

David Goldfrank

THE SERMONS IN RUSSIA BEFORE THE ERA OF BELARUS-UKRAINIAN INFLUENCE

Thanks to the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, XVI-century Europe witnessed the revival of the liturgical sermon composed for the current listeners and readers. So, naturally, when Roman Catholics or Protestants visited Russia, they might remark upon the absence of such sermons in church services¹. But did this mean that the Russians did not write or preach sermons? Before we examine the various aspects of this problem, let us listen to written words of three Russian monks from the late XV – early XVI century.

Прежде всего подобает ведати како повелено есть нам от божественных писании о Бозе мудръствовати и что есть не неизглаголанное и что изглаголанно. Яко убо Бог есть, вемы; а еже что есть существо божие, не вемы. Яко велик есть, вемы; а еже что есть величество Его, не вемы. Яко убо премудр есть, вемы, а еже колико есть премудр, не вемы. Яко промышляет и объемлет и вся содержит, вемы; а еже како, не вемы. И еже Бог нам неповеле сих глаголати, немощно и не токмо нам, но и небесным силам.

That is a written text, the opening of a late XV-century Russian explanation of Christian epistemology, part of Iosif Volotskii's defense of Orthodoxy against accused heretics². But with structured use of antithesis, it also sounds like part of a didactic sermon, just as do parts of John Chrysostom's lectures on Holy Scripture³. So did Iosif also teach theology by word in this way, or did he teach only by writing?

¹ For a Protestant example, with a reference as well to the Catholic Jesuit Antonio Possevino, see: *The Travels of Olearius in Seventeenth-Century Russia* // Ed. and trans. Samuel H. Baron. Stanford, 1967. P. 251–252.

² Казакова Н.А., Лурье Я.С. *Антифеодальные еретические движения на Руси XIV-начала XVI века* [далее – Казакова/Лурье]. М.-Л., 1955. С. 394; orthography modernized.

³ Brilioth Y. *A Brief History of Preaching* / Trans. Karl E. Mattson. Philadelphia, 1945. P. 33–37; Chrysostom, of course, is the *Златоуст*, so well beloved by *Slavia Orthodoxa*.

Молю же вас, пьянство безмерное и безчиние отънуд да не будет в вас. Великаго бо Христовых уст проповедника Павла слова не забывайте: «Пияницы царствия божия не наследят» [1 Кор. 6.10]. Господь же провъзвещая предреченная, всем заповедает, глаголя: «Блюдитесь, да не отягчают седца ваша объядением и пьянством, и печальми житейскими» (Лк. 21.24). Исаия же, окаляя в вине пребывующия, глаголаше: «Горе квас гонящим и ждущим вечера: вино бо я сожжет» [Ис. 5.11], и паки: «Прельщены суть, заблудили суть» [Ис. 28.7]. Иоиль же вопиет: «Истрезвейтеся упивающесея от вина, плачете и рыдайте вси пиюще вино в пьянство» [Иол. 1.5]. Плакати и рыдати повелено есть пьянство любящим. Сего ради и вспоминаю вам братие, яко да не от нашего начала имя божие похулится и одеяние великого ангельского образа зазрится к нашему вечному осужденю. Еще же молю тебе, о игумене и всю братию.

Efrosin Pskovskii, before he died in 1479, placed, this demand for abstinence in his общежительный *Устав*⁴ – Russia's earliest original monastic rule of a founder or renovator and a likely locus of an embedded sermon. This stricture in the form of a plea contains three types of repetitions: one, a simple exegetical (плакати и рыдати повелено есть пьянство любящим following плачете и рыдайте вси пиюще вино в пьянство); the second, a succession of similar statements; and the third, a stylistic *kyklos* – repetition completing an imaginary circle (Молю же вас at the beginning; Еще же молю тебе, о игумене и всю братию at the end). Did Efrosin never preach something like this to his monastic brothers?

И тако приемлем в уме второе пришествие Господне и наше воскресенье и страшный суд, самыи еуангелския глаголы Господня предлагающе, яко богогласный Матвей написа: «И по скорбы,» рече, «дній тех солнце померкнет, и луна не дает света своего, и звезды спадут с небеси, и силы небесные подвигнутся. И тогда явится знамение сына человеческого, и тогда въсплачется вся колена земная, и узрят сына человеческого, градуща на облацех небесных с силою и славою мноюю. И послет аггелы своа с трубным гласом велім, и съберут избранные его от четырех ветр, от конець небес до конець их» [Mt. 24.25–31].

And so, around 1500, Russia's «великий старец» Nil Sorskii utilized a colorful, cadenced, and frightening Evangelical prophesy as part of the *Слово* which he composed on mourning and repentance⁵. Did he too write a paranetic (ethical) sermon only to be read individually within the monk's cell? Did this most of sophisticated of Russian writers of his day merely advise his readers to take the words of the Gospel

⁴ Еп. Амвросий Орнатский. *Древнерусские иноческия уставы* [далее – ДИУ] / Изд. Т.В. Суздальцева. М., 2001. С. 48–49.

