“Latin” and “Slavonic” Education in the Primary Classes of Russian Seminaries in the 18th Century*

“Латинское” и “славенское” образование в начальных классах русских семинарий в XVIII веке

Ekaterina I. Kislova

Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia

Екатерина Игоревна Кислова

Московский государственный университет им. М. В. Ломоносова, Москва, Россия

Abstract

The article focuses on the issue of using the Latin and “Slavensky” (that is, the combined Russian and Church Slavonic) languages in primary ecclesiastical education in the 18th century. By the 1740s, seminary education in Latin had established itself in Russia. But primary teaching of reading and writing in Russian and Church Slavonic was the tradition until the end of the 18th century, regardless of where the teaching was taking place, either at home or at a Russian school affiliated with a seminary. Russian schools were organized for teaching illiterate or semiliterate children. But by the late 18th century, several seminaries attempted to reorganize “Russian schools” into ecclesiastical schools in which Russian would be the only language of instruction. Junior classes at seminaries were fully focused on teaching Latin, but Latin was by no means a complete replacement for Russian. The principal method of instruction was translation, and the administrators of many seminaries demanded attention to the quality of the students’ translations into Russian. Thus, Russian and Latin were functionally distributed in primary education. Only Church Slavonic was practically excluded from teaching after

* Работа выполнена на средства гранта Президента РФ по государственной поддержке молодых российских учёных — кандидатов наук МК-4924.2015.6, проект “Язык и языки церковного дискурса в России 18 века”.

the primary courses of reading and church singing, and that preconditioned its conservation as a language used only for church services, leading to the extinction of the hybrid form.

Keywords

Latin, Russian, 18th century, Russian seminaries, Church Slavonic, history of education

Резюме

Статья посвящена исследованию употребления латыни и "славенского" (под которым понимались одновременно русский и церковнославянский языки) в начальном духовном образовании XVIII века. Семинарское образование на латыни утвердилось в России к 1740-м гг. Однако начальное обучение чтению и письму на русском и церковнославянском языках было традиционным до конца XVIII века, независимо от того, где оно имело место: дома или в "русской школе" при семинарии. "Русские школы" первоначально были организованы для обучения неграмотных или недостаточно грамотных детей, однако к концу XVIII века в некоторых семинариях была сделана попытка преобразовать "русские школы" в духовные учебные заведения, в которых преподавание шло исключительно на русском языке. Начальные классы семинарий были полностью ориентированы на преподавание латыни, однако латынь не являлась, вопреки распространенному мнению, полной заменой родного языка. Основным методом обучения являлся перевод, и руководство многих семинарий обращало особое внимание на качество русского языка в выполненных студентами переводах. Таким образом, русский и латынь оказывались функционально распределены в начальном образовании. Только церковнославянский был практически исключен из преподавания после начальных курсов чтения и церковного пения, что предопределило его консервацию в качестве языка исключительно церковной службы и привело к исчезновению его гибридной формы из употребления среди духовенства.

Ключевые слова

латынь, русский язык, церковнославянкий язык, XVIII век, русские семинарии, история образования

1. Introduction: Modern Perspectives on Latin-based Ecclesiastical Education

This paper focuses on the role that Latin played in primary education for children of the clergy in 18th-century Russia. It is critical, though, that we consider the status of Latin as it relates to the role and status of the children's native tongue, which, in the ecclesiastical papers of the time, was commonly referred to as "Slavensky" (Slavonic) or as "Slaveno-Russian," both of which indicated a combination of the Russian language with Church Slavonic [Кислова 2013: 103–104].

Dealing with the issue of Latin in Russian ecclesiastical education requires looking into recorded descriptions of the actual ways and methods of

teaching, as well as explaining the reasons and purposes for young Orthodox priests to study Latin. The latter question has traditionally led scholars to ponder the correlation between the study of Latin and a certain set of religious, ideological, and nationalistic beliefs of the time.

Up to the present time, the vast majority of researchers have relied on works by P. Znamensky (1881) and G. Florovsky (1981, originally published in 1937) in their assessment of what they called "Latin-based education" for the Russian clergy. The key notion is described as follows: Latin-based education, deriving largely from the Polish-Latin model, is believed to be the reason behind the rejection of Church Slavonic and Russian and the spread of what these scholars term "Latin-Protestant Scholastics." The perceived result is the alienation of theological knowledge from the experience of the Church [Флоровский 1981]. A significant number of academic papers still reflect the view that Latin-based education was so common in the seminaries that Russian was hardly used at all [Сухова 2013: 43]. However, this assumption was only partially true and then only for senior students in philosophy and theology classes.

One of the most notable academic works on the subject of Latin in the 18th-century Russian school system is the book *The Rise and Fall of Latin Humanism in Early-Modern Russia. Pagan Authors, Ukrainians, and the Resiliency of Muscovy* by M. J. Okenfuss [1995]. The author attributes the initial spread and the following decline of Latin-based education in Russian seminaries to the change in national intellectual elites: the replacement of what Okenfuss calls "Ukrainian humanist scholars" by Russian graduates of secular and ecclesiastical institutions. In his account of the 1780s, Okenfuss depicts a veritable banishment of Latin from church education, which he connects to the work of Platon Levshin: ". . . instructions and the disputations were now exclusively in Russian. Classical Greek became the chief language to be studied [. . .] and Latin was reduced to an 'elective' class for the minority of students who continued studies to [the levels of] philosophy and theology" [ibid.: 219]. This statement, however, is exaggerated and has no basis in actual fact.

Such radical assessments of Latin and its place in church education very obviously stem from the fact that the archives of Russian seminaries are often in poor condition and difficult to access (and this is especially true for small regional establishments). As early as the mid-19th century, the earliest authors to attempt serious research on the history of seminaries were complaining about the partial loss of archives [Никольский 1898: i–v]. Thus, the majority of Russian and European scholars [Freeze 1977; Okenfuss 1995; Смолич 1996; Любжин 2014] have been forced to rely on 19th-century sources, e.g., [Знаменский 1881; Смирнов 1855; 1867], etc.

Nevertheless, the status of Latin and Slavonic was not consistent throughout the course of study, from the lowest levels up through the theological

course. I will focus first on the primary level of ecclesiastical education, since it was the most widely available, which made the issue of choosing the language and the mode of education all the more pressing.

