

RHETORIC AND RUSSIAN HISTORICAL THOUGHT OF THE 16TH AND 17TH CENTURY

MARIJA PLJUCHANOVA

Russian historical texts of the 16th and the first half of the 17th centuries, as the *Stepennaja kniga* (31), the *Kazanskaja istorija* (10), the *Povest' ob osade Pskova* (25), the *Povest' o žitii carja Fedora Ioannoviča* (9), the *Skazanija Smutnogo vremena* (21) and others, strike as stilistically new in comparison to the more ancient annalistic tradition. The simple style of the chronicles is replaced by an opulent, bombastic syntax. The matter-of-factness of the chronicle disappears, giving way to rythmic and euphonic effects. Scholars correlate the rhetoric of the new style with the pomposity of the new autocratic state (19, p. 3).

Historians and philologists have shown a tendency to disparage this period of Russian historiography. S.M. Solov'ev characterized the *Kazan' Chronicle* as "a very turbid source" (14, p. 193). S.F. Platonov doubted the reliability of the texts pertaining to the *Time of the Troubles* (24). P. G. Vasenko warned against the possibility to find a "systematic history" in the *Stepennaja kniga* (1). A.S. Orlov was disgusted with the rhetorical novelties of the *Kazanskaja istorija*. In his opinion, rhetoric simply ruined the *Tale of the Siege of Pskov* (19, p. 20).

Though the authors of historical texts of that time had witnessed and even participated in the events they described, the new style blurred the factual accounting, the very events were made obscure by rhetoric. At first one is tempted to conclude that the evolution of Russian historiography followed the traditional route: after the noble simplicity of ancient style came its decline. Despotism brought about splendour and empty pretentiousness. The Attic style gave way to that of Asia. But such a conclusion would not be correct.

Rhetoric is the main fault the texts in question are being accused of. In recent years, however, the term "rhetoric" has been rehabilitated. This allows us to reevaluate its role in Russian historiography of the 16th and 17th c. The very term, thus, will be used here in its traditional meaning of "eloquence".

The style of Old Russian chronicles does not correspond to the Attic style. As Eremin has demonstrated (8), the style of those annals had no compact and uniform stylistical organization. Chronicles incorporated texts of different genres. Therein one finds fragments with parallel constructions as well as fragments organised by rhetorical rhyme (23, pp. 3-14). Still, this does not prove that means of sublime eloquence were used. Stylistic ornamentation was rather the result of the use of some ready-made fragments of various genres, as eulogies and sermons. D. Čiževskij maintains that alliterations in the chronicles were not used as an intended stylistic device, but that they were simply remnants of the epic folklore (38). Only the organizational principle of annual reports is strictly followed in the chronicles. Chronicles had their own political inclinations and every one of them had its own way to mourn, to accuse or to preach. Eremin has pointed out many inconsistencies in the chronicles (8, p. 124). Annual reports are the only fractions whose structure coincide in all the chronicles, thus also being the only consistent expression of a general historical reflexion.

Rhetoric however implies a certain organization of the text's structure. Therefore, having become rhetorical, the historical literature of Rus' reached a new stage of its development. Rus' profoundly adopted the tradition of intensive textual organisation that was to be found in the ornamentalism of church sermons. The sermons of the Fathers of the Church and of their Slavic followers were known to both the literate and illiterate population of the time.

The ornamental style in ancient Rus' had at its command a repertory of well defined and conspicuous devices of text formation: ways of organizing the development of subject-matter, parallelism, repetitions, amplification, rhyme, alliteration, etc. (8, 13, 27, 37).

The rhetoric of the ceremonial sermon in its most perfect form is more than an embellishment of speech: it is a way of thinking. No parallelism, repetition, consonance occurring in genuine texts of this type are of merely ornamental importance. Consonance manifests semantic correlations in the text. For example, in the *Slovo o Zakone i Blagodati* by Metropolit Ilarion, the main sound image is the consonance of "stěň" (shadow) and "istina" (truth). "Stěň" is only partly "istina", its shadow, its incomplete version, it is Law. In its fullness it is Grace.