⁵ Прохоров Г. *Преподобный Нил Сорский и Иннокентий Комельский*. СПб., 2005 [далее – Прохоров]. С. 170.

from the written page into their intellect, but not himself give voice to such words in order to create the community, which he so describes in his *Предание* or «писание душеполезне себе и господе братии моей присным, яже суть моего нрава»?⁶

Of course, we do not and we cannot know whether Iosif or Efrosin or Nil taught or preached exactly what they wrote, but we can be quite certain that they did teach and preach. According to Nil, as he relied upon what he deemed to be the allegorical words of Macarius of Egypt, teaching and preaching were integral to the life of the hesychastic master⁷:

И притчею положи о съвършенных благодатью, якоже на дванадесет степені възыти. «Обаче посябляет», рече, «благодать. И, един изступльши степень, на единьнадесятом, якоже рещи, стоит, и сего ради съвършеніа мера не удержася им, да имут время: и о братии упряжняются, и промышляти словом служеніа».

For Iosif, however, the issue at hand was not merely his own teaching by word. Rather, he explicitly expected that others would make use of the arguments of his *Просветитель* (*Книга на новгородских еретиков*) for the defense of the Church and the salvation of souls and the land⁸:

И аще кто что потребно будет противу еретиков речем, и благодатью Божию обращет готово без труда в коемждо слово, яже суть сиа...

Still a key question of his time was whether a *de jure* renovating, but *de facto* innovating pastor of his day had the authority to instruct via writings. Accordingly, he borrowed sharp invective from a Byzantine diatribe, used a *sic et non* rhetorical question of his own, and stretched his patristic authorities to justify his own compositions:

Аще ли кто есть презорлив, велехвален, высокошиав, величав, укаряя благое и любя зазоры, и глаголя⁹, яко в предних летех святые отцы наши поучения и предания общежительная писанием изложиша, ныне же не подобает тако творити, но точию словом наказовати. И аще бы тако было, то како глаголет преподобный отец наш Никон: «Яко

⁶ Там само. С. 82.

⁷ Там само. С. 120. Nil's source here, in Old Slavic Translation, is (Pseudo-)Macarius, *Главизни*, as in Hilandar Monastery, Slavic Manuscripts, no. 468, pp. 52-52v.; they are identified by the editors of the English-language *Philokalia* as Symeon Metaphastes' *Macarian Chapters*, a rewrite of what was already Pseudo-Macarius: *The Philokalia. The Complete Text Compiled by St. Nikodimos of the Holy Mountain and St. Makarios of Corinth* / Transl. and ed. G.E.H. Palmer, Philip Sherrard, and Kalistos Ware. London – Boston, 1979–1995. Vol. 3. P. 285–353.

⁸ Казакова/Лурье. С. 475.

⁹ Up to here from: «Дионтра» Филиппа Монотропа. *Антропологическая энциклопедия православного средневековья* / Ред. и перев. Г. М. Прохорова, Х. Микласа, А. Б. Бильдюга, М. Н. Громова. М., 2008. С. 193, 315, 503; the Old Rus *Зерцало* // Российская Национальная Библиотека. Ф. 304, оп. 1, д. 191. Л. 222–222 об.

же убо в древних летех, тако и ныне подобает, да каждо настоятель, паче же в своей обители, въобразить или предасть согласующая божественным писанием учительства же и наказания словесы же и писанием. ...?»

Indeed, and surely with full confidence in his own righteousness, Iosif added *писанием* here, just as he did a few sentences later to a citation from Chrysostom¹⁰.

Why would Iosif edit a revered church father? Because the stakes were so high. As his own sources stated, well before Prince (St.) Volodimer commanded the Kievans be baptized in the Dniepro, the Orthodox Church (really, the Undivided Church of the VI and VII Ecumenical Councils) had commanded the chief pastors to preach and teach. But they were to do so only according to the established божественным писанием, and not their own individual conceptions. So if Iosif's writings were to be accepted by the Russian Church, then they could be used not only as appropriate sources for other writings or sermons, but also for authoritative decisions. And despite some opposition, Iosif's chief compositions did achieve officially recognized status. Even without his canonization as a saint, church authorities so utilized his *Просветитель* as authoritative in the 1550s at the synod trials of accused heretics¹¹. This is a clear indication that an original Russian composition, which was itself influenced by earlier models of this standard ecclesiastical genre – namely, didactic, apologetic oratory, – became a source for another such oral and written genre, the heretical trial indictment. And such an indictment could end up, in a reworked, written form, to be read aloud, inside or right outside a church, as surely did the circular from 1490 with the following title¹²:

Смиреннаго Зосими митрополита всея Руси и всего священнаго собора поучение всему православному христианству, на ересники обличение.

So despite the haughty sneers of the foreign observers; despite the absence of the formal schooling in the *Trivium* found in Byzantium and the West; and, more important, despite the Late Antique liturgical smothering and swallowing of the individualized church service sermon; and despite the compensatory availability in the major Slavic Orthodox churches and monasteries of entire сборники, with ready made formal

¹⁰ ДИУ. С. 98–99, corrected here from: *Великие минеи четии, собранные все-российским Митрополитом Макарием*. СПб., 1868–1917. Сент., стб. 549–550. Nikon's original is: *Пандекты*. Почаев, 1795, Слово 8: 63; see: *The Monastic Rule of Iosif Volotsky* [далее – MR] / Trans. and ed., David Goldfrank, 2nd rev. ed. Kalamazoo, 2000. P. 225–227.