I hope that awareness of the shifts in balance between the two languages at different levels of instruction will help us avoid the trap of polarity in our assessment of 18th-century ecclesiastical discourse. My goal here is to present an objective socio-linguistic picture of the period, which included specific functional distribution of the Latin and Russian languages in ecclesiastical education. In my research, I go beyond historical accounts to the surviving archival data, which is why I have to set aside in this paper the important question of the origins and providers of the "Latin initiative" in Russian education. It is a commonplace to assume that the widespread promulgation of Latin education might have been at Peter the Great's personal initiative [Живов 1996: 137-142]; it might also have been a result of the Ukrainian or European (even Jesuit) influence provided by Feofan Prokopovich [Okenfuss 1973]. In fact, we do not have information about the emperor's personal position on this question, and every educational influence resulted from complex interactions among individuals and organizations—so this question goes far beyond the limitations of this paper. A number of related issues (such as the place of Latin in secondary and high schools, the clergy's own view of Latin-based education, and the level of language proficiency demonstrated by seminary students) as well as important questions of the historical context of 18th-century Russian education (imperial dimensions of the Russian state, social disciplining/confessionalization policy of the government, the connections between all these processes and the transfer of knowledge, and so on) also require separate consideration and separate papers, and will thus not be included in the present article.

2. The Latin Language in Late 17th- and Early 18th-Centtury Russia

Traditionally, the history of teaching Latin in Russia is dated to the reign of Peter the Great. Still, it is worth remembering that 18th-century Latin culture was brought to an environment that had already seen numerous translations from Latin [Соболевский 1903].

By the turn of the 18th century, future Ukrainian and Belorussian territories already had a number of establishments, modeled on Polish and Western European collegiums (especially Jesuit), which taught in Latin [Посохова 2011: 19–52; Сухова 2013: 4–16]. Their growth had been triggered by the confessional and political turmoil of the 16th and 17th centuries [Успенский 2002: 386–387].

It is no coincidence that teaching Latin was gaining momentum along with "regular" school education. At the time, Latin was the language of education throughout Europe, and thus the tongue that was commonly associated with

literacy [Waquet 2001: 7–40]. By the 17th century, even Moscow's Greek-Slavonic schools would have some courses in Latin: Arseniy Grek taught Greek and Latin, the Typography School library had a number of Greek and Latin books; the 1668 "Privilege for the Academy" featured Latin along with Greek and "Slavensky" [Фонкич 2009: 63, 168, 207]. The Likhud brothers used Latin alongside Greek to teach rhetoric, logic, and physics [Рамазанова 2003: 242–246].

Why was Greek scholarship displaced and then (by the 1720s[1]) replaced with Latin in ecclesiastical education? While Latin training was predictably opposed to the Grecophilia inherent in the teachings of the Orthodox church and in traditional Russian culture, it agreed very well with Peter I's Latinophile leanings. Viktor Zhivov lists a number of closely related cultural oppositions of the time: "'Helleno-Slavic teachings' versus 'Slaveno-Latin education,' 'Church Fathers' tradition versus 'Hellenistic wisdom,' Greek and Russian Orthodoxy versus Roman and European enlightenment, ecclesiastical culture versus secular culture, clergy versus royalty, Church versus Empire" [Живов 1996: 88]. In that context, Latin was seen as the crucial element of the new, emergent culture. It seems, however, that this process was important only in the church sphere; in civil education there was hardly any effort to develop Latin schools [Любжин 2014: 319–345; Rjéoutski 2016].

3. The Rise of a New Educational Model in Russia

Until Peter the Great's reforms, Russian clergy had inevitably been home-taught, but the demand for priests' literacy had been raised long before Peter, as early as in the 15th century [Кошелева 2012: 64–65]. The parish was, de facto, an hereditary holding [Матисон 2009: 5–6]; therefore, the education of future priests became the responsibility of their fathers. That kind of education was limited to practical aspects of church service; children of the clergy would also learn some reading, writing, and choral singing skills (an approach that is documented in every source on the traditional model of ecclesiastical education, e.g., [Кравецкий 1999: 230–231; Миронов 2003: 98–100]).

Latin was left out of the system since it had no practical use in the everyday lives of parish clergy. Understandably, in the eyes of anyone who had had the benefit of "regular" education (European visitors, nobles and rulers, higher clergy, and so forth), that sort of training was regarded as the equivalent of illiteracy.[2] The exemplary kind of educational establishment, according

[1] Some seminaries continued to teach Greek throughout the 1720s; by the 1730s, however, it was dropped from their curricula [Описание, 19: 616–620].

[2] See Vockerodt on the time of Peter I: "Nächst der Einführung dieser neuen geistlichen Reglementsform, und der damit verknüpften Anstalten, hat Petrus I. sich nichts mehr angelegen sein lassen, als seine Clerisei aus der vorigen Unwissenheit zu ziehen. Dieselbe war zu Anfang seiner Regierung weit gröber, als sie in Europa in den finstersten Seculis des Pabstthums gewesen sein kann [. . .] Wer lesen und schreiben

to both the government and the Synod, was the Kiev Academy,[3] the model for Russian seminaries [Смолич 1996: 392]. Quite logically, in church society, the mastery of Latin became the distinctive mark of the new, Petrine Imperial culture (see also [Живов 1996: 84] and [Уортман 2004: 31–40]). For example, in the introduction of the *Лексикон трязычный*, Fedor Polikarpov described Latin as a language of "undivided authority" (*единоначалие*), whereas Greek was described as a "language of wisdom" and Slavonic (which replaced Hebrew) as "sainted" language. So Latin was presented by Polikarpov as the language of state authority. Traditional Greek scholarship was no match for new cultural trends; one could cite the example of Pallady Rogovsky (originally, Rogov), who first studied under the Likhuds and then proceeded to attend institutions in Vilna, Neiss, Olomouc, and finally studied at St. Athanasius Collegium in Rome. After being appointed head of the Slavic Greek Latin Academy, he would teach all his courses in Latin [Любжин 2014: 463].

Ecclesiastical schools were modeled on Western European collegiums and would typically have the following classes and subjects:

a) Primary classes: *инфима* (infima) and *фара* or *аналогия* (fara, analogia), later united as *информатория* (informatoria) This was followed by two "grammar" classes, the lower (*грамматика* [grammar] as such) and the higher (*синтаксима* [syntaxima], or the class of syntax). The goal of this primary stage was to prepare the students for further learning, i.e., the teaching of Latin.

b) Secondary classes: *поэтика* (poetics, present or absent in different curricula at different stages) and *риторика* (rhetoric).

c) Higher classes: *философия* and *богословие* (philosophy and theology).

