



Rus'—Rossiia,
and *russkie—rossiiane,*
and *ruskii—rossiiskii*
in the *Catalogue of the*
Kievan Metropolitans
by St. Demetrius of
Rostov*

Русь — Россия,
русские — россияне,
русский — российский
в “Каталоге митро-
политов Киевских”
свт. Димитрия
Ростовского

Alexander I. Grishchenko

Moscow State Pedagogical University

**Александр Игоревич
Грищенко**

Московский педагогический
государственный университет

Резюме

В данной статье на материале малоизвестного сочинения по истории русской церкви “Каталог митрополитов Киевских” (нач. XVIII в.), написанного, скорее всего, свт. Димитрием Ростовским, рассмотрены особенности употребления и сочетаемость слов из синонимических рядов *Русь / Россия / Руссия, русский / российский / росский, русские / россияне / россы*. Всего в тексте памятника представлено 32 слова на *рус-* и 37 на *рос-*, причём топонимы и производные от них прилагательные равноупотребительны, однако наблюдается определённая привязка последних к тому или иному имени в составе пока ещё относительно устойчивых коллокаций. Отмечено преобладание этнонимов на *рос-*, а также общая тенденция к редакторской правке *рус-* → *рос-* в более поздних списках и единственном издании “Каталога” (1776).

* Работа выполнена на средства гранта Президента РФ по государственной поддержке молодых российских учёных — кандидатов наук МК-3307.2013.6, проект: “«Своя» и «чужая» этничность в русской лексике и фразеологии”.

Ключевые слова

начало XVIII века, церковнославянский язык, “проста мова”, этнонимы, историческая стилистика, орфография, Димитрий Ростовский

Abstract

This article deals with the usage and combinability of words from the synonymic rows *Rus'/Rossiia/Russiia*, *russkii/rossiiskii/rosskii*, and *russkie/rossiiane/rossy*, on the basis of the *Catalogue of the Kievan Metropolitans*, from the early 18th c.—a little-known work on the history of the Russian Church. In the Catalogue, there are about the same number of place names using either *rus-* or *ros-* and the adjectives derived from them (a total of 32 and 37, respectively); however, there is an identifiable relationship between each adjective and a specific noun, apparently reflecting fairly stable collocations. Also, the author notes the predominance of ethnonyms with *ros-* and a general trend towards editing *rus-* to *ros-* in the later copies of the Catalogue and in its sole publication in 1776.

Keywords

early 18th century, Church Slavonic language, Ruthenian language, ethnonyms, historical stylistics, orthography, Demetrius of Rostov

By the beginning of the 18th century when, as a result of Peter's reforms, the Tsardom of Muscovy was transformed into the Russian Empire, there appeared a series of large-scale language changes revising the distribution of Church Slavonic and a number of Russian proper idioms (the Moscow koiné, Ruthenian, and vernaculars).¹ It is against this background that one finds the actualization of the old synonymic rows with the initials *rus-* and *ros-* (and, respectively, the roots *rus-*, *rus(s)ii-*, *ros(s)-*, *ros(s)sii-*), relating to the name of the Russian state, its territory, and inhabitants. As a consequence, the rows *Rus'/Rossiia/Russiia* (place names), *russkii/rossiiskii/rosskii* (attributes), and *russkie/rossiiane/rossy* (ethnic and inhabitants' names) differ stylistically: the first terms were gradually moved to lower stylistic registers and the rest remained almost solely in solemn bookish discourse. However, this did not happen all at once, and in many texts of this epoch there is a significant variability in the usage of these words, including serious orthographic inconsistencies. Furthermore, it should be mentioned that the history of this process and of the appearance of these forms in various languages—Slavic and non-Slavic—is in general still not clear, although some of its episodes have been examined in a number of studies in considerable detail; cf. [SOLOVIEV 1947;

¹ Regarding multilingualism of authors originating from Ruthenian lands and the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth of that epoch, see, e.g., a special paper [BROGI BERCOFF 2005] on the works by Metropolitan Stephen Yavorsky (1658–1722), a close friend and associate of St. Demetrius of Rostov.

TIKHOMIROV 1953; SOLOVIEV 1957A; 1957B; TRUBACHEV 2001; ULUKHANOV 2008; KLOSS 2012], and the review [GRISHCHENKO 2013B] of the latter, and also an essay on corpus study [IDEM 2013A] based on the analysis of the Middle Russian Corpus (a demo version) included in the Russian National Corpus (http://www.ruscorpora.ru/search-mid_rus.html).

The spellings with the root *ros-* (in Muscovite Russia since the end of the 17th century with the doubled *s*, i.e., *ross-*)² supplanted the corresponding forms with *rus-* in Russian literature of the 18th century; this differentiation occurred both at that time as well as later on (up to the present), including semantic differentiation, due to which there have appeared pairs explicitly opposed in meaning in the modern Russian literary language. This opposition includes semantic differentiation, due to which there have appeared pairs explicitly opposed in meaning in the modern Russian literary language: adv. *r'usskii* 'of or pertaining to the ethnic Russian' vs. *ross'iiskii* 'of or pertaining to Russia in general,' and n.pl. *r'usskie* 'ethnic Russians; East Slavic ethnic group native to Russia' (sing. masc. *r'usskii*, fem. *r'usskaia*) vs. *rossii'ane* 'citizens or inhabitants of Russia' (sing. masc. *rossii'anin*, fem. *rossii'anka*). This duality is hardly translatable into most of the world's languages.³ For example, when the traditional translation of Nikolai Karamzin's historical survey is employed—*History of the Russian State*—it is thus quite difficult to understand the following passage from the Russian-language article by Alexandre Soloviev:

In the years after the end of the Napoleonic Wars Karamzin, who had become a conservative, published his *History of the Russian (Rossiiskogo) State* (1816–1826), and returning to the tradition of the 18th century, he more often spoke there of *Rossiiiane* than of *Ruskkie*. But young Nikolai Polevoy replied to him through the title of his *History of the Russian (Russkogo) People*. This antithesis: "Russian (*Rossiiskoe*) state" and "Russian (*Ruskkii*) people" became characteristic for the whole 19th century [SOLOVIEV 1957A: 154].⁴

The first person seriously to draw attention to the change of the root *rus-* into *ros-* in the Slavic-Russian literature was Nikolai Karamzin himself:

² This was first established by KLOSS [2012: 115 ff.], who notes: "The spelling *Rossii* with two «s» naturally appeared in the lands of Kievan Metropolia, which was an area of mixed Slavic and Latin influence" [ИВД.: 123].

³ Except some Slavic languages, e.g., see [BUNČIĆ 2006: 40–41] on the difference between the Polish terms *ruski* 'East Slavonic (= Ruthenian)' and *rosyjski* 'Russian (= Muscovite).'

⁴ Cf. the original: "В годы после окончания наполеоновских войн ставший консервативатором Карамзин издает «Историю Государства Российского» (1816–1826) и, возвращаясь к традиции XVIII в., чаще говорит в ней о «Россиянах», чем о «Русских». Но молодой Н. Полевой отвечает ему «Историей русского народа». Эта антитеза: «Российское государство» и «русский народ» станет характерной для всего XIX в."