The phonetic recurrence that appears on the surface of the text manifests an inner correspondence of metaphysical concepts that exist outside of and apart from the text (cf. alliterations in Kirill Turovskij: "reky razum'nago raja") (8, p. 141). Rhyme brings about the association of meaning. One can exemplify this by the use of anaphora and homeoteleuton in the *Slovo pochval'noe Petru i Pavlu* by Grigorij Camblak. Amplification here is carried out by the means of anaphora and homeoteleuton: "Az esmъ. iže nebo propjach i zemlju ni na česomъže osnovach. Az more obuzdach peskom. Az nebo ukrasich svetily velikymi i zvezdnym likom. Az sotvorich pьrvago človeka, pьrsti vzjav ot zemlja..." (37, p. CLII). Here repetition and rhymes symbolise the unity of the agent and the integrity of all his actions.

Rhetorical texts that follow the pattern of the Church Fathers' writings do not permit improvising. New thought never originates spontaneously from previous reasoning, the truth pre-exists and the written word is no more than a process of getting closer to it. The given theme does not develop and never gives way to another theme. It is surrounded by numerous parallels, comparisons and analogies. Compositional parallelism reveals the inner symbolic correspondencies between phenomena.

The sublime eloquence of eastern Slavic recension is simpler and more holistic in terms of devices used than that of the Byzantine tradition from which it derives. It more distinctively strives to express the unity of cosmic order. According to I.P. Smirnov (30) conjunction unbalanced by disjunction is inherent in the culture of Ancient Russia. Hence the prevalence of parallelisms, amplifications, and the tendency to enumerate all the constituents of a given paradigm to explain the meaning of the latter. Thus, certain stylistic devices not only testify to the assimilation of European oratory techniques, but also manifest some inner features of Russian culture as a system.

Sublime eloquence is primarily preoccupied with composition as symmetry and parallelism of the text's segments. Consequently, its mechanism fits very well as a mean to bring out the events described from the flow of narrative time. The chronological diversity of events is thus somewhat neutralized by rhetoric which connects and associates facts otherwise distinctly separate. Compare the *Beseda o kreste i razbojnik* in the *Novyj Margarit*: "Dnesь Adam izgnan estь iz raju, i dnesь razbojnik v raj vnide, izьšel tatь, i všel tatь, izgnan prestupnik, i vveden razbojnik: vyšel preziratelь slova i všel ispovedujušče i slovo: izšel prezirajuščij spasenie, i všel ot kresta kupujuščej izbavlenie..." (39, p. 60-60v).

One can hardly find a style less appropriate for historical thinking and even for narration as such. Still, Russia of the 16th c. with its monoglot culture chose for its historiographic writings just this type of text structure as the highest available.

Some scholars correlate parallelisms, rhymes, and other devices in the prose of the 16th and 17th c. not with rhetoric but with the tradition of folklore (especially when the speech structure was not based on the vocabulary used by Church) or with intensive emotiveness leading to spontaneous formation of repetitions and parallelism: L.I. Timofeev calls rhymed segments of documents of the 16th and 17th c. "emotive italics" (33, p. 210).

For the 16th c. the very notion of emotive prose associates with the notion of sublime eloquence which in itself is always emotionally charged. One cannot speak of "spontaneity" in the formation of Russian emotive prose knowing how well orchestrated is its sound structure, and how much it is permeated with parallelisms. One must instead admit that it is deeply rooted in the history of world literature. It is difficult to draw a border-line between folklore oriented texts on the one hand, and texts derived from the tradition of sublime eloquence on the other, especially for the 16th c. in which folk literature was not recorded. This border-line will always remain

hypothetical. And besides, it is not necessary for our purpose to do so. Witchcraft and fairy-tale formulae as well as proverbs are closer in their compositional characteristics and thought structure to sublime eloquence than to syllabic verse. The similarities between the rhetorical devices used by Clement of Ochrid and the structural principles of folklore has been pointed out by M.I. Lekomceva (16). In both instances sound correspondencies pertain to semantic correlation between words, whereas in syllabic verse they lead to text segmentation into commensurate sections and to a "vertical organization" of the text itself.