Some seminaries might also have a Russian school, which represented the preparatory level of instruction.

It was not until the late 1730s, though, that the structure became more than just a guideline. Up to the early 1720s, bishops' houses would host schools

konnte, und die Ceremonien der Kirche genau zu beobachten wusste, der hatte alle Requisita, die man nicht nur zu einem Priester, sondern auch zu einem Bischof erforderte" [Herrmann 1872: 14–15].

[3] It was not uncommon for an ecclesiastical institution of the 18th and early 19th centuries to change status: school to seminary, seminary to academy, academy back to seminary (under a different name); seminaries would open lower-level schools, classes and students would be redistributed, etc. Given these kinds of shifts, I will call most institutions by their best-known names, for example, the Kiev Academy, Slavic Greek Latin Academy, Alexander Nevsky Seminary, etc. The changes in the names usually reflect changes in the structure of classes and therefore in the status of the institution (for example, an archiereus' school usually evolved into a seminary after introducing Latin classes, as in the case of the school in the Alexander Nevsky Monastery, which became a seminary). The precise name could also change: the Slavic Greek Latin Academy was first called the Zaikonospasskaya School or Spasskie Schools (after the monastery in which it was located—but it was also called the Greek Latin School and, after the Likhuds left, the Slavic-Latin Academy.

for children from all social strata; later on these houses might be converted into seminaries or closed down.[4] During the 1720s, the newly opened establishments[5] would mostly teach reading and writing in Russian and Church Slavonic, which was hardly different from the traditional, "non-seminary," model. The teaching of philosophy and theology in Latin remained no more than a lofty dream. There were very few lecturers who would qualify for the job; as a result, the archiereus' schools were limited to teaching the very basics, starting with the Primer. Having mastered that, the boys were supposed to take up Fyodor Polikarpov's *Slavonic Grammar*, along with arithmetic and geometry. Reports from the archiereus' schools indicate that curricula also included traditional books, such as the Primer (azbuka), the Psalter, and the Book of Prayers [Титлинов 1905: 376–377; Князев 1866: 5]. Other subjects could be added, such as music, painting, or Greek [Чистович 1857: 10–11].

Apparently, the new mode of education was viewed as contrasted to the old system in terms of method: one method was more theoretical, the other more practical. The traditional pattern of education is summarized in [Успенский 1997: 246–267] and [Кравецкий 1999]; until the end of the 19th century, it consisted largely in constant re-reading of basic texts in Church Slavonic and learning them by heart. By contrast, new state establishments were supposed to go beyond reading and writing in Church Slavonic and teach a set of theoretical linguistic skills.[6] Moreover, this kind of "grammatical approach" was to be introduced at the beginner stage as the proper basis for further education. Teaching "Slavensky" to children was now believed to require "correct grammatical indoctrination," starting with the essentials and moving on to reading and writing skills [Синод 1722, 2: 172].

The introduction of grammatical methods for the teaching of Church Slavonic in the early 18th century faced severe setbacks and required official interference. Feodosy Yanovsky, the archbishop of Novgorod, repeatedly wrote to the Synod in 1722–1723, pointing out the need to select teachers who would be "proficient in grammar," and to ban from the profession anyone found lacking. He forbade those who had not themselves taken a course in grammar to teach any student in his diocese, while encouraging "real grammatists" to take up each and every pupil willing to learn. He believed that this

[4] Among the first establishments of the new kind was the school founded by Dimitry Rostovsky. It had three grades, in which were taught the Russian Primer (azbuka, for reading and writing), Latin, and Greek. However, it survived for only three years, 1702 to 1705 [Сухова 2013: 28].

[5] By 1723, eight ecclesiastical establishments had been founded: the Alexander Nevsky Seminary in St. Petersburg, plus seminaries in Novgorod, Nizhny Novgorod, Kazan, Vyatka, Suzdal, Kolomna, and Kholmogory.

[6] The co-existence of the two models throughout the Russian Southwest is analyzed in [Мечковская 1985].

would promote "proper knowledge" among the people.[7] He also pointed out the fact that in his schools, with their carefully chosen teachers, about 500 students were children of the clergy, with only 30 "commoners" (*raznotchintsy*), whereas average "secular citizens" (*svetskie obyvateli*) were still "clinging to the ignorant teachers of their children" (детей своих по прежнему обучают невеждами), that is, those using the traditional system. Indeed, the 1722 assessment of the teaching staff, carried out at his insistence in St. Petersburg, revealed that most teachers were relying on the traditional method: reading Slavonic, the Psalms, and prayers; as far as grammar and orthography were concerned, those subjects were not sufficiently familiar to the teachers themselves ("словенского чтения, псалмов и молитв и писания, ничтоже грамматического разума и правописания сами знающии" [Синод 1722, 2: 176]). Smaller regional towns were unlikely to have any teachers who would be knowledgeable enough in "the new ways"; therefore the Synod prescribed sending "three smart and literate men" from each diocese to Novgorod, for further training [Агнцев 1889: 12].

The newly introduced grammatical method of teaching Church Slavonic was an obvious counterpart to the grammatical method of teaching Latin. While Church Slavonic was intuitively comprehensible to any Russian speaker, even within the traditional educational system, Latin could not be taught without proper study of its grammar. Since Latin was the standard language of education, it was only natural that methods of teaching Latin were expanded and projected onto the teaching of other languages, Church Slavonic among them.

4. The Spread of "Latin Training"

Despite the initial setbacks in establishing ecclesiastical schools, in the mid-1720s basic Latin (*наука елементарная латинская*) began to be taught at seminaries in Kazan, Nizhny Novgorod, Kolomna, and Ryazan. Seminaries in Tver and Novgorod, as well as the Alexander Nevsky Seminary, ran classes in both Latin and Greek [Титлинов 1905: 376–377; Описание, 19: 616–620]. By the late 1720s, top seminaries in the regions offered courses in poetics (Nizhny Novgorod) and even rhetoric (Novgorod). Although only the Slavic Greek Latin Academy in Moscow offered a complete course of study, regional seminaries, too, could boast an increasing number of students who were proficient, at least to some extent, in Latin. That allowed the new, Latin-oriented educational system finally to settle in. But the process took time: provincial seminaries suffered from the permanent lack of financial support,

[7] ". . . по той Духовнаго регламента силе заказано в епархии моей, дабы кроме оного славенскую грамматику окончавших никого учить никто отнюдь не дерзал, а учили б всех учиться хотящих оные грамматисты, дабы правильное учение во всех возрастало" (РГИА, ф. 796 оп. 4 ед. хр. 440).

books, students, trained teachers, and even enthusiastic church hierarchs, and the main question was the financing of the seminaries, which was not defined until the late 1730s [Титлинов 1905: 377, 391–392, 398–414].