¹¹ Зимин А. А. *И. С. Пересветов и его современники*. М., 1958. С. 79, 159, 178.

¹² АФЕД. С. 384.

sermons for every regular occasion — despite all of this, — individual Russians did create sermons for themselves and for others. In fact, it could not have been otherwise. For the corpus of translated patristic and Byzantine sacred literature could not include sermons in any form directed to current issues or celebrating current events or native saints, and this created the opportunity for the creative Russians, just as earlier such opportunities existed for the creative Rus of the XI–XIII centuries.

As we have seen, the Moscow Metropolitan Zosima or a ghost-writer composed a denunciatory, hortatory circular. It commenced: «Да есте вѣдуще вси православные христиане», and ended with a threat of excommunication¹³. Iosif Volotskii and his assistants composed a dozen «слова на новгородских еретиков», which contained material assembled for others to do the same. Nil Sorskii descended from Pseudo-Macarius's metaphorical twelfth степеня to the eleventh in order to offer his слова служения to disciples. Accordingly, his treatise on безмолвием — *О мысленом деланіи* (his так наз. «Устав») — served as a source for his two didactic, sermon-length посланиям, one of them to an experienced старцу (Gurii Tushin), who had his own disciples to teach¹⁴. Iosif composed a sermon-letter to magnate concerning the treatment of his slaves, and a laudatory funerary oration with an anti-heretical diatribe¹⁵. Even those of his letters, which, in defending his monastery's interests, returned to the original use of rhetoric, the legal argument, contained elements of sermon¹⁶.

All of these examples stem from the reign of Ivan III, and we have not even mentioned the most famous sermon of all from his time, that of the Rostov Archbishop Vassian Rylo (died 1481), which appears in the летописях under the year 1480. Known as *Послание на Угре*, this work, like many epistles, is essentially a sermon in the form of a letter¹⁷, and in its original form may well have been read aloud as a patriotic rallying cry. For it was a ringing summons for armed resistance to the «богостудному» khan or царю, who had led the armies of the Great Horde to the Ugra River¹⁸. Nor have we turned to the most prolific writer in Russia during the 1440s–1480s, the Serbian священноиннок

¹³ Казакова/Лурье. С. 384–385.

¹⁴ Срав. *Послание Вассиану, Послание Гурию, и Устав, Слово 5* // Прохоров. С. 132–160, 222–238.

¹⁵ Лурье Я. С., Зимин А. А. *Послания Иосифа Волоцкого* [далее — Лурье/Зимин]. — Л., 1959. С. 152–160.

¹⁶ Там само. С. 145–152. For a summary of Iosif's sermonizing, see below, Appendix I.

¹⁷ Свящ. Павел Николаевский. *Русская проповедь в XV и XVI веках* // Журнал Министрства народного просвещения. 1868. № 2. С. 368.

¹⁸ *Библиотека литературы Древней Руси*. Т. 7. С. 386–398.

Pakhomii Logofet, author of a slew of specimens of two other identifiable forms of sermon: the *житие святых*, which is much more than sermon, and the less ambitious, more purely sermon — *похвальное слово*¹⁹.

The variety of known Russian sermonizing continued to expand during the sixty years following the death of Ivan III (1505), partially, it seems, under the influence of Iosif's legacy. His successor игумен, Daniil the Riazanian, served as Metropolitan of Moscow for seventeen years (1522–1539), during which he composed both pure sermons (слова) and sermon-послания on a variety of topics, but especially personal and social ethics — this, despite his own willingness to stretch or break the ecclesiastical canons in the interest of his sovereign, Vasili III. In fact, Daniil was the only native head of the pre-Petrine Rus or Russian Church to leave a сборник of his own sermons and another of his moralizing послания. His слова often had a unique tri-partite structure, with an introduction to the issue under discussion, an exposition, often with so many citations from authorities that it is difficult for the modern reader to believe that it was delivered orally, and a closure on a general problem of salvation. If, though, Daniil did preach his слова, we have no evidence that he did so within the context of the church service²⁰.

Virtually simultaneously, Archbishop Makarii of Novgorod (r. 1526–1542), from Iosif's original monastery (Pafnut'ev Borovskii), an adherent of Iosif's school of thought, instructed all of the clergy under him to teach their flock and force all the laymen, even the upper crust, to listen²¹. He himself undertook to collect much of the available translated and original reading and sermonizing material in twelve monthly codices (*Великия четвии Минеи*), a project he continued and finished when he became Metropolitan of Moscow (1542–1563). Among his other apparent achievements was his orchestrating the coronation of Ivan IV as Tsar in 1547, and hence a new ceremonial, including a coronation sermon, whose surviving copies, however, exhibit signs of later tinkering²². Makarii's послания to Ivan IV and the Russian army during the Kazan campaign of 1552 included one with moral rebukes for sodomy to be read aloud to all of the commanders — clear proof that a sixteenth-century Russian послание could serve as a sermon²³.

