповедников использовались в качестве “библиотеки” панегирических и теологических образов и моделей и служили образцами для студентов и учителей, создававших свои проповеди. Придворная традиция за редким исключением не пересекается с текстами, восходящими к древнерусским и классическим богословским традициям, хотя и те, и другие тексты называются “словами”. Однако к концу XVIII в. новый жанр распространяется всё шире — вслед за распространением семинарского образования и увеличением числа священников, воспитанных в этой традиции.

Ключевые слова

проповедь, проповедничество, издательское дело, Россия XVIII века, семинария, российский двор

By the early 18th century, a new type of homily or sermon¹ had appeared in Russia, a type usually described with the terms “shkol’naia” (school), “scholastic,” or “baroque.” Its origins were in the Ukrainian and Polish and, more widely, Western European baroque traditions.² In Peter’s time such homilies

¹ In this article, I use the English terms “sermon” and “homily” as counterparts of the names of the genre used in the 18th century: *propoved’*, *slovo*, and *predika*.

² For more information see [Живов 1996; Кагарлицкий 1999; Кислова 2010].

were seen as a tool for working with mass consciousness and a means of forming public opinion: the objectives of reforms, the meaning of the changes taking place in society, or the significance of a military victory could be explained in a homily [УОРТМАН 2002: 68–80]. A series of decrees was aimed at requiring the educated monks to preach.³ At the same time, seminaries were being established in Russia, and an educational system for the clergy was formed. This system was based on the Ukrainian ecclesiastical colleges, first of all, on the model of the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and, consequently, on the Polish Jesuit collegiums in general [СМОЛИЧ 1996: 411–417; ФЛОРОВСКИЙ 1983: IV.4]. The subjects taught at the seminaries were aimed at the formation of an educated monk who had a knowledge not only of theology, but also of rhetoric and poetics. Regular preaching was also developing at the seminaries.

As a result, we can define several co-existing types of homilies by the 1740s:

a) Court homily, usually delivered during festive divine services at the court, often in the presence of the ruler. This type of homily is the best-researched, as these texts were regularly published (see [УОРТМАН 2004; ПОГОСЯН, СМОРЖЕВСКИХ 2002; ЖИВОВ 2004; MARKER 2007]). We discuss this type in detail below;

b) Seminary homily, regularly delivered in churches at seminaries and open to everyone. Staff preachers appeared first at the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy in Moscow,⁴ and they were approved by the Synod just as the teachers were.⁵ Homilies could be delivered not only by staff preachers but also by teachers and prefects of some provincial seminaries (monks as well as “laymen”). In some provincial seminaries, regular preaching had developed relatively early: for example, since the 1720s in the Smolensk, Novgorod, Tobolsk, and Rostov seminaries, and since the 1740s in the Pereslavl, Kazan, Nizhny Novgorod, and Vyatka seminaries [ХАРЛАМПОВИЧ 1914: 748–752];

c) Parish homily (in the capitals and the provinces), delivered at parish churches and monastery cathedrals. The government routinely issued decrees ordering regular preaching at churches and monasteries, but in the first half of the 18th century, such preaching was rare outside of a monastic setting.⁶

³ For example, *Decree of the 31st of January 1724 about Monasticism* (Указ от 31 января 1724 г. о монашестве [ПСПиР, 4: file No. 1197]).

⁴ In the course of the 18th century, this educational institution had several different names (Hellenic-Greek, Latin or Slavic-Latin, Slavic-Greek-Latin, or Moscow Academy); for the purpose of this article, we shall call it the Moscow Academy, after its location.

⁵ See [ПСПиР, 7: files No. 2366, 2486, 2613, and others].

⁶ For example, on July 9, 1729, the Synodal attorney-general Baskakov sent the following query to the Synod: “why were the preachers not sent to all the ranked monasteries in Moscow and near Moscow?” (“во все степенные в Москве и близ Москвы мужские монастыри чего для проповедников не определено?” [ПСПиР, 7:

Apart from court celebrations and divine services attended by the rulers at Uspensky Cathedral in Moscow and Peter and Paul Cathedral in St. Petersburg, homilies were sometimes delivered as early as the beginning of the 1730s, but only in the 1750s did they become regular occurrences.⁷ The spreading of homilies in ordinary parishes was connected with the increase in the number of seminary graduates among the clergy. Preaching and catechesis were beginning to be understood as highly important activities of the clergy, so, for example, already in 1737 in the Vologda Seminary students appointed as priests gave a written statement affirming that they “will preach sermons according to their ability and will instruct the people on a good, honest, and godly life” (‘будут по искусству своему проповедать и поучать народ, что подлежит доброду, честному и непорочному житию’ [ХАРЛАМПОВИЧ 1914: 751]). In 1775, Gavriil Petrov’s and Platon Levshin’s *Collection of Various Sermons for all Sundays and Holidays* (“Собрание разных поучений на все воскресные и праздничные дни”) was published. It set an example, providing material for parish homilies and reinforcing the preaching tradition.

Court homilies could be dedicated to a variety of different topics. Many homilies were connected with originally secular holidays: military victories, conclusions of peace treaties, birthdays and name days of the monarchs and their heirs, marriages, anniversaries of a ruler’s ascension to the throne, etc. Their content could be theological or quite historical and publicistic, regardless of the formal subject, although on the whole, there was generally a correlation. For example, Amvrosy Yushkevich’s *Sermon on the Day of the Third Solemn Gratitude Brought to the All-Generous God about the Everlasting Peace between the Russian Empire and the Swedish Crown* (“Слово в день торжественного Всещедрому Богу принесеннаго третьяго благодарения о состоявшемся вечном между империею Россійскою и короною Шведскою мире,” July 15, 1744) is dedicated mostly to the description of the persecution of the Russian Orthodox Church before Elizabeth’s reign; Simon Todorsky’s *God’s Special Blessing* (“Божие особенное благословение,” a sermon for the marriage of the heir to the throne on August 21, 1745) related in detail the history of Petr Feodorovich’s glorious ancestors and contained a great deal of historical material.

Homilies delivered during church holidays were more often dedicated to theological subjects (the salvation of the soul, the necessity of fasting, lives of individual saints). But there is no strict correlation; obviously, the content of

file No. 2246]. The answers to the Synod’s requests show that in the early 1740s, this type of homily was not yet widespread in Moscow monasteries due to a lack of monks who could and would preach (РГАДА, ф. 1184, оп. 4, д. 633, лл. 28–32).