A number of decrees from 1737 and 1738 (at the end of Empress Anna's reign) outline the structure of seminaries, which were supposed to "teach reading and writing in the Russian language, *then* grammar, rhetoric, and other sciences of a higher order"[8] [ПСЗ, 10: 257]. Let me underline that the point about the "teaching in the Russian language" referred, in these decrees, only to the primary skills of reading and writing and not to the choice of language of the further training; thus, we cannot assume that "grammar, rhetoric and other sciences" might have been studied in Russian. The study of grammar theoretically could be adapted for the classes of Church Slavonic; but a subject such as rhetoric, however, to say nothing of philosophy and theology, were only applicable when taught in Latin, thus requiring prior mastery of the language itself [Стратий и др. 1982; Суториус 2008]. This we can see in the Decree on Establishing a Seminary at the Troitskaya Lavra, which points out the need for teaching "Latin, Greek, and, if possible, the Hebrew language as well, starting with grammar and aiming as high as rhetoric, philosophy, and theology" [ПСЗ, 10: 620].

From that moment on, "Latin literacy" (*латинская образованность*) became the symbolic core of ecclesiastical education. Indirect evidence for this can be found in the accounts of fathers who sent their sons to seminaries in the 1740s and 1750s. They had to fill out papers stating the purpose of enrolling their child in the program. The only reason given for enrolling their son was "mastering the Latin (less often, "the Greek-Latin" [*греколатинский*]) dialect" (РГБ, ф. 277 ед. хр. 1, 2 и др.; ф. 757 к. 2. д. 2; РГАДА, ф. 1189 ед. хр. 332 и др). It was not until the 1770s that some fathers began to list "mastering various sciences" (для обучения разным наукам) as the purpose for enrolling (РГБ, ф. 277, ед. хр. 5), but I have found only a few examples of this formula.

Schools of this new type encountered numerous problems (shortage of funding, lack of teachers and books, student drop-outs, social and cultural rejection by many fathers; see [Смолич 1996: 394–395]). Nevertheless, by the 1740s most new seminaries had classes at the senior level in poetics (in Kholmogory, Ryazan, and Novgorod) or rhetoric (in Vologda, Vyatka, Pskov, and Pereslavl). Seminaries in Smolensk and Kazan were the first to have introduced a higher level course—that of philosophy. Apparently, by that time the most advanced students, who had started at the elementary level in the early 1730s, were proficient enough to take up poetics, rhetoric,

[8] ". . . надлежит обучать на российском языке грамоте, *а потом* грамматике, риторике и других вышних наук."

and philosophy.[9] Yet, until late in the 18th century, relatively few children of the clergy would have access to "Latin education"; only a few could afford to take a complete course of seminary study (statistics for Tver can be found in [Матисон 2009: 113–124]; for Pskov, in [Князев 1866]; and partial data for Siberia, in [Побединский 1896]).

5. The Beginner Level of Study

From the 1740s, teaching Latin in seminaries was to be enhanced even at the primary level: it was considered crucial to start learning the language as early as possible. Thus, reading and writing in Russian were once more relegated to the pre-seminary level. The 1738 Decree on Establishing the Troitskaya Seminary specifies that "only boys 10 to 15 years of age, and capable of reading and writing in Russian" be admitted for study [ПСЗ, 10: 620]. Boys who were not sufficiently literate (that is, they struggled to read and write in Church Slavonic) were returned to their fathers for a certain period (between one and three years) for further preparation.

Still, the majority of regional seminaries continued to host a "Russian School" (sometimes called Slavonic-Russian, Writing School, Orphan School, or School for Russian Grammar). There, illiterate children would learn to read and write, and semiliterate children would perfect their skills until they were declared fit for further training in the seminary. Russian schools in seminaries were originally meant for orphans and for children of the poorest families, although in reality, that rule was largely disregarded.[10] In some cases, the function of a Russian school was performed by a private school in the town. In Voronezh, for example, illiterate children would be sent (during the 1740s) to study the Primer, the Psalter, and the Book of Prayers under the church reader Fyodor Ivanov [Никольский 1898: 36–37].

Russian schools hosted by seminaries, while the lowest in status, had the largest attendance of all. In 1738, the Voronezh Seminary had 407 students in its Slavonic-Russian School, whereas there were only 120 in the Slavonic-

[9] Inevitably, the success of a Latin-based school depended on its geographical location, namely, its proximity to the capital city. Other major factors included the prosperity of the diocese and the funding available; the ability to get quick deliveries of books from the capital; the bishop's background and his commitment to supervision of the seminary, etc. Freeze dates the settling of a Latin-based school system by the 1760s [Freeze 1977: 94]; in fact, though, by 1739 Latin figured (to varying extents) in the school curricula of every diocese except Ryazan, Suzdal, Tobolsk, and Irkutsk [Описание, 19: 616–620].

[10] In 1742, for example, Bishop Stefan Kalinovskiy demanded that the Russian school at the Pskov Seminary should keep only orphaned boys and sons of the poorest local families, and the rest of the pupils should be sent back to their fathers for home tuition [Князев 1866: 15]. In 1768 the Russian school there was joined with the informatoria class [Ibid.: 32]. In 1780 another attempt was made to open a separate school for orphans, one that was supposed to teach reading in Russian and singing. The best pupils were to be taught to read and write in Latin [Ibid.: 28].

Latin branch [Титлинов 1905: 393]. In 1740, the Pskov Seminary had 114 students in the Slavonic-Russian School, but only 35 boys attended the fara [Князев 1866: 7–9].

The curricula of Russian schools remained largely traditional: teachers used the primers, the Psalter, and the Prayer Book; in the second half of the century they could add arithmetic, Catechism, Church statutes, history of the Church, singing, cursive writing, "the compilation of church registers and certificates, and the construction of short tables and notes [from them]" (составление церковных росписей, метрик и извлечение из них кратких табелей), and a few other subjects [Побединский 1896: 46; Смирнов 1855: 308; Агнцев 1889: 114].