A stylistic differentiation of the vocabulary would help to establish the border, but the obvious colloquial lexems are not to be found in the historic prose of the period. The whole bulk of words in the stylistic chaos of the 16th c. is not easy to classify. It is quite possible that the rhetorical principles of folk literature and those of ceremonial sermons merged while interacting in the structure of historical texts of the 16th c.. Probably this process took place in the Kazan Chronicle.

The Russian *Chronograf* of 1512 was probably the first example of the change in historiographic style in Rus'. This text strongly influenced the historical prose to follow, both stylistically and conceptually.

The author of the *Chronograf* of 1512 is in search of a style for historical narration. He frequently elaborates the source in a more rhetorical way. Compare f.i. the prayer of Prince Jurij in the *Simeonovskaja Letopis'*: "Gospodi, se li bysť ugodno tvoemu miloserdiju? ... Uvy mne, glagolja, gospodi, luče by mi umreti, neželi žiti na svete sem! nyne že čto radi ostach az edin?" (28, p. 57), with its elaboration in the *Chronograf* (32, p. 176): "Uvy mne, gospodi, oltarja tvoa raskopaše i svjaščenniki izbiša i blagočestivoe stado izklaša i ognem popališa, i ostach az edin, pastyrь, i iščut dušju moju izjati..." (35, p. 398). The *Chronograf* however maintains an evident compilative character, only a part of the source materials are elaborated in a rhetorical manner. In search of new methods of history-writing the author or compiler of the Russian *Chronograph* turned in particular to the Chronicle of Constantine Manassia. The poem was composed in 15-syllabic iambic verse with the caesura after the 8th syllable. It was rich in poetic descriptions and comparisons, not necessarily bound to the subject matter by symbolic ties. The story of creation, for instance, is narrated with a colourful description of animal life and with an enumeration of plants (6, 7). In the 14th c. it was translated in prose in Bulgaria, albeit with the preservation of many analogies in the colons. The verse form of the original influenced the style of the translation. From it derive the descriptive passages, poetic comparisons and the plethora of epithets. The Bulgarian translator adapted the byzantine chronicle to local circumstances: he made the style more rhetorical and introduced a glorification of Bulgaria, considered as a continuation of ancient Rome and a new Constantinople. This fragment passed to Russia, as it is well known: "I sija ubo priklučičusja staromu rimu. naš že novyj carigrad, doit, i rastit, krepitsja i omlašdaetsja. budi že emu i do konca rasti. ej carju vsemi crstvuj" (follows the glorification of Ivan-Aleksander) (6, pp. 91, 183; 7, p. 25; 26, p. 23; 40, p. 86).

The author of the *Chronograf* of 1512 did scarcely follow the stylistic features of the byzantine chronicle. According to Tvorogov an example of such an influence by the Manassias chronicle can be found in the *Chronograf* in the chapter about Svjatoslav (Cvetoslav) (32, p. 363), in the use of compound words. Thanks to the *Chronograf* such compound words were assimilated by the Kazan History and other works (20). Generally, however, the *Chronograf* does not follow the descriptive and cumulating style of Manassias: it tends rather to elaborate synonymical expressions and word constructions organized by rhetorical (semantic and phonetic) devices. Because of the similar social and historical background, the *Chronograf* followed more closely the Bulgarian than the byzantine text. The *Chronograf* of 1512 is profoundly rhetorical in its structure. The most important feature of the *Chronograf's* composition is the parallel between the fall of Rome and that of Byzantium, according to the presentation of the four kingdoms upon earth in the Old Testament book of Daniel. That parallel is produced by the duplication of the image in the translation of the Manassias text. After the comment on the fall of Rome the *Chronograf* identifies Rus' as the New Car'grad: "Sia priključisjasja staromu Rimu, naš že Novyj Rim, Car'grad, doit i rastet, krepit'sja i omlašdaetsja, budi že emu i do konca rasti. Ej, carju, vsemi carstvuaj..." (35, p. 285). And again after the lament on the fall of Car'grad: "Sia ubo vsja blagočestivaa carstvia Grečeskoe i Serp'skoe, Basan'skoe i Arbanaz'skoe i inii mnozi grech radi našich Božiiim popuščeniem bezbožnii Turci popleniša i v zapustenie položiša i pokoriša pod svoju vlast', naša že Rosiskaja zemlja Božieju milostiju i molitvami prečistyja Bogorodica i vseh svjatyh čudotvorec rastet i mladeet i vozvyšaetsja, eže, Christe milostivij, daždъ rasti i mladeti i razširjatisja i do skončanija veka" (35, pp. 439-440). This ends the 1512 version of the *Chronograph*.