In ancient times we used to write *Rus'*, after *Rusia*, but have finally turned the letter *U* into *O*. Tatishchev thought that Metropolitan Macarius was the first to coin this novelty, but all the oldest copies of the *Book of Degrees*, the so-called *Macarius' Book*, all the 16th-century manuscripts I happened to see use the names *Rus'* and *Rusia* [KARAMZIN 1998: 325].

However, there are some later copies of the same *Book of Degrees* in which *Rus'* was replaced by *Rosia*, e.g., in the *Piskarev copy* from the end of the 16th–the early 17th centuries; this was compared by Alexey Sirenov with the earlier *Chudov copy*:

Apparently, these changes should be attributed to the creation of the scribe of the *Piskarev copy*, who intended to modernize the text [SIRENOV 2007: 248].

Such replacements in the copies of the same monuments were noted by other researchers. Thus, the *Praise of St. Vladimir* contains the word with the root *rus-* in the *Troitsky copy* of the 1520s, but in the later *Academy copy* of 1557/58 they were replaced by *ros-*:

This variant reading type could be explained by the tendency marked by M. N. Tikhomirov to the establishment of the term “*Rossia*” in monuments of Russian literature in the 16th century. It can be assumed that the replacement of the root “*rus*” with “*ros*” was made by the scribe of the *Academy copy* unknowingly, because the second vocalization was apparently familiar for him. This is supported by the fact that the *Academy copy* kept the most of the words with the root “*rus*”, which the scribe borrowed from his source. Perhaps active adoption of the root “*ros*” in the Russian literature fell in the thirty-year period separating the *Troitsky* [. . .] and the *Academy* copies . . . [USACHEV 2006: 7–8].

Besides spelling modernization from one copy to another, in some works one can also come across variation in the roots *rus-* and *ros-* within the same copy, which cannot be attributed only to a scribe’s inattention or to orthographic inconsistency, but can also be interpreted as belonging to the original. Among such monuments there is the practically unknown *Catalogue of Kievan Metropolitans with Short Chronicle* by St. Demetrius of Rostov, which in 1776 was carelessly and without any attribution published in the *Moscow Curious Almanac* by Vasily Ruban, an omnivorous and indiscriminate publisher. This unique printed edition of the *Catalogue, Ruban1776*, had some corrections and inserts both in the main text and at its conclusion, that is, the publisher treated the original work the same way medieval scribes treated their manuscripts: the list of Kievan metropolitans was extended to include Gabriel Kremenecky, who held the chair of Kiev from 1770 to 1783, and this additional material amounts to approximately 19% of the final text. Despite the dubiousness of Ruban’s edition, this work of St. Demetrius was nevertheless identified in the early 19th century by Metropolitan Eugenius

Bolkhovitinov, who included it in the list of the Rostov bishop's writings in the *Historical Dictionary of Russian Writers of the Clerical Titles of the Graeco-Russian Church* at no. 10; he noted that Ruban had amplified the work of St. Demetrius with “references to the *Russian Hierarchy* by Sellius and other books, and also added biographies of Kievan metropolitans of the 18th century” [EUGENIUS 1827: 129]. This refers to the Latin work by Adam Burchard Sellius (monastic name Nicodemus)—a teacher at the Alexander Nevsky Theological School in the 1730s and 1740s—titled *De Russorum Hierarchia* (in five books). Following metropolitan Eugenius, the authorship of St. Demetrius was mentioned by M. A. FEDOTOVA [1992: 268; 2007: 15–16], although, in general, she acknowledges only the hypothetical character of many attributions to the unpublished works of St. Demetrius [IDEM 2014].

The *Catalogue* is known in several manuscripts, and one of them, *Syn139*, written in a clear cursive hand and originating from the personal library of St. Demetrius, contains his own handwritten corrections and marginalia. This manuscript has clearly legible Polish insertions using Latin letters, unlike *Ruban1776*, where the publisher did not cope with them; scribes of other manuscripts tried either to transliterate them into Cyrillic (as in *SPb319*, also written in a cursive hand) or to translate them (as in *Syn123*, written in Church Slavonic half-uncial), as shown in the following series of comparisons of a quotation from Marcin Cromer:

Table 1

<i>Syn139</i> 185r _{21–23}	<i>Syn123</i> 19v _{13–16}	<i>SPb319</i> 16v _{25–28}	<i>Ruban1776</i> 84
по ѿездѣ Іаггелла крола, Rus wolyńska, kosciół ktorekolwiek nabożenstwa Ruskie niebyły naproch paliła, y zgruntu wywraçała. ⁵	поѿѣзде іаггела крола рѣсь волинскаа костѣлы которыє колвекъ набожества рѣского небыли напрѣ палила.	по ѿѣздѣ, аггела кроля, рѣсь волинска, костели, которыє колвекъ набожество рѣске небыли напрахъ палилы, ѿзгрѣнту выворочала.	... Волинскія церкви, каковыя только Грекороссійскаго исповѣданія ни были, въ прахъ сожжены и до основанія превращены.

Furthermore, the copies of the *Catalogue* differ in the contents of the articles:

- *Syn139* ends with the mention of the living Metropolitan Barlaam Yasin-sky, who died in 1707, and this may be the terminus ante quem both for the MS itself and for the author of the *Catalogue*.
- *Syn123* ends with the mention of the ordination of Metropolitan Joasaph Krokovsky in August 1708 in Moscow, a ceremony in which St. Demetrius

⁵ “After the leaving of Jogaila the King, Volhynian Rus' burned all of the churches not of the Russian religion to ashes and razed them to the ground.”

participated. The convoy of the *Catalogue* placed in the codex at the beginning, but not attributed to anyone, is also interesting. The second text in *Syn123* (28–52v) is “Выписка изъ подлинниковъ о бытности Црей грѣческихъ и Россійскихъ. и Патріарховъ цреградскихъ и Россійскихъ. и Кіевскихъ митрополитовъ” (= *An Extract from the Originals About Activities of the Greek and Russian Tsars, Constantinople and Russian Patriarchs, and of Kievan Metropolitans*) consisting of eight “edges” (*grani*; i.e., parts); the third one (55–77) is the so-called *Moscow Catalogue* (“Кѡтологъ Архіереевъ РоССійскіихъ” = *A Catalogue of Russian Bishops*); the fourth one (78–190) is the *Activities* (“Бытности”) of the bishops of various Russian regions and cities, and of the priors of major Russian monasteries; the fifth one (192–203v) is “Степени роССійскіѣ архіереевъ” (= *The Degrees of the Russian Bishops*); and, at the end (204–205v), the codex concludes with “Чинъ архіереевъ роССійскіѣ имѣѣ бы посемѣ” (= *The Order of the Russian Bishops Is as Follows*). Thus, the entire codex is a collection of works of a similar type—that is, in the genre of catalogue—while the *Catalogue* by St. Demetrius, placed at the beginning, was probably recognized as the earliest and the most authoritative document.

- In the MS from the Vernadsky National Library of Ukraine (Kiev), no. 352/169—known to me but not researched de visu—the *Catalogue* ends with the report of the death of Joasaphus Krokovsky in 1718. Moreover, “the whole initial part of this *Catalogue* is full of Lomonosov’s marginalia. He marked all the events connected with Hilarion’s activities at the Kievan Metropolia. The signs and marginalia are near the reports on the first Kievan metropolitans, that is, the Greeks: on Michael being sent to Kiev by Constantinople Patriarch Leontius and on Neophytus and other church figures” [MOISEEVA 1971: 76].