Thus, primary education was still quite traditional for any child, regardless of his place of study—whether he was home-taught or attended a Russian school at a seminary. It included reading in Church Slavonic (from the Primer, the Psalter, or the Book of Prayers; see [Мошкова 2013]), and writing in Russian, which, until the last quarter of the 18th century, presumably meant mastering the Russian cursive. The Synodal prescription to teach "civil print" (*гражданская печать*) along with Church Slavonic did not appear until 1781; it was endorsed by shipping new "civil Primers" to every diocese [Нечаева 2005: 19]. Apparently, seminary students could read civil print long before that, since many schoolbooks for secondary and senior levels were printed in civil characters. From 1781, however, the use of civil primers was required at the seminary beginner level.

In rare cases, fathers who had already had seminary training themselves could start teaching Latin to their sons beforehand. Thus, Stefan Levitsky, a prominent preacher and priest at the Kremlin Uspensky Cathedral, testified that his son Ivan had "skills of reading and writing in Russian and Latin" (обучен российскому и латинскому чтению и писанию) by the time he was admitted to the Slavic Greek Latin Academy (РГБ, ф. 277. ед. хр. 2, л. 20).

6. Russian Schools at the Turn of the 19th Century

By the end of the 18th century, Russian schools were not so much preparing children for further study of "the Latin science" as teaching pupils with learning difficulties who failed to master Latin and got stuck at the beginner level for several additional years. On August 25, 1800, the Synod issued a decree prescribing the training of the "less capable ones" as vergers (*причетники*—key local agents of confessionalization). They were to be taught at Russian schools; those seminaries that had no such school were obliged to open one. The required subjects were reading, Church regulations and proceedings, singing, writing, Catechism and sacred history, and other topics relevant for performing their future duties [ПСЗ, 17: 278].

On March 18, 1803, another decree followed, prescribing the establishment of Russian schools in accordance with the curriculum compiled by Amvrosy Podobedov. They were supposed to have three grades (all in all, a five-year course of study), and the following set of subjects (РНБ ф. 522 ед. хр. 209 л. 170):

a) The first grade (one year of study): reading in Church Slavonic and Russian ("Slavonic and civil print"), calligraphy, regular church singing, and the study of the *Brief Course of Russian Grammar* by E. Syreishchikov.

b) The second grade (two years of study): world and Russian history, geography, arithmetic, and *computus* (*Пасхалия*).

c) The third grade (two years of study) implied the most intensive study. The boys were supposed to be taught basic logic (most probably, from the *Brief Course of Logic for the Benefit of the Russian Youth*, Moscow, 1788); rhetoric in Russian (based on Gallien de Salmoranc's *Eloquence, or Brief Rules of Rhetoric for General Use*, St. Petersburg, 1785); and the full Catechism and church regulations. Among other books marked for study were *On Duties of the Individual and the Citizen; On the Position of the Parish Presbyter* by Parfeny Sopkovsky and Georgy Konissky (Moscow, 1796), and the *Brief Guide to Reading the Old and New Testament* by Amvrosy Podobedov (Moscow, 1779).[11]

The demarcation line between Russian schools and seminaries was clearly drawn by the ability of students to master Latin: ". . . children of priests and other clergy who prove incapable of mastering higher sciences and the Latin language, which is habitually used to teach said sciences, can still hone the natural abilities of their intellects, and thus become good and helpful servants to the Church" [ПСЗ, 27: 502]. Graduates of such schools were not only entitled to hold the position of verger, but were also allowed to teach children in parish schools. In some cases, they could even become priests in village churches [ibid.].

Understandably, not every Russian school had this structure, and not all of the officially prescribed subjects were actually taught. In the Pskov Seminary, the first grade of the Russian school was merged with the informatoria, and, furthermore, Russian grammar was moved to the second grade, which, apparently, never opened [Князев 1866: 31–32]. As a result, the Russian school at the Pskov Seminary taught reading in Church Slavonic and civil print, Russian cursive, the brief Catechism, choir singing, and arithmetic [ibid.: 40]. In

[11] *Краткая логика, или Умословие, служащее в пользу российского юношества*, Москва, 1788; Гальен де Сальморан, *Краснословие или Риторика в кратких правилах для всеобщего употребления*, С.-Петербург, 1785; *О должностях человека и гражданина*, С.-Петербург, 1783; Парфений Сопковский, Георгий Конисский, *О должностях пресвитеров приходских*, Москва, 1796; Амвросий Подобедов, *Краткое руководство к чтению книг Ветхого и Нового Завета*, Москва, 1779.

Tambov, classes were closed down for lack of students [Знаменский 1881: 743]. The Troitskaya Seminary and seminaries in Kazan, Ryazan, Voronezh, and a few other towns, however, implemented Amvrosy Podobedov's plan, and survived until between 1808 and 1816 [Смирнов 1867: 325–326; Можаровский 1877: 22–23; Агнцев 1889: 125; Никольский 1898: 172–173].

During the 1800s, Russian schools modeled on Amvrosy's plan became the primary sites of practical ecclesiastical education, much in demand among the ordinary clergy. In fact, this model was so popular that Latin-based education, by then viewed as traditional, could no longer compete. Priests and the lower clergy preferred to send their sons to Russian schools only, since their students would acquire knowledge and skills in their own language, while escaping the "Latin science." In 1816, Archbishop of Kazan Amvrosy Protasov demanded the closure of the "extended" Russian school, retaining only the classes for "less capable ones." His reasoning was as follows: "Russian schools are not only useless; indeed, they do a lot of harm for the clergy's enlightment, since the clergy enroll their sons in Russian classes instead of sending them to an academy for a complete course. Instead of becoming worthy and capable servants of the church, they end up being not scholars but rather non-scholars [. . . и так делаются не учеными, но не учеными]. Therefore I suggest that such classes be dismissed but for the first grade, which is to be preserved for teaching beginners who prove incapable of any other study. It is to be understood that after leaving such a school they can only serve as vergers"[12] [Можаровский 1877: 45–46]. As early as 1808 a similar fate befell a very successful Russian school in Ryazan. It was reorganized, with two grades emerging: one for "students preparing for the study in Latin schools," and the other remained "solely Russian, for those who train to be vergers" [Агнцев 1889: 125].