Thus the *Chronograph* is illustrative of the idea of the monk Philotheus that Moscow is the Third Rome - a basic idea for the historical texts of this period. A. Šachmatov suggested that the *Chronograph* might have been compiled by the same starec Philotheus (36). Stremouchov however, rejects this hypothesis because some ideological aspects of the *Chronograph* contradict the theories of Philotheus (40). In the *Chronograph* the lament on the fall of Byzantium contains the hope that the Great Car'grad will be liberated by the Russians. The belief that the World's City ("grad") can be resurrected contradicts Philotheus' conviction that Russia will become the centre of the world. Philotheus' conception, according to Stremouchov derives from European ideas of an Empire, whereas the prophecies of the *Chronograph* are of Eastern, clerical origin. Stremouchov's differentiation of the two contradictory positions connected with the concept of Moscow - the Third Rome is very important. Both already co-exist in the text of the 1512 *Chronograph*, since there the prophecy of the liberation of Constantinople is followed by the laudation addressed to Russia as the only and final Rome.

We are not going to touch upon the problems and scholarly disputes about the political background, origin and function of the concept of

Moscow - the Third Rome in the state activities of the 16th c. More important for us is the problem of the structural peculiarities of this concept, namely its rhetorical quality.

The image of three consecutive kingdoms, according to Stremouchov stems from the Old Testament (Book of Ezra). Three eagle heads symbolize there the end of the world. The three kingdoms form a triple parallelism. Their identification with each other has little to do with experience or logic, but is rather a product of a special culture of thinking, operating with parallel categories. The consecutive replacement of three kingdoms is not a chronological development, but the tripling of the same sign. The fate of Rome, the last of the four world kingdoms, has been tripled for the sake of the rhythm that prepares the finale. In Philotheus' epistles (or, according to A. Gol'dberg, those of his followers) (3; 4) the concept of Moscow - the Third Rome is rendered extensively in the apocalyptic image of a woman clothed in the sun. The woman (in later exegesis the Church piety) fled into the wilderness for fear of the dragon. In the Apocalypse her actions are usually repeated in fragments the number of which is symbolic, or are reiterated. Also here the woman clothed in sun is attacked by a dragon three times. Twice she flees into the wilderness, and finally the earth swallows the flood which the dragon cast out of his mouth after the woman. In Philotheus: "I dany byša žene obe krile velikago orla, da bežit v pustynju v mesto svoe..." (17, p. 62). Exegesis: "V novyj že Rim beža eže est' Konstantin grad. no ni tamo pokoja obret" (p. 62). "...I paki v tretij Rim beža, iže est' v novuju velikuju Rusiju" (p. 63).

Initially, Russian learned men, while interpreting the ways of piety in Russia, stuck to the letter of the Apocalypse: piety is threatened, the clergy is deep in sin, but there are forces to avert the disaster, first of all the tzar, whom Philotheus addresses.