⁷ On homilies at Uspensky Cathedral, see, for example [СКВОРЦОВ 1914: 116–138; ХАРЛАМПОВИЧ 1914: 755–758].

the homily depended on the preacher's desire and the possibilities afforded by the situation or holiday. Homilies delivered without any church or secular context were very rare; the presence of the empress at a divine service, however, would motivate the composition of a sermon (for example, Markell Rodyshevsky's *Sermon in the Presence of Her Imperial Majesty in the Home Church of Her Imperial Majesty* ("Слово при присутствии Ея Императорскаго Величества в домово́й Ея Императорскаго Величества церкви") on March 28, 1742, and his homily on June 22, 1742). All texts delivered in the presence of the empress contained elements of a panegyric, but this element had appeared already during the coronation celebrations in 1742, generally only in the conclusion of the homily; many texts omitted descriptions of the ruler's actions and were quite "theological" in their subjects.

This article is dedicated to a single aspect of homily study:⁸ how did the court homilies in Elizabeth Petrovna's time spread the cultural models, thoughts, and ideas created by court preachers throughout Russian society? Were court homilies sought after, both at court and outside, and was there any difference in the perception of nominally "panegyric" and "theological" texts? Who read them? Did these texts penetrate the traditional culture and how were they adopted?

To answer these questions, let us take a look at how court homilies were published, how they were sold, and how they entered the handwritten tradition.

1. Court Homilies: Publishing and Selling

Although most of the spoken homilies were not printed,⁹ some homilies delivered in the presence of the emperor or empress could be published at the decision and with the permission of the ruler. Before 1710, only two homilies, both by Feofan Prokopovich, were published. After the opening of the St. Petersburg Typography, homilies were actively published there (eighteen editions between 1717 and 1730). In total, between 1701 and 1726, thirty-three texts delivered in this period were published. Each text had from one to three editions. In Anna Ioannovna's time, only four homilies (five editions) were published. Thus, in the first forty years of the 18th century, thirty-seven texts were published (forty-eight issues, forty-one of them in the Church Slavonic orthography and seven in the civil orthography).

⁸ We omit from the present article the Old Russian tradition of *Zlatostrui*, *Izmaragd*, *Margarit*, and other such collections of homilies by church fathers, because the 18th-century court homilies were not included in such collections; we also omit the Old Believers' homilies, because this phenomenon is an independent and separate tradition. As for the Ukrainian homily, we shall speak about it only in a few specific aspects and in connection with the "Great Russian" homily.

⁹ For example, out of forty-five homilies delivered by Gavriil Buzhinsky between 1717 and 1727, only six were published after delivery [ПЕТУХОВ 1901: V–X].

After the 1740s, publication of court homilies became a prominent phenomenon in Russian culture.¹⁰ On March 31, 1742, Elizabeth Petrovna issued a decree on the obligatory printing of homilies delivered in her presence, and on May 14, 1742, she issued a decree on obligatory preaching on Sundays and holidays. From then on, a homily delivered in the presence of the empress was submitted to the Synod for consideration and subsequent publication (from 1743, members of the Synod could send the text to a press immediately). Publication of court homilies in the first ten years of Elizabeth's reign became a significant phenomenon of Russian culture, which is evidenced by the number of published texts (including republications).

	1742	1743	1744	1745	1746	1747	1748	1749	1750	1751
Moscow Typography (Church Slavonic orthography)	34	6	17	8	3	5	1	11	5	3
Typography of the Academy of Sciences (civil orthography)	6	7	4	1						
Typography of the Senate in Moscow (civil orthography)	2									
Total	42	13	21	9	4	5	1	11	4	2

Between 1752 and 1761, only two homilies were published immediately after being delivered; both of them were connected with educational institutions, and only one of them was delivered in the presence of a member of the imperial family.¹¹

Does this mean that the court had lost its interest in homilies? In a certain sense, yes: the homily had fulfilled its propagandistic goal in the first years of Elizabeth's reign, having established her image as an Orthodox ruler. But the publishing policy had also changed: it was re-oriented toward collections of works by contemporary preachers. Collections of sermons by Gedeon Krinovsky (two editions, in 1755–1759 and 1760) and Feofan Prokopovich (1760–1761) were published. Previously, publication of homily collections by contemporary authors had been common only in the Ukrainian-Polish tradition, where collections of a

¹⁰ I have described the appointment of preachers, preparation of homilies, their delivery, publication, and sale in [Кислова 2011А].

¹¹ *The Speech about the Merit and Profit of the Catechesis Pronounced before the Beginning of Study after the Academic Recess in the Imperial Moscow University* [. . .] 17th of August 1759 ("Речь о достоинстве и пользе катихизиса, которую пред начатием после вакансии учения в Императорском Московском университете [. . .] Августа 17 дня 1759 года") by Peter Alexeyev and *The Sermon and Speech Pronounced before the Rank of the Land Nobility Cadet Corps when the New Colors were Dedicated in the Presence of His Imperial Highness* [. . .] Petr Fedorovich 16th of May 1760 ("Проповедь и слово говоренные пред фрунтом Сухопутного шляхетного кадетского корпуса при освещении новых знамен в присутствии его императорского высочества [. . .] Петра Федоровича мая 16 дня 1760 года") by Tikhon Yakubovskiy.

single author's homilies had been published already in the late 17th century (for example, Lazar Baranovich's *The Spiritual Sword* ("Меч духовный," 1666) and his *The Trumpets of Preaching Words* ("Трубы словес проповедных," 1674).

Under Catherine II, the number of published non-court homilies increased, a development connected with the appearance of private and provincial typographies (individual homilies and collections were published by presses associated with educational institutions, typographies in Nizhny Novgorod, Kostroma, Yassy, Yaroslavl, and elsewhere, and private typographies owned by Lopukhin, Shnor, Ponomarev, and others). At the same time, the share of individual, separately published homilies decreased, and the number of collections of works by the same author (mostly in civil orthography) increased. Between 1762 and 1796, 276 individual editions (including republications) and seventy collections of works were published; between 1797 and 1800, twenty-one newly delivered individual sermons and twelve collections were issued.¹² We now turn our attention to the fate of court sermons delivered during Elizabeth Petrovna's reign.