- *SPb319* ends with Barlaam Vonatovich, the Kievan metropolitan who followed Joasaphus Krokovsky; he certainly would not have been mentioned by St. Demetrius in this bishopric, since he was ordained in 1722, i.e., 13 years after St. Demetrius’ decease. Therefore, Ruban (or his immediate source) was not the first to continue St. Demetrius’ *Catalogue*.

As for the language of the *Catalogue*, it can be characterized in general as Ruthenian Church Slavonic with minor vernacular and Polish inclusions, primarily in the quotations from the sources used by St. Demetrius. Thus, the peculiarities of the usage of the roots *rus-* and *ros-* both in the Ruthenian and in the Muscovite literature by the turn of the 18th century could no longer be opposed. There was, however, little difference even earlier, although there has recently been an attempt to separate them, or rather to silence the unity of the “ethnic”—more precisely, religious—terminology of Muscovy and Ruthenian lands in the 16th–17th centuries [FARION 2010]. Farion’s article does not contain any reference to [SOLOVIEV 1957A: 149–152 = 1957B: 37–43] where the author in some detail considered the usage of the Graecized

forms with *ros-* in the activity of the Ruthenian fraternity schools. It seems that Farion is also unaware that the first known use in the Slavic literature of the term *rosiane* (1524)—Greek not only by the root, but by the suffix as well—appeared in Moscow in the writings of the Orthodox monk from Mount Athos, Maxim the Greek [KLOSS 2012: 56, 76]; furthermore, she apparently does not know that the term *rossy/rossove* most likely can be attributed to the archimandrite of the Kievan Caves Monastery, Zacharias Kopystensky. He was the author of a polemical treatise, the *Palinode* (1620s), with the subtitle “Книга Обороны каволической святой апостольской Веходней Церкви и святыхъ патриарховъ, и о Грекохъ, и о Россохъ христанехъ” (= *The Book of the Defense of the Holy Catholic Apostolic Eastern Church and Holy Patriarchs, and about the Greek and Russian Christians*). This work was a reply to the Polish treatise *Obrona jedności cerkiewnej* (*Defense of the Church Unity*, 1617) by Leon Krewza—the Uniate archimandrite who used only the forms *Ruś, naród Ruski, Rusin*, etc. Since Zacharias Kopystensky’s main purpose was to prove the canonical unity of Russian Orthodoxy with Greek Orthodoxy, he used mainly the Graecisms *Rossia, Rossiiskii, Rosskii*, and *Rossy (Rossove)*. The latter form originates not from the standard indeclinable Ῥῶς, but from the less common Ῥῶσοι and Ῥωσοί [SOLOVIEV 1957A: 138].

The manuscript copy of the *Palinode* published in *Palinode 1878* came from the personal library of St. Demetrius, who frequently referred to the work of his predecessor, but very cautiously and selectively. Unlike the famous *Palinode*, the version in St. Demetrius’ *Catalogue* was first of all a historical work, although some of the themes expressed in the *Palinode* appeared in it as well, for example, the approval of the all-Russian canonical and perhaps—if one could use modern terminology—ethnic unity, which at that time was based of course primarily on confessional unity. St. Demetrius explicitly compared the Union of Brest (1596) with the great Arian controversy, i.e., the Union was conceived as an ecclesiastical catastrophe, as described in *Syn 139* 188_{r16-25}:

Михайль Рагоза свѣцень бѣ на митрополію | Кіевскѣю въ Вилни
Стѣйшимъ Патріархомъ Іереміемъ, | вътоже лѣто внеже Онисифѣ
ѡставленъ. Сей Митро|политъ знѣю воведѣ въ РѢ, ѡтѣгшиса ѡ
исконнаго | своего Патріарха Цариградскаго, природнаго РѢсѣ |
пастыра, а ко Римскомѣ Папѣ приставши, и смѣтилъ | тѣмъ цѣковъ
сѣло, раздѣливъ Росііскій народъ надвое, | аки ризѣмъ раздравъ іакоже
иногда Арій, зачто Михайль | той и проклатъ бысѣ на соборѣ
Берестѣскомъ въ лѣто | *зрѣд. *афѣс.⁶

⁶ “Michael Rahoza was ordained to the Kievan Metropolia in Vilna by the Most Holy Patriarch Jeremias, in the same year when Onesiphorus was dismissed. This metropolitan established the Union in Rus’, when he fell away from his primordial Patriarch of Constantinople, the natural shepherd for Rus’, and joined the Pope of Rome, he thereby disturbed the Church greatly, and divided the Russian people into

It is noteworthy that the rare collocation *Rosiiskii narod*⁷ with the Polish *n'arod* 'nation, race,'⁸ which later entered into standard Russian and, owing to its Common Slavic form, was merged with the Russian proper *nar'od*.⁹

In addition to the *Catalogue of the Kievan Metropolitans*, or the *Kievan Catalogue*, there were also two other works similar in their genre and content; one of them, attributed by Metropolitan Eugenius to St. Demetrius, is the *Short Chronicle*, or, more exactly, the *Synchronistic Tables* [EUGENIUS 1827: 132, no. 17], known only in MS *SPb251*; the second is the so-called *Moscow Catalogue*, known in many copies (e.g., *Mos122*). The attribution of authorship to St. Demetrius was questioned by Metropolitan EUGENIUS [1827: 133, no. 18]. Unlike the *Kievan Catalogue*, the origin and text history of the *Moscow Catalogue* are less clear. Indeed, the two works have some parallel readings, but begin very differently: the *Kievan Catalogue* begins with the so-called "Photius' Christianization of Rus'" passage containing the episode of unburnt gospel; in the *Moscow Catalogue* this episode is presented as the third element and is described much more briefly. It is preceded by a text relating the baptism (*sic!*) of Rus' by St. Andrew the Apostle and the baptism of Pannonia by Andronicus, St. Paul's disciple, with reference to the *Kievan Synopsis* by Innocent Gizel. The second text (also with a reference to the *Synopsis*) is an account of the Moravian mission of SS. Cyril and Methodius, which is again named "the baptism of Rus'": in total there are as many as three baptisms! However, the *Synopsis* does not say anywhere that St. Andrew *baptized* Rus', and the episodes with Cyril and Methodius and with Photius are not mentioned there at all. In the *Kievan Catalogue* there are no such omissions. Nevertheless, one can find the report that St. Andrew not only visited but baptized Rus' in the *Palinode* by Zacharias Kopystensky: "Тогожь часу св. Андрей, проходячи землю Росскую, многихъ крестилъ и до познаня Христа привелъ" [*Palinode*1878: 970].¹⁰ Furthermore, there is a *Moscow Catalogue* (either the same source mentioned above or another, unidentified, one) which is

two, just as Arius once had divided [Christ's] garment, and therefore this Michael was anathematized at the Synod of Brest in 7104/1596."

⁷ This refers first of all to the "people" (noble estate) of Ruthenia, but by the turn of the 18th century it could be also refer to Russians as a whole, i.e., including Muscovites.

