THEOLOGY AND LITERATURE

VOLUME ELEVEN
in *THE COLLECTED WORKS* of

GEORGES FLOROVSKY

Emeritus Professor of Eastern Church History
Harvard University

General Editor
RICHARD S. HAUGH
Visiting Scholar
Andover Newton Theological School

Translated from Various Languages by Translators Mentioned at the End of Each Work

BÜCHERVERTRIEBSANSTALT
Postfach 461, FL — 9490 Vaduz, Europa
[Exclusive Sales Agent: Notable & Academic Books
P. O. Box 470, Belmont, MA {USA} 02178]

THEOLOGY AND LITERATURE
ISBN 3-905238-15-2

THE COLLECTED WORKS OF GEORGES FLOROVSKY

Volume I ..... *Bible, Church, Tradition: An Eastern Orthodox View*
Volume II ..... *Christianity and Culture*
Volume III ..... *Creation and Redemption*
Volume IV ..... *Aspects of Church History*
Volume V ..... *Ways of Russian Theology: Part One*
Volume VI ..... *Ways of Russian Theology: Part Two*
Volume VII ..... *The Eastern Fathers of the Fourth Century*
Volume VIII ..... *The Byzantine Fathers of the Fifth Century*
Volume IX ..... *The Byzantine Fathers of the Sixth to Eighth Century*
Volume X ..... *The Byzantine Ascetic and Spiritual Fathers*
Volume XI ..... *Theology and Literature*
Volume XII ..... *Philosophy: Philosophical Problems and Movements*
Volume XIII ..... *Ecumenism I*
Volume XIV ..... *Ecumenism II*

[Additional forthcoming volumes. The final volume contains an Index to the entire *Collected Works*, Errata, Bibliography, Appendices, and Miscellanea]

SECOND PRINTING

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

"The Quest for Religion in 19th Century Literature: Three Masters — Gogol, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy," originally appeared in *Comparative Literature Studies*, vol. 3, No. 1, 1966, pp. 115-137.

"Tiutchev and Vladimir Soloviev" originally appeared in Russian in *Put'* (November-December, 1933), No. 41, pp. 3-24. *Translated from the Russian by Roberta Reeder.*

"The Historical Premonitions of Tiutchev," originally appeared in *Slavianski Kalendar' za 1924 g.* (Sofia, Bulgaria), pp. 29-42. *Translated from the Russian by E. M. Zvegintsev.* An earlier English translation appeared in *Slavonic Review*, No. 8 (London), pp. 337-349.

"The Tortuous Religious Path of Gogol," originally appeared in a slightly different version in *Puti. Translated from the Russian by Robert L. Nichols; edited by Catherine Boyle.*

"Dostoevsky and Europe" originally appeared in Bulgarian in *Slavenska Biblioteka*, II, No. 2 (Sofia, Bulgaria) in 1922. *Translated from the Bulgarian by Thomas Butler.*

"The Evolution of the Dostoevskian Concept of Human Freedom" originally appeared in *Puti. Translated from the Russian by Robert L. Nichols; edited by Catherine Boyle.*

"The Brothers Karamazov: An Evaluation of Komarovich's Work" originally appeared in *Put'* (August, 1930), No. 23. It is a review of *Die Urgestalt der Brüder Karamasoff* by V. Komarovich. *Translated from the Russian by Roberta Reeder; edited by Catherine Boyle.*

"On the Origins of the Tolstoyan World View" originally appeared as "I Istokov" in *Sovremennye Zapiski* [Contemporary Annals], No. 61 (Paris, 1936), pp. 393-400. *Translated from the Russian by Catherine Boyle.*

"Vladimir Soloviev and Dante: The Problem of Christian Empire" originally appeared in *For Roman Jakobson: Essays on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday* (The Hague: Mouton, 1956), pp. 152-160.

"The Rationalistic Religion of Tolstoy" originally appeared in *Puti. Translated from the Russian by Robert L. Nichols; edited by Catherine Boyle.*

"An Unpublished Essay by Vladimir Soloviev" originally appeared in *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie*, vol. 33 (1965), pp. 16-26. *Translated from the German by Claudia Witte; Russian text translated by Vladimir Perlovich.*

"An Unpublished Letter by Goncharov" originally appeared in *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie*, vol. 33 (1965), pp.90-100. *Translated from the German by Claudia Witte; Russian text translated by Vladimir Perlovich.*

"The Crisis of Faith in Turn-of-the Century Russian Poetry"; "From the Ascetic Mystics of Soloviev to the Mystical Romance of Blok"; and "V. V. Rozanov and the Naturalistic Fallacy" all appeared in *Puti. Translated from the Russian by Robert L. Nichols; edited by Catherine Boyle.*

APPENDIX

"A Critique of the Dostoevsky and Hawthorne Comparison"; "Dostoevsky's Vision of the Golden Age and Human Freedom"; and "The Correspondence between Tolstoy and the American Shakers: Introduction and Texts" all originally appeared in *Zapiski*. They are published here in a slightly modified version.

A NOTE FROM THE PUBLISHER ON THE APPENDIX

The three articles in the Appendix are included in this volume for two reasons. First, Fr. Florovsky was interested in the research and writing of Dr. Haugh and had read the two articles on Dostoevsky. It was not the first time that Fr. Florovsky had expressed himself publicly on the work of Dr. Haugh. About Dr. Haugh's book entitled *Photius and the Carolingians: The Trinitarian Controversy*, Fr. Florovsky wrote that the book is "*one of the major contemporary contributions to the history of Christian doctrine.*"

Fr. Florovsky wrote that Dr. Haugh's article on "Hawthorne and Dostoevsky" was "the most penetrating and perceptive work on a subject poorly handled previously. Dr. Haugh's range of knowledge in literature and theology and his perceptive analysis of the subject (especially the characters) makes this article necessary reading for a deeper knowledge of Dostoevsky and *Crime and Punishment.* To my knowledge the theological background of the worlds of both Hawthorne and Dostoevsky — and by extension, to a portion of the world of American literature, has never before been handled with such competence. Dr. Haugh's knowledge of the Church Fathers richly adds to his insightful literary analysis of Hawthorne and Dostoevsky."

Fr. Florovsky read an earlier draft of the article on "Dostoevsky's Vision of the Golden Age and Human Freedom" and considered it "one of the most perceptive and necessary works of criticism written."

The reader can judge for himself.

The article on "The Correspondence between Tolstoy and the American Shakers" was, to our knowledge, never seen by Fr. Florovsky. It is not a work of analysis but rather an introduction to a correspondence. In this sense, it fits in reasonably well with Fr. Florovsky's two works: "An Unpublished Essay by Vladimir Soloviev" and "An Unpublished Letter by Goncharov."

The second reason we are publishing these three articles in this volume is that we believe they add a special dimension to the volume, one which we are certain Fr. Florovsky would have endorsed.

The three articles form a portion of a book nearing completion by Dr. Haugh on religion and literature. They are printed here with the author's reluctant permission.

IN MEMORIAM

FR. GEORGES FLOROVSKY
1893-1979

"Preeminent Orthodox Christian Theologian, Ecumenical Spokesman, And Authority on Russian Letters."

[All quotations are from pages 5 and 11 of the *Harvard Gazette* of October 1, 1982, written by George H. Williams, Hollis Professor of Divinity *Emeritus*, Harvard Divinity School and Edward Louis Keenan, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University and "placed upon the records" at the Harvard Faculty of Divinity Meeting on September 16, 1982.]

"Archpriest Professor Georges Vasilyevich Florovsky (1893-1979), preeminent theologian of Orthodoxy and historian of Christian thought, ecumenical leader and interpreter of Russian literature . . . died in Princeton, New Jersey in his 86th year" on August 11, 1979.

Born in Odessa in 1893, Fr. Florovsky was the beneficiary of that vibrant Russian educational experience which flourished toward the end of the 19th century and produced many gifted scholars. His father was rector of the Theological Academy and dean of the Cathedral of the Transfiguration. His mother, Klaudia Popruzhenko, was the daughter of a professor of Hebrew and Greek. Fr. Florovsky's first scholarly work, "On Reflex Salivary Secretion," written under one of Pavlov's students, was published in English in 1917 in the last issue of *The Bulletin of the Imperial Academy of Sciences.*

In 1920, with his parents and his brother Antonii, Fr. Florovsky left Russia and settled first in Sophia, Bulgaria. He left behind his brother, Vasilii, a surgeon, who died in the 1924 famine, and his sister Klaudia V. Florovsky, who became a professor of history at the University of Odessa. In 1921 the President of Czechoslovakia, Thomas Masaryk, invited Fr. Florovsky and his brother Antonii to Prague. Fr. Florovsky taught the philosophy of law. Antonii later became a professor of history at the University of Prague.

In 1922 Georges Florovsky married Xenia Ivanovna Simonova and they resettled in Paris where he became cofounder of St. Sergius Theological Institute and taught there as professor

of patristics (1926-1948). In 1932 he was ordained a priest and placed himself canonically under the patriarch of Constantinople.

In 1948 he came to the United States and was professor of theology at St. Vladimir's Theological Seminary from 1948 to 1955, and dean from 1950. From 1954 to 1965 he was professor of Eastern Church History at Harvard Divinity School and, concurrently (1962-1965) an associate of the Slavic Department and (1955-1959) an associate professor of theology at Holy Cross Theological School.

"Although Fr. Florovsky's teaching in the Slavic Department [at Harvard University] was only sporadic, he became a major intellectual influence in the formation of a generation of American specialists in Russian cultural history. His lasting importance in this area derives not from his formal teaching but from the time and thought he gave to informal "circles" that periodically arose around him in Cambridge among those who had read *The Ways of Russian Theology* [then only in Russian], for decades a kind of "underground book" among serious graduate students of Russian intellectual history, and had sought him out upon discovering that he was at the Divinity School . . . During a portion of his incumbency at Harvard . . . patristics and Orthodox thought and institutions from antiquity into 20th century Slavdom flourished. In the Church History Department meetings he spoke up with clarity. In the Faculty meetings he is remembered as having energetically marked book catalogues on his lap for the greater glory of the Andover Harvard Library! In 1964 Fr. Florovsky was elected a director of the Ecumenical Institute founded by Paul VI near Jerusalem." Active in both the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches, Fr. Florovsky was Vice President-at-Large of the National Council of Churches from 1954 to 1957.

"After leaving Harvard, Professor *Emeritus* Florovsky taught from 1965 to 1972 in Slavic Studies at Princeton University, having begun lecturing there already in 1964; and he was visiting lecturer in patristics at Princeton Theological Seminary as early as 1962 and then again intermittently after retirement from the University. His last teaching was in the fall semester of 1978/79 at Princeton Theological Seminary."

"Fr. Florovsky in the course of his career was awarded honorary doctorates by St. Andrew's University . . . Boston University, Notre Dame, Princeton University, the University of Thessalonica, St. Vladimir's Theological Seminary, and Yale. He was a member or honorary member of the Academy of Athens, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the British Academy, and the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius."

Fr. Florovsky personified the cultivated, well-educated Russian of the turn of the century. His penetrating mind grasped

both the detail and depth in the unfolding drama of the history of Christianity in both eastern and western forms. He was theologian, church historian, patristic scholar, philosopher, Slavist, and a writer in comparative literature. "Fr. Florovsky sustained his pleasure on reading English novels, the source in part of his extraordinary grasp of the English language, which, polyglot that he was, he came to prefer above any other for theological discourse and general exposition. Thus when he came to serve in Harvard's Slavic Department, there was some disappointment that he did not lecture in Russian, especially in his seminars on Dostoievsky, Soloviev, Tolstoi, and others. It was as if they belonged to a kind of classical age of the Russian tongue and civilization that, having been swept away as in a deluge, he treated as a Latin professor would Terrence or Cicero, not presuming to give lectures in the tonalities of an age that had vanished forever."

Fr. Florovsky's influence on contemporary church historians and Slavists was vast. The best contemporary multi-volume history of Christian thought pays a special tribute to Fr. Florovsky. Jaroslav Pelikan of Yale University, in the bibliographic section to his first volume in *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, writes under the reference to Fr. Florovsky's two works in Russian on the Eastern Fathers: "These two works are basic to our interpretation of trinitarian and christological dogmas" (p. 359 from *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition: 100-600*). George Huntston Williams, Hollis Professor *Emeritus* of Harvard Divinity School, wrote: "Faithful priestly son of the Russian Orthodox Church . . . , Fr. Georges Florovsky — with a career-long involvement in the ecumenical dialogue — is today the most articulate, trenchant and winsome exponent of Orthodox theology and piety in the scholarly world. He is innovative and creative in the sense wholly of being ever prepared to restate the saving truth of Scripture and Tradition in the idiom of our contemporary yearning for the transcendent."

THE QUEST FOR RELIGION IN 19th CENTURY RUSSIAN LITERATURE
THREE MASTERS: GOGOL, DOSTOEVSKY, TOLSTOY

". . . quia fecisti nos ad te et inquietum est cor nostrum donec requiescat in te."

St. Augustine, *De Confessione*, I. I

P. N. Sakulin in his well-documented book *Russian Literature and Socialism* makes an important observation: "The Russian intelligentsia of the thirties [1830's] was, on the whole, undoubtedly religious."[1] The word "religious" is used here in a comprehensive sense, covering a wide "variety of religious experience." The religion of the early Russian intelligentsia was frequently quite unorthodox, vague, dreamy, erratic, syncretistic. It was often a psychological mood or an aesthetic rapture, or else a kind of moralistic psycho-analysis, rather than a sober and firm belief. (The same is true of the religious situation in the contemporary West.) We should recall that even Rousseau pleaded for "a religion," that the deism of the Enlightenment was still a kind of religious option, and that sentimentalism, in life and literature, was a metamorphosis of a long mystical tradition. The role of German Pietism and of Freemasonry, including the cult of the Rosicrucians, in the formation of modern Russian culture and literature was conspicuous. In this connection the names of Novikov, Kheraskov, Karamzin, and Zhukovsky must be noted. The mystical movements of the time of Alexander I cannot be dismissed as just obscurantism and reactionary extravagance. Their psychological impact on the intellectual and emotional character of Russian society was strong and lasting. Russian romanticists derived much of their vision and pathos, as well as much of their imagery, from precisely that mystical agitation of the preceding age and from its Western sources. The best example of such influence can be found in the literary work of Vladimir Odoevsky, one of the first Russian idealists. Believers were also not unusual among the Decembrists, who included Alexander Odoevsky, Kuechelbecker, G. Batenkov, and probably K. Ryleev. It was by no means an accident that in the thirties many of the future leaders of the radical intelligentsia (Herzen, Belinsky, and — most conspicuously — Mikhail Bakunin) passed through a protracted period of intensive religious, or quasi-religious, exaltation. This mood was characteristic of the epoch. The heritage of that "remarkable decade," as it was styled by a contemporary, remained for long an integral component of Russian culture and of Russian psychology. It is significant that socialism itself first appeared in Russia under a religious guise and in the halo of prophetic enthusiasm; among its proponents were Vladimir Pecherin, Herzen,

Ogarev, and the young Dostoevsky and several of his friends in the circle of Petrashevsky. It has been rightly suggested that it was precisely as a "Christian socialist" that Dostoevsky came to a sharp clash with Belinsky in the late forties, when the latter had lost or renounced his earlier idealistic or "romantic" convictions.[2]

Impending since the late forties, the crisis came in the sixties. It was a violent explosion, a radical break, a kind of conversion. From that time we date the "retreat" of the Russian intelligentsia from Christianity and, indeed, from any religion or "metaphysics," a "retreat" in variable and fleeting versions, from indifference to revolt. As a matter of fact, the Russian movement was a continuation or repetition of the simultaneous shift and crisis in Western thought; and foreign sources of the Russian inspiration can be easily identified. Yet the Russian response to the new message or challenge of the West was spontaneous, passionate, and elemental: it was a kind of wild emotional storm. Indeed, it was rooted in emotions, not in ideas. The ideological equipment of the Russian radicals was rather flat and meager; and there was in it a poisonous alloy of cynical disregard for any cultural concerns. Here lies the sting of Russian nihilism of the time. Existentially it was a transfer of allegiance. There was a kind of new creed to be adopted. There was a new commitment, a new engagement, and a thirst for substitutes. Psychologically it was a change of faith. Dostoevsky was undoubtedly correct when he identified the major theme of his time as religious. It was the problem of faith and unbelief, in their confrontation and conflict. But unbelief itself is a religious phenomenon and a religious option in the direction of ultimate negation; it is a kind of inverted religion. There were different shades of Russian radicalism and different stages in its development. Occasionally religious motifs can be found even in radicalism itself. And there was a new movement in the early seventies with the rise of Populism. There was a new search for religion, or a search for a "new religion." It was again utterly unorthodox: a "religion of the heart" or a "religion of humanity"; but even there one can observe a resurgence of certain evangelical motifs.[3] The Russian intelligentsia was inwardly split at that time. And the movement itself was dialectical; it was a "retreat" counterbalanced by a "return."

The quest for religion is a distinctive feature of all those periods in history which are usually described as "transitional" and which are actually "critical" — when "the time is out of joint" and "walls are crumbling." In such situations the quest for faith assumes inevitably a dramatic and even a tragic turn. Not all who seek find.[4] Yet for believers all epochs are, in a sense, "critical" and problematic. Faith is in no case an easy venture; it has its own internal obstacles and temptations, even its own discomfort — its "dark nights." It is a venture of hope and courage. It is an incentive, an urge. A quest itself is an ambivalent exploit: it may be a sympton of failing or shaken belief; it may also be a token of spiritual vigilance.