2. Numbers of Copies of Editions and Sales of the Texts

The Moscow Typography published homilies in press runs from 300 to 1,200 copies, with a standard "half-run" of 600. An analysis of the *Inventory of the Church and Civil Books Printed after the Foundation of the Synodal Typography* ("Реестр церковных и гражданских книг, напечатанных со времени основания Синодальной типографии," РГАДА, ф. 1184, оп. 5, д. 217) gives us the number of published copies more than 50,000:

Year	Press Runs	Copies	Press Runs
1742	34	24,000	three editions
1743	6	8,400	five editions
1744	17	4,200	five editions
1745	8	3,300	
1746	4	3,600	
1747	5	1,200	
1748	1	300	
1749	11	2,100	four editions
1750	4	1,200	
1751	2	900	
1752 (delivered in 1750)	1	300	
Total		49500	min. 5,100 ¹³

¹² For detailed data including translations and publications of homilies by church fathers, as well as information on typographies and type of edition (in civil or Church Slavonic orthography), see [Кислова 2011в: 78–89; Кислова, Матвеев 2011].

¹³ The minimal press run for the sermon was 300 copies, the average—600 copies, so the figure of seventeen undocumented press runs could not produce less than 5,100 copies.

Thus, during the first ten years of Elizabeth Petrovna's reign, only the Synodal Typography published more than 50,000 copies of different homilies; if we consider 300 to be the minimum possible number of copies in any given press run, we have to add about 6,000 copies published in the typographies of the Senate and the Academy of Sciences. The decrees attached to the submitted homilies declared publication "for the public knowledge" (*для всенародного известия*), "day and night, so that there might be no interruptions in the regular issuing of editions" (*денно и ночью, дабы в очередном деле в печатании книжном не учинилось остановки*). The low cost of the texts is also underlined: five kopecks "in booklets" and six kopecks in hard binding: "The homilies in booklets, mentioned above, are to be sold to the people for the indicated price, each for five kopecks [. . .], and at such a price it (the homily) can be sold to the people quickly, because everyone will be able to buy it willingly for such a low price" (*Вышеозначенные предики в тетратех продажею в народ производить надлежит по явленной цене каждую по 5 копеек [. . .] и по таковой цене продажею в народ может произойти в непродолжительном времени, ибо по оной малой цене всяк может купить охотно,* РГАДА, ф. 1184, оп. 2, д. 4, л. 35об.).

Were these hopes fulfilled?

The surviving documents show that the demand for homilies was stable. At a St. Petersburg bookshop in 1739, according to S. P. Luppov, "out of 186 editions bought in May 1739, 168 were homilies" [Луппов 1976: 118]. A more detailed picture is provided by the information in the surviving registers of books sold from shops connected with the Moscow Typography.¹⁴ For example, in mid-March 1743 the Moscow Typography shop sold the following texts (РГАДА, ф. 1184, оп. 1, д. 645, лл. 36об.–38) (see the table on the next page).

Simultaneously with recently delivered homilies, sermons not only by Feofan Prokopovich but by other authors as well were sold. For example, on March 21, 1743, the Typography shop sold nine copies of Gavriil Buzhinsky's *The Key to the House of David* ("Ключ дому Давидову," October 11, 1719, published on November 19, 1722) and five copies of Varlaam Lenitsky's *Sermon* [. . .] *on the Day of the Great Martyr Catherine* ("Слово [. . .] в день великомученицы Екатерины," November 24, 1726, published on December 17, 1726).

From 0 to 600 copies of homilies could be sold per day; obviously, batches of more than 100 copies are bulk purchases, perhaps by merchants for subsequent sales during fairs. The fact that merchants bought homilies to resell is indirectly indicated by the decree on republication of two homilies by Dimitry Sechenov: ". . . to print a full press run, i.e., 1,200 homilies, of each of the existing originals, because the copies printed in the past year, 1742, have

¹⁴ For a detailed analysis of the documents, see [Кислова 2011А].

March 11		
Feofan Prokopovich	<i>Sermon in Praise</i> [...] of Peter the Great (“Слово на похвалу [...] Петра Великого”)	five copies
Silvester Kulyabka	<i>Sermon on the Sunday of the Samaritan Woman</i> (“Слово в неделю самаряныни,” delivered on May 16 and published on June 14, 1742)	thirty copies
Iosaf Khotuntsevsky	<i>Sermon on the Day of the Assumption of the Lord</i> (“Слово в день вознесения Господня,” May 27, published on June 25)	nine copies
Stefan Savitsky	<i>Sermon on the Fourth Sunday after the Descent of the Holy Spirit</i> (“Слово в неделю четвертую по сошествии Св. Духа,” July 4, published on August 25, 1742)	thirteen copies
Afanasy Topolsky	<i>Sermon on the Seventh Sunday of the Holy Fathers after Easter</i> (“Слово в неделю седьмую святых отец по пасце,” May 30, published on July 2)	nineteen copies
Platon Malinovsky	<i>Sermon on the Second Sunday after the Descent of the Holy Spirit about the Call of the Apostles</i> (“Слово в неделю вторую по сошествии святого духа о звании апостолов,” June 20, published on August 2)	eighty-six copies
Markell Rodyshevsky	<i>Sermon in the Presence of the</i> [...] Empress (“Слово при присутствии [...] императрицы,” either the one delivered on March 28 and published on April 30, or the one delivered on June 20 and published on August 2)	seventy-three copies
Total		235
March 12		
Feofan Prokopovich	<i>Sermon in Praise</i> . . . (“Слово на похвалу . . .”)	three copies
Arseny Matseevich	<i>Sermon on the Day</i> [...] of the Apostles Peter and Paul (“Слово в день святых [...] апостол Петра и Павла,” June 29, published on August 18)	nine copies
Arseny Matseevich	<i>Sermon on the Name Day of</i> [...] Elizabeth Petrovna (“Слово в день [...] тезоименитства [...] Елизаветы Петровны,” September 5, published on October 7)	twenty copies
Stefan Savitsky	<i>Sermon on the Fourth Sunday after the Descent of the Holy Spirit</i> (“Слово в неделю четвертую по сошествии Св. Духа,” July 4, published on August 25, 1742)	thirteen copies
Platon Petrunkevich	<i>Sermon on the Day of the Transfiguration of the Lord</i> (“Слово в день преображения господня,” August 6, published on September 9)	sixty-nine copies
Kirill Florinsky	<i>Sermon</i> [...] on the Dedication of the Church [...] of the Joy of All Who Sorrow (“Слово [...] в день освящения церкви [...] всех скорбящих радость,” July 15, published on September 30)	eighty copies
Total		194