⁸ Cf. Polish *n'arod* (mainly resp. Latin *gens, natio* in the Vulgate) vs. Church Slavonic *narodъ nar'od* (mainly resp. Greek *ἔθνος, ὄχλος*), *людіе li'udie* (mainly resp. *λαός*), and *іазъ ѱк* (mainly resp. *ἔθνος*).

⁹ Regarding this fact, see, e.g., [ПЛОХИ 2006: 187 ff.], especially the following passage: "The term *narod*, which is occasionally encountered in Muscovite texts of the period, is not used in the sense of «nation» or «ethnocultural community», as in Ukraine and Belarus of the period, but simply means «a number of people»" [ИВІД.: 216–217]. Later the term *narod* was connected with Muscovites, too, in the *Synopsis* (1674) by archimandrite Innocent Gizel: "The concept of one nation (*narod*) uniting Ruthenians and Muscovites was a revolutionary element introduced by the author of the *Synopsis* to the field of early modern Slavic ethnology" [ИВІД.: 263].

¹⁰ "At the same time, St. Andrew going around the Russian land baptized many people and led them to the knowledge of Christ."

The Distribution of the Words with the Initials *RUS-* and *ROS-* in the Text of the *Catalogue of the Kievan Metropolitans*

place names	stems with <i>RUS-</i>	stems with <i>ROS-</i>
<p>бѣ мѣдрѣ въ писаніахъ ѿ рѣчитѣхъ, ѿкожѣ небѣ прежде въ Р8си 176_{Г14-15} / <i>Syn</i>123 вѣрсіи 6₉ въ р8сіи 176_{Г11} / <i>Syn</i>123 вѣрсіи 7_{Г15} / <i>SPb</i>319 вѣ р8сіи 8_Г / <i>Ruban</i>1776 въ Русіи 64 митрополитъ всеа Р8ссіи 182_{Г13} / <i>Syn</i>123 митрополитъ всеа р8ссіи 15_{Г12}, and ditto in <i>SPb</i>319, <i>Ruban</i>1776 въ Р8сѣ 183_{Г25} / въ Русіи 80 / <i>SPb</i>319 въ р8ссіи 14_Г на Р8сѣ всю 183_{Г9} Rus wolyńska 185_{Г23} блѣви Р8си [въ малѣ Россіи] 185_{Г9} / <i>Ruban</i>1776 благослови Русіи (въ Малой Россіи) 85 / <i>SPb</i>319 р8ки [въ малороссіи] 17_{Г7} въ Р8си 185_{Г15} / <i>Ruban</i>1776 въ Русіи 85 на митрополію всеа Р8си (186_{Г15-16}) / <i>Syn</i>123 намитрополію всеа р8ссіи 21_{Г6-7}, and ditto in <i>SPb</i>319, <i>Ruban</i>1776 на митрополію всеа Р8сіи 186_{Г17} / <i>Syn</i>123 намитрополію всеа р8ей 21_{Г22} / <i>Ruban</i>1776 всеа Россіи 88, and ditto in <i>SPb</i>319 митрополитъ всеа Р8си 186_{Г25-26} / <i>Syn</i>123 митрополитъ всеа р8ссіи 22_{Г9-10}, and ditto in <i>SPb</i>319, <i>Ruban</i>1776 ѿ крещеніа Р8си 128_{Г11} / <i>Ruban</i>1776 отъ крещенія Русіи 92 / <i>SPb</i>319 р8си 20_{Г7} въ Р8 188_{Г19} природнаго Р8сѣ пастыра 188_{Г20-21} / <i>Syn</i>123 природнаго р8ей пастыра 25_{Г7} / <i>Ruban</i>1776 Русіи 93, and ditto in <i>SPb</i>319</p>	<p>пришедшій въ Росію 173_{Г10} въ Росію прійде 174_{Г8} велигіа ѿ малыа Россіи митрополитъ 183_{Г10} блѣви Р8си [въ малѣ Россіи] 185_{Г9} / <i>Ruban</i>1776 благослови Русіи (въ Малой Россіи) 85 / <i>SPb</i>319 р8ки [въ малороссіи] 17_Г посѣтилъ Росію 188_{Г6} прійдеже въ Росію 188_{Г10} посѣщаа Русію 189_{Г10} [<i>Ruban</i>1776 невѣдомо гдѣ, въ Россіи ли, или въ Греціи 73 / <i>Syn</i>139 домали, или вгредіи 180_{Г9-10}]</p>	<p>14</p>
	7	8

	stems with <i>RUS-</i>	stems with <i>ROS-</i>
ethno- nyms	Курдилъ, егоже каталогъ московскій Гречиномъ називаѣ, падинодаже и лѣтописъ печѣскій Рѣсиномъ 180v ₆₋₇	<p>rossy (4): крещеніа ради Россовъ 172Г₁₆ / <i>Syn123</i> крещеніа рѣди россианъ (the latter was written boldly over illegible one) распространисѣ вѣра сѣаа вѣ Россѣхъ 173Г₁₂ звѣреніа ради Россовъ 177Г₁₀ / <i>Syn123</i> роковъ 8Г₂ / <i>SPb319</i> рѣсовъ 9Г₁₅ / <i>Ruban1776</i> Р соовъ 65 (a letter was not printed) й того часѣ Россове вѣрѣ были 185Г₁₉ / <i>SPb319</i> рокове 16v₂₁ / <i>Ruban1776</i> Росіане 84 / <i>Syn123</i> рокове</p> <p>ROSSILANE (4): ктоже бѣ родомъ, Гречинъ ли йли Россіанинъ, нѣсть извѣстіа 176Г₃₋₆ / <i>Ruban1776</i> Россіанинъ 63 / <i>SPb319</i> росіанинъ 7v₂₇ / <i>Syn123</i> рѣссіанинъ бГ₂₂ нѣщїже Россане 185v₃₆ / <i>Syn123</i> россіане 20v₇ / <i>SPb319</i> россіане / <i>Ruban1776</i> Рускіе 85 Курдилъ Россіанинъ 181Г₂₃ / <i>SPb319</i> Россіанинъ 75, and ditto in <i>SPb319</i> / <i>Syn123</i> рѣссіанинъ 13v₁₅ Алеѣй сѣѣ, Россіанинъ 182v₁₂ / <i>Syn123</i> россіанинъ 15v₁₁, and ditto in <i>Ruban1776</i> [<i>Ruban1776</i> КИПРІАНЪ Сербинъ а по другимъ Россіанинъ 79, in als. сербинъ only]</p>
	1	8 (9)
de- topo- nymic adjec- tives	<p>'LAND' (6): вѣ Рѣскѣдѣю землю 172Г₇ / <i>Ruban1776</i> Росіейскую 54 ѣ рѣскѣ земли 172v₆₋₇ / <i>Syn123</i> росіейскій 1v₁₉ крестиль всю землю Рѣскѣдѣю 173v₅₋₆ земля рѣскіа 173v₁₈₋₁₉ / <i>Syn123</i> росіейска 3v₁ всѣа земли рѣскіа 174Г₁₇ надѣ всю Рѣскою Московскою землею 181v₇</p>	<p>'VISHOP' (4): своими Росіейскими Еписѣпы 175v₄ Росіейтїи Еписѣпы 177v₁₈ / <i>SPb319</i> росіейтїи 9v₂₄ ѣ Еписѣповъ Росіейхъ 185Г₉ / <i>Syn123</i> росіейскїхъ 19Г₂₁ ѣ Росіейскїхъ Еписѣповъ 185Г₁₁ / <i>Ruban1776</i> Росіейскїхъ 84 / <i>Syn123</i> рѣскїхъ 19v₁</p> <p>'METROPOLITAN' (2): первы Росіейскїи митрополиты 177Г₇ наши Росіейтїи митрополиты 180v₁₃₋₁₄</p>

