

Paola Cotta Ramusino

How to Behave at Home and in Society: Karion Istomin's *Domostroj* and Its Possible Sources

Along with the well-known 16th century *Domostroj*, there is, in Russian literature, another *Domostroj*, probably less known, written by Karion Istomin¹ in the second half of the 1690s. The title *Domostroj* was not chosen by the author himself, but by the first editor of the treatise (Byčkov 1862: 126), who had probably in mind Sil'vestr's *Domostroj*. Later, S.N. Brailovskij, the first scholar to write a monograph about Karion Istomin, published passages (Brailovskij 1902: 268-273) of the treatise from the text found in the manuscript volumes². If Brailovskij highlighted the ideological context in which Karion's *Domostroj* was written – that is, the beginning of the Enlightenment, and a rising need for social changes and for the diffusion of new ethical and social values – he also suggested, less correctly, that *Domostroj* could be seen as a sort of autobiographical work reflecting Karion's family social status of “znatnye ljudi” (Brailovskij 1902: 7).

The treatise consists of 14 untitled stanzas³, concerning children's behaviour in different situations. In the first stanza the author invites children to behave themselves well and to study, if they do not want to be punished (“Кто не радует, не делавиш ленился / за безчинство той и бити годится”). The 2nd, 3rd, and 4th stanzas concern children's behaviour at home: their activities during the day, at what time they should wake up and so on. The 5th stanza is about how to behave “vne doma” (outside). Stanzas 6, 7, 8 are about lunch and the proper things to do while eating. Stanzas 9, 10 and 11 concern afternoon and evening and invite children to go to bed early and not to waste time in bad companies. The 12th stanza gives some pieces of advice about how to blow one's nose and how to sleep properly, and things like that. Stanza 13 concerns children's games. The last stanza is a conclusive moral statement, in which Karion advises children to follow his teachings.

Brailovskij (1902: 268) showed that the comparison between this treatise and the 16th century *Domostroj* was not very convincing: other sources had to be investigated.

¹ Karion Istomin (1640-1718 or 1722), monk of the *Čudov monastery*, *pisec*, *čtec* and finally *smotritel'* (director) of the Pečatnyj Dvor. About his life and works see Sazonova 1993 and Cotta Ramusino 2002.

² See GIM, *Čudovskoe sobranie*, N 302, ff. 49-50v.

³ We follow the text published, on the basis of the manuscript in *Čudovskoe sobranie*, N 302, by A.M. Pančenko (1970: 206-211).

Alekseev's article about Erasmus' fortune in Russia in the 17th century marked a turning point in scholarly research on the subject. In his essay, the philologist convincingly demonstrated that *Graždanstvo obyčaeu detskich* – an important treatise about children education circulating in several copies in 17th century Moscow Rus' – was not an original work, but a translation from Erasmus (*De civilitate morum puerilium*) done by Epifanij Slavineckij (Alekseev 1958: 255-330). Following this up, and also taking into account that Karion knew and worked with Epifanij's pupil Evfimij Čudovskij and that the ideas of *Graždanstvo* were to a certain extent relevant to Karion's interests already in the early '80s, a few years later Agarkova suggested that Karion's *Domostroj* might be considered a "pereloženie" of *Graždanstvo*⁴ (Agarkova 1967: 109-110). A closer comparison of the two works reveals considerable differences as to structure and form itself: *Graždanstvo obyčaeu detskich* is a long treatise in the question-answer form⁵, consisting of an introduction and eight chapters (the first without title followed by "O odějanii", "O npravach v crkvi", "O besēdē", "O npravach na srētenii", "O obyčaeach vo učilišči i kako slušati čtenija", "O igranii", "O loži ili ložnicē") for a total of 163 questions, whereas Karion's *Domostroj* is a short composition in verse concerning just some points of children's behaviour. Anyway, let us compare the similar passages:

*Graždanstvo Obyčaeu detskich*⁶*Domostroj*⁷

83) В. Како отрок стол устрои имат. О. <u>Скaтeрть бѣдую постeдeт: сoсудo-пocтaвкy пoсрeдѣ пoлoжит тaлeри</u> принесет	<u>Осмотрeти стoл, скaтeрть бeдy слaти</u> <u>/ хлeб, сoль и лжицы, тaрeли сoбрати</u> (6)
86) В. Како трeбѣ естѣ стoлa сoбрати	<u>Сo стoлa сoбeри всякы нa нeм вeщы</u> (8)
98) О. (...) лyчшe чacтo пo мaлy нeжe eдинoци мнoгo дaбы дѣтицe чрeз мѣрy	Кyшaй пo мaлy, чeгo дoвeдeтcя... (7)

⁴ A copy of *Graždanstvo* is present in Karion's manuscript volumes of GIM, *Uvarov sobranie*, N° 73, f. 73-93v.