The greatest Russian writers of the nineteenth century (Gogol, Dostoevsky, and Tolstoy) were deeply concerned with the problem of faith. As writers they were and wanted to be interpreters of life, of human existence, with all its predicaments and with all its promise. Their ultimate problem was the problem of man and of his destiny in the double dimension of personal and corporate life. Gogol was acclaimed by his contemporaries as a genial master, and his influence in the field of literature was decisive and enormous. In fact, he was probably the central figure in Russian literature of his century. But the intimate message which he wanted to communicate was misunderstood in his own time, through his own fault, and rejected even by his close friends as an unhealthy aberration, as a deception or an illusion. This message was rediscovered, with astonishment and even with alarm, by the end of the century. At last his voice was heard. Notwithstanding, Gogol is still an enigmatic figure, a tragic figure indeed. Dostoevsky walked in his steps, but in his own peculiar manner, and rather critically, with caution and reservation. His message was heard in his own time, but was hardly understood in full and by all. He was a disquieting spirit in Russian literature. His prophetic soundings in depth-psychology were moving and imposing. He raised and discussed perennial problems, "the damned problems," but always in the perspective of his own time. He interpreted current events, but always in the perspective of the ultimate. All his writings were "situation-conditioned" and need historical commentary. And yet they were focused on recurrent themes of human existence. Although many of his prophecies were false and delusive, he had the full stature of a prophet.

The position of Leo Tolstoy was always peculiar. He was forever in opposition, in opposition to any particular historical situation, actually to history itself. His concern was rather with man as man, *in nudo, in puris naturalibus*. In a certain sense, of course, such an approach is quite legitimate and even necessary. Man stands naked before God; and human life with its toil and tribulation is, in a certain sense, dust and vanity in God's sight. Nonetheless, this is but one dimension of man's existence and of his relationship with God. The real man is always a "historic man" with concrete and personal needs and failures, as well as with concrete and diversified tasks in a particular historical setting. It is unrealistic to subtract all "historicity" from human existence and to regard it as an aberration, not as the fulfillment of human "nature." And Tolstoy was persistently doing precisely this, in spite of his great skill in depicting life in its concrete shape and variety. Ultimately, he was dealing with a schematic man in certain typical situations, so that, strangely enough, the real mystery of the human personality was lost. Indeed, moral principles and standards are always essentially the same; and it was timely in an age of irresponsible relativism to remind men of that fact, which may explain the wide response to Tolstoy's moral, or rather moralistic, preaching at home and abroad. Still, it also explains the sterility of this preaching. Tolstoy was able to teach one to evade

the present, but he could not teach how one had to wrestle with it on its own level. Moreover, he stubbornly refused to do so: evil, he contended, should not be resisted but only condemned and disavowed — and endured. His rigoristic radicalism led him, ultimately, to passivity. At this point he was the antagonist of Dostoevsky. The contrast of their views was illustrated, at a later date, in the remarkable literary dialogue between Viacheslav Ivanov and Gershenzon, embodied in their "Correspondence from Two Corners."[5]

These three masters were not basically in agreement. They differed deeply in their analyses and in their conclusions. Gogol wanted to reform the "inner man" without any change in his environment, although he was extremely concerned with social issues. Dostoevsky dreamed of a historical renewal, of a coming Kingdom on earth. Tolstoy simply disregarded history; on this point, he was strangely close to Gogol. But there was a common element in their divergent endeavors. It was their conviction that human life without faith is a perilous adventure which is bound to end in disaster. Man without God cannot remain truly human; he sinks and decomposes. This joint preaching, in spite of all divergences, alerted those who were willing to listen to the responsibilities of the higher calling of man: to faith, to obedience, and to service. But there were many who simply did not want to listen.

GOGOL

In his late years Gogol made the following significant statement about himself: "I came to Christ rather by a *Protestant* than by a *Catholic* way." At the time Gogol was residing in Rome, and his friends in Moscow suspected that his new religious views had been derived from Catholic sources. He was prompted to deny the charge sharply and emphatically. His phraseology, however, is rather obscure. Indeed, there is no evidence of any interest taken by Gogol at that time in the Protestant Reformation, with its specific and distinctive issues and options. Gogol, on the whole, had little interest in doctrine and doctrines. Probably he should have said that he came to Christ by an "evangelical" or even by a "pietistic" way, which, it seems, is precisely what he meant to say. In fact, he continued: "His analysis of the human soul, in a manner in which others do not make it, was the reason that I came to Christ, being struck in Him first by His human wisdom and unprecedented knowledge of the soul, and only then proceeding to worship His Divinity."[6] Gogol elaborated on this testimony in his *Confession of an Author*, a kind of apology. Here he stressed once more the fact that his primary and initial interest was in man, in the human soul. He was searching for those "eternal laws" by which man is governed. He was studying human documents of all kinds. And by this road, "imperceptibly, almost without himself knowing how," he came to Christ and found in Him "the key to the soul of man." In other

words, Gogol came to know Christ by way of a peculiar psychological analysis. He did not expect to meet Christ on this road. In fact, he came to Christ by way of that pietistic humanism which was typical of the epoch of Alexander I. He was himself a belated representative of that age. He seemed archaic to his own generation, wrestling alone in his own peculiar universe of discourse.[7]

Gogol was well acquainted with romantic literature. But he was hardly touched by the philosophical movements of his time. His first stories were written in a romantic way that was not an imitation and was much more than just a literary manner. His own vision was romantic; he had "romantic experience." The world of men was sharply divided for him in a distinctly "romantic" manner: there were strong men with clearly defined personalities and there were "common men." He was never really interested in the strong men or heroes; his occasional attempts to depict such men were never successful. But he was desperately concerned with those ordinary people who fill the whole stage of human life. If these people are amusing or picturesque, their existence is nonetheless meaningless, monotonous, and futile. They are trivial and petty, and they dwell in their own narrow and secluded little worlds without any perspective. Although Gogol was ready to sympathize with poverty and hardship, with sorrow and misfortune, he could be only frightened and shaken by this vision of empty life — almost subhuman and, at its worst, even beastly. In this stagnant world there are "passions," but these "little passions" or ambitions only reveal the utter corruption and debasement of human nature. It may seem that Gogol took pleasure in drawing his comical, grotesque, and ridiculous figures or, better, figurines. There was, of course, some epic charm in his early stories. Yet even in these stories, allegedly humorous and sentimental, there is often heard a strongly tragic note — a note of boredom. As Gogol matured, this feeling grew in him, until it overwhelmed him completely by the end of his life. In this connection, it has been suggested that Gogol apprehended life *sub specie mortis*,[8] which does not mean simply that death is the inevitable end of each individual life. Rather, it means that life itself is deadly and deadening, a sort of impasse or illusion. Life stands under the sign of frustration — not because hopes are not fulfilled but because there are no hopes. "The earth is already inflamed with incomprehensible melancholy. Life is becoming more and more hardhearted. Everything is getting smaller and smaller. Only the gigantic image of boredom is growing in the sight of all, reaching day by day beyond all measure. Everything is hollow, and graves are everywhere." The wording is hyperbolic indeed! But these words are well chosen to render the real vision of Gogol, a vision that was apocalyptic. Merezhkovsky used to compare Gogol with the hero of one of Hans Christian Andersen's fairy tales who had the misfortune to get a piece of an accursed mirror into his eye, with the effect that he could see only distorted and disfigured things. But was the sight of Gogol really distorted? Or was it not sharpened to enable him to

perceive reality beneath the veil of conventions, to grasp the impending catastrophe beneath the veil of stagnation? Gogol described fallen men; and his "caricatures," like those of Goya, are utterly "realistic" in this perspective. Professor Viktor Vinogradov has recently contended that in Gogol's writings men are presented as things, that they are, as it were, "reified."[9] And Rozanov suggested that the human figures in Gogol are not actually living persons; instead, they are marionettes, "wax figurines" moved on the stage by the hidden hand of a skillful master who is able, by certain devices, to create the impression that they are alive. They have no spontaneous motion — they are static and fixed.[10] The question remains: was this striking peculiarity of Gogol's art a sympton of his distorted sight or a sign of his deep insight? Indeed, he never dwelt on the surface — he was always digging and sounding in depth. Under the veil of banality he detected the dark underworld. Emptiness itself was an obvious evil. But it was more than just a human defect or failure: a great Adversary could be discerned behind his victims.

The demonology of Gogol's early stories was probably not quite serious, being derived from the Western romanticists, including Hoffmann, and from folklore. The devils here are only grotesque and amusing. Still, in *The Terrible Revenge* and even more in *Vii*, the intrusion of evil spirits into human life is presented with tragic sobriety. In the major works of Gogol evil spirits do not appear in person, but their presence is assumed. They are operating everywhere, if usually in disguise. By the end of his life he was overwhelmed with the feeling that evil, or the Evil One, was omnipresent, as it were. Satan, he thought, had been unbound and released so that he might appear in the world without even a mask. Although one may be embarrassed by Gogol's phraseology, there can be no doubt that evil was for him a supra-human reality charged with enormous power which could be conquered only "by the mysterious power of the unfathomable Cross," the sole hope of Gogol in his later years.

In spite of his grim vision of reality, Gogol was, except in his very last years, optimistic. He believed in the possibility of conversion, of renewal and regeneration. Moreover, he expected it shortly. Over this very point his difficulties began. In his early years he believed in the redemptive power of art and felt that man could be awakened by a vision of beauty. This hope was frustrated. He soon discovered the ambiguity of aesthetic emotions, the ambiguity of beauty itself. In this respect he was followed by Dostoevsky and also by Vladimir Soloviev, who, with him, believed that Aphrodite is ambiguous and unprotected against corruption. And still the hope for conversion was not lost. Strangely enough, Gogol expected that when his famous play *The Inspector General* was performed on the stage it would effect widespread awakening and conversion. He believed that people would be moved by the vision of human misery, of human nothingness, of human absurdity. And he was once more grievously disappointed. The play was

received as an entertaining comedy, as an invitation to laugh. It did not evoke any deep moral emotions; it did not move people's hearts. Gogol's later attempt to explain the moral significance of the play and to interpret it symbolically was hardly convincing. Yet he firmly believed that he had been called from above to the ministry of persuasion. In this mood he conceived the plan of his greatest work, a "poem," *Dead Souls*.

The title *Dead Souls* was chosen for its symbolic connotation. In this work Gogol intended to deal with the deadly condition of man. The poem was to be in two parts: the "dead souls" depicted in the first part were expected to come to life in the second. The internal pivot of the poem was the concept of "conversion." There was to be a confrontation: "Dead Russia" and "Russia Alive."[11] Only the first part was published by Gogol, who was rather disappointed with the response of readers — they did not understand his intention. And probably their inability to understand was inevitable: the first part could not be properly assessed before it was supplemented by the second, in which the true meaning of the story was to be disclosed. Indeed, Gogol engaged in a description of human pettiness and vice only in order to demonstrate finally that even misers and crooks could be saved or healed. He wanted to show the transformation of the human soul. Although the second was to be much more important than the first, unfortunately it was never completed, and Gogol was unable to achieve his purpose. He wrote his *Paradise Lost* but failed completely with his *Paradise Regained*. He worked on it intensively, obstinately, desperately, but he was increasingly dissatisfied with the results. The story of his work is still rather obscure; the published text of the second part is only one of the versions of the poem. In it no "conversion" has taken place. Instead, some new persons are introduced to illustrate the way of goodness. They are the least convincing of all Gogol's figures. For Gogol this failure was more than a disappointment: it was a terrible shock. Awakening or conversion proved to be a much more complicated matter than he had expected. Man could not be moved to conversion simply by aesthetic emotions or by moralistic reasoning. He could not be moved by any of his own resources; he could be moved only by the grace of God. In order to become a "new man," the old man had to turn to God, Gogol concluded. The whole problem had to be thought over afresh. But there was another difficulty of which Gogol himself was not fully aware. In spite of his intensive study of the human soul, he was not a master of psychological analysis. His men and women were simply marionettes, which could not be brought to life by any device.

The last book which Gogol published, *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*, was probably his greatest "human document." And yet it was an unfortunate book. It was unfavorably received even by his most intimate friends and was violently attacked from all sides, as evidenced by Belinsky's famous letter. In any case, it was not understood by anyone at the time of its publication. Later on,

however, it was heartily appreciated by Leo Tolstoy, when he was himself engaged in a religious quest — the book was, in fact, a program of social Christianity. Conceived as a kind of ideological preface to the second volume of *Dead Souls*, it describes in advance what Gogol sought to prove by the images of his still unfinished poem. ("To prove" is his own wording: artistic images were regarded as proofs.) It was by sheer misunderstanding that the book was interpreted as an essay on personal piety; its pathos is practical, even utilitarian. On the whole, it is a call to social and public action: the basic category of Gogol is *service*. He does not call for retreat and seclusion; the monastery is now Russia itself. Gogol is still frightened by her present situation; he does not try to defend it. Those who are not yet in service must take jobs. Only by doing so can one be saved, for salvation depends upon service. Service itself is understood as work within the state structure. But the state itself has been transformed. Therefore, one has to serve as a member of "another heavenly State, or Kingdom, the head of which is Christ himself." No one can serve as he would have served in "the former Russia." Gogol's phrase is striking: "the former Russia" is already unreal for him; he finds himself in "another world," in a new theocratic dimension. The phrase reminds us of the Holy Alliance: it was, in fact, a solemn invitation to realize that earthly kingdoms have been fused to constitute a new Celestial and Sacred Kingdom of which the only Sovereign is Christ. Accordingly, the state assumes all the functions of the church. Christian work must be done more by laymen than by the clergy; and the laity must guide the clergy, Gogol emphatically insisted. The monarch himself must understand that he is and must be "an image of God on earth." Gogol's peculiar biblicism reminds us of the epoch of the Biblical Society in Russia: the Bible must be read as a contemporary book. In it all current events can be found, as well as the Last Judgment, which is already going on. On the other hand, the Bible is a book for kings: the pattern of contemporary kingship is set in the story of the ancient theocracy of Israel. The king's vocation is to be on earth an image of Him Who is Love. The same paradoxical and utopian image of the theocratic Tsar dominated the mind of Alexander Ivanov, who was quite close to Gogol at the time of their stay in Rome and who was going through his own religious crisis. Much later one hears echoes of the same conception in Vladimir Soloviev: the Tsar's vocation is to forgive and to heal by love. All these motifs should be traced back to the time of the Holy Alliance and its popularity in Russia. It is significant that Gogol's friends of that old generation did actually welcome the book. His own generation would not follow him; even the Slavophiles' concept of theocracy was quite different, as was also their idea of the state.

Gogol regarded the Eastern Church as the church of the future. Up to the present she had been hiding herself, "like a chaste virgin." Now she was called to meet the needs of the world. (The church in the West was hardly prepared, in his opinion, for new historical tasks.) Everyone, in

his own place, was called to action. Indeed, Gogol even had practical advice to offer and often went into minor details. Most of this advice seems naive and casuistic. That he tended to treat all problems as moral problems, without much attention to their other aspects, is especially true of his new "economic utopia," to use a phrase of Father Zenkovsky. Still, the moral aspect of the economic problem cannot be disregarded. Gogol continued to believe that social renovation could be achieved by preaching alone. But now, more than ever before, he was stressing the power of Christian love. He was deeply distressed by the fact that the contemporary world had lost the spirit of brotherhood. At this point he was close to early French socialism and to Lamennais, who believed that brotherhood had been forgotten for the sake of equality and freedom. Gogol further remarks, "Christians! Christ has been expelled to the streets, to infirmaries and hospitals, instead of being invited into private homes — and people still think that they are Christians." Such words express more than philanthropy or sentimental truisms: to recognize Christ in all one's neighbors, the true name of every man to be simply "brother," was for Gogol the first step on the road to perfection. First of all one had to learn love for one's brethren, and only then was one enabled to love God. There is no trace of personal piety in this sharp claim. It is true that Gogol took no interest in social or political reforms and that he was therefore attacked as "a reactionary" by Belinsky. But in no sense was he an apologist for the current situation; he was sharp and pathetic on that point. The world, which he saw crumbling, stood under an apocalyptic sign. Nonetheless, there were bright omens: youth were striving now to embrace all men as brothers and to reform mankind. It was suggested that everything must be owned in common, even houses and land — a daring viewpoint in Gogol's time.

Various and often discordant motifs were intertwined in Gogol's last book, which may be regarded as his spiritual testament, his last will. Apocalyptic alarm and utopian expectation of a speedy resurrection of Russia and the coming of a Sacred Kingdom of Christ on earth could not be easily reconciled, although this paradoxical combination is not quite unusual in the history of human thought: it was rather a typical phenomenon in the pietistic age. Fear and love were strangely synthesized in Gogol's own religious experience. Above all, he was at the same time sincerely humble, even inclined to an excessive self-denigration, and intolerably ambitious, almost intransigently proud — and this odd mixture irritated his best friends in Moscow. From his early years Gogol regarded himself as an instrument of Providence. He was certain that he had been chosen for some high and exceptional mission in the world, that he was predestined for some high task. To an extent, this feeling was characteristic of all people in the romantic epoch. In Gogol self-confidence grew at times into a real obsession: "The invisible One is writing before me with a mighty rod." Gogol often claimed a kind of infallible authority for his words. "My word is

now charged with supernal power," he exclaimed on one occasion, "and woe to any one who will not listen to it." It is for that reason that Gogol expected so much, too much, from his writings; and, for the same reason he apprehended painfully his failures. He wanted to act as an authoritative counselor of friends and acquaintances through pretentious imposition and claimed infallible authority for himself even in private affairs. This inner contradiction, this unresolved tension, was the root of his personal tragedy and collapse. By nature Gogol was an extrovert, although he used to mix together dreams and reality. On the other hand, he claimed to be a student of the human soul, of man's inner life, which was precisely his weakest point. His prophecy was often little more than sheer rhetoric. And yet he had genuine prophetic insight. In his own generation he was one of the few who were able to perceive and to understand that the whole historical world was on the eve of a crisis, and it was already entering into a "revolutionary situation" and was in a state of danger and impasse, a perception which was both a true prophecy and a timely warning.

In spite of his glamorous literary fame, Gogol is a lonely figure in the history of the Russian mind; his literary heritage has been grievously misinterpreted. He is regarded mainly as a great humorist, although his laughter is always bitter, and as the pioneer in the realistic trend in literature. His religious ideas are commonly disregarded or dismissed as nonsense and superstition. It should not be forgotten, however, that Dostoevsky stood in direct succession to Gogol.[12]

DOSTOEVSKY

All his life Dostoevsky wrestled with a basic problem, the problem of human freedom. It was his starting point, his primary intuition, his central theme. The dignity of man, his human identity, is perilously grounded in his freedom. The loss of freedom is the major human grief. But freedom is at once a privilege and a burden, an endowment and a task. The highest human achievements and the most hideous failures are rooted in the exercise of freedom. Freedom is intrinsically dynamic. It is given to man, it is inherent in the human constitution, but it must be vigilantly maintained. Strangely enough, freedom can be lost, for the world of freedom is problematic. Freedom is always at a crossroads, which confronts us with a crucial antinomy: by nature man is a free being called to freedom, but in empirical reality he usually appears as enslaved. What is the cause of this bondage? Is there any safeguard for human freedom?