7. Primary Classes at Seminaries

Primary classes at seminaries were inevitably bilingual. Teaching Latin to beginners had to draw on the children's own language. After the level of the informatoria, however, Russian was no longer the subject of study. Secondary classes were exclusively focused on Latin, and therefore carried out entirely in Latin. Traditionally, the basics of Latin were studied by using the grammar book by Alvar; in the second half of the century, pupils would also use the

[12] "Русские классы совершенно почитаю я не только бесполезными, но и вредными просвещению духовенства; ибо очень приметно, что духовные, вместо того, чтобы записывать детей своих в академию для окончания академического курса, и тем сделать их со временем достойными служителями церкви, записывают их в русские классы; и так делаются не учеными, но не учеными. Почему и нужно их уничтожить, как не отвечающие и новому уставу, кроме первого, который должен оставаться только для тех учеников низших классов, кои неспособны окажутся к учению, и притом с тем, чтобы они из оного выходили только на причетнические места."

Brief Latin Grammar by Lebedev, the *Latin Grammar* by Bantysh-Kamensky, and others. But very few of the materials that could illustrate the use of Russian in the process of teaching Latin have survived to this day.

A rare example of early 18th-century school materials can be found in Rafail Zaborovsky's "Treatises on Home Pursuits and School Exercises" (Трактаты окупаций домашних и ексерцицей школьных Рафаила Заборовского, РНБ, ф. 577, ед. хр. 77). These are school texts for the classes of infima, grammar, syntaxima, and poetics, used at the Slavic Greek Latin Academy between 1714 and 1716. Every text, except the section on poetics, is bilingual (each exercise is given in Latin and in Russian). Poetics, however, is presented only in Latin. This corresponds to the tradition of Latin poetics and rhetoric, which had originated at the Kiev Academy and was then transplanted to Russian seminaries [Вомперский 1988: 29–38; Стратий и др. 1982].

A similar balance of Russian and Latin in primary classes can be observed in the materials of the Novgorod Seminary as late as the turn of the 19th century (РНБ, ф. 522, ед. хр. 209). In 1802, the informatoria students were taught "Latin and Russian calligraphy, Russian cursive, and, to the best of their abilities, Latin cursive and the basics of Latin grammar" (fol. 91). The two grammar classes (the lower and the higher level) studied Latin grammar and read Latin authors (Julius Caesar, Cicero, Cornelius Nepos, Phaedrus' fables, and so forth). The students practiced translating long "periods" from Russian to Latin and vice versa; they would also memorize sample conversations in Latin from the *Colloquia Scholastica* by Maturinus Corderius. In this higher level, teachers were supposed to talk to the students mostly in Latin: "At most times, teachers themselves shall speak Latin so that their pupils can become accustomed to Latin discourse" (для приучения учеников к латинскому разговору по большей части и сами [учителя] говорят по-латине, fol. 90v.).

This approach (with slight variations) was the predominant educational model for the mid- and late 18th century in the Voronezh, Ryazan, and Vladimir seminaries [Никольский 1898: 147–148; Агнцев 1889: 114–115]. In the latter establishment, the informatoria class would be taught reading and writing in the Russian and Latin languages; the students would also read the minor Catechism and memorize "Latin vocabulae"—the most commonly used words. Grammar classes would continue the study of Russian grammar, doing translations from Russian to Latin. Starting mid-term, they would analyze "sample conversations with scrutiny of etymology and rules of grammar" (школьные разговоры с разбирательством этимологических и грамматических правил [Надеждин 1875: 105]). At that point, the teacher would switch to Latin. In the syntaxima, teachers and students were to communicate in Latin only. They would study the *Latin Grammar* by Alvar, translate from Latin to Russian, read conversations of Erasmus and Castellion in Latin, memorize

more difficult words from the *Cellarius* ("Христофора Целлария Краткой латинской лексикон с российским и немецким переводом. . ."), and they would also start writing poems in Latin [ibid.: 104–105]. In some seminaries, students would learn a whole grammar book (such as the *Grammar* by Bantysh-Kamensky) by heart, and not just the Latin but the Russian part as well [Агнцев 1889: 114–115].

8. Conclusions

During most of the 18th century, primary education in "Slavensky" was little different from the traditional, pre-Petrine, model. Teaching based on pre-Petrine Slavonic grammar books (by Smotritsky, Polikarpov, Maksimovich, and others) could continue in archiereus' schools and seminaries, but was not universally employed. By the end of the 18th and the turn of the 19th century, there were new grammars of the Russian language.

Complete rejection of Russian was only possible (theoretically) at secondary and higher levels of study, by which time the students' Latin would have become fluent enough. The implementation of that model, however, varied greatly depending on the student's abilities, the teacher's training and background, and the regulations introduced by the supervising bishop. In their original Polish-Ukrainian model, classes in poetics, rhetoric, philosophy, and theology were largely or even completely Latin-oriented. However, from the mid-18th century on, Slavic vernaculars would play an increasingly important role in the teaching process, starting with poetics and rhetoric and eventually going up to the level of theology.

The 1786 Decree on Common Schools (Устав о народных училищах) endorsed and extended teaching in Russian, but also the teaching of Russian itself. The decree was extended to include seminaries as well. It even promoted Russian at the senior level of seminary education [Знаменский 1881: 792]; however, it could not displace Latin at primary and secondary levels. The rector and the prefect of the Troitskaya Seminary discouraged teachers from enhancing Russian in primary-stage classes: "If we accept the regulations for common schools as far as Russian literacy and writing are concerned, we may well expect poorer performance in Latin, since those who first have to do a course in Russian grammar and writing would start learning Latin at a much later stage."[13]

Therefore, Russian did not become a full-fledged subject at the initial level of seminary training, even after 1786. It remained a preparation course before the switch into the "Latin-based" system.

[13] ". . . ежели принять правило народных училищ в рассуждении учения российской грамоте и писанию, то предвидится из того впредь последовать препятствие успехам в латинском языке, ибо те, которые должны будут учиться наперед российской грамоте и писанию, к учению латинского языка будут приступать уже гораздо позже. . ." [Смирнов 1867: 328].

Yet the principal method of language teaching at the time was the translation. Therefore, exercises in translation that students would do throughout their course in the seminary (not only in Latin classes, but also while studying Greek, Hebrew, French, or German) naturally became the ground for improving their practical command of Russian. The quality of the Russian text resulting from such translation would be closely scrutinized. Thus, beginner students at the Ryazan seminary would get simple translating assignments, but the resulting text was to be stylistically adjusted for the target language "without any of the barbaric phrasing which is equally deplorable in Latin and in Russian" [Агнцев 1889: 115]. Platon Levshin would repeatedly prescribe that close attention be paid to the quality of translated texts and the idiom used therein [Смирнов 1867: 310]. The bishops of Voronezh would regularly insist on ensuring correctness of Russian spelling and Church Slavonic reading throughout the latter half of the 18th century [Никольский 1898: 168–170]. This was especially important for those regions in which students were speakers of Ukrainian or a southern Russian dialect [Знаменский 1881: 736]. At the turn of the 19th century, the actor Yakovlev even taught correct articulation and public reading at the Alexander Nevsky Seminary [Чистович 1857: 126].