⁵ Erasmus' treatise was widespread in 16th and 17th century Europe in the question-answer form, to which it had been reduced by Hadamarius, and in this form it was also known in Russia, where it arrived, probably, through Poland (Čislenko 1978: 5-17).

⁶ Quoted from Buš (1918: 33-57).

⁷ Pančenko 1970: 206-211. In brackets the numbers of the stanzas.

- 140) В. Достоит ли по всему блюду И не разгребай на блюде рукою (7)
руками рыгги...?
- 149) В. Кия игры заповѣданны суть? Костми и карты в деньги возбранити (13)
О. Всякое костьство кости карты купание в водѣ.
- 150) В. Кая же убо упражнения суть Игра же летом приличная буди (...) мечик и кубарь, городаи и клетки...(13)
честная и дѣтем приличная.
О. Кубарь, мечик кики...
- 159) В. Вечер пришеде (...) что долженствует творити отрок. Пришеде к вечеру...(10)
- 160) В. В началѣ что имать памятовати отрок в ложницѣ своей. В постели улы срамны прикрывай, / и спи на боках, честно везде бывай. (12)
О. (...) ничто же не обычай но ничтоже безстыдно сотворит (...)
- 162) В. Како долженствует спати лещи отрок.
О. (...) первѣ на правый бок

If it is indeed undeniable that there are instances of correspondences (see examples underlined with dots) – probably justified by the fact that Karion himself had a copy of the treatise⁸ – it is nevertheless my opinion that *Graždanstvo* could hardly be considered more than an inspiration, or, at least, only one of the possible sources.

Among the pedagogical treatises of the time, one should not forget *Praecepta Morum*, a small work on child education written by the Czech pedagogue Jan Amos Comenius and published in 1653. The Soviet scholar Medynskij tried to demonstrate, although not convincingly enough, that *Praecepta Morum* was the source for *Graždanstvo obyčajev detskich*⁹. Doing so he highlighted an extremely relevant question, that is, to what extent *Praecepta* can be considered “original” or rather one of the several imitations of Erasmus’ work (Elias 1988: 168 and Revel 1987:130-131). At the same time he introduced another issue: to what extent were Comenius and his works known in Moscow Rus? The only existing monograph concerning Comenius’ presence in Russia, it is Čuma’s work (Čuma 1970), which reconstructs Comenius’ influence from around the middle of the 17th Century to the end of the 18th.

As the Czech scholar (Čuma 1970: 16) has pointed out, we find Comenius’ traces both in the *Katalog slavjanorossijskim rukopisjam (pogibšim v 1812 godu) professora*

⁸ See GIM, *sobranie Uvarova*, № 73, ff. 73-93v.

⁹ For further discussion see Čuma (1970: 23).

Bauze [Professor Bauze's Catalogue of Russian Manuscripts destroyed in 1812], where under No. 27 we read *Komeniev mir v licach*¹⁰, *napečatannyj na pjati jazykov*, 1679. *Na poljach napisan k tomu rossijskij perevod rukoju togo že vremeni, v četvertku*¹¹, and in Orlov's preface to *Biblioteka Moskovskoj Sinodal'noj Tipografii (časť I – rukopisi, vypusk 1, sborniki, Moskva 1896, NN 3182-4036)*, which lists 854 Latin books, among which there are, of course, some Comenius' works. Most of them belonged, according to Orlov, to Simeon Polockij, Sil'vestr Medvedev and Dimitrij Rostovskij.