Early in life Dostoevsky discovered the mysterious paradox of human freedom. All the meaning and all the joy of human life lie precisely in man's freedom, in the freedom of his mind, of his will, of his actions. All the values of human existence presuppose freedom. And yet, paradoxically, freedom itself may become an instrument of bondage.

Moreover, man is able to enslave not only others, but also himself. On the other hand, free will may degenerate into "self-will," causing the suicide of freedom. The root of human tragedy is not so much in man's clash with a blind and inexorable *fatum*, as was assumed by the ancient tragedians, but rather in the aberration of man's own will and in the conflict of discordant "self-wills." This perception was probably the deepest insight of Dostoevsky. The theme can be traced through all his writings. Indeed, he knew well that man is often enslaved by social pressures, by violence and constraint, by tyranny and neglect, by poverty, and by many other forces — in short, by the environment, the outer life. Dostoevsky was always ready to intercede for all those who were humiliated and debased, for the offended, and for the oppressed. He was fully aware of social ills and horrors and could describe them with incomparable power and pathos and with shocking realism. It suffices to recall that his *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions* is truly prophetic and that he began his literary career with a moving plea for the "poor folk." But he came to believe that the root of human bondage is not in the environment but primarily in man's inner world. It is significant that, after having written his first "philanthropic" story, Dostoevsky immediately turned his attention to another side of the problem on a deeper, psychological level. He was concerned now with the peculiar phenomenon of human estrangement, of self-imposed solitude. It was probably from French socialists (particularly from Fourier and George Sand) that Dostoevsky first learned that the ultimate source of all social ills is the spiritual disintegration and dissociation of human life, the decay or decrease of brotherhood among men. Indeed, that was the initial assumption of the French socialist school. The theme of estrangement was also a characteristic theme of romanticism. Man detaches himself from his environment in protest, or in order to preserve and protect his individual independence. He hides himself in a secluded world of which he seems to be the only master. Now he may perhaps set himself free from outer pressures or from interference by this shift, but only at a high cost. He is in danger of losing all contact with objective reality. He becomes, as it were, his own prisoner, the captive of his own passions and thought, over which he has no control. His experience is reduced and impoverished; his personality may break down at any moment. Such was Dostoevsky's firm conviction from the time he wrote *The Double* and *White Nights*. The problem of the "dreamer" became the center of his thought. All the major figures of his later great novels are "possessed," are swallowed, as it were, by ideas. Dostoevsky was tracing the transformation of the dreamer into the "superman." Dreamers become aggressive and want to impose their dreams and their own "self-will" on other people and on external reality. They tend to regard their ideas and passions as absolute authority; and at the same time they suffer from an incurable schizophrenia, as witnessed in Raskolnikov, Stavrogin, and Ivan Karamazov. A claim for ultimate authority is inherent in the "self-will." It begins with detachment from

historical reality and ends with rebellion against God. There is a threatening consistency in this development. It is the destiny of the uprooted man. Solitude and rebellion are intrinsically correlated.

Man is a social being meant for communal life. But the "community" itself has been broken. It has lost its "organic" character. Cohesion is now maintained only by "ideas," that is, by abstract principles. It has become itself a sphere of coercion, a threat to the personal freedom of man. In this situation the revolt of individuals seems to be justified. This much Dostoevsky could learn from his early socialist inspirers. But he inherited from them also the conviction that a normal or perfect community can be built only on love or brotherhood. Equality and freedom have to be supplemented by brotherhood, which has to be more than just a principle.

Planning for the new society tended to impose new abstract schemes on reality which promised to be no less prescriptive and oppressive than the ancient order itself. The concept of order dominated all these schemes. But the real question concerned not so much the new order as the new man. Dostoevsky's early doubts were confirmed by his experience at the "house of the dead." Indeed, there he could well observe the fatal power of evil over man, with all its existential consequences. But his major discovery there was something else. The common life of the criminals was horrible enough, but the real torment lay in the fact that the common life was *compulsory*. It is significant that it was precisely in his *House of the Dead* that Dostoevsky for the first time introduced the image of the palace: it is beautiful in itself and everything there has been provided for man's happiness and prosperity. Only one thing is missing — freedom. In his later writings Dostoevsky elaborated on this image in his vigorous protest against any schemes of an ideal society. From the *House of the Dead* there remained but a step to *Notes from the Underground*. At this point the tragic antinomy of the human dilemma appears in full light. It cannot be solved either by individualistic detachment or by inclusion in any order, however "perfect" it may be. In both cases human freedom is curtailed or threatened. Could this antinomy be solved at all? From the humanistic concept of brotherhood Dostoevsky moved to organic theories of society. They were in the air at that time in Russia. A return to "nature" or to "the soil" could be regarded as a remedy against individualistic dissociation and against the threat of dreams and ideas. Dostoevsky could not be satisfied with this solution for long, however, although certain elements of the organic view remained in his later attempts at synthesis. Moreover, a return to organic wholeness was impossible because the world was in a crisis. The real question was how one could get out from the ruins of the old world. At this point Dostoevsky could not take that way which was adopted by Leo Tolstoy at approximately the same time. Dostoevsky looked forward to the future and could not be satisfied with references to the static structures of human existence *in abstracto*. Moreover, he did not believe that

human problems could be solved at the personal level alone by individual conversions. His thinking was essentially social; he had to have a social ideal. By the end of his life his suggestion was, as Vladimir Soloviev formulated it, that human problems could be solved only in the church, which he regarded as a "social ideal."

Dostoevsky was referring, of course, to the Eastern Orthodox Church. He did not believe that Western Christianity was able to overcome with its own resources the crisis in which it was at that time involved. Concerning this point he was sorely prejudiced, and there was a great deal of wishful thinking in his predictions. But such a prejudice should not obscure the validity of his basic option: only in the Church of Christ can human freedom be reconciled with the living brotherhood that brings persons together in Christ. Actually, his thinking evolved from two different questions, related but not identical. On the one hand, he believed that the Church as a divine establishment is, as it were, the realm of redemption in which man's existential predicament is being solved: the wholeness of life is restored and the freedom of man is rehabilitated there. On the other hand, he continued to believe in the possibility of an ultimate historical solution for all human contradictions. There was an obvious utopian alloy in his belief in the coming general reconciliation, as is pathetically professed in his great *Pushkin Address*. Still, Dostoevsky's Christianity was in no sense "rosy," as Constantine Leontiev quite unjustly insinuated in a way that betrayed only the limitations of his own view. Dostoevsky's vision of life was much more tragic than Leontiev's, and he had much more courage in dealing with it. He apprehended history as a kind of continuous apocalypse in which God and evil were struggling against each other. The world of human values was being destroyed by demonic counterfeits. The new Tower of Babel was in the process of construction. Apollo would once more stand against Christ. And if Dostoevsky still believed in the power of love, it was the love of Christ that he was preaching, the Crucified Love.

From his youth Dostoevsky was aware of human tragedy. He could discern the symptons of spiritual anxiety, of intensifying anguish and despair in human hearts, in human societies, on all levels of human existence. Modern man is an arrogant, rebellious creature; he may even make blasphemous claims and assign a God-like dignity to himself. And yet this rebellious creature is a troubled and suffering being. In the turmoil of contemporary history, in the face of growing revolt and apostasy, Dostoevsky could discern the anguish of unbelief. It was his deep conviction that it is unnatural for many to deny God's existence: *quia fecisti nos ad te*. Man ceases to be truly human when he retreats from God and claims to stand alone. On the other hand, Dostoevsky knew only too well how difficult it is for man to believe. He used to claim that his own faith was in no sense "naive" or unaware of difficulties and objections, that his hosanna had passed through the crucible of trials and temptations, had been tested and proved. Indeed, he

was himself affected by the doubts and hesitations of his own turbulent and skeptical age. It was a long and arduous way from his early vague and sentimental commitment to the Christ of history to his definitive belief in Christ's Divinity, in the decisive role of the Incarnation in the redemption of man. But in his presentation of skeptical or atheistic arguments he was speaking not always of himself or out of his own personal experience. He was able to speak with such unparalleled insight, honesty, sympathy, and precision only because his own faith was strong. Dostoevsky was not a theologian, although he was a Christian visionary and prophet in his own style; and he never claimed authority or competence in this particular field. One should not look in his novels for pondered and accurate doctrinal statements, as some have unfortunately, for polemical purposes. But he was a believer who had not only the right but also the duty to render a responsible account of his faith and beliefs. He used to claim that before him nobody, even in the West, had been able to present the atheistic case with the same fullness and with the same power as he had presented it. And he did so deliberately and conscientiously in order to demonstrate its fallacy. He felt that there was no sense in asking about the origins of nihilism in Russia because everyone was nihilistic. It was a strange and unexpected contention. What Dostoevsky meant to say was rather simple: people in general tend to be negligent about faith and ususally reduce it to certain propositions. Therefore, unbelief can be overcome not by arguments but by internal evidence, by an encounter with the living God. It may seem that Dostoevsky presented the case of faith less convincingly than the case of unbelief: the arguments of Ivan Karamazov are not refuted in the novel. In fact, they can be dismissed only by the act of faith — they cannot be refuted in the "nihilistic" universe of discourse. Experience itself must be widened; the proud man must humble himself.

Dostoevsky was, first of all, an interpreter of a crisis. He was wrestling not so much with metaphysical problems as such, but rather with the existential situation of man. Accordingly, he described metaphysical options primarily in relation to their impact on man's destiny. Freedom was at the center of his query. It is the theme of his great *Legend of the Grand Inquisitor* (probably the greatest of his achievements and at the same time the most controversial and enigmatic). Is this work just an exposition of Ivan Karamazov's views? Or is it Dostoevsky himself who is speaking in disguise? Is the image of Christ an "orthodox" image, or is it reduced? Was the *Legend* written, primarily or even exclusively, about the Roman Church and the Inquisitor presented as her authorized spokesman? And who, after all, is the winner in the story which ends so abruptly and so unexpectedly? There is no unanimity and no consensus on any of these questions. It may be contended, however, that none of them really touches the core of the story. The true sting of the *Legend* lies in the alternative: *freedom*, with all its uncertainty, dangers, and risks, or

satisfaction — it is difficult to find the right word for that option which the Inquisitor adopts, proclaims, and imposes. Dostoevsky's own option is obvious, even if he is speaking on behalf of Ivan. Actually, the alternative itself is false. No genuine satisfaction is possible for man outside of freedom. Any other kind of satisfaction would reduce him to a subhuman status, which is precisely what the Inquisitor is doing. Here lies his crucial fallacy, the main deceit and counterfeit of the Wise Spirit. Even if we could trust his sincerity and admit that he is really moved by compassion for the frail and the weak, the love which fails to respect freedom and is ready to eliminate it from human love is a demonic counterfeit. What is really exposed in the *Legend* is the tragedy of a misguided philanthropy. It is a new variation on the old theme of Shigalev in *The Possessed*: to begin with unconditional freedom for the few in order to end with unconditional bondage for all. It may seem paradoxical that Christ in the *Legend* gives no answer to the invectives of the Adversary, except the silent kiss. But probably it is the only truly divine answer to the challenge. Did not Christ come into the world to redeem the blind and the lost? Certain basic motifs of the *Legend*, and the scheme of temptation itself, were already anticipated in the earlier writings of Dostoevsky, beginning with *The Possessed*; and at that time Dostoevsky was thinking of the socialist utopia in which priority was given to order and prosperity at the expense of freedom. In any case, the *Legend*, as well as Dostoevsky's own attacks on the Roman Church in his *Diary of a Writer*, must be read in the context of the time in which they were written — soon after the Syllabus and Vatican Council I, when the common impression in Europe was that Rome stood against freedom. It may be that this impression was erroneous or grossly exaggerated; but it should not be forgotten that at that time it was shared by many faithful and honest members of the Roman Church herself.

It is obviously impossible, in a brief survey, to exhaust the whole wealth of Dostoevsky's observations and suggestions. Nor is it possible to translate his experience from the language of images into the language of concepts. No logical summary of his visions is even desirable. As a seer and prophet Dostoevsky became a guide for later generations in their religious quest, a guide not only in Russia.[13]

TOLSTOY

D. N. Ovsianiko-Kulikovsky, a renowned literary critic and historian of Russian literature, made a startling statement in writing about Tolstoy in 1908. He strongly contended that Tolstoy was not, in any sense, a religious man and even claimed that he had no gift for relgion. Tolstoy's alleged "religion" was just a substitute. "His teaching was dry, rational, and rationalistic. It was not a religion of soul, but a religion of syllogisms."[14] Ovsianiko-Kulikovsky was a scholar of

positivistic persuasion, who had no religious convictions himself, but who did have a keen interest in the psychology of religious experience. Thus, his impression cannot be simply ignored; and he was struck by the total absence of *transcensus* in the vision and experience of Tolstoy.

Tolstoy himself described his religious crisis at the end of the seventies in his *Confession*. It is a peculiar book — an interpretation, not just a narrative. It is built on the scheme of "conversion." That is, Tolstoy was a libertine, but then an awakening occurred and he understood his depravity. It is a typical revivalist theme. No doubt Tolstoy was profoundly shaken at the time; it was, however, not the first time. It was a trying experience, but there was hardly any change of convictions. Tolstoy himself stresses two main aspects of the conversion. The first was a feeling of bewilderment: was there any meaning in life? The second was a craving for death, an aversion to life, a fear of life. Everything seemed but a lie; only death was true. Was there any meaning in life which could survive death? In Tolstoy's words, it was the feeling of being abandoned, lonely, lost. Then the crisis was solved by understanding. Tolstoy understood that he was not alone in the world. And he underlined the fact that the strength of life did come back to him, not as a new power but precisely as the same old power which had always been in him. There was no change, except in his attitude. There was no encounter in this renewal, no "mystical" experience, no new disclosure or revelation. Everything suddenly became clear and comprehensible: God is life. After this major crisis Tolstoy continued his religious search. Actually, he was not searching — he was testing the beliefs of others, at the present and in the past, making his own selection and brutally dismissing everything which he could not understand or was unwilling to accept. The Gospel itself was subjected to the same testing. In one of his late essays Tolstoy recommended a method of reading the Scriptures: take a pencil and mark all passages which you can understand, "what is simple and fully comprehensible." Tolstoy was sure that everyone would make approximately the same selection, because reason is identical in all men. One has to believe in reason, first of all, and then may select passages from any scriptures: Hebrew, Christian, Moslem, Buddhist, Confucian — whatever is in agreement with reason, and then reject whatever does not agree with it. This process is exactly what Tolstoy was persistently doing himself in disregarding completely the context from which he was detaching his selections. What is puzzling in his peculiar method is Tolstoy's naive confidence in the infallibility of reason, of common sense. Mistakes, he thought, can occur anywhere except in reason, which is given to man by God. Let people follow reason and there will be no discussion. Tolstoy undoubtedly had a thirst for the spiritual life, but it was poisoned and distorted by his unbridled rationalism. He was able to appreciate as excellent the *Invisible Warfare* of St. Nicodemus Hagiorites, a favorite guide of the Athonite monks; but he measured it also by the criterion of "comprehensibility" and

wanted to omit the "superfluous." He would read the lives of the saints, the writings of the fathers and masters of spirituality; but, again, he was selective, omitting miracles and whatever pertained to dogma. Christianity was not his actual starting point. He was essentially pre-Christian in his mentality and could accept the Gospel only in his own expurgated version. (He was sympathetic to Stoicism and admired both Epictetus and Seneca.) In them everything was "comprehensible."

In 1852 he wrote in his diary: "I believe in one, incomprehensible and good God, in the immortality of the soul and in the eternal reward for our deeds. I do not understand the mystery of the Trinity and the genesis of the Son of God, but I respect and do not reject the faith of my fathers." (Later the phrase "do not understand" would become his main weapon in the destruction of "the faith of my fathers.") In 1855 he mentioned in his diary his new and formidable idea of establishing a *new religion*, adjusted to the contemporary stage in human development — it would be the religion of Christ, but cleansed of faith and mystery, and would not promise any future happiness but would bestow happiness on earth. All men might be united in this religion. In 1860 he decided to write a "materialistic Gospel," a "life of Christ the materialist." It is not easy to detect the sources of all these passing plans and ideas. But it is obvious that his later "faith" was prepared for by his searching in the years before his alleged "conversion." He was psychologically and ideologically rooted in the Enlightenment and in sentimentalism. Reading his early diaries and his lengthy intimate letters, one gets the impression that they were written by a contemporary of Zhukovsky, or even of Karamzin. Tolstoy did not belong psychologically to his own generation; he was much behind it. He was in permanent opposition to the course of history.

War and Peace was originally conceived as an attack on history; and this tendency is still strongly felt in the definitive version: historiophilosophical digressions, which many readers simply omit, were, in the conception of Tolstoy, an integral part of the story, a kind of running commentary. According to these digressions, history has no meaning; it is an irrational stream, intrinsically indifferent to human striving, to human aims and purposes. Meaning can be found in the private lives of men and women, not in great historic events. Ovsianiko-Kulikovsky described *War and Peace* as a "nihilistic epic." No doubt such was the initial intention of Tolstoy, who stressed that nothing really valuable happens or is achieved in history. One may happily get out of it. Accordingly, Tolstoy was bound to reject culture, in the manner of Rousseau, for the same reasons and probably under the direct influence of the French master for whom he always had profound admiration. Culture is indeed an artifact of history, a historic superstructure situated on top of nature and common sense. It is grounded in tradition, in the accumulation of human achievements and experience. Tolstoy regarded culture as a corruption, a burden, a waste of energy and time. As he could not get out of history, even by retiring

into private life, he hoped at least to get out of culture, to return to the simplicity of the pre-cultural stage. B. M. Eikhenbaum, one of the most competent students of Tolstoy in recent years, has aptly described Tolstoy's position as a *nihilism of common sense* in which common sense is pitted against history.[15] It is because of his radical "antihistoricism" that Tolstoy was unable to "understand" Christianity and was bound to respect it: Christianity is essentially a historic religion, appealing throughout to historical revelation at sundry times and in diverse fashions. An appeal to historical revelation had no meaning for him. Nor could he admit any Christian metaphysics, since all philosophy was for him just nonsense and illusion.