	stems with <i>RUS-</i>	stems with <i>ROS-</i>
de-toponymic adjectives	<p>лѣтописы Р8скій 172Г_{8,9} ѣзь лѣтописовъ Р8скихъ 173Г₂₅₋₂₆ лѣтописы р8стїи 174Г₆ митрополїа Р8скаа 184Г₂ <i>Syn123</i> р8ской митрополїи 20v₃₋₄ / <i>Syn139</i> Іасуна князь Р8скї Р8рикъ 172Г₃₋₄ ѿ нестроенїа князѣ Р8скихъ 177Г₂₂₋₂₃ / <i>SPb319</i> г8скихъ 9Г₃₁ по развѣнїю Р8скихъ лѣтописателѣ 173v₁₆ ѣ княженїемъ Р8скимъ 172Г₅ naboženstva Ruskie 185Г₂₄ / <i>Ruban1776</i> Грекороссїйскаго исповѣданїа 84</p>	<p>росейскї народъ 188v₂₂ Іларїонъ, ѿ Росейскаго народа певѣй кїевскїй митрополитъ 175Г₂₆₋₂₇ ‘SIDE’ (2): вросійскихъ сідегъ странахъ 173v₉₋₁₀ на Росейскїа страны 183Г₃ ‘CHRONICLE’ (1): ѣ лѣтописахъ Росейскїхъ 175v₁₈ ‘METROPOLIA’ (1): ѿ вѣдѣгъ вѣконечно раздѣлїса Росейскаа Митрополїа 187Г₅₋₆ стѣхъ стрѣгопѣновъ Росейскїхъ глѣба ѣ борїса 176Г₁₋₂ ‘PEOPLE’ (1): росейстїи люде 172Г₁₇ / <i>Ruban1776</i> Росстїи 54 ‘PRINCE’ (1): князѣ Росейскихъ 178Г₁₂ / <i>Syn123</i> р8скихъ 9Г₂₁ [‘CHRONOLOGIST’ (1): И Селлїй лѣтосчититель Росейской въ Іерархїи про Кирилла сумнительнаго упоминаеть 61, in als. no]</p>
compounds with VELIKO-, MALO-, and BELO-	<p>16</p> <p><i>BELO-</i>: Ёлпѣть бѣлор8скїй 189v₁₀</p>	<p>15 (16)</p> <p><i>VELIKO-</i> (3): въ владимѣрь великоростѣ 181Г₅ / <i>Syn123</i> ѣвеликоросейстѣмъ 13Г₁₇ въ владимѣ великоросейскїй 181v₂ въ великоросейскїй столнїй градъ владимѣрь 182Г₅ <i>MALO-</i> (4): ѿ малоросейскихъ свѣннїковъ 184Г₅ землї малоросейскїа 184Г₂₅₋₂₆ землї малоросейскаа 184v₂₄₋₂₅ съ всѣмъ дѣвенствомъ малоросейскимъ 187Г₁₆₋₁₇</p>
TOTAL	<p>1</p> <p>32</p>	<p>7</p> <p>37 (40)</p>

mentioned by St. Demetrius as one of his sources, so the attribution of the *Moscow Catalogue* to him is highly unlikely. In fact, St. Demetrius reconciled the information about the two baptisms of Rus' in the following passage: “. . . обаче ни тогда | распространиса вѣра стаа въ Россѣхъ ниже стведиса, | бываемы ради со различными народы +и междѣсобны+ частыхъ бранѣ” [*Syn139: 173*₁₁₋₁₃].¹¹

Thus, the *Catalogue of the Kievan Metropolitans* by St. Demetrius of Rostov stands on the border between the old Ruthenian Church Slavonic and the new common Russian historical literature. In fact, this was the first proper scholarly essay on the history of the Russian Church, as it was first to use a critical method. That is why the usage of the terms with the roots *ros-* and *rus-* in this work is of particular interest. *Table 2* compiles all usage and distribution patterns by types of nomination. The main source, which provides the most relevant statistics, is MS *Syn139*. The table also includes variant readings from other MSS and the edition by Ruban. The differences between these four versions at the selected places are numerous; they characterize the stylistic preferences of the copyists and perhaps the publisher.

Despite the limited sample size, even in the framework of the *Catalogue* one can trace the following statistical trends:

1. The number of place names with *rus-* and with *ros-* used in the *Catalogue*, as well as of the adjectives derived from them, is roughly even (in total, 32 vs. 37, respectively).

2. There is an observable link between specific adjectives and nouns, iapparently representing fairly stable collocations: for *zemlia* ‘land’—*rusaskaia* (the same applies to the words *kniaz'* ‘prince,’ and *kniazhenie* ‘principate’), but *episkop* ‘bishop’ and *mitropolit* ‘metropolitan’ are *rossiiskie* (as words denoting church realities, they combine better with the more bookish adjective originating ultimately from the Greek name of Rus’); cf. the statistically more reliable data on the combinability of the attributes *ruskii* and *rossiiskii* in the preceding period [GRISHCHENKO 2013A: 42] in *Table 3*.

Table 3

<i>RUSSKII</i> (the 14th–the early 18th centuries)	<i>ROSSIISKII</i> (the 16th–the early 18th centuries)
<i>zemlia</i> ‘land’ 36.2%	<i>tsarstvie</i> ‘kingdom’ 37.2%
<i>kniaz'</i> ‘prince’ 13.4%	<i>gosudarstvo</i> ‘state’ 13.4%
<i>liudi</i> ‘people’ 8.2%	<i>zemlia</i> ‘land’ 8.1%
<i>polk</i> ‘army’ 2.6%	<i>derzhava</i> ‘state’ 5.8%
<i>tsarstvo</i> ‘kingdom’ 1.3% <i>derzhava</i> ‘state’ 0.9% <i>gosudarstvo</i> ‘state’ 0.2%	<i>kniazi</i> ‘princes’ 1.7%, <i>tsari i kniazi</i> ‘tsars and princes’ 3.5% <i>liudi</i> ‘people’ 0.6%, <i>polk</i> ‘army’ 0.0%

¹¹ “. . . but not then the holy faith was propagated neither established amongst the Russian because of frequent wars against different nations and internecine wars.”

In the full (unpublished) version of the ranked frequency list of these collocations, the word combinations with the superordinate *mitropolit* and subordinate *russkii* are in 17th place (ones with the superordinate *episkop* are in 20th place), but those with the subordinate *rossiiskii* are in 4th place. In addition, the stability of the collocation *russkaia zemlia* ‘Russian land’ is very notable, and, in the pre-Mongol chronicles, it was polysemantic, also having a “narrow meaning.”¹²

3. Among ethnonyms, the words with *ros-* predominate.

4. The only possible compound adjectives are *veliko-* and *malorossiiskii* ‘Great and Minor Russian’ (not *-russkii*) as derivatives of the calques from the Greek Μεγάλη Ῥωσία and Μικρὰ Ῥωσία; whereas *belorusskii* ‘White Russian’ was possibly a later derivative of more vernacular origin, cf. [SOLOVIEV 1947; BUNČIĆ 2006: 48–51].