The Library of the Russian Archive of Ancient Acts (RGADA) is indeed a precious source: in his work Čuma quoted one copy of *OSP* (Nürnberg edition, 1682), under shelf-mark "CT3877"¹². It is a bilingual edition, Latin and German, with white sheets inserted for pupils' exercises (Čuma 1970: 16), which probably belonged to the monk German. The marginalia still present on the pages of these books (translation of words from Latin into Church Slavonic) clearly show that they were used as school material. According to Čuma (1970: 17) a similar copy of *OSP* in four languages "Latino-Gallico-Germano-Polonice", but edited in Bregae Silesiorum in 1667, is now in S. Petersburg, at the Library of the Academy of Sciences (BAN). Since the publication of this monograph, in 1970, RGADA Library has undergone a thorough reorganization and ancient books, until then hidden in dusty trunks, have been taken out and inserted in the catalogue. As a result, another edition of *OSP* (Nurnberg 1698¹³) can now be added to the copy quoted by Čuma (Nurnberg 1682). In addition to that, there are several editions of *Januae Latinitatis Vestibulum*¹⁴ and one copy, which belonged to Silvestr Medvedev, of *Aureae Januae Linguarum reserata sive Seminarii*, edited in Hamburg in 1635¹⁵. Another edition of *Januae*, London 1685, is in ORI (Otdel Redkich Izdanij), under N 2920.

In addition to the tangible presence of Comenius' books in Russian libraries and archives, and as a consequence of it, there is another, even more significant, presence which needs further enquiry: the influence of Comenius' thought on Russian works of the second half of the XVII century, that is to say, mostly on Simeon Polockij's, Sil'vestr Medvedev's and Karion Istomin's writings.

Scholars¹⁶ have underlined how, both in *Obed duševnyj* [*Spiritual Dinner*] and *Večerja duševnaja* [*Spiritual Supper*], Simeon devoted great attention to education. Demkov first tried to point out Simeon's contribution to Russian pedagogical thought but without identifying its sources. In a later article the scholar seemed to identify John Locke as a possible source, which is, indeed, extremely unlikely. Rodnikov (1913: 231-245) went

¹⁰ *Orbis sensualium rerum pictus* (from now on *OSP*).

¹¹ As the title itself suggests, the manuscript was burnt in the big Moscow fire in 1812, so we can only guess at this "Russian" translation.

¹² New shelf-mark: BMST/in. 2009.

¹³ BMST/in. 2010-2020.

¹⁴ BMST/in. 1814-1816. These books should correspond to the 11th Leipzig edition, although the date clearly written on the frontispice is 1604.

¹⁵ BMST/in. 1817.

¹⁶ See Čuma 1970: 17-19.

further on and showed that the most likely source was Comenius' *Didactica Magna* (DM)¹⁷. The concepts found both in *Večerija* and *Obed*, of course, were not new, and go back, in most cases, to Plato and Aristotle, and although they are present both in Simeon and in Comenius it is not possible to infer that Simeon's source was Comenius.

As far as Karion is concerned, it is indisputable that Comenius was part of his readings. Before going back to *Domostroj*, I would like, to begin with, to compare some passages concerning education from Comenius (both from *OSP* and *DM*) with some from Karion Istomin. The first passages from Karion Istomin are taken from his *Bukvar*¹⁸.

Comenius

Karion Istomin

Descriptiones sunt partium Picturae explicationes, propriis suis appellationibus ita expressae [...] Qui talis Libellus, tali hoc apparatu, serviat, spero: Primum, ad allucendum huc Ingenia, ne sibi crucem in Schola imaginentur, sed delicias. Notum enim est, Pueros (ab ipsa propemodum infantia) picturis delectari, oculosque his spectaculis libenter pascere¹⁹.

Literarum Lectioni facilius quam hactenus ad discenda, stratagema suppeditabit: praesertim eidem praemisso Alphabeto Symbolico, Literarum nempe singularum characteribus, cum appicta Animalis istius, cujus vocem Litera illa imitatum it, imagine.

... sed omnes pariter, nobiles et ignobiles, divites et pauperes pueros et puellas (...) scholis esse adhibendos sequentia evincunt (DM IX, 1)²⁰.

Под всяким же писменем, ради любезнаго созерцания отрочатом учащимся предложены виды во удобное званье в складѣ: да что видит, сие и назовет слогом писмене достолѣннаго начертания тѣх.