Of all modern philosophers Tolstoy respected only Kant and precisely that part in Kant's system which is its weakest, his philosophy of religion. Tolstoy was more than influenced by Kant; he shared with him an identity of conception of purpose: Religion *innerhalb des bloßen Vernunft*, with the excision of everything "mysterious" and "miraculous," with a deadening regimentation and legalism. Of course, Kant's *Vernunft* and Tolstoy's "reason" are not quite identical. But the regard for legalism was the same in both cases. Tolstoy had the temperament of a moral preacher; but his moral vision was strangely reduced. The highest moral category for him was law. He persistently invited people to do not what was "good," but what was "lawful" or prescribed. Only the fulfillment of the law gives satisfaction. Only this fulfillment is necessary and joyful. God to Tolstoy was not a Heavenly Father, but a Master for whom man must work. It is curious that even as a youth Tolstoy was inclined to a minute regimentation of his life and conduct, although he had little success with it. He wanted to live according to a schedule, recording his progress or failures day by day. He kept this habit until his very last years. Moral behavior, in his opinion, could be reduced to a schedule, a simple and reasonable scheme.

In spite of all his obvious limitations, Tolstoy was widely acclaimed in his day as a moral guide, as a teacher of the righteous life — although few were prepared to follow him to the end. The strength of Tolstoy was in his radicalism, in his polemical frankness, in his vehement and outspoken exposure of human ills and contradictions. His voice was heard as a call to repentance, to a renewal of life. Yet his positive program was poor and somewhat superficial, in spite of his radicalism. He never went beyond an invitation "to understand" and "to withdraw." Strangely enough, Tolstoy was not aware of the depth and the potential of evil in the human soul. Sometimes his artistic insight was ahead of his moral analysis: he could depict the devastating growth of the passions and the burden of temptation. Discovering pollution in human life, he spoke of it with scorn, disgust, and aversion. Still, shame is not yet repentance, although it may lead to repentance. In *Resurrection* his attempt to describe the renovation of broken souls is hardly successful, because his conception of the human person was

inadequate. His explanation of the origin of evil in human life is flat and naive: evil things are born out of mistakes, out of somebody's mistakes or deceptions in the past, out of somebody's fraud or stupidity, out of a malicious lie. Such thinking was exactly in the style of the Enlightenment. The deeper aspects of the human dilemma escaped Tolstoy's attention. He could not understand the problem of man's social existence: he was an incorrigible individualist. There was a paradoxical disproportion in his moral teaching between the aggressive maximalism of his invectives and the striking poverty of his positive program. Actually, his ethics were reduced to common sense and practical prudence. He was able to suggest that even Christ taught simply that one should do no silly things. In Tolstoy's digest of the Gospel, Christ was often presented as just a teacher of the happy life. The doctrine of nonresistance was a capitulation or an impasse. Even Maksim Gorky was shocked by the lack of enthusiasm and inspiration in Tolstoy, who spoke of Christ without any fervent spark.[16]

It seems that in his very last years Tolstoy was becoming increasingly aware of that impasse which he himself had created. Maksim Gorky speaks of the "infinite, irresistible despair and loneliness" which he discerned at the bottom of Tolstoy's radical negation.[17] In any case, Tolstoy's dramatic exodus was a pathetic epilogue to a long life of gropings and ramblings.[18] The rest is silence.

The 1890's were a critical period in the history of Russian thought and literature. In this period of renascent romanticism and of symbolism, motifs of hope and resignation, of expectation and despair, of faith and disillusionment were strangely amalgamated in a new manner. By the end of the century religious themes had become conspicuous. The trend reached its peak in the first decade of the new century, on the eve of World War I. N. A. Berdiaev has rightly called the whole movement the Russian Religious Renaissance.[19] On the whole, it held an odd mixture of insights and illusions, of honest search and irresponsible vagaries, in which were integrated various impulses from philosophy, art, and literature. As the heritage of older masters was rediscovered and reassessed in a changed situation and in a new perspective, the religious and prophetic message of Gogol, Dostoevsky, and Tolstoy came alive in the consciousness of the Russian intelligentsia. Later it assumed a new significance during the Revolution.[20] One of the distinctions of the great Russian literature of the last century, the religious and prophetic note was a mighty stimulus in the quest for ultimate reality and truth.

TIUTCHEV AND VLADIMIR SOLOVIEV

Dedicated to P. B. Struve

In 1883 Soloviev began to print his well-known articles on "The Great Dispute and Christian Politics" in Ivan Aksakov's weekly newspaper *Rus*. This new development in the world view of Soloviev, who at that point had come from Slavophilism to his own unique religious Westernism, was not pleasant or acceptable to Aksakov. One of the chapters Aksakov absolutely refused to print. This was the chapter about Empire, about universal monarchy. Soloviev had to concede, with reluctance and chagrin. And he then wrote to Aksakov: "The idea of universal monarchy is not my own, but is an age-old aspiration of nations. Of all the people of ideas, this idea inspired Dante among others in the Middle Ages, and in our age Tiutchev stood for it, a man of extremely refined mind and feeling. In the complete edition of *The Great Dispute* I intend to expound upon the idea of universal monarchy mostly in the words of Dante and Tiutchev."[1] The name of Tiutchev is particularly interesting here. Aksakov himself had probably called Soloviev's attention to the political articles of Tiutchev and had given him a copy of his own biography of the poet, whose daughter he had married. And in this fascinatingly written biography Soloviev was able to find ample material on the very theme of Empire. In additon, the name of Tiutchev easily explains this paradoxical transition from Slavophile premises to Western conclusions, which is so very typical of the religious and philosophical development of Soloviev. The complete edition of *The Great Dispute* was never completed. Instead, Soloviev wrote his French book, and in it really developed his schema of "universal monarchy." We cannot judge how this French and final text related to the original, which was rejected by Aksakov. In any case, in the French book there is no allusion to Tiutchev. Much later Soloviev wrote about Tiutchev as a poet, spoke in his article about Tiutchev's historical views and expectations. Soloviev does not speak here about his own former sympathies for Tiutchev in regard to these expectations and predictions.[2] The letters to Aksakov were published for the first time only in 1913, and none of the scholars have turned their attention to the acknowledgment of Soloviev mentioned above. It is not difficult to be convinced that the articles of Tiutchev made a strong impression on Soloviev. From Tiutchev he heard new motifs, and was attracted to them.

In 1849 Tiutchev began to write the French book: *Russia and the West*. This book was never finished. From the plan mentioned by Tiutchev only two themes were worked out by him in individual articles of publications appearing abroad at that time. Right after the death of Tiutchev, Ivan Aksakov published individual fragments and

remarks from his manuscripts. Of course, not everything that remained. But it was sufficient to restore and plan the general conception of the writer.[3] Tiutchev wrote under the impression of recent events. This was immediately after the February Revolution. All of Europe had just been shuddering in revolutionary convulsions. It seemed a new age was beginning, a new historic era. It seemed not only to Tiutchev, and it did not only seem so to him. Very many thought like this at that time, and prophesied. Of the Russians it is sufficient to mention Herzen. A great mysterious spectator of nature, Tiutchev also remained insightful in history. For him political events were mysterious signs, symbols of latent processes in the depths. By them he guessed the ultimate secrets of historical fate. For him history had turned into the Apocalypse. "The Lord writes with fiery signs in the heavens blackening from storms." In this respect Tiutchev was more a Western man. He was psychologically closer to de Maistre than even to Khomiakov. His Russian contemporaries, older Slavophiles, still were not experiencing apocalyptic anxiety, were still not aware of that metaphysics of Revolution, about which Maistre had already recently spoken in the West with such impudent daring. It was namely Maistre whom Tiutchev keeps mentioning. Tiutchev proceeds from the antithesis: Revolution and Russia. "For a long time in Europe only two real states have existed: Revolution and Russia. These forces now stand facing each other, and tomorrow perhaps will collide. Between them neither contract nor agreement is possible. The life of one of them is death for the other. On the outcome of the battle between them — the greatest battle which the world has ever witnessed — for many ages the political and religious future of mankind depends." Two states, two powers, two forces — *deux puissances réelles*. These are not only political and empirical forces. Two spiritual principles, two metaphysical principles are opposed and antagonistic. The struggle will culminate in the depths, and will explode only on the surface. Tiutchev opposed Russia to revolution not because he saw in it the bulwark of reaction or a certain kind of counter-revolutionary rock and stronghold of absolutism. Tiutchev was not an absolutist. And moreover, "what Russia is called in official language," he always treated with unconcealed denial, with suffering irritation and anger. He always responded sharply about it, about this official Russia: this flightly being, horrible and laughable at the same time, had now become totally stupid — *tout s'est crétinisé d'ensemble*. Consciousness was enclosed here in a kind of magic circle. Thought became petrified. Everying became blunted. The feeling and comprehenision of historic traditions had been lost. Nicholas' Russia opened before Tiutchev like the vision of Ezekiel. "The whole field was covered with dry bones. These bones will revive. You know, Lord. And only the breath of God can revive them, the breath of a storm." No, not about this imaginary Russia ("*ce faux peuple*") did Tiutchev think and speak. But behind the transparent stage set he saw and guessed another and genuine Russia — "the edge of native long-suffering" and this

Russia — he knew and saw this — "in the form of a slave the Heavenly Tsar came, blessing." This is the Russia of the Russian people. And Christian Russia, in the very depths and mysteries of its being. In no sense could Tiutchev by any means be called a *narodnik*.[4] Social motifs of Slavophilism did not have much significance in his schemas. His historical shibboleth was certainly not: *society* but *Empire*. This Empire, however, he saw namely in the Russia of the people —"the Russo-Byzantine world in which life and liturgy are one." This Russia is still in potential, still in development, still awaits its hour. It is namely this Russia, future and developing, that Tiutchev oppposes to the revolutionary West. And Revolution for Tiutchev is not only an empirical fact, a national mutiny or self-affirmation, not only "freedom-loving striving." Revolution is, above all, an "idea," a spiritual reality — in this Tiutchev is only repeating Maistre. Tiutchev always writes: Revolution, with a large letter — *La Révolution*. He does not speak of revolutions, individual revolutionary outbursts or movements, or of any local events or accidents. Revolution, as a principle or spiritual essence, is not exhausted in its empirical manifestations. Revolution is anti-Christian, affirmed Tiutchev — and this is the source of its power or might in the world. The anti-Christian spirit is the soul of Revolution, this is its basic distinguishing feature — *l'esprit anti-chrétien est l'âme de la Révolution*. And now in the West this is not some kind of haphazard, isolated phenomenon. This is the last word of the West — the extreme limit, the logical conclusion of Western civilization. Moreover, this is the entire West. Tiutchev insists on this generalization — "all new thought, from the time of its falling away from the Church"; that is, from the time of the Reformation. Again Tiutchev repeats Maistre — the Revolution proceeds from the Reformation, equates and identifies them, these two uprisings. It is necesary to remember that here Tiutchev coincides not only with de Maistre but also with St. Simon, who in his *New Christianity* very directly brings together these two acts of revolutionary self-affirmation of the human "I". This was a general organic antithesis of the new or "romantic" epoch, contrasted to the critical thesis of the preceding age. And after St. Simon came Comte. Tiutchev went even further to the other side. For him Revolution begins in the West not only not in 1789 and not even in the time of Luther. For Tiutchev derives the Reformation itself from Papism (in this he was repeated by Khomiakov). And a single and uninterrupted revolutionary tradition results. The latest revolutionary school makes only the last conclusion, the extreme generalization. *The entire West is Revolution*, is uprising and apotheosis of the human "I." In this is the unity of the West. And this is the unity of Revolution. The West or Europe is revealed to Tiutchev as a great spiritual unity, in spite of all the divisions and discord. "Revolution, which is nothing other than the apotheosis of that very same human "I," having achieved its fullest blossoming, did not hesitate to recognize its own and greet as two of its

glorious ancestors both George VII and Luther. Kindred blood began to speak in it, and it accepted one in spite of his Christian views and almost deified the other, even though he also was a *pope*." And this means that in the West there is not and cannot be support against Revolution. Any counteraction to Revolution, any reaction or restoration in the West is only self-deceit and mystification. Apparently the divided West is one and solid in the idea. The West is Revolution — namely because the West is Rome. Ancient, pagan Rome — "the traditon of the Roman empire," appearing through the Christian centuries. And thus it is a kind of imitation of the true Kingdom of Christianity. This is Caesar, eternally hostile to Christ: *c'est là le César qui sera éternellement en guerre avec le Christ*." The idea of Empire always was the soul of the history of the West," thought Tiutchev; but he immediately added: "but empire in the West never was anything but the abduction of power or usurpation." The legal Empire from Constantine in the East was for Tiutchev.the main "Christian fact," which denies the pagan — *c'est la donée chrétienne que la donnée païenne cherche à nier*. In the West, "Empire" is therefore something forced and unnatural. In essence, Empire in the West is unrealizable; all attempts to "set it up" there collapse in failure. "This was the plunder which the popes divided with the German caesars. The legal Empire remained fettered to the legacy of Constantine." The entire history of the West is compressed into the "Roman question," and all the contradictions and the "impossibilities" of Western life are focused in it. The papacy made an attempt "to organize the kingdom of Christ as a secular kingdom," and the Western church "turned into an institution," "became a state within a state" — like a "Roman colony in a conquered land." That is the reason for this "godless and sacrilegious duel" with "Empire." This historical duel has been destroyed by a dual downfall: the Church is renounced in the Reformation in the name of "the individual human I"; and the State is renounced in Revolution. However, in a strange and unexpected way — the force of tradition remains so resilient that the Revolution itself strives to be organized into Empire as if repeating the work of Charlemagne. This revolutionary imperialism can only be a parody. In his "Empire" Napoleon attempted to "annoint" or "sanctify" (*sacrer*) Revolution: such was the design of this "centaur," half of which is Revolution. "It was an earthly flame, not a Divine one." This is already a direct and open return to pagan Rome. The secular power is openly directed against Christ in the name of secularization and strikes a blow to the last foundation "which somehow still supports the remains of the Christian edifice in the West, which remained intact after the great downfall of the 16th century and the landslides occurring afterward." That is — against the Roman church. The Western church broke away and left the universal unity, "creating a distinct fate for itself." It was not the Church which fell apart or was divided — indeed, the Church is one and catholic. But two worlds, "two humanities, so to speak," divided,

separated in their historical striving. Rome "hid the Universal Church from the West," "confiscated the universal tradition for its own use" — and in this way made the administration of the Western world impossible: Empire is connected with the *universal* Church. Through its self-will Rome began the dissolution of the Universal unity. The attempt to absorb the entire church in "its own Roman I" is the beginning of that Western autonomism which then turns against Rome.

For a transaction between the autocracy of the human will and the law of Christ is unthinkable." And here now is the hopeless circle of the destructive consequences of primordial self-will completed. And Christian Rome now stands helpless and defenseless under the blows of godless Romanism. "The West is perishing, everything is being destroyed, everything is collapsing in a general conflagration — the Europe of Charlemagne and the Europe of the treaties of 1815, the Roman papacy and all Western monarchies, Catholicism and Protestanism, faith lost long ago, and reason, reduced to idiocy. Order is henceforth impossible and freedom is already unrealizable — and Civilization will end in committing suicide over all these ruins which it has accumulated." These are almost those very same words which explode in Herzen in that same historical hour. That same frightened and trembling renunciation. But not with hatred and malicious joy, not with angry reproach does Tiutchev contemplate this destruction of the West. His heart burns with suffering and torment, in deep and condolent grief. Tiutchev grieves over that fatal weakness into which the West was plunged by centuries of Roman "sacrilegious guardianship." The West regained consciousness, but cannot overcome the inherited poison. "And where is the way out?" Like Herzen, Tiutchev also appeals to the East. He does not stop at disillusionment, does not end with a hopeless verdict.

> No, such a horrible, such an unnatural position cannot endure. Whether this is punishment or ordeal it is conceivable that the Lord in his mercy has abandoned the Roman church, seized by such a fiery circle, for a long time to come, and did not reveal the path, did not show the way out — a way out which is marvelous, radiant, unexpected. Not small will the flame be, not brief will that conflagration be which will devour and reduce to ashes whole ages of vain pretences and anti-Christian enmity, and will finally smash the fatal barrier hiding the desired way out. Before the face of events being accomplished, before the face of a new organization of evil, more cunning and threatening than people have ever seen, before this world of evil in full possession and readiness of the standing evil, with its church of disbelief, with its mutinous government — Christians have surely abandoned the hope that is surely removed from Christians that the Lord will favor making the forces of His Church conmensurate with the new feat which He has designated for it. The hope has surely been removed that on

> the eve of the imminent battle He will favor returning to it its full force and for this, at the hour appointed by Him, He Himself, by His merciful Right hand, will heal the wound in its body inflicted by a human hand, and now continually bleeding for eight centuries already. The Orthodox Church never despaired of this recovery. In spite of the many centuries of division, in spite of all human prejudices, the Church did not stop recognizing that the Christian principle did not disappear in the Roman church, that it is stronger in it than error and human passion. The Church knows that, as for the duration of many centuries, so now the fate of Christianity in the West is still in the hands of the Roman church; and it firmly hopes that on the day of the great unification, the Roman church will return this sacred pledge unharmed.