5. When referring to the text history of the *Catalogue* (from *Syn139* to the other two MSS and the edition), it turns out that the forms in question were subjected to editing, and mostly in one direction—from *rus-* to *ros-*. Such corrections (all of them seen in variant readings in *Table 2*) are found in nine places in the *Catalogue*; the opposite change *ros-* to *rus-* is found in six places, and in fewer sources (in *SPb319* and *Ruban1776* only once). In three emendations of *Ruban1776* in which there was a choice between the forms with *rus-* and with *ros-*, the publisher preferred the second one, which corresponds to the general tendency in the use of those forms in the 18th century.

6. Particular attention can be drawn to the spellings *rozsonianin* and *rozsiistii* in the hand of the second scribe of MS *SPb319*. These hypercorrect interpretations of the initial *ros-* as the Polish or Ruthenian prefix *roz-* are likely to have originated from rather old folk-etymological versions of the place name *Rossiia* and the ethnonym *rossiiane*. This was fixed for the first time in the *Notes on Muscovite Affairs* (1549) by Baron Sigismund von Herberstein:

... [Mosci] asserentes Rosseiam antiquitus appellatam, quasi gentem dispersam, seu disseminatam: id quod nomen ipsum indicat. Rosseia etenim, Rhutenorum lingua, disseminatio, seu dispersio interpretatur. quod verum esse, varii populi incolis etiamnum permixti, & diversae provinciae Russiae passim intermixtae ac interiacentes, aperte testantur [*Herb1556*].¹³

With regard to the Russian, not *Russia* proper, this etymological legend was repeated by Adam Bohorič in his *Arcticae Horulae Succisvae* (1584):

¹² See numerous literature on this problem: [KUCHKIN 1995; DANILEVSKY 1997; RYZHOV 2001; KOTYSHEV 2006].

¹³ "... [the Muscovites] assert, that it was anciently called Rosseia, as nation dispersed and scattered, which indeed the name implies for Rosseia, in the language of the Russians, means a dissemination or dispersion; and the variety of races even now blended with the inhabitants and the various provinces of Russia lying promiscuously intermingled, manifestly prove that this is correct" [*Herb1851*: 3].

Ruteni seu potius Ruři, volunt, quasi Rossojeni, id est, disseminati, dici [Boh1584: 14].¹⁴

Finally, this etymological version could have been known to St. Demetrius directly from the *Kievan Synopsis*:¹⁵

...ѣ бо ѣкѡ славане ѡ славныхъ дѣлесеъ своихъ ѣскони славеское ѣма себѣ прѣобрѣтѡша, такѡ по времени ѡ РОССѢАНІА помнѡгимѡ странаѣ племене своѣ, РОССѢАНЫ, а потѡ РѢССЫ прозѡвѡшасѡ [. . .] пѡче всѣхъ тѣхъ подобѣѣ достовѣрнѣе, ѣ прилічнѣе ѡ Россіаніа своѣгѡ Рѡсси ѣма то ѡ дрѣвнѣе времяѣ себѣ стажаѣшъ: ѣбо наширокой чѡсти свѣта, по мнѡгимѡ разлічнымѡ странамаѡ [. . .] ширѡко ѣ рѡлічно селѣми своѣми Рѡссіашасѡ [Synopsis1674: 7–8].¹⁶

7. In the name of the country and its inhabitants in St. Demetrius' *Catalogue*, one can find derivational and orthographical inconsistencies typical of the manuscript tradition, and associated with the following alternations: -Ø-/-ij- (*Rus'* vs. *Rusija*), -ian- / -ijan- (*rossiane* vs. *rossijane*), -s- / -ss- (*Rosija* vs. *Rossija*).

Studying the history of the words with *rus-* and *ros-*, these alternations, as well as the accentological features thereof, clearly require special analysis, which is possible only with a full textual study of the *Catalogue of the Kievan Metropolitans* and by comparing it to other works by St. Demetrius of Rostov and other writers of his era.

Bibliography

Sources Including MSS

Boh1584

ADAMUS BOHORIZH, *Arcticae horulae succisivae de Latinocarniolana literatura*. . . , Witebergae, MDLXXXIII.

Herb1556

SIGISMUND VON HERBERSTEIN, *Rerum Moscoviticarum Commentarii*, Edition Frank Kämpfer, lateinische Fassung, 1556 [online version: Bibliotheca Augustana: <http://www.hs-augsburg.de/~harsch/augustana.html>].

¹⁴ “The Ruthenes, or better the Russes, want to be named quasi *Rossojeni*, i.e., dispersed.” The corrupted form *Rossojeni* was interpreted as a passive participle in the past tense.

¹⁵ Or from the *Chronicle of Poland, Lithuania, Samogitia and all of Ruthenia* (1582) by Maciej Strykowski. On the influence of Strykowski on the *Kievan Synopsis*, see [ROTHE 1983: 72–83].

¹⁶ “. . . as the Slavs acquired the Slavic name from their glorious deeds long ago, so over time they were named ROSSĚIANY, then ROSSY—from their ethnic dispersion (ROSSĚIANIE) over many lands. [. . .] but it is more reliable and more proper that the Russes (ROSSI) gained this name by their dispersion (ROSSĚIANIE) from ancient times, because in the wide area of the world and in many various lands they [. . .] were dispersed widely and variously with their settlements.”

Herb1851

SIGISMUND VON HERBERSTEIN, *Notes upon Russia*. . . , translated and edited by R. H. MAJOR, 1, London, 1851.

Mos122

Russian State Library (Moscow), MS МДА-I (f. 173.I = Fundamental Collection of the Moscow Theological Academy), no. 122, the *Moscow Catalogue*, the mid-18th century, 126 fols.

Palinode1878

ЗАХАРІЯ (КОПЫСТЕНСКІЙ), АРХ., “Палинодія (1621)”, *Русская Историческая Библиотека, издаваемая Археологическою Коммисією*, 4, С.-Петербургъ, 1878, 313–1200.

Ruban1776

“Роспись Митрополитовъ Кіевскихъ, съ краткимъ лѣтописаніемъ”, въ: В. Г. РУБАНЪ, изд., *Московский любопытный мѣсяцесловъ на 1776 годъ, и на всѣ высокосныя лѣта* . . . , Москва, 54–108.

SPb251

National Library of Russia (St. Petersburg), MS СПбДА (Collection of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy), no. 251, the *Short Chronicle* by St. Demetrius of Rostov (ЛѢТОПИСАНІЕ | краткое константинопольскихъ = | царей и патриарховъ, право_ | славныхъ, и еретиковъ. | и княжений киевскихъ, | и владычскихъ: | и московскихъ князей. | и в благочестивейшихъ, | црѣхъ: истъйшихъ па_ | триарсѣхъ всероссийскихъ: | собрано многихъ лѣтописцевъ скорого ради при_ | вѣрѣнія), the 18th century, 17 fols.; for a description of the MS, see [RODOSSKI 1893: 239–240].