¹⁹ Прохоров Г. М. *Пахомий Серб // Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* [далее — *Словарь книжников*]. Т. 2, ч. 2. С. 167–177.

²⁰ Жмакин В. И. *Митрополит Даниил и его Сочинения*. М., 1881. С. 298–312; Буланин Д. М. *Даниил // Словарь книжников*. Т. 2, ч. 1. С. 182–185; for a mixed estimation of Daniil's sermons: Čiževskij D. *History of Russian Literature from the Eleventh Century to the Baroque*. S-Gravenhage, 1962. P. 286–291.

²¹ Свящ. Павел Николаевский. *Русская проповедь*. С. 370.

²² Miller D. *The Coronation of Ivan IV of Moscow // Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas*. 1967, bd. 15. S. 559–584.

²³ *Акты исторические собранные и изданные Археологической комиссией*. М., 1848. Т. 1, № 160.

While Makarii was Metropolitan and shortly thereafter, several competent churchmen in the provinces composed sermons, which addressed contemporary issues. The Novgorodian monk Zinovii Oten'skii, (died ca. 1572) preached, taught, wrote in several genres, and spoke out on behalf of the local people as well as his faith. His *Похвальное слово Ипатию гангрскому* (an anti-Arian bishop at the First Ecumenical Council) masterfully embeds theological apologetics within a celebratory sermon. His *Послание* (to the powerful Novgorod *дьяку*) Я. В. Шишкину cleverly sneaks sermonizing into a plea for the rapid expediting of judicial cases²⁴. Zinovii's *утешительное послание* to three disgraced high churchmen, who had been exiled to Solovki, deftly combines historical and practical reasoning from the Old Testament concerning moderate drinking with sermonizing from the New Testament²⁵. And his lengthy, uniquely (for a Russian of the time) systematic theological-polemical treatise, *Истины показание* against the radical dissident Feodosii Kosoi, takes the form of oral responses to questions posed by three other clerics²⁶, and thereby illustrates the living connection between the written theological discourse and oral pedagogy.

Meanwhile in Pskov, the priest Ermolai (later the monk Erazm, who died maybe late 1560s), like Iosif, composed maybe ten different types of sermon, including one framing a concrete proposal for reform of the landholding and fiscal system and abolition of both taverns and private possession of daggers. Another appeared in the form of ten short, consoling chapters, and still others as prayers²⁷. Ermolai-Erazm stands as definite proof that some secular priests did sermonize in a variety of ways.

So what can we make of all of this?

First of all, we have one more example of the fluidity of literary genres in old Rus. From the Kyievan and early Mongol period, Muscovy 'inherited' such diverse forms as the conversion sermon in *Повесть временных лет*, the celebratory sermons of Ilarion, brief, *поучения* attributed to Feodosii Pecherskii, *Пролог*-type readings such as the hagiographic-eulogy as to Boris and Hlib, the Easter cycle festive sermons and also an epistle-sermon of Kirill of Turau, the didactive *поучение* attributed to Volodimer Monomakh, and the general, ethical *слова* of the Pecherskii monk and later Bishop Serapion Vladimirskii.

²⁴ Клибанов А. И., Корецкий В. И. *Послание Зиновия Отенского дьяку Я. В. Шишкину* // *Труды Отдела древнерусской литературы* [далее – ТОДРЛ]. 1961. Т. 17. С. 201–224.

²⁵ Корецкий В. И. *Новые послания Зиновия Отенского* // *ТОДРЛ*. 1970. Т. 25. С. 119–134.

²⁶ *Истины показание к вопросившим о новом учении. Сочинение инока Зиновия*. Казань, 1863.

²⁷ On these ten, see below, Appendix II.

Second, XV–XVI century Russia's talented, writing clerics were sermonizers, even if we do not know under what circumstances, how and how often they gave formal addresses.

Third, we should not be surprised that Russians sermonized, since both formal sermons, such as John Chrysostom's, and mini-sermons, such as sections in John Climacus's *Лествица* and some of the scores of citations that Russians found in Nikon of the Black Mountain's *Пандекты* and *Тактикон*, were essential components of Muscovy's received Orthodoxy.

Fourth, Russians often composed not only the genuine sermons, but also discourses, prayers, and strings of regulations with embedded sermons in such a way that they could be delivered in one hearing, as well as be used for instructional purposes – though again we do not know how they were used as educational devices. These works were available for private reading followed by questions, which we know occurred in Iosif's monastery²⁸, and for public reading, which we also know could take place in that monastery²⁹. However, we do not know what kind of «classes,» if any, existed, where a master might read, either open or not to immediate questioning as he proceeded.

The reader of this brief essay may notice that I have not mentioned for this period the Italian-educated Maksim Grek, who was active in Russia, 1517–1555, if under surveillance as of 1525. He lacked the authority to deliver oral sermons, but he composed them (both dogmatic and ethical) as слова and послання. His balanced construction and his erudition impressed Russians and helped pave the way for later acceptance of Western influence. In the seventeenth century, the number of сборники of or with his works easily equaled the combined total of those with the works of Nil and Iosif³⁰.