И на тѣ видообразныя вещи, приличны юным людям метафорично си есть преноснѣ, еже от вещей слово к дѣлу потребну вземлется, стихи нравоучительны суть.

Изобразися надписицах ваяннем, имущим учитися отроком и отроковицам мужем и женам писати.

¹⁷ For the treatment of the two positions, see Čuma 1970: 18-19.

¹⁸ Karion Istomin 1694. The first three passages are quoted from author's introduction.

¹⁹ J.A. Comenius 1698. The first two passages are taken from author's *Preface*.

²⁰ It is a quotation from *Didactica Magna* (from now on *DM*), in *Opera Didactica Omnia* (from now on *ODO*), Comenius 1657. In brackets the number of chapters and of paragraphs.

...salutari consilio jam pridem introductum est, ut personis delectis, rerum intelligentia et morum gravitate conspicuis, multorum simul liberi concredantur erudiendi. (DM VIII, 2)

Б: Человѣкомъ есть брада совершенство / младымъ слушати старыхъ людей дѣнство

Т: при старыхъ твердо научишься жити, / тако и иныхъ имаши учити.

Ч: В чолну разума в книгахъ проезжайся, / людемъ избраннымъ вездѣ приобщиайся.

The evident similarity notwithstanding, in his *Preface* to the *Bukvar*, Karion, quite puzzlingly, wrote:

Ибо в новости с трудом, и иждивением собирая и издася (Karion Istomin 1694: 3)

that is to say, what you read and see is a product of my own mind, I did not take it from anyone else. (“excusatio non petita, accusatio manifesta”, one could remark!)

It is worth observing that we find the same ideas in other works written by Karion in the ‘80s and ‘90s; in particular, he emphasized them very much in the panegyric written for Peter the Great, *Kniga Vrazumlenie umnago zřenija telesnago dĕlanija v Božĕj mudrosti* (Cotta Ramusino 2002), from which the following lines are taken (in brackets the numbers of the lines):

Аще в юны твоя Примеши мудрость	лѣта, свѣта. (19-20)
Зѣло добро учися той Возраститъ ты буди о ней	во юности, без трудности. в добродѣтель. прирадѣтель. (35-38)
На ню царю В юных тою Отрок еси ты путь мудрости	восклонися, удобрися. разумен есть не труден. (77-80)
В мудрости учится С рабы в лѣтех Да будут	рости, прости. твоими, равными. умны,

в дѣлѣх	разумны ²¹ . (111-116)
Учися нынѣ в младости твоей	прилѣжно учися, царь мудр просвѣтися. (139-140)
ПЕТРЕ мой царю и юных слуг ти	мене не остави, к мудрости управи. (155-156)
Ей же убо ты спрязися в юных Поистиннѣ ты учащася	дражайший мой сыне, твоих лѣтех нынѣ. имать просвѣтити, имать умудрити. (377-380)
Да учатся той и собирают Навыкнут же той да свободятся	юнѣйшыя дѣти, разумныя цвѣты, свершеннии мужи, от всякия нужи. (447-450)
Да учатся той и навикают	юны отрочата, зѣло дѣла свята. (569-570)

As a matter of fact, although Comenius' influence on Karion seems to be at times self-evident, scholars are very careful in claiming it. Not long ago, for instance, the Russian historian and Istomin scholar A.P. Bogdanov, in an article concerning Karion and Comenius, wrote that “следует, однако, отметить, что близость букварей Истомина к *Миру чувственных вещей* Коменского не очевидна” (Bogdanov 1989a: 129). Furthermore, Okenfuss discusses the characteristics of Karion's and of Comenius' primers separately, as if they were completely independent things and about Karion Istomin he writes that he “made an original contribution to this active learning as well” and that his primer “represented an exceptional rejection of the traditional alphabetic method of learning to read in the early modern period” (Okenfuss 1980: 26-27).