SPb319

National Library of Russia (St. Petersburg), MS СПбДА (Collection of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy), no. 319, the *Miscellanea* of the first half of the 18th century, 811 fols.; for a description of the manuscript, see [RODOSSKI 1893: 319–321].

Syn123

State Historical Museum (Moscow), MS Син (Collection of the Moscow Synodal Library), no. 123, the *Catalogue of the Hierarchs of the Russian Church*, the early 18th century, 206 fols.; for a description of the manuscript, see [PROTAS'EVA 1970: 30–31, no. 610].

Syn139

State Historical Museum (Moscow), MS Син (Collection of the Moscow Synodal Library), no. 139, the *Miscellanea* of the small works and historical materials with the autograph notes and annotations by St. Demetrius of Rostov (from his personal library), the end of the 17th–the early 18th centuries, 211 fols.; for a description of the MS, see [PROTAS'EVA 1970: 34–35, no. 617].

Synopsis1674

СΥΝΟΠΣΙΣ ѿ ли КРАТКОЕ СОБРАНІЕ ѿ Раннихъ Лѣтописцевъ, ѿ Началь Славяно-Россійскаго народа, и Первоначальны Кнзѣй Бгоспасѣаемаго ГРАДА КІЕВА. . . [Kiev, 7182/1674].

Literature

BROGI BERCOFF 2005

BROGI BERCOFF G., “Plurilinguism in Russia and in the Ruthenian Lands in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. The Case of Stefan Javors'kyj,” in: VYACH. VS. IVANOV, J. VERKHOLANTSEV, eds., *Speculum Slaviae Orientalis: Muscovy, Ruthenia and Lithuania in the Late Middle Ages* (= UCLA Slavic Studies. New Series, 4), Moscow, 2005, 9–20.

BUNČIĆ 2006

BUNČIĆ D., *Die ruthenische Schriftsprache bei Ivan Uževyč unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Lexik seines Gesprächsbuchs Rozmova/Besěda: mit Wörterverzeichnis und Indizes zu seinem ruthenischen und kirchenslavischen Gesamtwerk* (= Slavistische Beiträge, 447), München, 2006.

DANILEVSKY 1997

Данилевский И. Н., “Загадки «Русской земли»”, *Знание — сила*, 1997, 11, 99–109.

EUGENIUS 1827

ЕВГЕНИЙ (Болховитиновъ), МИТР., *Словарь историческій о бывшихъ въ Россіи писателяхх духовнаго чина Греко-Россійской церкви*, 1, 2-е изд., испр. и умнож., С.-Петербургъ, 1827.

FARION 2010

ФАРІОН І., “До історії термінів *роский*, *россійский* та *словенороский* язык (на матеріалі українських пам’яток XV–XVII ст.)”, *Вісник Національного університету “Львівська політехніка”*, 675 (= Л. Полюга, ред., *Проблеми української термінології*), 2010, 178–182.

FEDOTOVA 1992

Федотова М. А., “Димитрій”, в: Д. С. Лихачев, отв. ред., *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси*, 3 (XVII век), 1 (А–З), С.-Петербург, 1992, 258–271.

— 2007

Федотова М. А., “Димитрий: Биография. Творения”, в: *Православная энциклопедия*, 15 (Димитрий—Дополнения к Актам...), Москва, 2007, 8–17.

— 2014

Федотова М. А., “О неизданных сочинениях святителя Димитрия Ростовского: к постановке проблемы”, *Вестник Православного Свято-Тихоновского гуманитарного университета*, Сер. III: Филология, 1(36), 2014, 47–64.

GRISHCHENKO 2013A

Грищенко А. И., “Сочетаемость атрибутов *русский* и *российский* по данным Среднерусского корпуса (XV–XVII вв.)”, *Древняя Русь. Вопросы медиевистики*, 2013, 3(53), 41–42.

— 2013B

Грищенко А. И., [рец.]: “Б. М. Клосс. О происхождении названия «Россия». М.: Рукописные памятники Древней Руси, 2012. — 152 с. — (Studia historica. Series minor)”, *Русский язык в научном освещении*, 2013, 2(26), 281–292.

KARAMZIN 1998

КАРАМЗИН Н. М., *Полное собрание сочинений*, 1: *История государства Российского*, Вступ. ст. и послесл. А. Ф. Смирнова, Коммент. А. М. Кузнецова, Москва, 1998.

KLOSS 2012

КЛОСС Б. М., *О происхождении названия “Россия”*, Москва, 2012.

KOTYSNEV 2006

КОТЫШЕВ Д. М., “«Русская земля» в первой половине XII в.: Из наблюдений над текстом Ипатьевской летописи за 1110–1150 гг.”, *Вестник Удмуртского университета*, 2006, Вып. 7: История, 26–41.

KUCHKIN 1995

Кучкин В. А., “Русская земля по летописным данным XI — первой трети XIII вв.”, в: *Древнейшие государства Восточной Европы. Материалы и исследования. 1992–1993 гг.*, Москва, 1995, 74–100.

MOISEEVA 1971

МОИСЕЕВА Г. Н., *Ломоносов и древнерусская литература*, Ленинград, 1971.

PLOKHY 2006

ПЛОКНУ С., *The Origins of the Slavic Nations: Premodern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus*, Cambridge, 2006.

PROTAS'ĖVA 1970

ПРОТАСЬЕВА Т. Н., *Описание рукописей Синодального собрания (не вошедших в описание А. В. Горского и К. И. Невоструева)*, 1 (№ 577–819), Москва, 1970.

RODOSSKIĪ 1893

РОДОССКИЙ А., *Описание 432-х рукописей, принадлежащих С.-Петербургской Духовной Академии и составляющих ее первое по времени собрание*, С.-Петербургъ, 1893.

ROTNE 1983

РОТНЕ Н., Hrsg., [*Sinopsis, Kiev sechzehnhunderteinundachtzig*] *Sinopsis, Kiev 1681: Facs.* (= Bausteine zur Geschichte der Literatur bei den Slaven, 17), Köln, Wien, 1983.

RŪZHOV 2001

РЫЖОВ К. В., “Еще раз о смысле и значении понятий «Русь» и «Русская земля» в летописях XII–XIII веков”, *Вопросы истории*, 2001, 7, 137–143.

SIRENOV 2007

СИРЕНОВ А. В., *Степенная книга: история текста*, Отв. ред. Н. Н. Покровский, Москва, 2007.

SOLOVIEV 1947

СОЛОВЬЕВ А. В., “Великая, Малая и Белая Русь”, *Вопросы истории*, 1947, 7, 24–38.

——— 1957A

СОЛОВЬЕВ А. В., “Византийское имя России”, *Византийский временник*, 1957, 12, 134–155.

——— 1957B

SOLOVIEV A. V., *Le nom byzantin de la Russie* (= *Musagetes: Contributions to the history of Slavic literature and culture*, 3, ed. by D. ČIZEVSKIJ), 'S-Gravenhage, 1957.

TIKHOMIROV 1953

ТИХОМИРОВ М. Н., “О происхождении названия «Россия»”, *Вопросы истории*, 1953, 11, 93–96.