Maksim, though, was really a transitional figure for those Russians who were en route to accepting educated Orthodox Ukrainians and Belarusians as validly Orthodox³¹. For he was perfectly Orthodox in religion, but more Western in his literary standards – which is precisely how the Jesuit influence operated in late XVI and XVII Belarus and Ukraine. The Jesuits themselves, with their respect for ceremonial traditions, sense that Basil of Caesaria and John Chrysostom were model

²⁸ Лурье/Зимин. С. 307–310, 320–21; *Великие минеи четыи*. Сент., стб. 523, 529; ДИУ. С. 78, 82, 200–203, 213–215; МР. Р. 139–43, 193.

²⁹ *Великие минеи четыи*. Сент., стб. 570; ДИУ. С. 118; МР. Р. 251.

³⁰ The literary legacy of Nil and Iosif involves maybe about one hundred codices each; that of Maksim numbers more than two hundred.

³¹ Space limitation precludes any discussion of the sermon during the Time of Troubles, of which, perhaps, Patriarch Germogen's 1612 circular from his prison cell to resist the Poles is the most noteworthy.

Christian orators, and recognition of the utility of the well constructed sermon aiming to influence the listener's will³², were better placed than other Roman Catholics, not to say Protestants, to exercise this influence. For in promoting, even if indirectly, the contemporary sermon among the Orthodox, the Jesuits were in effect asking the Orthodox to restore the place in the service which Classical Christian oratory had once enjoyed. In this endeavor, as in others, Russians followed Ukrainians and Belarusians in relinquishing the purely medieval for the Baroque «early modern».

³² Old H. O. *The Reading and the Preaching of the Scriptures in the Christian Church*. Grand Rapids MI – Cambridge, 1998. Vol. 4. P. 226-227: «If Scholasticism showed the preacher how to teach the people Christian morality, and if the Protestant Reformers showed preachers how to expound the Word of God, the Counter-Reformation showed preachers how to move the wills of their congregations».

Appendix I: Types of Sermon by Iosif Volotskii (1439/1440–1515)*

1. Simple, with one-point only¹.
2. Complex, maybe on just one theme, but with an uplifting section².
3. Complex, with several sermonizing genres³.
4. Testamentary and mini-regulatory⁴.
5. The fully regulatory⁵.
6. The polemical-didactic⁶.

* The superscripts B, E, and Pr, refer to the Brief Rule, the Extended Rule, and *Просветитель*, all of which have an introduction followed by a series of *слова*. The Extended Rule changes the number and content of the Brief Rule, the original eleven *слова* becoming nine, and then adds five more, plus nine more purely instructive *предания* corresponding to the nine *слова*. The extended *Просветитель* simply adds four or five *слова* to the original eleven.

¹ For example, as *Слово 11^B/8^E* of his Rule, on keeping women out of the monastery with a total of 25 brief verb clauses, and maybe three minutes to read aloud, if I dare venture a «guesstimate,» based on the cadence of a Russian priest who once read aloud some of Iosif's works as if he were lecturing or preaching: Лурье/Зимин. С. 319; *Великие минеи четьи*. Сент., стб. 543–544; ДИУ. С. 95–96; MR. P. 160–161, 219–220. Iosif commences with a mini-Chrysostom sermon of nine brief sentences, followed by the regulation forbidding women; next a moralizing apothegm attributed to the obscure Marcian, then another aphorism of John Climacus serving as a thematic conclusion, and finally Iosif's own sermon closure.

² For example, *Слово 1^E* of the Rule on community prayer with a masterful revision of a Chrysostom sermon, flexibly adapted to allow the insertion of regulations, in this case a total 350–400 verb clauses, maybe 30–40 minutes oral reading time: *Великие минеи четьи*. Сент., стб. 503–513; ДИУ. С. 61–69; MR. P. 169–179.

³ For example, *Слово 10^E* of the Rule, the *Отвещание любозазорным*, about fifty per cent longer than *Слово 1^{B/E}* of the Rule, and with three distinct sections: a) dramatic polemical defense of rule-writing; b) hagiography of Rus monk-saints exemplifying fidelity to traditions; and c) a defense of rules, closing with a mini-review of everything a monk keep in mind: *Великие минеи четьи*. Сент., стб. 546–563; ДИУ. С. 98–112; MR. P. 225–241.

⁴ For example, the introduction of the Extended Rule, which would take about fifteen minutes to read aloud: *Великие минеи четьи*. Сент., стб. 498–503; ДИУ. С. 57–61; MR. P. 163–168. That the structural rules of the sermon are followed here is clear: a) the testamentary introduction with an invocation; b) sermonizing on the fear of the last judgment; c) a list of the Rule's chapters in form of commandments, positive and negative; d) an affirmation of the ability of everyone to adhere to the Rule; and e) the testament ending, which reverts to the last judgment theme, just as a charter does.