The differences between *OSP* and the Russian primer are undeniably evident: Comenius depicted a pre-bourgeois society, in which the different arts and crafts had a precise role; he treated all the different aspects of reality, religion and sciences. The complexity of the world of *OSP* is not comparable to what we find in Karion's *Bukvar'*. A superficial glance at the two primers reveals a certain distance, but, after ascertaining the differences between them, one should not neglect the deep similarity

²¹ See Comenius' *DM* (1657: VIII, 7): “quia nimirum laborum & fructus & jucunditas major inest, quum alii ab aliis exempla sumunt & impetum. Agere enim, quae alios agere; & ire quo alios ire, videmus; & praecedentes sequi, sequentibus praecire, naturalissimum est. (...) Infantilis praesertim aetas magis omnino exemplis quam regulis ducitur & regitur. Si quid praecipis, parum haeret: si quid alios facere commonstras, imitantur etiam non jussi”.

connecting them, which is at the core of the innovative part of both primers: the use of *nagljadnost'*. The use of pictures and the structure of the page are, as a matter of fact, very close, although in the written part Comenius gives a complete, more or less encyclopedic description of the picture, with a deep attention to the linguistic aspect of the text (syntax and grammar) whereas Karion prefers to give a description, sometimes quite funny, in verse, of the objects presented in the upper part of the page. The encyclopedic idea, common both to *OSP* and to *Janua reserata linguarum*, was adopted by Karion himself in a series of other works like *Ekklesija*, *Polis*, and some other texts still unpublished. In particular, it has been noticed (Bogdanov 1989a: 132) that *Grad carstva nebesnago* (Bogdanov 1989b: 131-144) strongly recalls *OSP*, in the sense that, even if the content is not the same, the idea and the didactic means are very close. “В Граде (...) содержание делится как бы на три части. В первой читателю предлагались знания об основных школьных науках того времени (...). Во второй по смыслу части речь шла о частях времени (день, ночь, часы, весна, лето, осень, зима, год), странах и частях света (восток, юг, запад, север...). Затем следовало *благодарение*” (Bogdanov 1989a: 132). So, as one can see, here Karion decided to present pupils with concepts structured in a system, and, more than that, to add explanatory pictures to the verses. No copy with pictures has been found, but the frame makes us suppose that they should have completed the final copy. Bogdanov dismisses these suggestions as insufficient to demonstrate Comenius' influence on the Russian writer, on the grounds that such works were quite common during the 17th century. What most significantly shows the penetration of Comenius' ideas, in his opinion, is the structure of Karion's “*učebnye sočinenija*”. Probably the scholar has in mind a *sbornik* (GIM, sobr. Uvarova, № 73), in which Karion collected his pedagogical works, among which we find, along with *Grad, Edem, si est' sladost'* and *Ekklesija, si est' cerkov'*, written for Aleksej Petrovič. In *Edem*, Karion exposed the fundamentals of religious dogmas, whereas in *Ekklesija* he explained church mysteries and rites. In Bogdanov's opinion these three works form a triptych which should have given the pupil “законченный цикл понятий об окружающем мире, мире не предметном, но интеллектуальном, духовном” (Bogdanov 1989a: 140) and which acquires a character of universalism, that allows scholars to compare it with Comenius' *OSP*.

Let us now go back to *Domostroj* and *Praecepta*. So far, no Slavic version of *Praecepta*, which could satisfactorily demonstrate the possibility of a direct reading, nor a Latin version of the 17th century (circulating in Russia), has been found. Nevertheless, a comparison between Comenius' Latin version and Karion's *Domostroj* can be of some interest as it shows the many and, in my opinion, more than casual coincidences between the two texts. *Praecepta* are divided into 16 chapters, entitled as follows: I. *De Moribus in genere*, II. *De Vultu, totiusque Corporis statu & gestu*, III. *Gestus circa naturales Actiones*, IV. *De Cultu & Vestitu*, V. *De Incessu*, VI. *In Sermone*, VII. *Mores matutini*, VIII. *Mores in Schola*, IX. *Erga Praeceptorem*, X. *Erga condiscipulos*, XI. *In conversatione cum quibusvis*, XII. *In Templo*, XIII. *Ad Mensam*, XIV. *A Prandio*, XV. *In Ludu*

& recreatione, XVI. *Mores Vespertini*²², whereas *Domostroj* consists, as we have already seen, of 14 untitled stanzas, whose contents seem to correspond to Comenius' short chapters.