Later on the eschatological gist of the concept as such and the inertia of the rhythm bring to a balance between the third constituent part of the parallelism and the two preceding it. By the end, Old Believers, particularly Semen Denisov in his *Vinograd Rossijskij*, gives the concept its final form. According to him the devil (= dragon) consecutively devoured the West and the East, than attacked Russia's dogmas, legends and laws: "vsja v svoe vsepožiratel'noe i bezdonnoe pogloti črevo" (5, Introduction, s.p.). The structure of the third constituent part of the parallelism constantly troubled Russian learned men during the period in question. The rhetorical rules of parallelism demanded that the third part repeat the two preceding as fully as possible. Hence the power of the Story of the fall of Car'grad over Russian annalistic thought of the time. Its influence was in no way diminished by the expressed hope for the liberation of Car'grad. The Story contains nothing that would indicate the transfer of the Third Rome to Moscow. Still it is important, for it describes the second constituent part of the parallelism.

The Story precedes the publicistic works of Ivan Peresvetov. The practical problems of ameliorating the management and the enforcement of power, which are related by Peresvetov to the history of the fall of the second kingdom, get a new, higher status: they become, in that eschatological

perspective, the problem of avoiding the third and final destruction. Peresvetov's particular style, which was later to become quite popular, is characterized by a matter-of-fact lexicon, but its compositional organization is based on rhetoric. The intensification of rhetorical means elevates the tone of the speech: "Kotoryj voinnik ljut budet protiv nedruga gosudareva smertnoju igroju igrati, i krepko budet za veru christijanskuju stojati, i o takovym voinnikom imena vozvyšati i serdca im veseliti, i žalovan'ja im iz kazny svoeja gosudarevy pribavlivati" (22, p. 71).

The general elevation of the literary tone of Makarij's epoch ("gr-jamovenie i zvjacanie", according to the ironical definition by A. Orlov) (19, p. 11) possessed an almost magical significance. The style not only claimed, but also sanctioned and strengthened piety in Russia and the grandeur of the state, thus prolonging the time of the third kingdom.

The *Stepennaja kniga* is devoted to strengthening the Russian rulers' and sovereigns' faith, viewed as a timeless constant. V. Ključevskij defined this book as a chronicle with first signs of historical criticism (11, p. 188). Another scholar, P. Vasenko, claimed that the *Stepennaja kniga* was a ceremonial text recited on appropriate occasions (1, p. 231). Taken in the general context of historical works of the 16th c. both opinions, apparently antagonistic, seem to converge. Here, as in the *Chronograph*, though on a larger scale, rhetoric thrusts itself into the historical narrative and organizes it. The work's primary sources and rhetoric do not yet form a complete unity (15). Only some lives of saints were re-edited and made stylistically ornamental speeches, mainly poor in events. Rhetoric reigns in reasoning on generalities and permeates the very composition of the Book of Degrees. Tales about sovereigns form a chain of elements which are functionally identical and tend to a formal similarity as if to a paradygm. The meaning of the paradygm is perpetuality, the unchanging piety of Rus' and the latter's timeless quality of being the kingdom of piety. The Third Rome, petrified in its greatness, tries to forget the end. Eloquence fights history and tries to stop it. It is in this dialogue with history that the Book of Degrees is historical.

An even deeper realization of possibilities brought about by eloquence can be traced in the *Kazanskaja Istorija*. Its dependence on patterns of eloquence has sometimes been interpreted as a slavish deformity of style or even as a distortion of the author's initial conception. It seems however that its readers in the 16th and 17th c. did not see in the History of Kazan' any traces of disintegration or incongruity. The number of copies and owners' inscriptions testify to the exceptional popularity of this text (14).

A thorough analysis of the *Kazanskaja istorija* may show that its author did not subordinate himself to the tradition, but profited by it. If we compare this work with its primary sources (e.g. the Trinity Monastery Stories about the capture of Kazan') (18, p. 2) we shall find that the rhetorical devices have been intensified and the text phonetically refined. For the author of the History of Kazan' eloquence was a vital power, necessary to build complexe and original concepts. Not intending to go into

a deep analysis, we are only going to touch upon the connection between the *Kazanskaja istorija* and the concept of Moscow the Third Rome.