⁵ As in *Слово 12^E* of the Rule, which frames a listing of the regulations of his nine basic sermon-discourses with a very brief version of the testament-introduction: *Великие минеи четьи*. Сент., стб. 567–570; ДИУ. С. 115–118; MR. P. 247–251. The frame simply invokes the Trinity, concludes with an affirmation that Rule can be followed and will result in salvation, and adds a couple of appendages. *Слово 14^E*, the list of penances, is structurally similar to *Слово 12^E* (*Великие Минеи Четьи*. Сент., стб. 610–616; ДИУ. С. 150–155; MR. P. 301–308). It would also take about fifteen minutes to read, and Iosif pointedly wrote it to be read to his entire community, which apparently included some initially or terminally illiterate monks.

⁶ For example, *Слово 5^{Pr}* on the Trinity Icon, with a serious framing of sermons around the apologetic theological discourse: It would take about an 70–80 minutes to

7. The complex, historical-polemical introduction⁷.
8. The simpler, self-contained preface, mixing practical and religious concerns⁸.
9. The several-theme funerary oration⁹.
10. The simple didactic admonition in an epistle¹⁰.
11. The admonitory petition¹¹.
12. The embedded general, fifty-minute sermon in a handbook on faith and morals¹².

read at the pace of a decent sermon, which I imagine to be reasonable for a lecture either followed or interrupted by discussion, if such a method of instruction was used by our Iosifites. It was originally the third of the three *слова* sent to an iconographer, but these three went respectively into *Просветитель* as *Слова* 6,7,5: Казакова/Лурье. С. 360-373; *Просветитель*. С. 170-218. It begins with a contrast between the divine commandments and diabolical attacks on them, specifically the attacks of the Novgorod Heretics; then come the arguments in defense of icons against these attacks, and finally a closing concerning the benefits of icons for salvation. We can contrast this discourse with Iosif's more historical-legalistic *Слово о осуждении еретиков/Слово* 13^р, which has little of the sermon and would have taken about fifty minutes to read aloud: Казакова/Лурье. С. 488-498; *Просветитель*. С. 475-502.

⁷ *Сказание о новоявившейся ереси*, commencing *Просветитель*, whose admonitory highlight is the drama of monks and pious laymen doing battle with the satanic heretics. It would also take about fifty minutes to read aloud: Казакова/Лурье. С. 466-486, both redactions; also *Просветитель*. С. 27-54. It begins with a frightening history, contrasting an idyllic Old Rus with the advent of the heretics; lists their alleged doctrines as part of the history; then has the drama of monks and pious laymen going to battle against heresy; and then the official contents of the following eleven, fifteen, or sixteen *слова*. The conclusion is at the end of *Слово* 11^р, which ends the brief redaction.

⁸ Here, *Сказание ... о сеннице*, linking earthly prosperity heavenly salvation for both the commemorators and the pay-as-you-go commemorated, followed by a list of citations: Казакова Н. А. *Васиан Патрикеев и его сочинения*. М.-Л., 1959. С. 355-357; only the sermon part has been published; the very boring remainder — a string of quotations — is found in: *Синодик Волоколамского монастыря*. Институт русской литературы (СПб.), Отдельные поступления 1953 г., Рпс. 27, с. 44об.-66.

⁹ Here for the fourth deceased princely brother (i.e., Iosif's patron Boris Vasilevich), in the form of a послание to the magnate Ioann, where the theme of combating heresy is interwoven. It would take about half an hour to read aloud: Лурье/Зимин. С. 154-160.

¹⁰ For example, the послание to an unknown magnate concerning his maltreatment of slaves Лурье/Зимин. С. 152-154, or the one to Prince Yurii Ivanovich concerning general morality, which is subtitled in the address as a поучение: Лурье/Зимин. С. 232-235. The first would have taken about seven minutes to read aloud, the second maybe fifteen. (Illiterate secular magnates presumably had short attention spans for sermons?).

¹¹ For example, the appeal to Prince Yurii to fix grain prices during the local famine; it would have taken about five minutes to read to him: Лурье/Зимин. С. 235-236.

¹² Here, *Слово 7^р*: Казакова/Лурье. С. 351-360; *Просветитель*. С. 304-331. The sermon section covers prayer in the church and then outside of the church; then general morality, stemming for love to God, and ends in typically with the achieving of salvation. The section on community, that is, liturgical prayer in the church underlies the similar treatment in *Слово* 1^{в/е}, with heavy borrowing and adapting from John Chrysostom: Лурье/Зимин. С. 300-303; *Великие минеи четьи*. Сент., стб. 507-510; ДИУ. С. 64-66, 192-194; MR. P. 125-129, 172-176.

Appendix II: Types of Sermon by Ermolai-Erazm (fl. 1540s-1560s)

1. Hints of sermon¹.
2. Sermonizing embedded in a historical/legendary tale².
3. А похвала/молитва³.
4. Little sermons embedded in dogmatics and apologetics⁴.
5. Pure, salvific sermon, following theological exposition⁵.