Tiutchev ends these solemn lines with a recollection about the visit to Rome of Emperor Nicholas in 1846. "The appearance in the church of St. Peter of the Orthodox Emperor — returning to Rome after so many centuries of absence." Tiutchev recalls: "Memorable is the electric shock which ran through the crowd when he came up to pray by the grave of the apostles. This was legal excitement: the genuflecting tsar was not alone — with him was all of Russia, and it plunged down. And one must hope that not in vain did its prayer to the holy remains arise." Empire and the papacy. The Papacy will be saved by the Russian Empire, and Russia will receive new strength from the unified Church. This is the conception of Vladimir Soloviev — we see he has been anticipated by Tiutchev. "There is only one secular power depending on the Universal Church which could transform the papacy without harming the Church. In the West such a power has never existed — and never could have." There is no such power now in the East either. But in the East it is possible, must be, and will be. This is not Russia. This is that "Great Greco-Russian Orthodox Empire" into which Russia must either be transformed or revealed — *quelque chose de formidable et de définitif.* Empire is that historic limit toward which Russia is striving. And if she does not reach it, then she will perish. The entire meaning and basic theme of Russian history for Tiutchev is the gathering of "the Orthodox kingdom," "the restoration" — and the gathering of Slavdom. "This," he thought, "is the most organic and legal of those matters which are occurring in history." And the Eastern Emperor is namely and above all the "All-Slavic Tsar." Slavdom is the "element" of the Eastern Empire — but only in the measure of their Orthodoxy will the Slavic peoples fulfill this their providential destiny. And the loss of Orthodoxy also means the loss of a national (and Slavic) image: by this the Catholicized countries will dissolve in an alien West. In this Tiutchev saw the tragedy of Poland: "you fell, single-tribed eagle, into a purging fire." The hope of the Czechs he saw in Husism, insofar as it preserves the "sympathetic memories of the Eastern church." The Empire is one, for it is a principle — and

therefore indivisible. "The Empire is one"; its soul is the Orthodox Church; its body is the Slavic tribe. Therefore, the "disgracefully secular" Slavic tribe, newly incorporated into the Eastern Church, will become and will be able to become the sovereign "people." The task of history is in the realization of the Empire. As an idea and principle, Empire is immortal, with the change of rulers. But this principle in different measure and in a different sense can be manifested also in a different sense in historical reality. In the history of "Empire" eclipses and breaks have been observed. And now, after four ancient monarchies, with Constantine "begins the fifth", the Christian Empire, and now the "final Empire" (*définitif*). The contemporary age Tiutchev perceives and recognizes as one of those breaks in the history of the Empire. That is the reason for his catastrophic feeling, his apocalyptic anxiety. He does not decide to directly confirm that the Empire is and will be born. "Perhaps Russia will perish." But Tiutchev insists on this fact first of all: "from 1815 the Empire of the West is no longer in the West"; and secondly, a decisive moment has arrived, for Europe has moved into a dilemma: victory and destruction. In any case, Russia is the "guardian of Empire," *dépositaire de l'Empire*. "It is not war and not politics that are starting — an entire world is forming and developing — and above all it must find its lost conscience." This meeting and skirmish of the East and West is the collision of two principles and two forceful ideas. "The decisive battle of the whole West with Russia" — thus did Tiutchev define the meaning of the Crimean campaign. "We will fight with the dead, having been resurrected for new burials." "Perhaps Russia will perish." But this will also be a failure for the West. For Russia and the West are inseparable. "The European West," thought Tiutchev, "is only one half of a great organic unity; the difficulties apparently unresolvable for and experienced by the West will be solved only in its other half." For Tiutchev, Russia is the "second Europe" ("*l'autre Europe*"), the East in Europe is just as organic as the West. Now they are in extreme rupture and discord. The *entire* West rose up against Russia — this is not a union but a conspiracy. "If the West were one, we, of course, would perish. But there are two of them: the Red — and the one which the Red must devour. For forty years we have taken away this plunder from the Red, and now we are at the edge of an abyss, and now the Red will save us in its turn." In these words it is impossible not to hear sympathy for revolutionary "chaos." Tiutchev is simply pointing to the split of the West, which is weakening the enemy.

Revolution does not create anything; but, in destroying the West, in this way for a time it will help the East. It will remove the barriers from the Russian path, will destroy Western surrogate empires. Western monarchies will be destroyed and the papal throne, struck by disbelief, will be shaken — and this will make the Eastern task easier: "reunification of both churches" and "formation of a Greco-Slavic Empire." If Russia wins, then the West will be saved. This will be a general peace and reconciliation. "The universal ringing of the

Victorious sun's rays will resound." Russia and Revolution — for Tiutchev these are two metaphysical principles, two precepts, "two unities," two "powers" (*empires*). Now this means: East and West. But it also means something else: Christ and Anti-Christ. Tiutchev felt an apocalyptic tremor in his own time. And he was very upset by the fact that too few distinguish these "clear apocalyptic signs of what is approaching."

"Empire" — this is the basic theme and basic category of Tituchev's historiography. He traces the fate of kingdoms in history — there is no *Kingdom for fate*. And no earthly Kingdom. In this "Orthodox imperialism" of Tiutchev is all the uniqueness of his thought, but also its limitations. Even Ivan Aksakov agreed that Tiutchev "lived outside the Church." And Tiutchev himself emphasized that it was not the East that was his native soul — "not that unpopulated region." And Orthodoxy was not a living reality for Tiutchev; it was rather a logical conception. "Imperialism" differentiates and distinguishes Tiutchev from the older Slavophiles. But the closeness to him of Khomiakov in characterizing the Western denominations is not weakend by this. Indeed, *Several Words* of Khomiakov was written namely in reply to the critical brochure of Laurence against the article of Tituchev about the "Roman Question." There is also a great proximity with the Slavophiles in the expectations from Russia of the free word — "and the mystery of freedom will speak" in Khomiakov.

The "Empire" of Tiutchev very much recalls that "universality," removing the tedious longing of "European contradictions" in which Dostoevsky saw Russian predestination, our lot among peoples of the Aryan tribe. And, in general, many things bring Tiutchev and Dostoevsky together in their historic conceptions and conjectures. In both Russian fate is closely connected with the solution of the Eastern question, with "our Constantinople." And if the dark nature of the West was disclosed for Tiutchev in the Crimean campaign, then Dostoevsky understood it from the experience of 1877 and 1878. This comparison can be made deeper. In the historical ideas of Dostoevsky the image of Empire is also drawn very clearly and distinctly. And the fate of the West he surmised always from the "Roman idea." "Empire" is a synthesis of the Ancient world, its central "religious idea." And this idea experienced the downfall of the Ancient world itself, and became "the idea of European humanity" in general. And now Empire and Church stand opposite each other. Dostoevsky immediately ends by saying: Apollo and Christ — "the man-god will meet the God-man." In the West Empire devoured everything for itself, and the Church itself, or the papacy, is the direct "continuation of the ancient Roman Empire in a new incarnation." And the Vatican Council showed Dostoevsky the victory of Julian the Apostate. "This is the Rome of Julian the Apostate, but not victorious, but seemingly having vanquished Christ in a new and last battle." The new reincarnation of that same "Roman idea" Dostoevsky saw in socialism. The theme and image of "Empire"

in Dostoevsky could hardly be from Tiutchev. But the ideas of Tiutchev also were woven into the fabric of his historical thought.[5] Vladimir Soloviev was much more profoundly and more intimately connected with Tiutchev in his religio-historiosophic systems.

The image of Empire did not enter into the historiosophic schema of Soloviev immediately and not from the very beginning. In the articles of the seventies he was not yet speaking about Empire. At this time, like Dostoevsky, he saw in Empire rather a negative principle, the "third diabolic temptation." One very expressive citation is enough. "In actual fact," wrote Soloviev, "once the Christian Church recognized itself as the only spiritual sacred society, looking at all the rest as *profanum*, it removed from the state all its former significance, renounced a sacred republic. Recognizing the state only as restraining repressive force, Christians removed from it any positive spiritual content. The emperor, the last god of the pagan world, could be for them only the supreme head of the police. In this way the very principle of ancient society is renounced, consisting namely in the deified republic and the emperor as its representative."[6] True, such division and opposition of the church and the state was considered only temporary by Soloviev, and even then he postulated a churchified state. However, at the same time he was a *narodnik* rather than an "imperialist" — and he saw a synthetic force in "society," in the people, in the *zemstvo*. He defined a free theocracy in articles about "The Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge" as an "integral society" — not as "Empire." In the state itself he saw only a formal principle, an organization of freedom and justice — not an embodiment of power. New motives in the work of Soloviev appear already at the beginning of the 80s, when he ponders intensely over the concrete problems of "Christian politics." At that time a new schema was forming in his head. He was evaluating anew the historical summation of the ancient world, the creation of Empire. It is not repudiated by the Church but sanctified — and sanctified in all its ideal fullness. "In the Christian state is found everything that was also in the pagan state"[7] And it is namely Empire that is sanctified — *imperium*; the principle of authority. The unity of humanity is realized namely in the state, so Soloviev now thinks. And the "state" is disclosed to him now as the maximum and positive expression of a purely human element, as "collective man." In the state humanity protects itself from nature, from dark chaos — the state represents the stability (*status*) of humanity against external elemental forces acting upon and within it." And only through the state can humanity "return freely to Divinity," only through the Christian State can the Godmanhood connection be realized or restored.[8] From this point of view, the basic theme of history is namely Empire, and Soloviev begins to observe and study the fate of this Christian Empire. The Roman Empire turned into the Byzantine kingdom. But it was namely the Kingdom which did not succeed in Byzantium — a churchified Empire did not occur, but just the opposite

— the Empire decomposed again into pagan Caesarism. In the West the Empire fell apart even earlier in feudal chaos and discord. The Empire can be only one, and only autocracy can be sovereign. Now the restoration of Empire is possible only in Russia — this is the basic premise of Soloviev. He sees the strength of Russia in the tsar's autocracy and in the piety of the people. Russia for him is above all the *Kingdom*. Russian history again is becoming in his perception the history of the Russian State. But this is Empire, not a national state. Empire in potential, and the creative potential of Russian Tsardom has not yet been revealed and not yet fulfilled. They can be revealed only in a higher synthesis which must resolve and end the "Great Dispute," the age-old argument of East and West. It is typical that in this dispute for Soloviev the bearer of the earthly or human principle turns out to be the East — he contradicts himself without noticing it, for in addition it is namely the West in this general schema which signifies or expresses the self-affirmation of the human element, but for the East it is rather humiliation of the human principle and freedom which is typical. However, the kingdom is nevertheless in the East. "We are a people of the present, a tsarist people."[9] Namely in Russia, and only in Russia can and must the universal Kingdom, the Christian Kingdom be revealed. In this Soloviev also saw the final meaning of Church renewal, which he preached in the eighties. This was, strictly speaking, not so much a "unification of churches" as a *reunification* of the divided and disconnected *Kingdom and Priesthood*, weakened and belittled in this rupture. The reunification of these two basic theocratic forces and principles which, when separated, are equally insufficient for the realization of the universal Godmanhood affairs on earth. Soloviev thought that only through reunification with the principle of Priesthood would the tsarist potential of Russia be able to be revealed in Empire. But also vice-versa: only through a churchified kingdom can the higher power of Priesthood be revealed in the world. In other words, the Church will be fulfilled in the Kingdom of God only through the earthly Kingdom, through Empire. For this, the tsarist nation of the present day, Russia, must reject its national self-complacency, must accomplish the feat of national self-denial — and in this way it will be infused with strength, will begin the process of gathering together or integration in the human world that has fallen apart. Imperalism through self-denial — this is the new and paradoxical thought of Soloviev. He proves this to the extreme in his French book.[10] In the introduction he speaks namely about Empire, as about the fulfillment of the state, and directly claims: "the establishment of the priesthood is an accomplished fact, but completely free brotherhood is still an ideal; that is why mainly the middle term — State in its relation to Christianity — determines the historical fate of mankind," and in the Christian State the Church becomes not only a temple but also the living body of God. It is interesting that all heresies of the early Church were examined here by Soloviev from the state's point of view. "Heresy

attacked the perfect unity of the divine and human in Jesus Christ in order to undermine at the very basis the organic connection of the Church with the State and confer to this latter unconditional independence." Heresy as such was in Soloviev's depiction a certain self-defined Byzantine Empire, pseudo-Christian, pagan. In other words heresy means the revolt and obstinacy of a non-churchified Empire. And now "the mission is to found a Christian state," repudiated by the Greek Empire, by the power of St. Peter will be transferred to the Romano-German world. However, also the Western medieval monarchs did not fulfill this mission — "the Holy Roman Empire of the German nation" turned out to be a historical fiction. Finally, the Western state completely fell away from the Church. There is no Christian Kingdom now in the world, and this weakens the church, deprives it of secular power, power in the world and over the world. Soloviev surmises "that historical fate determined that Russia give to the universal Church the political power so necessary for the salvation and rebirth of Europe and the entire world." The religio-historic mission of Russia is determined, in Soloviev's understanding, by its state power. And this power must freely surrender and obey the Priesthood. Then the Church again and forever will find itself a living communal body — a new Kingdom, and a universal Kingdom will arise. Here a new motif is expressed in Soloviev. He traces the fate of Empire in the ancient world to the time when "from a deformed and transparent cohesion of varied elements of humanity it turned into a uniform and organic body, the Roman Empire, with a living and personal center, Caesar Augustus, the bearer and representative of the unified will of the entire human race." This Empire rested only on blind strength and on success. And that is why it was removed. To put it more precisely, the political monarchy was overshadowed by the spiritual. Universal monarchy and international unity were preserved. Moreover, the center of the unity was not geographically shifted. But there was a shift of dynasties. "Deposing from the throne the false and impious absolutism of the pagan Caesars, at that time Jesus confirmed and immortalized the eternal monarchy of Rome, gave it its true theocratic basis. In a certain sense this was only a change of dynasties; the dynasty of Julius Caesar, exalted high priest and god, was replaced by the dynasty of Simon Peter, high priest and servant of God's servants." Empire was immortalized, and namely the Roman empire. Rome does not abide immutable, as the eternal form of the Kingdom of God. "Grand, holy and eternal Rome." "In this Rome I believe," wrote Soloviev to Aksakov, "before it I bow, I love it with all my heart and with all the strength of my soul I desire its restoration for the unity and wholeness of the universal church; and may I be cursed as a father-killer if ever I prononce a word of condemnation against holy Rome."[11] Great and eternal Rome, Eternal City, *Urbs aeterna* — visible and here — a certain eternal Capital cliff or rock. For Soloviev the Church itself is Rome. And he did not make a slip of tongue when he once named the "father of Aeneus" next to "the father of the faithful,"

Abraham. Rome does not wander — there was not, is not and cannot be a Second or Third Rome. But the social milieu changes, in which the unchanging power of the single Rome is realized. Rome does not wander, is not reincarnated. And actually the church itself is already the Empire. The teachings of Soloviev about Empire are very complex. Various motives and influences cross in it. It as not the influence of Tiutchev that was basic and primary. However, was it not from Tiutchev that Soloviev took and borrrowed this image of *the Russian tsar in papal Rome*, who indeed expresses the most basic concept of Soloviev. "Russia and the Universal Church" — and in actual fact tsarist Russia and papal Rome as manifestations of the Kingdom and Priesthood. The concept of Christian reunification is displayed in Soloviev as the plan of the Christian Church. The tsarist center must be in Russia. And Slavic tribes will be the new body. In Soloviev the Slavophile tradition has still not yet burst out, but in his French book it is felt very strongly. Of course, Croatian influence and the direct influence of Strossmeyer gave it new life. But is it, again, not Tituchev who reminded Soloviev of this dream about the transformation of Russia into the eternal Greco-Slavonic Kingdom in which the peoples of Europe will find peace and happiness. When several years later, and now more in disillusionment, Soloviev wrote about Tiutchev, he conveyed in quite extensive detail these imperialistic surmises of the poet. And he does not argue with him. He does not object, does not deny that Russia is the living soul and focus of humanity. He only emphasizes that the world recognition of Russia will be realized not by an external but by an internal feat. Russia can become the "Christian Kingdom" even without Tsargrad, become the "kingdom of truth and mercy."[12] Tiutchev also did not doubt this.

Translated from the Russian by
Roberta Reeder

[1]Letter from November 1883, *Pisma* [Letters], IV, (Pgr. 1923), pp. 26-27. Originally in *Russkaia Mysl*, (December) 1913.

[2]"The Poetry of F. I. Tiutchev," originally in *Vestnik Evropy*, (April) 1895. *Sochineniia* [Works], VI, in the 2nd ed. VII.

[3]I. Aksakov. "Feodor Ivanovich Tiutchev," *Russkii Arkhiv*, 1873. (Moscow, 1874). There also in *Russkii Archiv* 1874 articles of Tiutchev were reprinted, included then into collecitons of his works. Three of them: "Rossiia i Germaniia" [Russia and Germany], originally, apparently, in *Augsburge Allgemeine Zeitung* (1844). "Rossiia i Revoliutsiia" [Russia and Revolution], published in a separate brochure under the title: Mémoire presente à l'empereur Nicolas, depuis la révolution de Février, par un russe, employe superieur aux affaires étrangers (Paris, 1849); "Rossiia i rimskii vopros" [Russia and the Roman Question], originally in *Revue des deux Mondes* (1849). In *Russkii arkhiv* a Russian translation is given, reproduced in editions of the works. Letters to his wife, from which Aksakov drew, were published in full: *Pisma F. I. Tiutcheva k ego vtoroi zhene, urozhd. bar. Pfeffel* [Letters of F. I. Tiutchev to his second wife, née Bar. Pfeffel] (St. Petersburg, 1914 and 1915); from the journal *Starina i Novizna*.

[4]*Narodnik* — members of a movement composed of the intelligentsia going to the countryside, to the "*narod*" [the people] to teach them and bring medical aid and raise their political consciousness.

[5]See my article "Dostoevsky and Europe," *Slavyanska biblioteka*, II, 2, (Sofia, 1922) (in Bulgarian). I intend to return to this theme soon. [*The English translation of this article is included in this volume.*]

[6]I, 244.

[7]III, 373.

[8]III, 370.

[9]IV, 230.

[10]*La Russie et l'église universelle*, p. 1889, *Put* (1911). See especially the introduction, p. XXIV ff. and Livre II, ch. 7, Les monarchies de Daniel, "Roma" et "Amor," p, 134 ff.

[11]Letters IV, p. 21. Letter of 9 March 1833.

[12]VII, 131-134.