TRUBACHEV 2001

ТРУБАЧЕВ О. Н., “Русский — российский: История двух атрибутов нации”, в: *Е. Р. Дашкова и российское общество XVIII столетия*, Москва, 2001, 12–21 (reprinted with the extended subtitle “История, динамика, идеология двух атрибутов нации” in: ТРУБАЧЕВ О. Н., *В поисках единства: взгляд филолога на проблему истоков Руси*, 3-е изд., доп., Москва, 2005, 225–236).

ULUKHANOV 2008

УЛУХАНОВ И. С., “К истории употребления слов «Русь» и «Россия» в письменности Древней Руси”, в: И. В. Ружицкий, Ю. Н. Караулов, О. В. Евтушенко, ред., *Русское слово в русском мире — 2008: Россия и русские в восприятии инокультурной языковой личности*, Москва, 2008, 158–175.

USACHEV 2006

УСАЧЕВ А. С., “Из истории русской средневековой агиографии: два произведения о равноапостольном князе Владимире Святославиче (исследование и тексты)”, *Вестник церковной истории*, 2006, 2, 5–44.

References

- Brogi Bercoff G., "Plurilinguism in Russia and in the Ruthenian Lands in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. The Case of Stefan Javors'kyj," in: Vyach. Vs. Ivanov, J. Verkholantsev, eds., *Speculum Slavicae Orientalis: Muscovy, Ruthenia and Lithuania in the Late Middle Ages* (= UCLA Slavic Studies. New Series, 4), Moscow, 2005, 9–20.
- Bunčić D., *Die ruthenische Schriftsprache bei Ivan Uževyč unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Lexik seines Gesprächsbuchs Rozmova/Besëda: mit Wörterverzeichnis und Indizes zu seinem ruthenischen und kirchenslavischen Gesamtwerk* (= Slavistische Beiträge, 447), München, 2006.
- Danilevsky I. N., "Zagadki «Russkoi zemli»," *Znanie – sila*, 1997, 11, 99–109.
- Farion I., "Do istorii terminiv *roskyi, róssiyskyi* ta *slovenoroskyi iazyk* (na materialii ukrains'kykh pam'iatok XV–XVII st.)," *Visnyk Natsional'noho universytetu "L'vivs'ka politekhnika"*, 675 (= L. Poliuha, ed., *Problemy ukrains'koï terminolohii*), 2010, 178–182.
- Fedotova M. A., "Dimitrii," in: D. S. Likhachev, ed., *Slovar' knizhnikov i knizhnosti Drevnei Rusi*, 3/1, St. Petersburg, 1992, 258–271.
- Fedotova M. A., "Dimitrii: Biografiia. Tvorennia," in: *Pravoslavnaia entsiklopediia*, 15, Moscow, 2007, 8–17.
- Fedotova M. A., "O neizdannyykh sochineniakh sviatitelia Dimitriia Rostovskogo: k postanovke problemy," *Vestnik Pravoslavnogo Sviato-Tikhonovskogo gumanitarnogo universiteta. Seriya 3: Filologiya*, 1(36), 2014, 47–64.
- Grishchenko A. I., "Sochetaemost' atributov russkii i rossiiskii po dannym Srednerusskogo korpusa (XV–XVII vv.)," *Drevniia Rus'. Voprosy medievistiki*, 2013, 3(53), 41–42.
- Grishchenko A. I., [rev.:] "B. M. Kloss. O proiskhozhdenii nazvaniia «Rossiia». M.: Rukopisnye pamiatniki Drevnei Rusi, 2012. – 152 s. – (Studia historica. Series minor)," *Russkii iazyk v nauchnom osveshchenii*, 2013, 2(26), 281–292.
- Karamzin N. M. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 1: *Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo*, A. F. Smirnov, ed., A. M. Kuznetsov, comment., Moscow, 1998.
- Kloss B. M., *O proiskhozhdenii nazvaniia "Rossiia"*, Moscow, 2012.
- Kotyshev D. M., "«Russkaia zemlia» v pervoi polovine XII v.: Iz nabliudeniia nad tekstem Ipat'evskoi letopisi za 1110–1150 gg.," *Vestnik Udmurtskogo universiteta*, 2006, 7, 26–41.
- Kuchkin V. A., "Russkaia zemlia po letopisnym dannym XI – pervoi treti XIII vv.," in: *Drevneishie gosudarstva Vostochnoi Evropy. Materialy i issledovaniia. 1992–1993 gg.*, Moscow, 1995, 74–100.
- Moiseeva G. N., *Lomonosov i drevnerusskaia literatura*, Leningrad, 1971.
- Plokhly S., *The Origins of the Slavic Nations: Pre-modern Identities in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus*, Cambridge, 2006.
- Protas'eva T. N., *Opisanie rukopisei Sinodal'nogo sobraniia (ne voshedshikh v opisanie A. V. Gorskogo i K. I. Nevostrueva)*, 1 (№ 577–819), Moscow, 1970.
- Rothe H., Hrsg., [Sinopsis, Kiev sechzhunderteinundachtzig] *Sinopsis, Kiev 1681: Facs.* (= Bausteine zur Geschichte der Literatur bei den Slaven, 17), Köln, Wien, 1983.
- Ryzhov K. V., "Eshche raz o smysle i znachenii poniatii «Rus'» i «Russkaia zemlia» v letopisiakh XII–XIII vekov.," *Voprosy istorii*, 2001, 7, 137–143.
- Sirenov A. V., *Stepennaia kniga: istoriia teksta*, N. N. Pokrovskii, ed., Moscow, 2007.
- Soloviev A. V., "Velikaia. Malaiia i Belaia Rus'," *Voprosy istorii*, 1947, 7, 24–38.
- Soloviev A. V., "Vizantiiskoe imia Rossii," *Vizantiiskii vremennik*, 1957, 12, 134–155.
- Soloviev A. V., *Le nom byzantin de la Russie* (= *Musagetes: Contributions to the history of Slavic literature and culture*, 3, ed. by D. Čizevskij), S-Gravenhage, 1957.
- Tikhomirov M. N., "O proiskhozhdenii nazvaniia «Rossiia»," *Voprosy istorii*, 1953, 11, 93–96.
- Trubachev O. N., "Russkii – rossiiskii: Istoriia dvukh atributov natsii," in: E. R. Dashkova i rossiiskoe obshchestvo XVIII stoletii, Moscow, 2001, 12–21.
- Trubachev O. N., *V poiskakh edinstva: vzgliad filologa na problemu istokov Rusi*, 3rd ed., Moscow, 2005.
- Ulukhanov I. S., "K istorii upotrebleniia slov «Rus'» i «Rossiia» v pis'mennosti Drevnei Rusi," in: I. V. Ruzhitskii, Iu. N. Karaulov, O. V. Evtushenko, eds., *Russkoe slovo v russkom mire – 2008: Rossiia i russkie v vospriatii inokul'turnoi iazykovoi lichnosti*, Moscow, 2008, 158–175.
- Usachev A. S., "Iz istorii russkoi srednevekovoi iografi: dva proizvedeniia o ravnoapostol'nom kniaze Vladimire Sviatoslaviche (issledovanie i teksty)," *Vestnik tserkovnoi istorii*, 2006, 2, 5–44.

Александр Игоревич Грищенко, канд. филол. наук
доцент кафедры русского языка
Московского педагогического государственного университета
119991 Москва, Малая Пироговская, д. 1, стр. 1
Россия / Russia
alexander@grishchenko.ru