¹ Шляпкин И. *Ермолай прегрешный. Новый писатель эпохи Грозного*. С. Ф. Платонову ученики, друзья и почитатели. СПб., 1911. С. 565–567. In his *Моление к царю*, where he mentions three (presumably ecclesiastical) pieces he has written to Ivan IV and offers to produce one on state affairs, Ermolai has a brief section to how one should live properly by following Christ. See also: Дмитриева Р. П. *Повесть о Петре и Февронии*. Л., 1979. С. 116, прим. 43: The title of Ermolai's unpublished *Зрячая пасхалия*, a guide to the Church calendar, itself preaches: «Бога же ради, сотворившаго всям, помяни прегршнаго Ермолая, открывшаго мудрость сию на изъясление всем хрстианом».

² Дмитриева Р. П. *Повесть о Петре и Февронии*. С. 209–223: the opening part of *Повесть о Петре и Февронии* is sermon, as is the elaboration of Petr's and Fevronia's ruling virtues. The conclusion returns to the opening Trinity theme, and thereby give structural symmetry to the work, which would have taken about 30–35 minutes to read at the preacher's pace.

³ *Сочинения Ермолая-Еразма // Памятники литературы Древней Руси. Конец XV–первая половина XVI в.* М., 1984. С. 647–650, concerning the wonder-working Богородица in: *О граде Муроме и о епископы его, како приеде на Рязань*.

⁴ Попов А. *Книга Еразма о святой Троице // Чтения в Императорском Обществе истории и древностей российских*. 1880, т. 4. С. 1–61 – part of the slightly misnamed *Большая Трилогия*. The first and longest of these parts, *Слово прибольше... о троичестве и единстве*, which might have taken two hours to read aloud, is a detailed handbook or textbook on the basic Christian dogmas, with numerous brief sermonizing addresses to the reader/listener. Following Ermolai's standard rhetorical strategy of teaching and preaching by means of a sacred-historical survey from creation to the last judgment, it leaves the intended audience with clear choice between the paths of salvation and damnation. Besides expounding on the Trinity as basic to man's created nature in God's image, this *слово* has several run-throughs both of Jesus's life to his enthronement and the last judgment and of human history. Combining the themes of Iosif's *Слово* 1-2^{Pr} (with OT prophesies; Jesus's life itself, and the nature of the Trinity), it also has lists of the alleged prophesies of the «Hellenic philosophers», of the development and reality of icon and holy object veneration, and of historical examples of divine punishment. It is thus somewhat analogous to Iosif's *Слово* 7^{Pr}, his general handbook of faith and morals, which also would have taken about two hours to read: Казакова/Лурье. С. 335–360; *Просветитель*. С. 254–332.

⁵ Попов А. *Книга Еразма о святой Троице*. С. 62–98: The four-part second item of this purported trilogy, *Слово о Божии сотворении тричастнем*, is the most original of any of Muscovy's exegesis, in that it attempts to find trinary principles in everything that has proceeded according to the divine plan. If the first two sections find these troikas in all sorts of occurrences and phenomena from creation to Abraham and then from the prophets to Acts last section, the third is apologetic and explanatory concerning two of the major «heretical» challenges of the time – to the Trinity and to icons – and the fourth section, running from the redemption to personal salvation, is a serious sermon on steadfastness and repentance. Read aloud clearly, it could have taken about 80 minutes.

6. The brief instruction-sermon⁶.
7. The prayer-sermon⁷.
8. The genuine, ethically grounded sermon⁸.
9. The reform proposal as sermon⁹.

⁶ As the three-minute *Поучение о Троицном пении*, which follows in the *Трилогия* of the 1560s MS, is a little sermon-instruction of how and how often to perform the various Trinity incantations: it originally was a separate work, grouped with the real sermons in the 1550s MS: Попов А. *Книга Еразма о святой Троице*. С. 99–100; Дмитриева Р. П. *Повесть о Петре и Февронии*. С. 115–116. Next come three brief prayers, but the one to Jesus, *благодатью первоначальнейших на наставник пустынножительствоу*, has a deceptively sermonizing title *Совершение тщащимся к пустынножительствоу*, as if by the very act of prayer one accepts the teachings of the addressee: Попов А. *Книга Еразма о святой Троице*. С. 100–101. In Sol. 287/307, *Поучение о Троицном пении* comes after *Слово о рассуждении любви и правды*, and then *Слово к верным*, but before *К своей ему душе поучение*.

⁷ Попов А. *Книга Еразма о святой Троице*. С. 102–116: the third of this trilogy, *Молитва ко Господу Богу, пресвятыи и пребесначалней и неразделней и неразлучней Троицы*, which originally followed *Слово о пребольшей*, is a half-hour ordered string of exactly 100 poetic incantations to the divinity, again starting with creation and ending with the last judgment, and throughout asking for aid for the supplicant to be ethically and ritually active in the pursuit of his salvation. In his 1560s сборник, Ermolai also included what has been termed his *Малая Трилогия*: a 10–15 minute *Слово на еретики*, which apparently has some original, quaternary principle theological speculation; a ca. 25-minute *Слово на жиди и еретики* in defense of rituals; and the 10–15 minute *Краткая молитва Троице*, a brief redaction of the *Молитва* discussed above. As they are unpublished, and I have not had a chance to read and analyze them, I cannot comment on their sermon content. Between the first and second of these pieces is a separate five-minute *Беседа* on the life Jesus, with nine laconic questions and answers, similar to points raised in the first two *слова* of the *Большая Трилогия*: Ржигга В. Ф. *Литературная деятельность Ермолая-Еразма // Летопись занятий Академии Наук*. 1926, вып. 33. С. 147–151; Клибанов А. И. *Сборник сочинений Ермолая-Еразма // ТОДРЛ*. 1960, т. 16. С. 179–180.