THE HISTORICAL PREMONITIONS OF TIUTCHEV

The summer of 1923 marked the fiftieth anniversary of the death of the poet Tiutchev, and this has conferred upon us the pleasant obligation of commemorating him and of once again experiencing the pleasure given by his creative work. Tiutchev's poetical genius was both great and original. He combined an exceptionally keen and penetrating aesthetic and philosophical vision with unrivaled ease and freedom of Russian poetic diction. In this respect he may be compared only with Goethe. Tiutchev saw into nature, sensing her deep, secret life and being. He felt himself in an animate and living world, one that was filled with inexhaustible power and continually recreated by some primary force. With unusual sensitivity he perceived the unity, correctness and completeness of his being, and found in himself an echo of all the living voices scattered throughout the universe. For the power and force of his aesthetic and philosophical conception, Tiutchev must be hailed as first among Russian poets. Perhaps this very poetic force, which demands great spiritual exaltation to be understood, prevented and still prevents a just evaluation of his achievements in Russian critical study. Still, there is hardly any need to speak further of Tiutchev as a poet. One must read and re-read his verse, absorb it, live in it. Years ago we received the gift of an illuminating artistic and philosophical commentary on his work in the remarkable article of Vladimir Soloviev. [Compare also the article on Tiutchev by Professor Frank, reprinted in his miscellany *Zhivoe Znanie* (Berlin, 1922)]. It is very difficult to add to it at all. That is why, in the following pages, we have confined our attention to another aspect of Tiutchev's work — to his historical prevision. It has rarely been discussed and is very little known. Yet here, too, the power and intuition of his wonderful lyrics is again revealed. What is forgotten must be called to mind.

"Since distant times, only two real powers have existed in Europe: Russia and Revolution. They have now met face to face and, perchance, may come to grips tomorrow. Neither pact nor compromise is possible between them. The life of one means death to the other. On the issue of this conflict, the greatest the world has ever witnessed, will depend for centuries to come the political and religious future of mankind." Thus wrote Tiutchev in one of his few political and philosophical articles, written in French. These lines were penned in 1848. And this juxtaposition of two opposing ideas provides the key to Tiutchev's historiosophical system and premonitions.

Tiutchev certainly did not set Russia in opposition to Revolution because he perceived the former as a stronghold of absolutism or a bulwark of "reaction." Like the earlier Slavophiles, his attitude towards that "which officially bore the name of Russia" was one of pained

negation, and at times of fierce indignation. To him, "official Russia" was like "the vision of Ezekiel" and, filled with melancholic apprehension, he asked: "These bones, will they come to life again? Thou knowest, O Lord! But truly, nought save the breath of God, the breath of the storm, can ever imbue them with life." To Tiutchev, the "official mentality" appeared as if enclosed within a kind of "magic circle"; and, mockingly, he wrote: "I will lay a wager that on the Day of Judgment people will be found in Petersburg who will pretend they were not told anything about it." "Official Russia has definitely and finally lost all sense and understanding of her historical tradition," wrote Tiutchev. But this was not all of Russia, nor was it even the real Russia. Beyond "this so-called civilization, which was foisted on our unhappy country," beyond "this terrible nonsense, terrible yet laughable," he sensed and recognized "something gigantic and final, something which as yet bears no name in history but which lives and expands before the very eyes of its contemporaries, both friends and foes." This new Russia, the Russia *in being*, is the only real Russia. For Tiutchev, Russia was above all else "the land of infinite endurance" through which, "casting blessings round his path," walked "the King of Heaven, clad in servile garb." She is a world apart , "one in its principle, cohesive in its component parts, living its own organic, individual life" — "the Russo-Byzantine world in which life and divine service are one." Not in name alone, nor in faith, is the Orthodoxy of the Russian people to be sought, but in something lying immeasurably deeper than mere beliefs. For Tiutchev, Russia was "the other Europe" ["*l'autre Europe*"], the second half of "that great organic unity — the Christian world." "Eastern Europe is the lawful sister of the Christian West." It is with this new Europe that Tiutchev confronts the old — not a raw, inert, material force, but a life-giving spiritual principle, an idea that is a power.

Tiutchev's conception of "Revolution" was not merely popular revolt, a "freedom-loving impetus." "Revolution" to him was essentially a principle, an "idea," and in this respect Tiutchev resembled de Maistre. Tiutchev wrote: "*L'esprit anti-chrétien est l'âme de la Révolution; c'est là son caractère propre, essentiel . . . c'est lui aussi qui lui a valu sa terrible puissance sur le monde.*" To him, Revolution was no "mere casual, peculiar, arbitrary theory, but the final limit, the last word of that lengthy intellectual process habitually known as 'modern civilization'." "It is the whole scope of modern thought since its secession from the Church — the purest product, the last expression, of what during three centuries went by the name of *Western civilization.*" "The human ego, aspiring to be independent of everything except its own self, recognizing no law except its own self-will, worshipping the self in place of God," this "self-assumed authority," this "apotheosis of the human ego" — that is Revolution. It is the Anti-Christ's substitute for the Kingdom of Christ. It is the tradition of the Roman Empire piercing through the secular layer of Christianity. It

is Caesar, eternally at war with Christ [*"c'est le César, qui sera éternellement en guerre avec le Christ"*].

Russia and Revolution. The two are not merely political or empirical forces. They are two universal metaphysical principles, two covenants of human order, "two unities" — the one wrought by "blood and iron," the other by "love" — two "powers." The East and the West are the embodiments of these spiritual principles: "the true empire of the East, the shadowy and imperfect forerunner of which was the first Eastern Empire of the Byzantine rulers," and "the usurping Empire of the West." Tiutchev contemplates the inevitable self-destruction of this Western empire. He concludes his article on "Russia and Revolution" in the following manner: "It may be said that the Lord is already tracing letters of fire across the skies, dark with the approaching storm . . . the West is nearing its ruin, everything is being destroyed, all is crumbling away in the general conflagration — the Europe of Charlemagne along with the Europe of the Treaties of 1815; the Roman See along with all the Western monarchies; Catholicism and Protestantism; the long-lost faith and the intellect brought to their final *reductio ad absurdum* ; order rendered henceforth impossible and freedom already non-existent; and upon these ruins which it has accumulated, modern civilization commits suicide. . . ."

Did Hell or some infernal might
Beneath the bubbling cauldron stir,
Kindle the blaze of Lucifer,
The world's foundations disunite,
And bring the lowest depths to light?

questioned Tiutchev, overwhelmed by the impression of the Revolution of February 1848 ("The Ocean and the Rock"). His apocalyptical surmises remind one of the alarmed and apprehensive repudiations uttered by another Russian observer, Herzen. And, like Herzen, Tiutchev turns to the East, exclaiming: "The East, in doubt, stands silent!" The East, Russia, as "a holy ark," as "an immovable rock," "a giant granite cliff," rises indestructible above "the maddening tumult of the waves" in the midst of the fury of the warring elements, in the hour of "the gigantic cataclysm." "Since 1815 the seat of the Western empire has no longer been in the West," asserted Tiutchev. "The empire has migrated, in essence, and found its center in the place where the *tradition* of empire has lived since time immemorial." Here Tiutchev did not mean political relations or external authority. At any rate, he did not mean them alone. To him, "the European West was but one half of a great organic unity. The apparently insurmountable difficulties experienced by the West would be resolved only within *its other half.*" "What is beginning now is neither war nor policy; these are the birth-pangs of a new world, and its first duty is to recover its forsaken conscience" — such was Tiutchev's interpretation of the Crimean War.

In it he saw "decisive combat between the West as a whole and Russia." "It *might* end in victory for Russia — or perhaps Russia is destined to perish." Russia's victory would signify general pacification and regeneration, the joy of "a universal resurrection."

Tiutchev dreamed:

> Wait yet a moment! As ye gaze,
> To east and west, to south and north,
> The sun's glad tidings shall ring forth,
> The summons of his conquering rays.

Then will "the universal orthodox day" dawn for the world. It will bring with it the final forgetting of "sorrow and suffering, and lift forever the pall of overpowering darkness in which we are now enveloped"; it will bring "the new message, the life and light of better times to come." The earlier Slavophiles also dreamed of that day, when "penitent Russia," the "still slumbering East," would awaken and "bring the mystic message of freedom" to the distracted peoples and nations of Europe. "The world will be illuminated by rays of love, holiness and peace." Thus will be realized the "pan-humanity" which is destined to end the death-like nostalgia of "European contradictions," which Dostoevsky later described as "Russia's pre-destination," "our lot" among the peoples of the Aryan race.

To Tiutchev, the West appeared as a great unity. Historically, it all grew out of the same roots, and these roots were Rome. Tiutchev wrote: "Now as ever before, Rome is the root of the Western world"; and therefore all the contradictions and "impossibilities" of Western life are focused within "the problem of Rome." Yet throughout its entire history, the West has been internally divided. "The principle of empire was always the very soul of Western history," asserted Tiutchev, adding as a reservation: "Yet in the West, the Empire was always founded on spoliation and usurpation of power." At the time of Constantine, the lawful empire was transferred to the East. Such, according to Tiutchev, is the Christian premiss which pagan fact endeavors to deny: "*c'est la donnée chrétienne que la donnée païenne cherche à nier.*" Hence, "the empire" of the West is opposed to nature and founded on violence. Hence, it can never attain fulfillment, and all attempts at "organization" are doomed to failure. "It is the booty that the popes of Rome have shared with the German Caesars. Hence all their disputes. The legitimate Empire remains bound to the heritage of Constantine." The papacy essayed "to build the kingdom of Christ as a kingdom of this world." Consequently, the Western Church ceased to be "a community of the faithful, freely united in spirit and truth within the law of Christ." She has become "an institution, a political force," a "state within a state." She has been transformed, as it were, into "a Roman colony in a conquered" empire. For this reason she was inevitably drawn into "godless and sacrilegious single combat" with the Empire.

This "fierce conflict of many centuries between the Pontiff and the Empire" ended in a double downfall: the Church was renounced by the Reformation in the name of "the individual human ego," and the State was repudiated by revolution. The forces of tradition, however, proved so powerful that Revolution itself aspired to raise an empire and repeat the achievement of Charlemagne. The task of Napoleon, "that Centaur whose body consisted partially of revolution," was an attempt to "consecrate" the Revolution. A similar idea inspired "the revolutionary scribes" of Italy and Prince Bismarck. Here we are witnessing a direct return to pagan Rome. The powers of this world are openly directed against Christ. They attack the last "support upholding the remnants of the Christian structure which were left standing after the great catastrophe of the sixteenth century, with its subsequent landslides." For however feeble and distorted it may be, the faith of Christ nevertheless still lives in Catholicism. The Western Church has departed from ecumenical unity "by creating a separate destiny for herself." Tiutchev emphasizes the idea that "it is not the Church which has divided herself, for the Church is one and is Catholic." It is two worlds, "two mankinds, so to speak," which have become disunited and followed different flags. Rome "took care to impose herself between the West and the ecumenical Church," to "confiscate the ecumenical tradition in her own favor," thereby rendering impossible the ordered progress of the Western world because the Empire is bound up with a *universal* Church. Rome, in her self-imposed assimilation of the Church "with her Roman ego," laid the foundation of the godless autonomism which is being turned against herself. "For no peaceful compromise is possible between the self-assumed authority of the human will and the law of Christ." Gregory VII, no less than Luther, is "a glorious master of revolution," a fact recognized even by "the modern revolutionary school." The Reformation took up the task of Rome and made the breach through which anti-Christian doctrines penetrated into the West-European communities. Thus is the circle of the destructive consequences of original self-will completed. Christian Rome now stands helpless, powerless to resist the onslaught of the world she nurtured. The sentence is being carried out "in renegade Rome" against "the Dalai-Lama of the Vatican," "the false vicar of Christ."

Tiutchev's attitude towards the "perishing West" has no anger or malevolence in it. It is imbued with profound and melancholy compassion. His soul is aflame with suffering and sorrow. He realizes that, left to itself, the West is powerless to effect its own religious revival, that any revolt against "the millenial falsehood" of Rome's "sacrilegious guardianship" will inevitably "go astray," will inevitably inflict more wounds upon the bleeding body of the Church and end in "an impenetrable deadend." He visualizes how helplessly "all of these suddenly re-awakened nations are seeking for the truth of God."

She cannot conquer! Still impure
Is the poison of that fount.
It flows through all their inmost veins,
And long will flow. And where's the cure?

Tiutchev, however, could not let himself be mastered by this spirit of bitter disenchantment. "Impossible," he protested:

> that such unnatural, such terrible conditions should last for ever! Whether it is ordained by God as a punishment or a trial, is it conceivable that the Lord, in His infinite mercy, should long forsake the Church of Rome, imprisoned in this fiery circle? Would He not point out the road or show some way of escape — wondrous, luminous and unforeseen? . . . Fierce will be the flames and long the conflagration which are destined to devour and turn to ashes the vain pretensions and anti-Christian enmity of centuries, to shatter the fatal barrier obstructing the longed-for culmination. In the face of present events, in the face of the newly-organized malignant forces, more cunning and menacing than anything the world has ever seen, in the face of this world of evil all armed for battle, with its church of atheism and its revolutionary government — is it conceivable that Christians are to be deprived of the hope that the Lord will deign to grant strength to His Church in proportion to the new task allotted her? Shall we abandon the hope that on the eve of the decisive combat He will mercifully endow her with the fullness of power? Or that in the hour appointed by Him, He will with His own loving touch heal the gaping wound inflicted on her body by human hands, which has bled incessantly for well-nigh eight centuries? The Orthodox Church never despaired of such a healing. Notwithstanding centuries of estrangement, in spite of all human prejudices, the Church never ceased to recognize that Christian principles were not dead within the Church of Rome, that they were stronger than her errors and human passions. . . . The Church knows that during bygone centuries, as well as now, the fate of Western Christianity is still in the hands of the Roman Church. And she cherishes the firm hope that on the day of the great re-union the Church of Rome will return this holy pledge unsullied.

Tiutchev concludes his article by recalling the "widespread heartfelt emotion" evoked in 1846 by the visit of the Emperor Nicholas I to Rome: "the appearance of the Orthodox Emperor, returned to Rome after centuries of absence, in the Church of St. Peter." Tiutchev recalls "the electrical tremor that ran through the multitude at the sight of the Orthodox sovereign worshipping at the tomb of the Apostles. The emotion was legitimate: the Tsar did not kneel alone, for all of Russia was prostrated in prayer along with him. Let us hope that her petition offered at the holy shrine was not in vain!"

Tiutchev, in a way particular to himself, foreshadows here Vladimir Soloviev's dream of a universal reconciliation and a regeneration of the world through "the re-union of the Churches," which Soloviev visualized as a union of the ecumenical Pontiff of Rome and the universal Tsar of Russia. The Papacy would be saved through the Russian Empire, while Russia would draw renewed strength from a re-united Church. This was Tiutchev's dream, as well. He wrote: "There exists only one secular power leaning on the ecumenical Church which is capable of reforming the Papacy without injuring the Church. No such power ever existed or could exist in the West." Nor does it exist in the East *at the present time*. Potentially, however, it is conceivable, and must come into being. This empire is not Russia. It is "the Great Greco-Russian Orthodox Empire" into which Russia must expand. It is her historical culmination, to which Russia is aspiring. "Had Russia not developed into an empire, she would have exploded," Tiutchev affirmed. To him, all of Russia's past history signified only the growth of this Orthodox kingdom. It is from this standpoint that he regards the history of Russia's "conquests." To him they represent "the most organic, the most absolutely legitimate of all historical processes," the great re-establishment" or "gathering together" of Slavdom. For to him, the Emperor of the East is above all "the Pan-Slavonic Tsar." Slavdom is the "element" of the Eastern Empire, and the Slavonic peoples consequently fulfill their national destiny only in so far as they remain faithful to Orthodoxy. Those who have lost their Orthodox faith have forfeited their "national status." Those countries which have embraced Roman Catholicism are thereby assimilated into the alien nations of the West. Herein, for Tiutchev, lies the tragedy of Poland: "Thou hast fallen into the purifying flames, thou eagle of our kin." The national hope of the Czechs lives in the fact that the Hussite traditions still preserve "sympathetic reminiscences of the Eastern Church." "The Empire is one," wrote Tiutchev in the notes for his unpublished book, *Russia and the West*, "her soul is the Orthodox Church, her body the Slavonic race." Therefore, only when its component peoples are gathered together within the fold of the Eastern Church will "the world's outcast," the Slavonic race, become "a ruling people." In Tiutchev's philosophy as later in Dostoevsky's, the destinies of the world are closely interwoven with "the Eastern problem." The ultimate consummation of history is the creation of "the Empire." As a basic principle and "idea," the Empire is eternal. It "has existed since time immemorial, only its rulers have changed." Tiutchev did, however, qualify this statement. "This Empire, which in its substance is immortal, may in the process of evolution go through phases of debility, eclipse and intermittent collapse." After the four ancient monarchies a "fifth" comes into being, founded by Constantine the Great: "the Christian empire," which is destined to become "the *final* Empire." Tiutchev regarded the present epoch as the period of "intermittent collapse" — hence his foreboding of an impending

catastrophe. He did not have the courage to implicitly assert that the Empire was being born. His faith, so full of joyful anticipation, was constantly obscured by premonition and doubt. Occasionally he let himself be carried away by his "presentiment of the unfathomable future," of the bliss to come when "all that is shadowy will disappear, when God's judgment will have been pronounced and the great Empire will have been founded." Now and then, he admitted with consternation that "Russia may perhaps perish." Of one thing he was certain: the decisive hour had struck. Europe was faced with the alternative of destruction or victory. The entire West stands arrayed against the East. Tiutchev was dismayed by the general lack of consciousness of "the clear apocalyptical signs of the approaching future." "If the West were one," he surmised, "we should certainly perish. But there are two: the Red West, and that other West which the Red West is destined to engulf. For forty whole years we have fought the Red West for this prey — and see, we now stand at the brink of the abyss, and the Red West will be our savior." This prophetic utterance contains no veiled sympathy with revolutionary "chaos." It is merely an estimate of the dual process in the West, which weakens the foe. Revolution creates nothing. Yet by ruining the West it renders a service to the East — such is the essence of Tiutchev's idea. The Revolution serves to remove the obstacles to Russia's progress. These constitute a danger inasmuch as they represent "substitutes" for the real "Empire." The Western monarchies are crumbling, the Papal throne is rocking under the onslaught of unbelief, and so the task of the East — "the re-union of both Churches" and "the founding of the great Slavonic empire" — is made easier.