been sold, and now the merchants are constantly demanding these homilies” (. . . напечатать с прежних оригиналов с каждой по 1му заводу то есть по 1200 предик, понеже напечатанные в прошлом 1742м году в продаже все, а ныне оных предик купцы требуют непрестанно, РГАДА, ф. 1184, оп. 2, д. 30, л. 4об.–5). Sales of Arseny Matseevich’s texts were almost as high. For example, by July 1, 1743, the Moscow Typography shop sold 474 out of 550¹⁵ copies of the *Sermon on the Day of the Apostles Peter and Paul* and 699 out of 1,150 copies of the *Sermon on the Name Day of Elizabeth Petrovna*. Also popular were texts by the court preacher Stefan Savitsky (they sold 367 out of 550 copies of the *Sermon on the Fourth Sunday after the Descent of the Holy Spirit*); Markell Rodyshevsky (356 out of 550 copies of the *Sermon in the Presence of the Empress*); and Amvrosy Yushkevich (356 out of 550 copies of the *Sermon on the Twenty-second Sunday after the Descent of the Holy Spirit*, i.e., “Слово в неделю двадцать вторую по сошествии Св. Духа”).

The *Inventory of the Moscow Typography Office* [. . .] 1 January 1749 (“Книга описная Московской Типографской конторы [. . .] 1 января 1749 г.,” РГАДА, ф. 1184, оп. 1, д. 664) shows that by that time, the “state warehouses” held 11,578 copies of homilies. By 1762, judging by the data in the *List of Catalogues* (“Росписной список,” РГАДА, ф. 1184, оп. 4, д. 192), 10,012 copies of homilies remained unsold (representing a total cost of 600 rubles 72 kopecks).¹⁶ Thus, we can state that most copies of homilies were sold in the first years after their publication (1742–1748), and then the demand for them predictably decreased.

Who was buying the homilies? Theoretically, homilies could be purchased and distributed to eparchies, but we have not found any documents confirming this.¹⁷ One might suppose that there was a certain “administrative pressure” on the part of the hierarchs, but we do not believe this to be the case: unlike odes and literary works, homilies were published at the state’s expense, the money from their sales went to the typography, and the authors themselves received only twenty-five copies.

Mostly, the buyers were priests and clergy, seminary students and teachers who had to deliver sermons to parishioners. Published sermons served

¹⁵ The author received twenty-five copies of each press run, and twenty-five more went “for giving” – to be presented to the Empress, members of the Court, the Synod, etc.

¹⁶ Some homilies printed in civil orthography were being sold until 1787, when they were confiscated by the decree of Catherine II [ПСЗРИ 22: 876–876, 882–883]: Markell Rodyshevsky’s 235 copies of the *Sermon on Christmas Day* (“Слово на день Рождества,” 1742), Peter Grebnevsky’s 230 copies of the *Sermon on the Day of the Coronation* (“Слово в день коронации,” 1742), Stefan Kalinovsky’s thirty copies of the *Sermon on the New Year* (“Слово на новый год,” 1742).

¹⁷ Such distribution was employed in the 17th century: thus, Lazar Baranovich’s collection of homilies *The Spiritual Sword* was sent by the government to the eparchies with the order “to pay three rubles for each exemplar” (“внести за каждый экземпляр 3 рубля” [Харлампович 1914: 422]).

as model texts for imitation, as sources for sets of facts and examples, and as convenient working material. Some of the buyers were ordinary readers: merchants, bourgeoisie, and clerks (sometimes the texts bear owners' inscriptions). But a more precise material for evaluation of the distribution of court homilies—and, consequently, the dissemination of cultural models and scenarios—in society is provided by the materials of handwritten collections of the second half of the 18th century.

3. Handwritten Copies of Court Homilies

Despite the spread of printed books, the handwritten tradition in the second half of the 18th century was still very much alive. In the first place, a handwritten copy was much cheaper than a printed text. Second, the copyist often made a selection from existing texts and created a collection for his own purposes and goals (for example, in the collection РГАДА, ф. 181, оп. 1, д. 1031, several New Year's sermons are included one after the other). At the same time, handwritten texts could be bound together with available printed ones (for example, РГАДА, ф. 181, оп. 1, д. 1030, д. 1031; НИОР РГБ, ф. 173, оп. 2, д. 49, and others). A number of such collections have been preserved in the archives of the Russian State Library, the Russian State Archives of Ancient Acts, the National Library of Russia, and other archives.

Handwritten collections including homilies could be varied in their content.¹⁸ Most often, court homilies are found in “dedicated” collections. Collections of spiritual literature from a wide spectrum,¹⁹ including homilies by the church fathers, dialogues, extracts, biographies, pilgrimages, etc., seldom include contemporary homilies.²⁰ Feofan Prokopovich's homilies connected with Peter were likely perceived more as historical, rather than theological, texts, so they are often included in historical collections of works dedicated to Peter.²¹

Even in the 18th century, the handwritten tradition stemming from the Old Russian tradition differed from printed practice in its attitude regarding author-

¹⁸ This diversity becomes more prominent if the collection was compiled from separate booklets by an unknown person and without any indication of a specific timeframe, but I have considered mostly collections published by a single author or at one time, and have used these parameters in my comparisons.

¹⁹ In library and archival catalogues, they may be called “polemical collections,” “theological collections,” “collections of ecclesiastical content,” etc.

²⁰ One of the few exceptions is РГАДА, ф. 188, оп. 1, д. 1365, *A Collection of Church Texts* (“Сборник церковного содержания”), in which, along with the homilies by John Chrysostom, Ephrem the Syrian, tales, dialogues, and extracts from *The Great Mirror* (“Великое Зерцало”) and *The Golden Bead* (“Златой Бисер”), we find a copy of Dimitry Sechenov's *Sermon on the Day of the Appearance of the Icon “Our Lady of Kazan”* (“Слово в день явления иконы Казанской богородицы,” лл. 44–50об.).