⁸ Ermolai's three genuine sermons: the 45-50 minute *Слово о рассужении любви и правде и о повеждении вражде и лже*, the 20-25 minute *Слово к верным, иже христианина словом нарицаются, Богови же супротивящиеся коварству и в сем на сиа грех не возлагают*; and the 15-20 minute *К своей ему душе поучение*. The first, centering on the Trinity as model of love, is a detailed attack on the selfish rich and a call for charity and what we would term today voluntary, faith-base initiatives to promote social peace Клибанов А. И. *Сборник сочинений Ермолая-Еразма*. С. 188–198. The second combines an excoriation of shaving and facial cosmetics, as a violation of God's creation, with a diatribe against monastic wealth and a warning of the moral danger from the donation of villages to cloisters: Клибанов А. И. *Сборник сочинений Ермолая-Еразма*. С. 198–203. The third is hardly «*Most Sinful Ermolai's Instruction to His Own Soul*», as the title suggests, but a properly composed sermon, which attacks pride among officials, false alms, and fornication, and then demands that one honor priests. Шляпин И. *Ермолай прегрешный*. С. 555–561.

⁹ The 20–25 minute *Правительница*, directed to the sovereign and composed when Ermolai was in Pskov or Moscow, is a mini-treatise combined with a petition containing an embedded sermon. Ermolai takes a chain of thought from the *Wisdom of Solomon* for kings to the plight of Russia's peasant. Next, invoking the model of Joseph's

10. Poetic, gnostic *Glavy* as Sermon¹⁰.

policies in Ancient Egypt, Ermolai makes concrete, carefully calculated suggestions to alter the «geometric» basis of the distribution of service lands, ending with the suggestion that the servicemen live in the cities, away from the peasants who provide the sustenance. He then shifts over to the problem of taverns in Pskov, with a racy description of a rather lusty singles pick-up scene, which materializes once the alcohol has taken effect upon the customers, and demands the suppression not only of taverns, but also, the prohibition of the manufacture of pointed daggers – what we might call a «knife control» measure – to reduce the incidence of murder, and then ends with a closing invocation: Ржигя В. Ф. *Литературная деятельность Ермолая-Еразма*. С. 193–199, and *Сочинения Ермолая-Еразма*. С. 652–663.

¹⁰ The ten *Главы о увещании утешительном царем, аще и хотещи, и велмож* (maybe twelve minutes in toto), which likely come from Ermolai's later, monastic period, are each mini-sermons: six for the «царь», two for «велмож», one for bishops, and one for commoners, of which total five are for joyful occasions (the tsar has a boy baby; he captures enemy cities; and he defeats domestic foes; the magnate and the bishop are appointed to office); four for sad occurrences (the tsar has a girl baby[!]; his baby dies; or he loses soldiers in battle; the magnate is disgraced) and the one for commoners is for all occasions. Taken together, these comprise a comprehensive sermon on God's relation to man in this world and how men should react to the everyday events in the light of God's ultimate design, including the birth of daughters, who are necessary for procreation. Implicitly foregrounding everyone's duty to the Heavenly King, Ermolai here typically emphasizes responsibility, repentance, and peace, and he specifically summons the «царь», to «convert his wrath into mercy»: Клибанов А. И. *Сборник сочинения Ермолая-Еразма*. С. 203–207.

Here is a partial summary of the ideas in the ten *главы*:

God creates all, including our seed, our progeny (1).

God's creation, women, is good too (2).

God is responsible for all the good which we obtain and for our successes (1, 3), for all is foreordained (3).

God selected the Apostles (and apostle-like princes) to spread faith (4).

God, by creating everything and giving man a soul, knows births and deaths (5).

God punishes us to lead us to repentance and to purify us (6).

God elevates people on earth (7-8).

God degrades the righteous as well as the sinner (9).

God cares for all of us (10).

God especially rewards those who beseech him and his saints (1).

God gives someone what he wants, only after he accepts what he has been given (2).

God will grant success to the merciful (ruler) (3).

A victorious person should be humble and avoid enmity (and therefore «you» {the царь} should please such «relatives» as Borys & Hlib) (4).

Christ's death is our model (5).

Not accepting the resurrection of dead (thus not rejoicing in the death of a sinless baby) represents the «Saduceean heresy» (denying the general resurrection) (5).

God can righteously reward us only if we are pure (6).

Bishops must follow the Apostles and lay down their souls for their flock (7).

Our duty to the heavenly king implicitly precedes that to the earthly king (8).

God wants to receive in heaven the shining righteous ones (9).

John the Baptist, SS Peter and Paul, and Christ are our proper models for righteous suffering (9).

God's words do not pass (10).

God's inexorable calculus of rewards and punishments is always operative (1–10).