"The Empire" — such is the fundamental principle of Tiutchev's historical philosophy. His ideas are purely empirical. His attention is riveted exclusively on contemporary political issues, on the destinies of kingdoms. In speaking of the East, he is solely preoccupied with "the Orthodox kingdom." Orthodoxy as such is never mentioned. This is not an accidental omission. Ivan Aksakov was right when he said of Tiutchev that "his personality, right down to the last nerve and sinew, breathed the charm of a higher, manifold, *un-Russian* culture." Tiutchev approached Russia from without. He was bound to her by ties of blood and ideas, but not by any true affinity of spirit. It was not chance which drew from him the avowal that his heart did not go out to the "poor hamlets," the "stunted nature," of his actual Motherland. The poet himself wrote:

> Oh no! Not here! Not this unpeopled land
> Was e'er my spirit's home.

Tiutchev treated Russia and Orthodoxy as an intellectual problem, as an ideal type. Unlike Khomiakov, Orthodoxy was not his life. It is difficult to make any connection at all between his Orthodox

imperialism and the ingenious cosmic intuition that inspired his wonderful lyrics. Herein lies the profound and insurmountable distinction between Tiutchev and the early Slavophiles. The idea of the "Empire" played no part in the world views of Kireevsky or Khomiakov. Instead, they tended to succumb to the opposite temptation — that of exalting "an absence of power." Theirs was the vivid, illuminated consciousness of the spiritual contrast between East and West, which was but slightly visualized by Tiutchev. His appreciation of the West was clearly of the typical negative spirit of reactionary romanticism. He spoke of the revolution in the terms of de Maistre and Saint-Simon. Of course, there can be no question of plagiarism. It is merely a typical kinship of mental receptivity. Tiutchev spoke of the West from living and throbbing experience. But he was incapable of creating a living image of Russia, however sensitive he was to her secret loveliness. "The orthodox kingdom," "the heritage of ancient Byzantium," the Russian landscape — all these prevented him from realizing Orthodoxy as a truth. The very term "universal" he interpreted in the sense of geographical extent. For this very reason he involuntarily succumbed to the same temptation of which he indignantly accused the West; namely, to a belief in "any kind of form," "the idea of some higher outward authority, dwelling on earth in the shape of some historical traditional institution," as Ivan Aksakov once defined Tiutchev's mentality.

In this respect, Tiutchev resembles the Slavophiles. They were united in the belief that a perfect religious community might be realized on earth, that Russia might thus repent and be purified, that all her sins, vices and iniquities would be washed away. During the 1840's, the Slavophiles were far removed from roseate optimism or from idealizing the current state of Russia. Nor did they unreservedly idealize the bygone past of Moscow or Byzantium. Not in this sense were they enthralled by the Messianic "theory of the Third Rome." The roots of their traditional mentality and historical serenity went far deeper: they believed that in the mysterious, distant future, an orthodox country free from sin and iniquity would come into being. The problem of Russia and Europe thus became a world-wide social and historical problem, but its religious aspect lost much of its poignancy. This inherent flaw in the Slavophile doctrine was revealed with particular clarity in the historiosophical vision of Dostoevsky.

There is undoubtedly a certain similarity between the mentality of Tiutchev and that of Dostoevsky, which stands out especially vividly in *The Diary of an Author*. Both writers are seemingly bewitched by their absorption in the petty details of everyday life — to such an extent, in fact, as to justify the ironic remark of one contemporary writer: "On the basis of *The Diary of an Author*, one might be led to think that a whole generation of poets, philosophers and musicians had become extinct in Europe, leaving room only for the Marshal MacMahons and the Lord Beaconsfields." By no means was this due to shortsightedness. On the

contrary, a prophetic intuition enabled Dostoevsky to discern in commonplace occurrences symbolic signs of the approaching catastrophe. It was this acute prevision of the ruin of social order and civilization, the somber foreboding of the failure of mankind's efforts to determine everyday life, which prompted Dostoevsky to seek new forms and conditions of prosperous and peaceful order. As the atmosphere of apocalytic expectation grew more tense in the West, the hope that Russia might withstand the onslaught grew in proportion. If the West were on the road to perdition through loss of faith, would not the true faith transform Russia into a glowing oasis at the hour of the general "gigantic cataclysm"? Both Tiutchev and Dostoevsky diagnosed the canker that was eating into the flesh of the West as the "Roman idea." In this sense Dostoevsky was akin to Tiutchev rather than to Khomiakov or Kireevsky, who both laid greater stress on Western rationalism. To counteract the Western tradition of forced unification, they were the protagonists of the covenant of love. "Love" was to be the foundation of "the universal monarchy." This ideal of Tiutchev's was taken up by Dostoevsky, and sounded a note of sharp discord in his generally pessimistic outlook concerning the possibility of a "final" consummation. Even the term "final," as employed by both, acquired a similar meaning. Both were captivated and allured by the image of "our Constantinople." Russia's destiny, according to both, was bound up with the Eastern problem. If the Crimean War were an apocalyptic symbol for Tiutchev, the "war of liberation" in 1877-78, which generally whetted Russian optimistic utopianism, produced a like effect on Dostoevsky. These similarities point to no generic connection. They are merely a result of kindred ideas. It may be said without exaggeration that Tiutchev was the key to Dostoevsky insofar as their historiosophical anticipations are concerned.

Tiutchev's orthodox imperialism presents a vivid example of the difficulties encountered by Russian philosophical and historical thought in the process by which it differentiates between and individualizes the problems of the "spirit" and those of "politics." The basic problem of Russian national and philosophical thought painfully evolved as a problem of cultural ideals, not merely as one of the empiric correlation of established historical realities. The renunciation of the thirst for historical triumph was bought at the cost of painful sacrifice. And yet, it was solely by renouncing these dreams of a millenium that it became possible to present the "idea" in all its purity, as a "quest" which may never find its realization in empirical history. Tiutchev was assailed by doubts as to the imminent realization of Russia's predestined mission. Yet he was incapable of rising to an eschatological conception of events which, far from depreciating the value of earthly history, merely relegated it to its proper sphere in the religious perspective of the progress of the universe. Tiutchev possessed sufficient strength of character, however, to condemn his own judgment. Even during his youth, when in Munich for the debates with Schelling, he branded

"impossible" the latter's attempt to "prove" the truth of Christian revelation by "intellect." "The philosophy of the catechism is the only philosophy that is compatible with Christianity," said Tiutchev. "One must believe as Paul the Apostle and Pascal believed and bend one's knee before the contradiction of the Cross, or else deny everything." Any attempt to "prove" faith leads to negation, and is itself a negation. Yet is not this too a partial negation — this attempt to replace faith with an earthly consummation? Does not Tiutchev belie himself in prophesying the "final" advent of an "Orthodox kingdom" over and above "the contradiction of the Cross"?

Translated from the Russian by
E. M. Zvegintsev

THE TORTUOUS RELIGIOUS PATH OF GOGOL

Gogol sensed the religious problematics of culture with particular acuteness. It is difficult to differentiate between his artistic path and his personal fate. At any rate Gogol occupies a highly distinctive place among his younger and older contemporaries. As a writer he was both progressive and backwards. New tendencies stem from his work, and not just in literature. His creative work possesses a prophetic quality. But he himself still remains a part of the preceding age. His spiritual backwardness or archaism is one element of his tragic fate.

The philosophical trends of the epoch did not affect Gogol, except through art. The "debates" of his contemporaries, all those "quarrels over our European and Slavic principles" between the "old believers" and the "new believers," or Slavicists and Europeanists, seemed to him to be a complete misunderstanding. "They all speak about various aspects of the same thing, never guessing that they are arguing over and repeating nothing to one another." Gogol mixed more frequently in the company of Slavophiles, but he personally was not one of them. With greater accuracy he might be considered a Westernizer. But he did not love the same West, nor did he feel the same kind of love for it, as did contemporary Russian Westernizers. Still, his world view and spiritual temperament made him entirely a part of the West. He fell under Western influence early in life, and remained there. In reality, the West was all he knew — about Russia he dreamed immensely. Gogol knew more about what Russia should be and what he wished to see in it than about what Russia actually was.

In his youth Gogol experienced the ordeal of German romanticism, and found it congenial to work in the romantic spirit. He mastered the creative problematics of romanticism in a manner that was neither imitative nor solely literary, intimately inserting himself into the romantic experiment. This was an important stage or revolution in his inner life. With a creative seriousness he lived through and deeply felt all the demonological motifs of the romantics, and reincarnated them in images that were pregnant with meaning. One feels the power of his personal conviction and the sharpness of his personal experience — the world lies in the power of evil forces, dark obsessions and wickedness. Hence his early awakened religious fear — an outright phobia, and not just trembling or reverence. The young Gogol lived his religious life in a peculiarly magical, bewitched and enchanted world, full of strange visions into the mysteries of dark passions. A "mortifying insensitivity for life" was subsequently unveiled before him. He perfectly depicted arrested, congealed, immobile faces — not quite faces but masks (Rozanov observed that a portrait by Gogol is always static). It has been correctly noted that he saw the world beneath the sign of death, *sub specie mortis*.

Romanticism also supplied his first utopian temptation: the temptation of the creative power of art — and then his first disillusionment: art turns out to be ambiguous, and therefore impotent. "Magical idealism" is seductively two-faced:

> You would be amazed, my son, at the terrible might of the devil. He strives to penetrate everything: our work, our thoughts, and even the very inspiration of the artist. Innumerable will be the sacrifices to this infernal spirit that dwells invisibly, without form, on earth. This is the dark spirit that breaks in on us even during moments of the purest and holiest meditation.

Gogol retained this fear throughout his life, right down to the prayers on the eve of his death. "Bind Satan once again with the mysterious power of your inscrutable cross."

The romantic experiment is always formed amidst antitheses and tensions: spontaneity and reflection, "conciliarity" and individual will, reconciliation and protest, peace and anxiety. Romanticism is entirely immersed in this dialectical game. In Russian romanticism the theme of reconciliation is more strongly expressed; "organic" motifs predominate over "critical" ones. To the extent that it was a romantic phenomenon one must say that this was especially the case with Slavophilism. Only a few voiced anxiety, only a few were granted an apocalyptical ear with which to listen. Lermontov was one such person, and his creative work is all the more enigmatic for not having been completed. This apocalyptical hearing was also at work particularly strongly with Gogol.

Romanticism alone offers no religious outlet. A return to the Church along the path of "religious renunciation" is necessary, for in itself romanticism is only an imaginary or false path. The young Gogol had quite a diffuse religious world view composed of a very vague religious humanism, romantic agitation, and sensitivity or feeling. Except aesthetically, he felt no reality in the Church at that time. "I came to Christ more by a Protestant route than by a Catholic one," he later wrote to Shevyrev. "An analysis of the human soul in a manner no one else has made explains why I encountered Christ, being at first amazed by his human wisdom and previously unheard-of knowledge of the soul, and then bowing down before his divinity." Or again in *An Author's Confession*:

> Since then, man and his soul have become more than ever the subject of observation . . . I turned my attention to the discovery of the eternal laws by which each man and mankind in general move. The books of lawgivers, of those who know the soul, of those who observe human nature, became my reading. I was occupied with everything — wherever knowledge of men and their souls found expression, from the testimony of

> the layman to the confession of the anchorite and hermit. Insensibly, almost without knowing how, I journeyed along this road and came to Christ. And I saw in him the key to the human soul and realized that none who knew the soul had reached the pinnacle of spiritual understanding on which he stood.

The admission is quite characteristic: Gogol traveled on the path of pietist humanism. Thus he remained a part of the Alexandrine age. Precisely speaking, he did not just read the books of "those who know the soul" and "those who study the soul," but he labored over them. In any case, he read the Bible and became accustomed to reading it as a prophetic and apocalyptic book. Even his style became affected by Biblical solemnity.

> Open the book of the Old Testament. There you will find every contemporary event, you will see clearly the day upon which that event transgressed in the sight of God, and how his awesome judgment was expressed upon it so plainly that the present will tremble.

This was spoken in connection with the lyricism of Russian poetry, in which he detected something prophetic. "The cadence of our poets is biblical," for a "new kingdom" is already approaching for Russia.

The impression of his Roman period proved decisive in Gogol's spiritual development. "I gathered and stored in my soul all that I needed. Rome, as a holy place, as a witness of wondrous things, acts upon me and dwells in me eternally." Whether Princess Zinaida Volkonskaia and the Polish brothers of the Order of the Resurrection did or did not try to turn Gogol toward Catholicism is beside the point. Gogol never considered "changing the rites of his religion," simply because at the time he saw no differences among confessions.

> Since both our religion and Catholicism are entirely one and the same, there is absolutely no reason to exchange one for the other. Each is true, each acknowledges one and the same Savior, one and the same Divine Wisdom, which once visited our earth and for its sake endured the ultimate humiliation, in order to raise the soul and direct it toward heaven.

From his Roman conversationalists he learned about more than Roman Catholic dogma. He also heard about "Slavic affairs." Gogol met Mickiewicz. And one must suppose that the Polish brothers told Gogol about the work of their congregation or order, and about Polish messianism — that aroused "apostolate of truth," or program of religious action.

This was Gogol's first introduction into the realm of contemporary social Christianity. Aesthetic experiences cannot fully account for these

years in Gogol's religious experiment. In his consciousness social motifs are also quite boldly pronounced — a fully understandable development given the historical background. Characteristic in this connection is Gogol's "Rome": "a frightful kingdom of words instead of deeds." Its universal desolation derives from unbelief. "The holy images were carried from the cathedral and the cathedral was a cathedral no more. Bats and evil spirits dwell in it." But on the other hand there is a hint of the ideal of religious recovery. Gogol's intimate friends (the Vielgorskys, Smirnova, and others) were connected with Catholic circles in Paris. Smirnova was captivated by the sermons of Lacordaire and Ravignan and in the 1830s she joined the Svechina circle. This was a new source of contact with social Catholicism. While in Rome Gogol quite likely read Silvio Pelliko's *On the Duties of Man* [*Dei doveri degli uomini*], which had been sympathetically noted in Russian journals. A note was quite enough for Gogol. His genial impressionability quickly seized upon these hints and created from them an agreeable legend. After all, he was a poet. One should remember that the priest introduced in the last, destroyed version of *Dead Souls* strangely combines the personal traits of Father Matvei "with Catholic overtones." This illustrates the strength of Gogol's "Catholic" influences.

During his years in Rome the famous *Imitation of Christ* became a basic component in Gogol's spiritual makeup. He sent copies to friends in Moscow for daily reading and meditation.

> After reading it through, give yourself over to contemplation of that which you have read. Turn it over on every side until you discover and perceive exactly how it might be applied to you.

Obviously, Gogol himself proceeded in this manner. "Choose a free and convenient hour for this spiritual occupation, which can serve as the foundation of your day. Immediately after coffee or tea would be best, so that your appetite will not deflect you." He advised Smirnova to read through passages from Bossuet's *Oeuvres Philosophiques*, and also asked her to "seek out Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologica*, if it had been translated into French.

Simultaneously, he was reading the Russian translations of the Holy Fathers in *Christian Reading* and in the *Moscow Supplements*. It is curious, however, that while working on his *Meditations on the Divine Liturgy* in Paris in 1842 and 1843 he was using not only the Slavic text, but also the Latin text by Goar, obviously in place of the Greek. The famous book by Dmitrievsky served as his basis for exegesis. Gogol also asked to be sent the *Areopagitica*. These details are all very revealing. Gogol's style was formed in a western manner, and by the time he had read the holy fathers his spiritual habits had already been established. Patristic motifs were merely sewn into a previously woven fabric. At that time he was also reading St. John Chrysostom, St.

Ephrem the Syrian, St. Maximos's *On Love*, the entire *Philokalia* (in Paisii's translations), and St. Tikhon of Zadonsk (see his extracts from the holy fathers). It is not clear why he asked to be sent the sermons of Stefan Iavorsky, *The Trumpets of Words* [*Trudy slov*] and *The Spiritual Sword* [*Mech dukhovnyi*] by Lazar Baranovich, and Dimitrii of Rostov's *The Search* [*Rozysk*], nor is it clear if he even received them. Among contemporary Russian authors, he read the sermons of Innokentii and Iakov Vecherkov and anonymous articles in *Christian Reading*.

From his youth Gogol was firmly convinced that he had been chosen, called and predestined — his existence meant something, he was to accomplish some great or special deed. This kind of self-perception characterized that whole generation, and even the entire sentimental-romantic era. It was a very complex alloy. In time his sense of destiny became an obsession, the seduction of pride. "An invisible person writes before me with a mighty scepter." He was convinced that he had been summoned to testify and to teach. "Henceforth a higher power invested my word." Persuaded of the special meaning of his personal existence and example, he justified himself against critics by exhibiting his inner self and reminding them that "nonetheless, I am not a monk, but a writer." He added further that "I did not believe that I would tempt anyone by publicly revealing that I aspire to be better than I am, I find no harm in acknowledging before everyone a thirst to be enflamed with a desire for perfection."

Gogol had a very dangerous theory of prayer:

> How does one apprehend God's will? One must peer with penetrating eyes into oneself and search oneself. Which of our abilities given from birth is higher and more noble than the others? With these abilities we must first of all labor, for such labor constitutes God's desire — otherwise they will not be granted us. Thus, by asking that these abilities be awakened, we are asking for that which is in accord with His will, and therefore our prayer will be heard directly. Prayer must come from all the powers of our souls. If such unremitting intensity is observed for only two minutes a day, after a week or two you will unfailingly see its effect. And toward the end of that time in prayer further things will become apparent. . . . Then answers to questions will flow directly from God, and their beauty will be such that your entire being will be rapturously transfigured.