²¹ For example, НИОР РГБ, ф. 299, д. 47 (with the inscription of the owner—collegiate assessor Andrey Vasilyevich Gubarev), д. 418 “Сборник сочинений о Петре Великом,” and others.

ship. When court homilies were transferred into the field of handwritten texts, they often became anonymous. Copyists always gave the name of the authors of court homilies when they copied the text directly from the printed original, and sometimes they preserved the entire title page, with information on the typography, time of issue, and so forth; they might even duplicate the layout of lines and font size. Much more often, the titles of published homilies were shortened to brief formulas. The event or date of delivery was preserved, along with the name (more rarely, the title) of the author and sometimes the place of delivery; information on the presence of the empress was cut; cf. the following texts:

Printed Text	Handwritten Copy (НИОР РГБ, ф. 29, No. 1154, л. 7)
A Sermon on the twenty-second Sunday after the Descent of the Holy Spirit in the Highest Presence of Her Imperial Majesty, the most pious, the most sovereign Christian Empress the Great Monarchess our Elizabeth Petrovna of All Russia, and His Imperial Highness, the blessed sovereign Grand Prince Petr Fedorovich. Pronounced by the member of the Holy Synod the eminent Amvrosy, Archbishop of Novgorod the Great and Velikiye Luki. In the Moscow Cathedral of the Archangel, 1742, November 8th	A Sermon on the twenty-second Sunday after the Descent of the Holy Spirit pronounced by Amvrosy, Archbishop in the М<oscow> Cathedral of the Archangel, 1742, November 8th
Слово в неделю двадцать вторую, по сошествии Святаго Духа, в Высочайшее Присутствие Ея Императорскаго Величества, Благочестивейшия Самодержавнейшия Крестоносныя Императрицы Великия Государыни нашея Елисавети Петровны Всея России, и Его Императорскаго Высочества Благовернаго Государя Великаго Князя Петра Феодоровича. Проповеданное Святейшаго Синода Членом Преосвященным Амвросием Архиепископом Великоновгородским и Великолуцким. В Московском Архангелском Соборе, 1742 года, Ноемвриа 8 дня	Слово в неделю кѣ по сошествии святаго духа проповеданное Амвросием архиепископом в м.[осковском] архангельском соборе 1742, ноября 8 дня

Most often, the authorship of the most prominent preachers was indicated, for example, Feofan Prokopovich and, of the non-court preachers, Demetrius of Rostov—moreover, some anonymous homilies were regularly attributed to Demetrius of Rostov [ФЕДОТОВА 2001]). Authorship is also often preserved in the case of collections of homilies by a seminary teacher or student, but using a brief formula: the subject or event (a specific holiday) can be given in the title or in the margins of the homily, and the date and place of delivery and the author's name are more often given after the texts (sometimes in Latin).

Most homilies remained anonymous when copied and included in collections. For example, the collection РГАДА, ф. 188, оп. 1, д. 1031 contains twenty-four copied homilies (and one printed text). Authors are given for nine

texts only, and of these nine, eight are copies of printed court homilies of the 1740s. Three more homilies are copied from the first volume of the collection of works by Gedeon Krinovsky without identification of the author. The authorship of the rest of the homilies remains unknown. At the same time, all court homilies, even when presented anonymously, retained their panegyric elements glorifying the empress, often addressing her as if she were present at the divine service (for example, the anonymous *Sermon on the Name Day of Elizabeth Petrovna*, i.e., “Слово в день тезоименитства [. . .] Елизаветы Петровны,” РГАДА, ф. 188, оп. 1, д. 1031, лл. 141–148об.).

Among the anonymous texts, some prohibited sermons could be found: the collection of Yakov Filippov, a student in the philosophy class at Moscow Academy (НИОР РГБ, ф. 299, No. 158), included a homily with the following inscription in the margin: “On marriage” (лл. 325об.–333об.). This is Amvrosy Yushkevich’s *God’s Blessing in the Three Natural Treasures on Her Highness Princess Anna and His Highness Sovereign Anton Ulrich Duke of Brunswick and Lüneburg which was on the Day of Their Highest Marriage, June 3, 1739 . . .* (“Божие благословение в природных трех сокровищах ея высочества государыни принцессы Анны и светлейшего князя и государя Антона Улриха герцога Брауншвейгскаго и Линебургскаго пребывающее в день же высочайшаго брачного их сочетания июля 3 1739 года . . .”). This text was prohibited during Elizabeth’s reign and removed from circulation,²² but was available as a handwritten copy.

Most often, court homilies are found in collections connected, in one way or another, with seminaries, where texts of copied sermons were considered as useful material for exercises in rhetoric. The copied texts often bear remarks, sometimes short and sometimes detailed, in Russian and Latin evidencing rhetorical analysis and subsequent use of the text: *ненадо* ‘not needed,’ *оставить* ‘leave,’ *сравнение* ‘comparison,’ *другое подобие* ‘another resemblance,’ *вопрос* ‘question,’ *нравоучения* ‘morals,’ *conclusio* (НИОР РГБ, ф. 299, No. 158, лл. 25–35об.), *synecdocha*, *ratio*, *hypotesis* [*sic*], *arg<ument>*, *epiphora*, etc. (НИОР РГБ, ф. 173.2, No. 49, лл. 4–17).

The collection of Semen Pavlov, a Moscow Academy student (НИОР РГБ, ф. 173.2, No. 49), is an excellent example of the ways in which homilies were used at a seminary. It begins with copies of sermons from Gavriil Petrov’s and

²² Decree of November 18, 1742 [ПСПИР, 1: 472–473]. The same decree prescribed, under penalty of fine, the submission to typographies and voivod’s offices, over the course of six months, “homilies delivered by different preachers after the death of Her Majesty Empress Anna Ioannovna [. . .] should they be found in the possession of anyone, both printed and written” (“которые предики проповедаемы были от разных проповедников, по кончине Ея Величества Государыни Императрицы Анны Иоанновны [. . .] ежели оныя у кого есть, как печатные, так и письменные”). Let us note that homilies delivered during Anna Ioannovna’s reign were not banished under Elizabeth and are often found in collections.