The History of Kazan' was composed against the background of Nestor Iskander's *Povest' o vzjatii Car'grada* and of the lament on the destruction of Car'grad from the 1512 *Chronograph*. It also interacts with both texts. Characteristically, the high degree of eloquence of Nestor Iskander's text seems insufficient to the author of the History of Kazan' (19, p. 10). Borrowing whole fragments from the *Povest'*, the History goes further in heightening the initial ornamentation and intensity of tone. The author of the History envisions the destruction of Byzantium within the new symbolic and rhetorical context which could not yet be intended by Nestor Iskander who described the fall of the Universal City. Compare f.i. the *Povest' o vzjatii Car'grada*: "Ot pušečnogo bo i piščal'nago stuku i ot zuku svonnago i ot glasa vopli i kričania ot oboich ljudej i ot treskoty oružija: jako molnija bo blistaachu ot oboich oružija, takže i ot plača i rydanija gradskih ljudej i žen i detej...", and the *Kazanskaja istorija*: "I ot pušečnogo, i ot piščal'nago grjamovenija, i ot mnogooružnogo krežetanja i zvjacanja, i ot plača, rydanija gradskih ljudej, žen i detej, i ot velikogo kričanja, i voplja, i svistanija i oboi voi ržanja, i topata konskogo, jako velikij grom i strašen zvuk daleče na Ruskich predelach za 300 verst slyšasja" (14, pp. 511-512).

The story of the capture of Kazan' is connected both with the concept of the fall of the Universal City and of its transfer to Rus': the author laments the destruction of the Universal City and glorifies it at the same time celebrating the triumph of the faithful Christians who liberated the town from Mohammedanism. Not every instance of the capture of Kazan' has its formal counterpart in the *Povest'* of the fall of Car'grad, but every instance is perceived as a parallel to that story (hence the mourning of the citizens of Kazan'), and simultaneously, in connection with the idea of its liberation (hence the laudation addressed to its Russian liberators). Liberation of the second city takes place inside the third city.

The fall of Kazan' is the fall of Byzantium under the attack of enemy forces, the liberation of Kazan' is the liberation of Byzantium from Moslems. This produces the above mentioned discrepancy in the depiction of both sides of the conflict.

In the History of Kazan' both the antipragmatism and the atemporality of the historical thought of the period are fully realized. Here is a fragment of the History of Kazan' in which the idea of the antiquity of Russian piety darkened by the Tatars, but restored to its previous radiance, and the concept of the Third Rome with the accompanying story of the fall of the Second Rome are brought together. The fragment precedes the story of the capture of Kazan' (symbolically conceived as the liberation of the City) and is crowned by the key quotation from the 1512 *Chronograph*, which elevates the significance of all that has been said: "I togda velikaja naša Ruskaja zemlja osvobodisja ot jarma i pokorenija busurmanskago, i načat obnovl-jatisja, jako ot zimy na tichuju vesnu prelagatisja. I vzyde paki na prednee svoe veličestvo i blagočestie i dobrotu, jako že pri velicem knjazi prvom

Vladimire pravoslavnom. Ej že premudryj carju Christe dažd' rasti, jako mladencu, i veličatisja, i razširjatisja, i vsjude prebyvati v muže soveršenne, i do slavnogo svoego vtorago prišestvija, i do skončaniya veka sego. I vozsi- ja nyne stol'nyj i preslavnyj grad Moskva, jako vtoryj Kiiv, ne ustremljužes- ja i ne budu vinoven narešči togo, - i tretij novyj velikij Rim, provozsijavšij v poslednjaja leta, jako velikoe solnce v velicej našej Ruskoj zemli" (10, p. 57). The multiplicity of cities and the chronology of their liberation are surface parallels to the indivisible essence.

Constructions of this kind seem possible only in the framework of rhetorical thinking, where parallelism dominates the narration and symbolic sameness overcomes the temporal and spatial disparity. Thus, the historical thought of the 16th c., based on eloquence and fed by its emotiveness, is capable of generating conceptions which today seem impossible to be conceived.