Thus, "Slavensky" and Latin would be distributed, at the beginner level of seminary training, according to the role that each of the two languages played in the lives of the students. Russian was a tool for teaching Latin, which, in turn, was "the key to higher learning." Nevertheless, students continued to perfect and hone their practical Russian skills due to their constant exposure to translation during their course of study. Latin interference in the Russian language (especially in syntax) was the logical consequence of this process. It was only Church Slavonic that would be completely dropped from the curricula after the initial courses in reading and church singing. This led to its conservation as the language reserved for church services only, and the eventual extinction of the hybrid linguistic form.

Bibliography

Freeze 1977
Freeze G. L., *The Russian Levites. Parish Clergy in the Eighteenth Century*, Cambridge, London, 1977.

Herrmann 1872
Herrmann E., Hrsg., *Russland unter Peter dem Grossen. Nach den handschriftlichen Berichten Johann Gotthilf Vockerodt's und Otto Pleyer's*, Leipzig, 1872.

Okenfuss 1973
Okenfuss M. J., "The Jesuit Origins of Petrine Education," in: J. G. Garrand, ed., *The Eighteenth Century in Russia*, Oxford, 1973, 106–130.

——— 1995
Okenfuss M. J., *The Rise and Fall of Latin Humanism in Early-modern Russia. Pagan Authors, Ukrainians, and the Resiliency of Muscovy*, Leiden, New York, Köln, 1995.

Rjéoutski 2016
Rjéoutski V., "Native Tongues and Foreign Languages in the Education of the Russian Nobility: The Case of the Noble Cadet Corps (the 1730s–1760s)," in: N. McLelland, R. Smith, eds., *The History of Language Learning and Teaching*, 1: *16th–18th Century Europe*, Oxford, 2016 (forthcoming).

Waquet 2001
Waquet F., *Latin or The Empire of a Sign: From the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries*, London, New York, 2001.

Агнцев 1889
Агнцев Д., *История Рязанской духовной семинарии*, Рязань, 1889.

Вомперский 1988
Вомперский В. П., *Риторики в России XVII–XVIII вв.*, Москва, 1988.

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

Знаменский 1881
Знаменский П., *Духовные школы в России до реформы 1808 года*, Казань, 1881.

Кислова 2013
Кислова Е. И., "«Природный язык» и язык обучения в духовном образовании XVIII века", in: S. Ulrich, E. Kislova, E. Kubicka, Hrsg., *Beiträge der Europäischen Slavistischen Linguistik* (= POLYSLAV, 16), München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 102–108.

Князев 1866
Князев А., *Очерк истории Псковской семинарии от начала до преобразования ее по проекту 1814 года*, Москва, 1866.

Кошелева 2012
Кошелева О. Е., "Обучение в русской средневековой православной традиции", в: *Одиссей. Человек в истории. 2010/2011*, Москва, 2012, 47–72.

Кравецкий 1999
Кравецкий А. Г., "Литургический язык как предмет этнографии", в: Е. Е. Левкиевская, ред., *Славянские этюды. Сборник к юбилею С. М. Толстой*, Москва, 1999, 228–242.

Любжин 2014
Любжин А. И., *История русской школы*, 1: *Русская школа XVIII столетия*, Москва, 2014.

Матисон 2009
Матисон А. В., *Православное духовенство русского города XVIII века. Генеалогия священно-церковнослужителей Твери*, Москва, 2009.

Мечковская 1985
Мечковская Н. Б., "Архаическое и новое в лингвистическом сознании одной эпохи (к характеристике восточнославянских грамматик XVI–XVII вв.)", *Slavica Tartuensia*, 1, 1985, 15–24.

Миронов 2003
Миронов Б. Н., *Социальная история России периода империи (XVIII – начало XX в.)*, С.-Петербург, 2003.

Можаровский 1877
Можаровский А. П., "Старая Казанская академия", *Чтения в императорском обществе истории и древностей Российских при Московском университете*, 2, 1877, 1–131.

Мошкова 2013
Мошкова Л. В., "Роль конфессионального фактора в развитии литературы для начального обучения на славянских языках в XVIII в.", в: О. Е. Кошелева, Л. В. Мошкова, *Западноевропейская и российская учебная литература XVI – начала XX вв. (конфессиональный аспект)*, Москва, 2013, 191–216.

Надеждин 1875
Надеждин К., *История Владимирской духовной семинарии (с 1750 года по 1840 год)*, Владимир, 1875.

Нечаева 2005
Нечаева Л. В., "Православные духовные школы Западной Сибири в XVIII веке. (К 300-летию духовной школы в Сибири)", *Известия Российского государственного педагогического университета им. А. И. Герцена*, 5/11, 2005, 15–31.

Никольский 1898
Никольский П., *История Воронежской семинарии*, 1, Воронеж, 1898.

Описание, 19
Описание документов и дел, хранящихся в архиве Святейшего Правительствующего Синода, 19: *1739 г.*, С.-Петербург, 1913.

Побединский 1896
Побединский М., *Старинные Томские духовные школы (1746–1820 гг.)*, Томск, 1896.

Посохова 2011
Посохова Л. Ю., *На перехресті культур, традицій, епох: православні колегіуми України наприкінці XVII – на початку XIX ст.*, Харків, 2011.

ПСЗ, 1–45
Полное собрание законов Российской империи, 1–45, С.-Петербург, 1830.

Рамазанова 2003
Рамазанова Д. Н., "Братья Лихуды и начальный этап истории Славяно-Греко-Латинской академии" (диссертация [. . .] канд. ист. наук, Москва, 2003).

Синод 1722, 2
Описание документов и дел, хранящихся в архиве Святейшего Правительствующего Синода. 1722 г, 2/2, С.-Петербург, 1878.

Смирнов 1855
Смирнов С., *История Московской Славяно-греко-латинской академии*, Москва, 1855.

——— 1867
Смирнов С., *История Троицкой лаврской семинарии*, Москва, 1867.

Смолич 1996
Смолич И. К., *История русской церкви. 1700–1917*, 8/1, Москва, 1996.