Platon Levshin's *Collection of Various Sermons*, without identification of the source but with a detailed rhetorical analysis in the margins; the same collection contains Semen Pavlov's own exercises in Russian and Latin, including speeches and homilies with corrections and reviews by teachers. The collection includes several booklets of anonymous homilies of the 1750s, copied in a different handwriting (but completed in Pavlov's handwriting) and containing, for example, notes on their delivery in 1750. Two printed texts were bound with Pavlov's collection: Alexander Levshin's *Grateful Sermon to the Omnipotent God on the Solemn Day of the Final Ending of the Infectious Disease in Moscow* ("Слово благодарственное ко всемогущему Господу Богу в торжественный день совершенного пресечения заразительной болезни в Москве," 1772, л. 369–374) and Feofan Prokopovich's *Sermon on the Funeral of Peter the Great* ("Слово на погребение Петра Великого," 1725, л. 375–378об.). They are followed by Semen Pavlov's practice speech, "On the Decease of Someone Well-Known in Studies ("На преставление какогolibо учением славнаго") in Russian and Latin (л. 379–381об.), in which the use of constructions and rhetorical devices from the "model" texts is evident.

Homilies included in collections used for study could be employed for long periods of time: thus, the texts of Feofan Prokopovich and Demetrius of Rostov remained essential examples until the very end of the 18th century. Texts also circulated freely (probably with their owners). Thus, the collection НИОР РГБ, ф. 173.1 (Collection of the Moscow Theological Academy), No. 222 contains homilies by Sergy and Silvester, teachers of rhetoric at the Alexander Nevsky Seminary, which they delivered in 1751–1752. The collection НИОР РГБ, ф. 299, д. 158, owned by Yakov Filippov, a student of the class of philosophy at the Moscow Theological Academy, contains fifteen homilies by Georgy Konissky which he delivered in Kiev, at the Kyiv-Mohyla Theological Academy; the texts were analyzed from the point of view of rhetoric and contain corrections and amendments. In the collection НИОР РГБ, ф. 173.1, д. 163, along with copies of published court homilies, we find three texts by Simon Todorsky which he delivered when he was the preacher of the Kiev Academy and which remained unpublished until the beginning of the 20th century (and also a copy of a published court homily on the birthday of the heir, Petr Fedorovich, in 1743).

How far did court homilies penetrate into the parishes?

Some collections that include court homilies contain entries and remarks indicating their circulation among provincial clergy (unfortunately, we cannot claim that they were created among this group). Thus, the collection РГАДА, ф. 188, оп. 1, д. 1031 was preserved in the village of Ignatyevvo in the Serpukhov District before coming to the archive in 1887; the collection-convolute РГАДА, ф. 188, оп. 1, д. 1030 was preserved in the village of Belaya

Tserkov in the Kiev Governorate until 1865; and the collection НИОР РГБ, ф. 299, д. 606 was presented to the priest Iona Mikhreich from the village of Bely Rast (Moscow District) by the “Moscow Major Ivan Gerasimovich Lgovsky” (л. 1). Secular persons were not only readers but also compilers of such collections, although the collections they created are usually more diverse and include more secular texts than those compiled by clergy. For example, the collection НИОР РГБ, ф. 299, д. 241 includes the following entry: “These spiritual homilies were written by Ivan Tokmakovskoy, son of Yakov, Sergeant of the Izmaylovsky Leib Guard Regiment, on September 1, 1775” (л. 31)²³ and it contains, along with several homilies from the *Collection* of Gavriil Petrov and Platon Levshin, extracts from magazines, poems, and fables, as well as Denis Fonvizin’s *Sermon on the Recovery of Pavel Petrovich* (“Слово на выздоровление Павла Петровича”), and so forth.

In the second half of the century, parish priests with seminary educations also started to compile their own collections of homilies, for example, the *Sermons of the Moscow Nikolo-Yamskoy priest Nikolay Dmitriev, etc.* (“Проповеди московского Николо-Ямского священника Николая Дмитриева и др.,” НИОР РГБ, ф. 299, д. 386): this collection is sewn together from separate booklets apparently by the same author, with corrections and notes made by the same hand when assembling the homilies. These homilies were delivered in Moscow from 1776 to 1791. By the end of the century, there appeared collections of works by provincial parish priests, for example, *The Moral Counselings of Priest M. Dmitrievsky* (“Нравоучительные беседы свящ. М. Дмитриевского”), written in the village of Lomtsy (probably in the Novosilsky District of the Tula Governorate) in 1798 [СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ, ПОКРОВСКИЙ 1915: 441–442].

During this time, as the genre of collections of homilies by the same author continued to develop, it is an open question as to whether the handwritten collections by provincial priests appeared under the influence of the printed collections or the printed tradition appeared as a result of the spread of such handwritten compilations.

The earliest examples of single-author compilations are, of course, homilies by Demetrius of Rostov, which were copied throughout the country and preserved in various collections of books [ФЕДОТОВА 2001]. Demetrius’ works were first published in the late 18th century as the *Collection of Various Sermons and Other Works* (“Собрание разных поучительных слов и других сочинений,” Moscow, Synodal Typography, March 1786).

²³ In the same collection, a copy of the printed *Brief Moscow Chronicle Composed by Alexander Sumorokov* (“Краткая московская летопись, сочиненная Александром Сумороковым,” St. Petersburg, 1774) was made by “deacon Ivan of Nikolskaya mill” (“диакон Иван Николск[ой] мельниц[ы]”) on September 29, 1775 (л. 166об.).