*Praecepta morum**Domostroj*²³

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. <u>Quum primum evigilaveris, Deum cogita..</u> (VII, 2) | <u>От сна скоро встав,</u> яко сотворенный,
/ <u>Бога помяни,</u> яко в то вчиненный....
(2) |
| 2. <u>Deditus literis somnolentus non erit: septem horis somno datis ad vigiliam festinabit.</u> (VII, 1) | Во дни и в ноци спати челоуѣку /
<u>токмо шесть часов,</u> – не утратит вѣку.
(11) |
| 3. <u>Lecto egressus capillitium come, manus & vultum aqua munda abluе, os proluе, vestes decenter induе.</u> (VII, 3) | (От сна скоро встав...) <u>С молитвою же</u>
<u>умыйся, одейся,</u> / <u>главу почесав, мый</u>
<u>уста, не смейся...</u> (2) |
| 4. <u>Quibuscunque in conspectum venis, felicem diem apprecare.</u> (VII, 4) | И родителем чинно поклонися, / <u>при-</u>
<u>ятством ко всѣм в дому си явися.</u> (2) |
| 5. In plateis, & ubicunque in hominum conspectu,... (V, 2) <u>Incedes autem pedes aequaliter movendo,</u> non subsultando, <u>non brachia iactando,</u> (...) <u>nec respectando subinde, retro vel ad latera</u> etc. (V, 4) | Ити по пути, кому где надлежит, / (...)
ход свой сотвориай <u>очей не раскиня</u> /
<u>руками не мажь,</u> <u>не прыскай ногами</u>
(5) |
| 6. <u>...alio autem amandatus, fideliter negotium expedi, ocusque redi</u> (VIII, 11) | (Не стой на пути гдѣ ждут тя часами) /
Срелся кто честен знаем, поклонися, /
<u>дѣло, ответ взяв, в дом скоро вратися</u>
(5) |
| 7. <u>Preces ante & post cibum nunquam intermittuntor:</u> Benedictio enim pluit de super. (XIII, 2) | <u>Кто ясти имать,</u> достоит внимати: /
<u>молитви прежде тишися Богу воздати</u>
(7) |
| 8. <u>Adolescenti edendum est ad refectiоnem, non ad ingluviem.</u> (XIII, 6) | <u>Купай по малу,</u> чего доведется, по-
ядший испий, егда поднесется (7) |

²² *Praecepta Morum* (from now on *PM*), in Comenius 1657. In brackets the numbers of the chapters and of the paragraphs.

²³ Quoted from Pančenko 1970: 206-211. In brackets the number of the stanzas.

9. Et Panem dapesque caeteras manibus frangere (...) Et praelingere digitos (XIII, 5) И не разгребай на блюдѣ рукою, не обляжь на стол, не колышь ногою (7)
10. Et bibendum ore absterso, & modice: non ultra duos, aut ad summum tres, moderatos haustus (XIII, 7) Брашны, питием юн не тяготися. (7)
11. Puer ad mensam nihil loquatur, nisi rogatus. (XIII, 8) Не обращай легкомысленно вскоре, / при честных людех не глаголи в сюре. (7)
12. A sacris Coetibus nemo se absenter, cui gloria Dei salusque propria cordi est. (XII, 1) Христианских бо дѣтей се порода / не лишатися в церковь святу хода (9)
13. Si mucus nares gravat, emunge illum: at non manica vel pileo, sed strophiole aut digitis duobus, (aversus itidem) ne manum commacules: ejectamque pituita protere pede, ne cui nausea creetur. (III, 4) Очи, нос, уста отирати платом, / ...Мокроты своей пред кѣм не поверзи, / отвратясь, притри, никого тѣм не мерзи (12)
14. Lectum ingressus, neque pronus cubueris neque supinus: sed primum lateri dextro innitens, a media vero nocte sinistro, valetudinis causa. (XVI, 7) В постели уды срамны прикрывай, / и спи на боках, честно вездѣ бывай (12)
15. Quando a laboribus conceditur relaxatio, Ludo te recrea, qui corpori motionem, & Animo vegetatione adferat: quales sunt Trochus, Globuli, Globus & Coni, Pila, Cursus, Saltus. Omnia tamen moderate: nec cura Praeceptoris praesentiam, aut veniam. (XV, 1) Но и возрастным юных назирати, / ради отрады дать время играти. / Игра же дѣтем приличная буди, / да не вредятся очи их и груди: / Мечик и кубарь, городи и клетки, / бѣгают, плетут, ловят, мещут сетки (13)
16. Ludi prohibiti sunt Alea, seu Testerae, Chartae pictae, Lucta, ... (XV, 2) Костми и карты в денги возбранити...(13)

Still, there are some passages which, although not literally similar, strongly recall *Praecepta Morum*.