The 17th c. makes eschatological conceptions active, it senses the fall of the Third Rome and the decline of piety. One of the most important testimonies of the Time of Troubles is the *Skazanie* of Avramij Palicyn. Its first part is an autonomous text, contemporary with the Time of Troubles. This caused Ključevskij to call Avramij a historian and a thinker (11, p. 189). The style of the first part should be defined as archaized eloquence of the church sermons. Its ideology is dominated by the concept of the total decline of piety in Russia and the sinfulness of "the whole world" (for an analysis of rhetorical devices, cf. 41). Unlike the first part of the *Skazanie*, the second is not uniformly rhetorical. The historical account required narrative, thus the second part returns to the old pattern of chronicle-like storytelling. The text incorporates fragments stylistically non identical and compiles testimonies of different origin. Compositionally, the text is open, it can progressively introduce and cumulate progressively new episodes.

A similar composition can be observed in the History of the Vygovska- ja Pustyn', composed 100 years later by Ivan Filippov at the Old Believers settlement on the Vyg (34). As an Introduction to this History, part of Semen Denisov's *Vinograd* was used, a highly rhetorical text about the destruction of the Third Rome and the sufferings of the last martyrs in the final days before doomsday. Filippov now retells the text of the *Vinograd*, now imitates its composition (f. i. when he enumerates the "gar's", i.e. the burning and self-immolation of Old Believers martyrs). Filippov ends the History occasionally introducing rhetorical interpolations, but the text as a whole is a chronicle-type narrative having a unified style. The learned tradition of rhetoric at the Vygovskaja Pustyn' is not reflected in this part of the History. According to the chronicles, the Trojca Monastery of Avramij and the Vyg Hermitage defended themselves as ships against the waves of the world that perished. The meaning of this defence consists in the fact that the rhetoric as well as the concept of Moscow the Third Rome are considered as perishing, as no longer vital. Thus the existence of the two monasteries destroyed the image and the idea of time annihilating itself in eternity, and required a narrative pattern no longer dependent on the special rhetorical tradition that we have analyzed in the 16th c. texts.

REFERENCES

- (1) VASENKO, P.G., *Kniga stepennaja carskogo rodoslovija i ee značenie v drevnerusskoj istoričeskoj pis'mennosti*, č. I, Spb. 1904.
- (2) VOLKOVA, T.F., *Kazanskaja Istorija i trojckie literaturnye pamjatniki o vzjatii Kazani*, TODRL, XXXVII, 1983.
- (3) GOL'DBERG, A.L., *Ideja "Moskva - Tretij Rim" v cikle sočinenij pervoj poloviny XVI v.*, TODRL, XXXVII, 1983.
- (4) ID., *Tri poslanija Filofeja*, TODRL, XXVII, 1974.
- (5) DENISOV, SEMEN, *Vinograd Rossijskij ili opisanie postradavšich v Rossii za drevnecerkovnoe blagočestie*, M. 1906.
- (6) DUJČEV, I., *Letopista na Konstantin Manasi*, Sofija, 1963.
- (7) ID., *Minjatjurite na Manasievata letopis*, Sofija, 1962.
- (8) EREMIN, I.P., *Literatura Drevnej Rusi*, M.-L.1966.
- (9) IOV, PATRIARCH, *Povest' o čestnem žitii carja i velikogo knjazja Fedora Ivanoviča vseja Rusii*, PSRL, T.14, M.1965.
- (10) *Kazanskaja Istorija*, M., 1954.
- (11) KLJUČEVSKIJ, V.O., *Neopublikovannye proizvedenija*, M., 1983.
- (12) *Kniga stepennaja carskogo rodoslovija*, PSRL, T.21, č. 1-2, Spb., 1908-1913.
- (13) KOLESOV, V.V., *K karakteristike poetičeskogo stilja Kirilla Turovskogo*, TODRL, XXXVI, 1981.
- (14) KUNCEVIČ, G.Z., *Istorija o Kazanskom Carstve, ili Kazanskij letopisec: opyt istoriko-literaturnogo issledovanija*, Spb., 1905.
- (15) KUSKOV, V.V., *O nekotorych osobennostjach stilja Stepenoj Knigi*, "Učenyje zapiski", Ural'skij Un-t, 1959, vyp. 28.
- (16) LEKOMCEVA, M.I., *K strukture teksta u Klimenta Ochridskogo (figura epanoda i poliptotona)*, "Trudy po znakovym sistemam", Tartu, XII, 1981.
- (17) MALININ, V., *Starec Eleazarova Monastyrja Filofej i ego poslanija*, Kiev, 1901.
- (18) NASONOV, A.N., *Novye istočniki po istorii Kazanskogo vzjatii*, "Archeologičeskij ežegodnik za 1960 g.", M., 1962.
- (19) ORLOV, A.S., *O nekotorych osobennostjach stilja velikoruskoj istoričeskoj belletristiki XVI-XVII vv.*, Spb., 1909 (ott. iz Izv.ORJaS, 1908, T.13, kn.4).
- (20) ID., *Chronograf i Povest' o Kazanskom Carstve*, in: *Sbornik statej v čest' A.I. Sobolevskogo*, L. 1928.
- (21) *Pamjatniki drevnerusskoj pis'mennosti, odnosjaščiesja k Smutnomu Vremeni*, (Izd. II) Spb., 1909.
- (22) PERESVETOV, IVAN, *Sočinenija*, M.-L., 1956.
- (23) PERETC, V.N., *Istoriko-literaturnye issledovanija i materjaly*, T.III, Spb., 1902.
- (24) PLATONOV, S.F., *Drevnerusskie skazanija i povesti o Smutnom Vremeni XVII v. kak istoričeskij istočnik*, Spb., 1913.
- (25) *Povest' o prichoždenii Stefana Batorija na grad Pskov*, M.-L., 1952.
- (26) RADČENKO, K., *Religioznoe i literaturnoe dviženie v Bolgarii v epochu pered tureckim zavojevanjem*, Kiev, 1898.