Feofan Prokopovich's homilies were occasionally gathered into individual, single-author compilations, but generally they tended to form the bulk of multi-author collections (the collection НИОР РГБ, ф. 299, No. 158, for example, contains fifty-three homilies, of which nineteen are authored by Prokopovich; the collection НИОР РГБ, ф. 173.1, No. 163 contains thirty-five texts, of which fifteen are his). There were also handwritten collections of the most productive preachers of Elizabeth's age: for example, we find eleven volumes of Arseny Matseevich's homilies delivered both at the court and outside it among early 19th-century copies in the library of the Moscow Theological Academy. Evidently, he is also the author of the anonymous collection of homilies delivered in Yaroslavl between 1753 and 1759 (НИОР РГБ, ф. 173.2, No. 14), because the first text in the collection is a copy of his printed homily delivered at court in 1744. We also have information on collections of unpublished works by Dimitry Sechenov, another popular preacher [ГУМИЛЕВСКИЙ 1861: 48]. At the same time, printed collections of homilies by the same author were copied very rarely. Thus, Gedeon Krinovsky's two-volume collection (the first edition, in civil orthography, published in 1754–1759, and the second edition, in Church Slavonic orthography, published in 1760) is represented only by single copies even in the archives of the Russian State Library. For example, the single complete copy of the second volume of Krinovsky's works was made by "Ivan Vasilyev, junior office clerk of the main palace chancellery," as he noted on the manuscript (НИОР РГБ, ф. 205, No. 394). The entire first volume of Krinovsky's collection is also preserved in only a single handwritten copy, НИОР РГБ, Музейное собрание, М 5426. It was produced by two copyists working in turn (the copy was made from a 1755 civil edition; judging by the notes with names of villages in the margins, it could be connected in some way with the Novosilsky District of the Tula Governorate. Other homilies by Krinovsky (from the published collection and from other sources) were selected and copied without identification of the author (for example, РГАДА, ф. 188, оп. 1, д. 1031).

We should also note that, to date, we have not seen a single complete handwritten copy of the *Collection of Various Sermons for All Sundays and Holidays* by Gavriil Petrov and Platon Levshin, although we find separate texts from this collection elsewhere. We should also note that Platon Levshin's homilies are relatively rarely encountered in the handwritten tradition of the period covered by our research;²⁴ this might be explained by the traditional "delay" of the reception of printed editions in the handwritten literature.

²⁴ An entirely different tradition of handling manuscripts is illustrated by a collection of autographs presented by Platon Levshin to the library of the Trinity Seminary in 1806 (НИОР РГБ, ф. 173.1, д. 84) with the following presentation inscription: "These, my autographs, are to be saved for the memories in Trinity library. Platon, Metropolitan of Moscow. 1806. Vifania" ('Сии мои рукописания для памяти хранить в Троицкой библиотеке. Платон, м. Московский. 1806 года. Вифания').

Which authors and texts by court preachers were the most popular in the handwritten tradition?

Throughout the 18th century, the most popular author was Demetrius of Rostov: his homilies were copied as entire collections and included in different collections, both with identification of the author and anonymously. But homilies by Demetrius of Rostov did not belong to the court tradition and contained virtually no publicistic or panegyric elements traditional for court homilies. Texts by Demetrius of Rostov were rarely included in collections connected with seminaries.

Among court preachers, Feofan Prokopovich was the most frequently copied author, and he is closely connected with the seminary tradition until the end of the 18th century (we should note that, even in the beginning of the 19th century, his homilies were included in school curricula as examples of rhetorical texts [ГАЛАХОВ 1861]). Several works by Amvrosy Yushkevich, Arseny Matseevich, Silvester Kulyabka, Stefan Kalinovskiy, and Kirill Lyashevskiy were popular. But the most popular text in the 1740s was Dimitry Sechenov's *Sermon on the Day of the Appearance of the Icon "Our Lady of Kazan"*: it appears six times not only in seminary collections but also in collections of "traditional spiritual content," obviously because it is more theological than publicistic and panegyric. Remarkably, this text was republished three times between 1741 and 1746 due to reader demand.²⁵ Dimitry Sechenov was one of the few preachers of the 1740s who was a Great Russian by nationality and who was able to combine in his texts the rhetorical rules of the "Latin education" of the seminaries and the traditions of Russian and Old Russian spiritual literature.

Conclusions

We can thus state that in the second half of the 18th century, the court sermon was only beginning to penetrate "traditional" culture. It was disseminated primarily in seminaries, where texts by court preachers were used as models and provided a library of panegyric and theological elements to be used by students and teachers in their own texts. With few exceptions, the court tradition does not intersect with texts originating from Old Russian and classical theological traditions, although all such texts are called *slovo* (literally 'word,' i.e., 'sermon'). However, by the end of the 18th century, the new genre was becoming increasingly widespread, following the growing cultivation of seminary education and the numbers of priests educated in this context.

²⁵ This text has recently been republished with a detailed commentary in [КИСЛОВА 2011с].

Abbreviated Names of Libraries, Archives, and Depositories

- НИОР РГБ Научно-исследовательский отдел рукописей Российской государственной библиотеки (Russian State Library, Research Department of Manuscripts, Moscow).
- РГАДА Российский государственный архив древних актов (Russian State Archives of Ancient Acts, Moscow).

Bibliography

MARKER 2007

MARKER G., *Imperial Saint. The Cult of St. Catherine and the Dawn of Female Rule in Russia*, DeKalb, IL, 2007.

ГАЛАХОВ 1861

ГАЛАХОВ А., *Историческая хрестоматия нового периода русской словесности (от Петра I до нашего времени)*, 1: *От Петра I до Карамзина*, С.-Петербург, 1861.

ГУМИЛЕВСКИЙ 1861

ФИЛАРЕТ (Гумилевский), архиеп., *Обзор русской духовной литературы (умерших писателей)*, 2: 1720–1858 гг., С.-Петербург, 1861.

ЖИВОВ 1996

ЖИВОВ В. М., *Язык и культура в России XVIII века*, Москва, 1996.

— 2004

ЖИВОВ В. М., *Очерки исторической морфологии русского языка XVII–XVIII веков*, Москва, 2004.

КАГАРЛИЦКИЙ 1999

КАГАРЛИЦКИЙ Ю. В., *Риторические стратегии в русской проповеди переходного периода, 1700–1775 гг.* (Диссертация . . . канд. филол. наук, Москва, 1999).

КИСЛОВА 2010

КИСЛОВА Е. И., “Проповедь 1740-х годов в истории русского языка”, в: П. Е. БУХАРКИН, У. ЕКУЧ, Н. Д. КОЧЕТКОВА, ред., *Оккациональная литература в контексте праздничной культуры России XVIII века*, С.-Петербург, 2010, 33–52.

— 2011а

КИСЛОВА Е. И., “Издание придворных проповедей в 1740-е годы”, в: *XVIII век*, 26: *Старое и новое в русском литературном сознании XVIII века*, С.-Петербург, 2011, 52–72.