Соболевский 1903
Соболевский А. И., *Переводная литература Московской Руси XIV–XVII веков*, С.-Петербург, 1903.

Стратий и др. 1982
Стратий Я. М., Литвинова В. Д., Андрушко В. А., *Описание курсов философии и риторики профессоров Киево-Могилянской академии*, Киев, 1982.

Суториус 2008
Суториус К. В., "Источники по истории преподавания православного латиноязычного богословия в России в первой половине XVIII века" (диссертация [. . .] канд. ист. наук, С.-Петербург, 2008).

Сухова 2013
Сухова Н. Ю., *Духовные школы и духовное просвещение в России (XVII – начало XX в.)*, С.-Петербург, 2013.

Титлинов 1905
Титлинов Б. В., *Правительство Анны Иоанновны в его отношениях к делам православной церкви*, Вильна, 1905.

Уортман 2004
Уортман Р. С., *Сценарии власти. Мифы и церемонии русской монархии*, 1, Москва, 2004.

Успенский 1997
Успенский Б. А., "Старинная система чтения по складам (Глава из истории русской грамоты)", в: Он же, *Избранные труды*, 3: *Общее и славянское языкознание*, Москва, 1997, 246–267.

——— 2002
Успенский Б. А., *История русского литературного языка (XI–XVII вв.)*, Москва, 2002.

Флоровский 1981
Флоровский Г., *Пути русского богословия*, Paris, 1981.

Фонкич 2009
Фонкич Б. Л., *Греко-славянские школы в Москве в XVII веке*, Москва, 2009.

Чистович 1857
Чистович И. А., *История С.-Петербургской духовной академии*, С.-Петербург, 1857.

Acknowledgements

Council for Grants of the President of the Russian Federation (grant MK-4924.2015.6)

References

Florovsky G., *Puti russkogo bogosloviia*, Paris, 1981.

Fonkich B. L., *Greko-slavianskie shkoly v Moskve v XVII veke*, Moscow, 2009.

Freeze G. L., *The Russian Levites. Parish Clergy in the Eighteenth Century*, Cambridge, London, 1977.

Kislova E. I., "«Prirodnyi iazyk» i iazyk obucheniia v dukhovnom obrazovanii XVIII veka," in: S. Ulrich, E. Kislova, E. Kubicka, Hrsg., *Beiträge der Europäischen Slavistischen Linguistik* (= POLYSLAV, 16), München, Berlin, Washington, D.C., 2013, 102–108.

Kosheleva O. E., "Obuchenie v russkoi srednevekovoi pravoslavnoi traditsii," in: Odissei. Chelovek v istorii. 2010/2011, Moscow, 2012, 47–72.

Kravetsky A. G., "Liturgicheskii iazyk kak predmet etnografii," in: E. E. Levkievskaya, ed., *Slavianskie etiudy. Sbornik k iubileiu S. M. Tolstoi*, Moscow, 1999, 228–242.

Liubzhin A. I., *Istoriia russkoi shkoly*, 1: *Russkaia shkola XVIII stoletiia*, Moscow, 2014.

Matison A. V., *Pravoslavnoe dukhovenstvo russkogo goroda XVIII veka. Genealogiia sviashchenno-tserkovnosluzhitelei Tveri*, Moscow, 2009.

Mechkovskaya N. B., "Arkhaicheskoe i novoe v lingvisticheskom soznanii odnoi epokhi (k kharakteristike vostochnoslaviankikh grammatik XVI–XVII vv.)," *Slavica Tartuensia*, 1, 1985, 15–24.

Mironov B. N., *Sotsial'naia istoriia Rossii perioda imperii (XVIII – nachalo XX v.)*, St. Petersburg, 2003.

Moshkova L. V., "Rol' konfessional'nogo faktora v razvitii literatury dlia nachal'nogo obucheniia na slavianskikh iazykakh v XVIII v.," in: O. E. Kosheleva, L. V. Moshkova, *Zapadnoevropeiskaia i rossiiskaia uchebnaia literatura XVI – nachala XX vv. (konfessional'nyi aspekt)*, Moscow, 2013, 191–216.

Nechaeva L. V., "Pravoslavnye dukhovnye shkoly Zapadnoi Sibiri v XVIII veke. (K 300-letiiu dukhovnoi shkoly v Sibiri)," *Izvestiia Rossiiskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta im. A. I. Gertsena*, 5/11, 2005, 15–31.

Okenfuss M. J., "The Jesuit Origins of Petrine Education," in: J. G. Garrand, ed., *The Eighteenth Century in Russia*, Oxford, 1973, 106–130.

Okenfuss M. J., *The Rise and Fall of Latin Humanism in Early-modern Russia. Pagan Authors, Ukrainians, and the Resiliency of Muscovy*, Leiden, New York, Köln, 1995.

Posokhova L. Yu., *Na perekhresti kul'tur, tradytsii, epokh: pravoslavni kolehiumy Ukraïny naprykintsi XVII – na pochatku XIX st.*, Kharkov, 2011.

Smolich I. K., *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi. 1700–1917*, 8/1, Moscow, 1996.

Stratiy Ya. M., Litvinova V. D., Andrushko V. A., *Opisanie kursov filosofii i ritoriki professorov Kievo-Mogilianskoi akademii*, Kiev, 1982.

Sukhova N. Yu., *Dukhovnye shkoly i dukhovnoe prosveshchenie v Rossii (XVII – nachalo XX v.)*, St. Petersburg, 2013.

Rjéoutski V., "Native Tongues and Foreign Languages in the Education of the Russian Nobility: The Case of the Noble Cadet Corps (the 1730s–1760s)," in: N. McLelland, R. Smith, eds., *The History of Lan-*

guage Learning and Teaching, 1: *16th–18th Century Europe*, Oxford, 2016 (forthcoming).

Uspenskij B. A., *Izbrannye trudy*, 3: *Obshchee i slavianskoe iazykoznanie*, Moscow, 1997.

Uspenskij B. A., Istoriia russkogo literaturnogo iazyka (XI–XVII vv.), Moscow, 2002.

Vomperskiy V. P., *Ritoriki v Rossii XVII–XVIII vv.*, Moscow, 1988.

Waquet F., *Latin or The Empire of a Sign: From the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries*, London, New York, 2001.

Wortman R. S., *Scenarios of Power. Myth and Ceremony in Russian Monarchy*, 1, Moscow, 2004.

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

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
Россия / Russia
e.kislova@gmail.com

Received on August 4, 2015