Morum fundamentum est Animus ita compositus, ut Deo & Hominibus bonis placere volupe sibi ducat. (I, 1)

Animus purus tibi sit proper Deum & conscientiam: Vultus autem, & Cultus, & Sermo & omnia externa, munda & honesta, propter Angelos & homines. (I, 4)

Spurcum quid si necessario dicendum est (...) ut res minus honesta non nisi honeste velata ad aures & animum veniat. (VI, 8)

Oculi non vagi, non limi, non distorti (...) sed verecundi... (II, 5)

Учения zde краткаго внимайте, / есть себе, славу в Бозѣ восплодите. / Умно-словна бо душа в чловѣцѣ, / учитися долг всяк в своем вецѣ. / Аще же свята нрава та навыкнет, / повсюду Богу песнь сладку воскликнет. (1)

Но во всем буди честность показуй, / не произноси скверна слова буй. (4)

В подменство не даждь на тебе порока, / в воздержании блуди твоя ока (4)

The number of similar passages in *Praecepta Morum* and *Domostrój* seems to be of greater relevance than in the latter one and *Graždanstvo*, thus suggesting, even without a concrete source, Karion's knowledge of *Praecepta*. There is, for instance, a hint at the number of hours a child should sleep, which, even if not completely equal (six hours in Karion and seven in Comenius), is not present in Erasmus' text and is quite new for the Russian society of the time (Živov 2003: 22). Taken for granted that *Praecepta* is one of the several imitations of Erasmus' work, which in turn is a renewed use of traditional material (Revel 1987: 130), Karion's transformation of these contents can be considered an attempt to introduce in Russia, a century and a half later than in Europe, the codification of good manners as an essential part of the new, dominating courtly society. Furthermore, to conclude, we should take into account that what Karion probably did with Comenius' work was not a simple translation or copy of his texts. So, on the one side, we can talk about a general theoretical influence on Karion and his circle, and on the other, of a more concrete one, if we accept the hypothesis of the dependence of *Domostrój* on *Praecepta*. Karion was, and considered himself, mainly a poet, and as a poet he did, in my opinion, a *pereloženie na russkie nrawy* of Comenius' works, much earlier than the 18th century writers, poets and scholars.

Abbreviations

GIM	Gosudarstvennyj Istoričeskij Muzej
RGADA	Rossijskij Gosudarstvennyj Archiv Drevnich Aktov
DM	<i>Didactica Magna</i>
ODO	<i>Opera Didactica Omnia</i> (Comenius 1698)
OSP	<i>Orbis sensualium rerum pictus</i> (Comenius 1657)