— 2011в

КИСЛОВА Е. И., “«Гражданское» и «церковнославянское» издание проповедей в XVIII в.: к вопросу о статусе двух типов орфографии”, в: *Проблемы изучения русской литературы XVIII века*, 15, С.-Петербург, Самара, 2011, 78–89.

— 2011с

КИСЛОВА Е. И., “Слово в день явления иконы Пресвятыя Богородицы во граде Казани» Димитрия Сеченова”, в: *Литературная культура XVIII века*, 4, С.-Петербург, 2011, 110–147.

ЛУППОВ 1976

ЛУППОВ С. П., *Книга в России в послепетровское время: 1725–1740*, Ленинград, 1976.

ПЕТУХОВ 1901

ПЕТУХОВ Е., *Проповеди Гавриила Бужинского (1717–1727). Историко-литературный материал из эпохи преобразований*, Юрьев, 1901.

ПОГОСЯН, СМОРЖЕВСКИХ 2002

ПОГОСЯН Е., СМОРЖЕВСКИХ М., “«Я Деву в солнце зрю стоящу . . . »: образ апокалиптической Жены в русской официальной культуре 1695–1742 гг.”, *Studia Russica Helsingiensia et Tartuensia*, 8, 2002, 9–37.

ПСЗРИ

Полное собрание законов Российской Империи, 22: 1783–1788 гг., С.-Петербург, 1830.

ПСПиР

Полное собрание постановлений и распоряжений по ведомству православного исповедания Российской Империи, 4: 1724 – 28 января 1725 г., 7, 1: 25 ноября 1741–1743 гг., С.-Петербург, 1876, 1890, 1899.

СКВОРЦОВ 1914

СКВОРЦОВ Н. А., *Материалы по Москве и Московской епархии за XVIII век*, 2, Москва, 1914.

СМОЛИЧ 1996

СМОЛИЧ И. К., *История русской церкви*, 8/1, Москва, 1996.

СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ, ПОКРОВСКИЙ 1915

СРЕЗНЕВСКИЙ В. И., ПОКРОВСКИЙ Ф. И., *Описание Рукописного отделения Библиотеки Императорской Академии наук*, 2, Петроград, 1915.

УОРТМАН 2004

УОРТМАН Р. С., *Сценарии власти. Мифы и церемонии русской монархии*, Москва, 2004.

ФЕДОТОВА 2001

ФЕДОТОВА М. А., "Украинские проповеди Димитрия Ростовского (1670–1700 гг.) и их рукописная традиция. Статья 2", в: *Труды отдела древнерусской литературы*, 52, С.-Петербург, 2001, 409–431.

ФЛОРОВСКИЙ 1983

ФЛОРОВСКИЙ Г., *Пути русского богословия*, Париж, 1983.

ХАРЛАМПОВИЧ 1914

ХАРЛАМПОВИЧ К. В., *Малороссийское влияние на великорусскую церковную жизнь*, 1, 1914.

References

Fedotova M. A., "Ukrainskie propovedi Dimitriia Rostovskogo (1670–1700 gg.) i ikh rukopisnaia traditsiia. Stat'ia 2," in: *Tруды отдела древнерусской литературы*, 52, St. Petersburg, 2001, 409–431.

Florovsky G., *Puti russkogo bogosloviia*, Paris, 1983.

Kharlampovich K. V., *Malorossiiskoe vliianie na velikorusskuiu tserkovnuiu zhizn'*, 1, 1914.

Kislova E. I., "Propoved' 1740-kh godov v istorii russkogo iazyka," in: P. E. Bukharkin, U. Ekuch, N. D. Kochetkova, eds., *Okkazional'naia literatura v kontekste prazdnichnoi kul'tury Rossii XVIII veka*, St. Petersburg, 2010, 33–52.

Kislova E. I., "Izdanie pridvornykh propovedei v 1740-e gody," in: *XVIII vek*, 26: *Staroe i novoe v russkom literaturnom soznanii XVIII veka*, St. Petersburg, 2011, 52–72.

Kislova E. I., "«Grazhdanskoe» i «tserkovnoslavianskoe» izdanie propovedei v XVIII v.: k voprosu o statuse dvukh tipov orfografii," in: *Problemy izucheniia russkoi literatury XVIII veka*, 15, St. Petersburg, Samara, 2011, 78–89.

Kislova E. I., "«Slovo v den' iavleniia ikony Pre sviatiya Bogoroditsy vo grade Kazani» Dimitriia

Sechenova," in: *Literaturnaia kul'tura XVIII veka*, 4, St. Petersburg, 2011, 110–147.

Lupov S. P., *Kniga v Rossii v poslepetrovckoe vremia: 1725–1740*, Leningrad, 1976.

Marker G., *Imperial Saint. The Cult of St. Catherine and the Dawn of Female Rule in Russia*, DeKalb, IL, 2007.

Pogosjan Je., Smorzhevskikh M., "«Ia Devu v solntse zriu stoiashchu . . . »: obraz apokalipticheskoj Zheny v russkoi ofitsial'noi kul'ture 1695–1742 gg.," *Studia Russica Helsingiensia et Tartuensia*, 8, 2002, 9–37.

Skvortsov N. A., *Materialy po Moskve i Moskovskoi eparkhii za XVIII vek*, 2, Moscow, 1914.

Smolich I. K., *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi*, 8/1, Moscow, 1996.

Sreznevskii V. I., Pokrovskii F. I., *Opisanie Rukopisnogo otdeleniia Biblioteki Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk*, 2, Petrograd, 1915.

Wortman R. S., *Stenarii vlasti. Mify i tseremonii russkoi monarkhii*, Moscow, 2004.

Zhivov V. M., *Iazyk i kul'tura v Rossii XVIII veka*, Moscow, 1996.

Zhivov V. M., *Oчерки istoricheskoi morfologii russkogo iazyka XVII–XVIII vekov*, Moscow, 2004.

Екатерина Игоревна Кислова, канд. филол. наук

старший преподаватель кафедры русского языка

Московский государственный университет им. М. В. Ломоносова

119991 Москва, Ленинские горы, ГСП-1, МГУ, 1-й корпус гуманитарных

факультетов, филологический факультет

e.kislova@gmail.com