- (27) SAZONOVA, L.I., *Drevnerusskaja ritmičeskaja proza XI-XIII vv.*, L., 1973 (Avtoref. Kandid. Diss.)
- (28) *Simeonovskaja letopis'*, PSRL, T.18, Spb., 1913.
- (29) *Skazanie Avramija Palicina*, M.-L., 1955.
- (30) SMIRNOV, I.P., *O sistemno-diachroničeskom podchode k drevnerusskoj kul'ture (Rannij period)*, "Wiener slavistisches Almanach", Bd. 9, 1982.
- (31) SOBOLEVSKIJ, A., *Iz istorii russkoj literatury XVII v.*, "Bibliograf", 1891, N.3-4.
- (32) TVOROGOV, O.V., *Drevnerusskie Chronografy*, L., 1975.
- (33) TIMOFEEV, L.I., *Očerki teorii i istorii russkago sticha*, M., 1958.
- (34) FILIPPOV, Ivan, *Istorija Vygovskoj staroobrjadčeskoj pustyni*, Spb. 1862.
- (35) *Chronograf redakcii 1512 g.*, PSRL, T. 22, c. 1, Spb., 1911.
- (36) ŠACHMATOV, A.A., *Putešestvie N.G. Misjurja Munechina na Vostok i Chronograf 1512 g.*, "Izv.ORJaS", T.4, Spb., 1899.
- (37) JACIMIRSKIJ, A.I., *Iz istorii slavjanskoj propovedi v Moldavii*, Spb., 1906 (PDP i I, CLXIII).
- (38) ČIŽEVSKIJ, D., *On alliteration in Ancient Russian Epic Literature, Russian Epic Studies*, Philadelphia, 1949.
- (39) KURBSKIJ, A.M., *Novyj Margarit*, hrsg. von I. AUERBACH, Giessen, 1977.
- (40) STREMOUKHOFF, D., *Moscow the Third Rome: Sources of the Doctrine*, "Speculum", XXVIII, 1953, N.1.
- (41) PLJUČANOVA, M., *K voprosu o rifmach v skazanijach smutnogo vremeni (Skazanie Avramija Palicina)*, (in press).