Bibliography

- Agarkova 1967: R.K. Agarkova, *Spornye voprosy biografii Kariona Istomina*, "Dušanbinskij gos. ped. inst. im. Ševčenko, Jazykoznanie i literaturovedenie", LI, 1967, pp. 109-112.
- Alekseev 1958: M.P. Alekseev, *Erazm Rotterdamskij v russkom perevode XVII veka*, in: V.V. Vinogradov and oth. (eds.), *Slavjanskaja filologija: IV Meždunarodnyj s'ezd slavistov*, I, M. 1958, pp. 255-330.
- Bogdanov 1989a: A.P. Bogdanov, *Karion Istomin i Jan Amos Komenskij (k probleme osvoenija tvorčeskogo nasledija "učitelja narodov" v Rossii XVII veka)*, "Acta Comeniana. Revue Internationale des études comeniologiques", VIII, 1989, pp. 127-147.
- Bogdanov 1989b: A.P. Bogdanov, *Pamjatnik ruskoj pedagogiki XVII veka*, in: B.G. Litvak (ed.), *Issledovanija po istočnikovedeniju istorii SSSR dooktjabr'skogo perioda*, M. 1989, pp. 96-144.
- Brailovskij 1902: S.N. Brailovskij, *Odin iz pestrych XVII stoletija*, SPb. 1902.
- Buš 1918: V.V. Buš, *Pamjatniki starinnago russkago vospitanija*, Pg. 1918, pp. 33-57.
- Byčkov 1862: A. Byčkov, *Domostroj Kariona Istomina*, "Letopis' zanjatij Archeografičeskoj komissii za 1862-1863 gody", 1862, 2, pp. 126-132.
- Čislenko 1978: N.D. Čislenko, *Graždanstvo obyčuev detskich" i ego polskij istočnik*, in: M.P. Alekseev (ed.), *Zarubežnye slavnjane i russkaja kul'tura*, L. 1978, pp. 5-17.
- Comenius 1657: J.A. Comenius, *Opera didactica omnia*, Amsterdam 1657 (photo-static edition Prague 1957).
- Comenius 1698: J.A. Comenius, *Orbis Sensualium Pictus*, Nürnberg 1698.
- Cotta Ramusino 2002: P. Cotta Ramusino, *Un poeta alla corte degli zar. Karion Istomin e il panegirico imperiale*, Alessandria 2002.
- Čuma 1970: A. Čuma, *Jan Amos Komenskij i russkaja škola (do 70 godov XVIII veka)*, Bratislava 1970.
- Demkov 1895: M.I. Demkov, *Istorija ruskoj pedagogiki*, Revel' 1895 (cf. I, 23: *Simeon Polockij i ego pedagogičeskie vzgljady*).
- Elias 1988: N. Elias, *Il processo di civilizzazione*, Bologna 1988.
- Karion Istomin 1694: Karion Istomin, *Bukvar' sostavljen Karionom Istominym gravirovan Leontiem Buninym opečatan v 1694 godu v Moskve*, photostatic edition, M. 1981.
- Okenfuss 1980: M. Okenfuss, *The discovery of Childhood in Russia. The Evidence of the Slavic primer*, Newtonville 1980, pp. 26-27.
- Pančenko 1970: A.M. Pančenko, *Russkaja sillabičeskaja počezija*, L. 1970.

- Revel 1987: J. Revel, *Gli "usi" delle buone maniere*, in: P. Ariés, G. Duby (eds.), *La vita privata dal Rinascimento all'Illuminismo*, Roma-Bari 1987, pp. 125-160.
- Rodnikov 1913: V. Rodnikov, *Dva temnych mesta v našej pedagogičeskoj literature XVI-XVII*, in: "Trudy Kievskoj Duchovnoj Akademii", VI, 1913, pp. 231-245.
- Sazonova 1993: L.I. Sazonova, *Karion Istomin*, in: D.S. Lichačev (ed.), *Slovar' knižnikov i knižnosti Drevnej Rusi*, III (XVII vek), 2 (I-O), SPb. 1993, pp. 140-152.
- Živov 2003: V.M. Živov, *Vremja i ego sobstvennik v Rossii na puti ot Carstva k Imperii*, in: M.S. Kiseleva (ed.), *Čelovek meždu Carstvom i Imperiej*, M. 2003, pp. 18-26.

Abstract

Paola Cotta Ramusino

How to Behave at Home and in Society: Karion Istomin's Domostroj and Its Possible Sources

Among Karion Istomin's pedagogical works, there is the so-called *Domostroj*, a sort of poetic book of good manners for children, written in the 1690s. Is it an original work or a translation? The question has interested scholars for decades. So far, the most convincing hypothesis is the one suggested by Agarkova (1967), that *Domostroj* might have arisen on the basis of Erasmus' treatise *De Civilitate Morum puerilium*, known in 17th century Russia in Epifanij Slavineckij's translation as *Graždanstvo Obyčaeu Detskich*. Despite the correspondences between the two texts, one could hardly regard, as Agarkova proposed, *Domostroj* as a *pereloženie* of Erasmus' treatise. In this article, I will consider another pedagogical work of the period, that is Comenius' *Praecepta Morum* and try to compare the Latin text written by Comenius and Karion's poetic text: the many correspondences seem to suggest that Comenius' treatise should be considered one of the main sources of this Russian work.