Obviously, Gogol himself practiced such prayer. Thus it is hardly surprising if he attached an almost sinless quality to his writings and saw a higher revelation in them. His persistent didacticism and outright insolence, however, greatly irritated his closest friends. There is a strange excessiveness in the way he chose his words and turned a phrase when speaking about himself and his work. "Compatriots, I loved you

— and I loved you with an inexpressible love, which was given to me by God."

Gogol had a difficult religious path, one whose twists and fractures have never been explained and are hardly explicable. He would frequently break out in convulsions of religious fright. Terrible visions would suddenly appear before his gaze and he would inwardly faint. "Without masks the devil stalks the world." Such is his terrible vision! "The entire dying structure groans. O, those gigantic growths and fruits, the seeds of which we have sown in life without foreseeing or detecting the frightening things that would arise from them." Gogol's experience undoubtedly contained some of the qualities of an ascetical anguish, an unhealthy and excessively intense penitential reflex. But his uniqueness lies precisely in his combination of this acute asceticism with a very insistent will for social action.

Therein lies the entire meaning of his fatal book *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends*. As Gogol himself insists in *An Author's Confession*, he wished "to speak out on some of the things I had to prove in the persons of the heroes discovered in the narrative work" (that is, in the second part of *Dead Souls*). Quite characteristic is the expression "to prove." He consciously converted his artistic images into proofs. In the second part of *Dead Souls* Gogol wanted to depict Russia "reborn" or awakened. As he conceived it, it was certainly not intended to be a story, but precisely a "poem." It was to be "a poem beneficial for the soul," and the *Selected Passages* is the ideological preface to that "poem." Only by an extreme misunderstanding is it possible to view the book as a sermon for personal perfection and salvation. In reality it was a program of social Christianity. Gershenzon was apparently the first to recognize that fact. "Perhaps no other work in the Russian language is so wholeheartedly and completely, down to the finest nuances of thought and word, suffused with a social spirit." He also rightly noted the unexpected way in which Gogol combined moral pathos with the most extreme and minute utilitarianism. "Aimless joy for living did not exist for Gogol. . . . His thought is thoroughly practical and utilitarian, precisely in a social sense." Gogol's basic category is to be in service [*sluzhba*], never merely serving [*sluzhenie*].

> No, for you, just as for me, the doors of the long-awaited cloister are locked. Your monastery is Russia! Array your thoughts in monastic garb and completely mortify yourself — but only for yourself, not for her. Step forth and give yourself up to her. She now summons her sons more loudly than ever. Already her soul aches and she cries out from her spiritual illness.

Still less could Gogol find contemporary life satisfactory; still less could he be content with the existing order and arrangement. He was

entirely possessed by a pathos for renovation, he had a kind of apocalyptical impatience, a thirst for immediate action. "The earth is already on fire with an incomprehensible anguish." Precisely because he felt so disturbed over Russia's existing condition he insisted that "whoever is not serving must enter service and seize upon his duty, even as a drowning man grabs a plank, for otherwise you can save no one." Gogol's book is concerned from beginning to end with social welfare — it is a utopia of the holy tsardom.

> Each of us on the ship must now carry out his duty, his service, that we might steer ourselves away from the whirlpool, gazing always at the Heavenly Helmsman. Each of us must now serve, not as we served in the former Russia, but as in the new heavenly kingdom, whose head is Christ himself.

The expression "former Russia" is also characteristic. Gogol came to see himself as part of "another world," as existing on a new, theocratic level. Is this perception of himself not in accord with the spirit of the "Holy Alliance" and with the ideology of the Alexandrine era and the "Combined Ministry"? The image of the governor-general in the second part of *Dead Souls* was sustained entirely in that style:

> Beginning tomorrow I will furnish a copy of the Bible to all the departments in the provincial bureau, and in addition three or four of the classics, a copy of each Russian chronicle, the foremost world poets, and the faithful chronicles of our life.

Moreover, the fact that Gogol's socio-religious utopia allows the state to overshadow the Church and give creative initiative to laymen as their "service," rather than to the hierarchy or the clergy, also ties him to the Alexandrine spirit. "The sovereign's authority would be a senseless phenomenon if he did not feel that he must be God's image on earth." The entire Bible turns out to be a book for kings, who must merely imitate God and rule as he ruled the chosen people. A king is called to be "the image on earth of him who is himself love." Everything throughout the world has become terrible, so much suffering exists "that even the unfeeling heart is ready to burst with compassion, and the power of commiseration, which did not exist before, evokes the power of love, which also previously did not exist." Gogol predicts that in some unprecedented way the heart will become enflamed.

> Men will burn with a love for all mankind such as has never before burned within them. As separate individuals we cannot make the full force of love real — it remains in the realm of thoughts and ideas, not that of deeds. It can be made real only in those in whom the commandment to love all others as one has been firmly rooted. By loving everyone in his kingdom,

> every single individual of every class and calling . . . by making them, as it were, all a part of his own body . . . by feeling for them with all his soul . . . by grieving, wailing, praying day and night for them, the sovereign acquires that omnipotent voice of love that alone can speak to a sick humanity.

As early as 1826, A. A. Ivanov sketched a very similar utopian image of the theocratic tsar. But still more curious is the later echo of this same ideal in Vladimir Soloviev's meditations on the Russian tsar's theocratic obligations: to forgive and to heal with love. This is a single stream of thought and temperament, the source of which may be traced back to the time of the Holy Alliance.

Gogol speaks about the great religious and historical advantages of the Eastern Church: "Our Church reconciles and resolves everything." The Eastern Church is the Church of the future, which "contains the road or the way by which everything in man will be joined in one harmonious hymn to the Supreme Being." The Western Church is not prepared for new historical tasks. In previous times it could somehow "reconcile with Christ" a one-sided and incompletely developed humanity, but now the tasks are immeasurably more complex. However, once again Gogol defines the historical mission of the Russian Church from a civil point of view:

> An unheard-of miracle can be accomplished before all Europe by compelling each class, calling, and rank among us to reach their legal limits and, without altering a thing in the state, give Russia the power to thereby amaze the entire world with the harmonious structure of that same organism that heretofore had frightened it.

Until now the Church had somehow hid herself "like a chaste maiden," but she was created to bear life.

How characteristic are Gogol's injunctions "to the wife of a provincial governor" and "to a Russian landowner" to take it upon themselves to guide priests. "Frequently reveal to them those terrible truths before which their souls unwillingly tremble."

> Take the priest everywhere, wherever you are working. Let him be with you always, as an assistant. . . . Take up the writings of Chrysostom and read him together with your priest, with a pencil in hand. . . .

Again, all of this is fully in keeping with the spirit of the "Combined Ministry." It is therefore not surprising that only people of the Alexandrine spirit and style liked Gogol's book, people such as Smirnova ("My soul has been enlightened by you") and Sturdza ("Our conversations in Rome are reflected as in a mirror"). Father Matvei,

Ignatii Brianchaninov, Grigorii Postnikov, and Innokentii all categorically detested it. In upbraiding Gogol for "pride" they meant precisely his spirit of utopian activism, and not without grounds did the Aksakovs see a Western influence and evil in the book. It has also been rightly noted that the book contains more morality and moralism than actual faith or sense of the Church. *The Inspector General* is written in the same style, with its moralistic allegories ("our spiritual city," "the treasury of our souls," etc.).

Gogol always remained within the circle of a rather vague pietism, and his book on the liturgy does not constitute an exception to this statement. The dogmatic content and symbolism are both borrowed from Dmitrievsky, and, in part, from the *New Table of Commandments* [*Novaia skrizhal*]. Gogol contributed only its style of moving and sincere sensitivity. "The Divine Liturgy is an eternal repetition of the great act [*podvig*] accomplished for our sake. . . . The gentle kiss of a brother can be heard. . . ." Characteristically, at the time he wrote the *Selected Passages* Gogol always and everywhere emphasized the psychological significance of the image of Christ, "who alone among all who have ever lived on earth revealed in himself a complete knowledge of the human soul."

There is yet another current in the *Selected Passages*, a current of authentic "social Christianity," which most forcibly comes out in the famous fragment "Bright Easter" ["*Svetloe Voskresenie*"]: "Christians! They drove Christ into the street, among the lepers and the sick, instead of inviting him into their homes, under their roofs — and they think they are Christians!" The stress on the diminution of brotherhood in the nineteenth century is also characteristic. "The poor man of the nineteenth century has forgotten that on this day no one is base or contemptible, but all are brothers of the same family, all bear no name but brother." The models of the Westernizers are more readily recalled here than those of the Slavophiles (although Gogol does remark that "the foundation of the brotherhood of Christ exists in our Slavic nature," among similar statements). One clearly hears the echoes of Lammenais and his *Paroles d'un croyant*. And Gogol's characterizations of the requirements and needs of "the nineteenth century" are quite typical:

> When the embrace of all mankind as brothers becomes the cherished dream of the young . . . when many dream only of how to transfigure all mankind . . . when nearly half have solemnly acknowledged that Christianity alone has the power to bring this about . . . when they have begun to say that everything will be in common, both homes and lands. . .

Gogol speaks about "brotherhood" in this wide frame of reference, lamenting that this feeling for a vital fraternity had not been grasped. Meanwhile, only by loving one's neighbor can one love God. "It is

difficult to love him whom no one has seen. Christ alone brought and announced to us the mystery that by brotherly love we receive love for God . . . Go into the world and first acquire love for your brothers." Full force falls on the word "first." This single word is placed under pathetic stress.

Quite diverse strands are crisscrossed and interwoven in Gogol's book, and there is no complete unity in it. However, his social concern and the direction of his will remain unaltered. The very design of the book represented a fatal discrepancy. He tried to bring everything to bear on the "spiritual task." "My task is the soul and the enduring labor of life." But the fact that he was least of all a psychologist and was unable to acquire a psychological foundation is another element in the plot of his creative drama. Instead of psychological analysis, one gets reasoning and arid moralizing. Apollon Grigoriev rightly emphasized that Gogol is entirely a man of action.

In *An Author's Confession* Gogol explains that *Selected Passages* is "the confession of a man who spent several years inside himself." Yet his inner experiment was confused and constituted his chief weakness. This fact is linked to the "religious crisis" of his last years. Gogol's only way out lay in the renunciation of his social utopia and in a genuine ascetical entry inside himself. "Turn about in your inner life," Father Matvei advised him. Later in life Gogol underwent an inner change which weighed heavily on him. But he could not undergo any change in his creative work. His final version of *Dead Souls* remained confined within the same fatal pietism as before. This was his ultimate ruin.

Gogol had no direct influence on the history of Russian religious development. He remained on the sidelines, disassociating himself from the themes and interests of his generation and its philosophical debates. Only a half-century later did anyone recognize him as a religious teacher; only in the epoch of Russian Neo-Romanticism did his religio-romantic motifs once more come to life.

In his own day his alarm and premonition of social upheaval and disorder separated and estranged him from the Slavophiles. He lived too long in the West, and during its most "social years," the years of utopias and premonitions, on the eve of an explosion. How typical was his coupling of apocalyptical trembling with the "calculations" of his utopian projects. This was also typical for pietism (compare this with Zhukovsky). Gogol expresses the temptation of the utopian side of Christian cultural problematics, with its dangers and discontinuities. His writings were, in part, an inner opposition to the pronounced patriarchal complacency found too strongly in individual Slavophiles.

Translated from the Russian by
Robert L. Nichols

DOSTOEVSKY AND EUROPE

NOTE FROM BULGARIAN EDITOR (1922)

[The present study is from the pen of the young Russian scholar G. V. Florovsky, former instructor (docent) at Novorosiisk University in Odessa. It is a revised version of the paper he read at a celebration organized by the Slavic Society in Bulgaria and the Society of Bulgarian Journalists and Writers on November 13, 1921 to commemorate the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of the great Russian writer F. M. Dostoevsky. The author entitled his paper "Dostoevsky and Europe," but he could also have named it "Russia and Europe," a theme which before the War preoccupied only the so-called Russian Slavophiles — one could mention, for example, the well-known work of Danilevsky, "Russia and Europe." Today this theme excites the interest of not only a large number of Russian thinkers, but also that of Western European thinkers and cultural historians. The unusual interest in the much-discussed book by the German Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West*, which has appeared in thirty-two editions over a short period of time and the second volume of which is due to appear any day now, testifies to the fact that the question of the future of Western European culture and its replacement by an Eastern culture in which Russia will play the main creative role excites a wide cross section of the European intelligentsia. Since the War, several French writers have also spoken out about the decline and even the fall of Western culture. The interesting movement in postwar Russian national thought which has been termed "Eurasianism" originates with this very "exodus to the East," whence will come the future light created by the combined creative powers of Russia and the Asiatic peoples who are close to her. As is well known to the readers of *Slavianski Glas*, that movement found expression in the collection *Exodus to the East*, which was published during 1921 by a group of young Russian scholars, among whom was our author. (See *Slavianski Glas*, bk 1, 1921, section: "Literary Notes and Evaluations.") His study "Dostoevsky and Russia" contributes to the founding of Russian neo-nationalism on the basis of the ideas of Dostoevsky, who in the eyes of Russians today has the status of a biblical prophet. We believe that this young Russian scholar's study is also instructive for our society, for which the great problem of national culture has been reduced to blind imitation and external adoption of the Western European way of life and culture, about which one of our university professors wrote not long ago. Generally speaking, our society must become interested in questions of national spirit and human creative activity if we too wish to make our contribution to the treasury of common European culture and thereby to justify our independent national existence. A thorough

acquaintance with the ideas of Dostoevsky will help us to become interested in these fundamental problems of the spirit.]

DOSTOEVSKY AND EUROPE

"We Russians," said Dostoevsky, "have two homelands — our Russia and Europe." And as passionately and impulsively as he loved that first homeland, he did not hesitate to admit that Venice, Rome, Paris, "their whole history," was dearer to him than Russia. And not only because "priceless memorials" are to be found there; it was not just the past of Europe — "those fragmentary pieces of holy wonders," "those ancient, foreign stones" — that was dear to Dostoevsky. No! In his dying dream about the historical fate of *his* people he dreamed only that it was historically determined for the Russian genius "to contribute reconciliation of European contradictions," to "show European sorrow the way out, and in doing so to help God's old world" — Europe. "Now what true Russian does not think first and foremost of Europe?" Moreover, there is perhaps no other figure in Russian literature who ever insisted with as much force and energy as Dostoevsky *that Russia is not Europe*, that she does not need to follow the European path. No one has ever insisted with such intensity upon the totally different origins of Russia and Europe and the complete ignorance concerning Russia on the part of Europe. "To Europe," wrote Dostoevsky, "Russia is an enigma, and every one of her actions is an enigma, and that is how it will be to the very end." "Someone will invent *perpetuum mobile* or an elixir of life," he believed, "before the West will reach the Russian truth, the Russian spirit and character, and its direction." The Russian will never be able *to become a European*, the Europeans will never accept a Russian as their own. In spite of all the Russian's efforts, in spite of all his assiduous copying and imitating, the Europeans will still regard the Russian as alien. Furthermore, it seemed to Dostoevsky that if Russia ever finally took the European path and set out to "save" Europe with her tools — "iron and blood"— she would lose her identity, she would cease to exist as Russia.

And so, on the one hand Europe is our second fatherland, and on the other we are inherently alien to Europe and should reinforce this isolation from her. Was there a contradiction in the opinions and views of the great Russian thinker? Did he waver between opposing solutions, powerless to choose between them? Or were they parallel currents of thought which remained in his conscious mind without fusing into an integrated, living synthesis? In order to answer that question it is necessary to closely analyze exactly what Dostoevsky meant by the term "Europe."

"Europe" is a word with many shades of meaning. In its broadest and most expansive sense it signifies the totality of historical fates and achievements of the ancient Graeco-Roman and the modern Latin-

Germanic world. Europe is Homer and Vergil, Aeschylus and Horace, Plato and Aristotle, Dante, Shakespeare, Buonarotti and Rembrandt. And at the same time it is Sparta and Athens, ancient Rome — both the republic and the monarchy — it is the struggle between the Papacy and the Empire, between the monarchy and society. Here, two unequal and heterogeneous groups of phenomena may naturally be observed: culture and way of life. "The European" ideas, in essence, are not at all the property of Europe, even though they may have been generated and developed on "European" soil and have assumed a "European" image. Neither Euripides nor Ovid, nor Goethe, belongs to Europe alone: their significance and meaning consist in the fact that they are *above* Europe, that their belonging to Europe is strictly a *coincidence*. The greatness of "European culture" consists in the fact that it is the culture of *all humanity*, it is not attached to any definite nation, nor associated with any definite epoch. It is for this very reason that European geniuses are the "eternal companions" of every human being, no matter where or when he was born, to the extent that he is a *human being*. And the true meaning of their feats is only disclosed when their origin is somehow forgotten: this is what Herzen and Dostoevsky wanted to express when they maintained that only a Russian could be a true "European," a complete European, because he alone can accept European culture as a value, independent of its transitory, concrete forms. But this quality of being common to all mankind is by no means a feature of European everyday life: the historical forms in which the political and social life of the European nations were molded, their economic and everyday activity, are essentially limited in time and place. They are just historical phenomena which cannot be duplicated or replicated. That is *only* Europe, something *unique*, the result of a special, unique historical process. Such a judgment does not at all depend on the values we give to such forms — good or bad, they belong to one particular nation.

So, "to be a European" can mean two things: on the level of culture it means that you are possessed of the spirit of Homer and Sophocles, Cervantes and Da Vinci; on the level of everyday life it means that you live in *forms* of the Latin-Germanic way of life, that you dress and carry on as in Paris or Berlin. In the former sense, a European is one who senses "the burning past life" under the "ancient, foreign stones," "the passionate faith in one's own feat, in one's own truth, in one's own struggle and one's own knowledge." In the latter sense, [the European] is one who resembles his Western contemporaries in his face and clothing.

The solution to the "paradox" of Dostoevsky and Europe lies in the above distinction. Here too, one should mention his great Russian predecessor — Herzen, who also loved Europe with a moving, filial love; he loved her as a second fatherland, and at the same time he mercilessly and harshly buried her, insisting that Russia was not at all like Europe and that she needed to follow not the European path but her

own special road. Acceptance of the European idea does not necessitate copying the European form of life; there is no inseparable bond between culture and everyday life. European culture can engender in *the new people* who accept it a new way of life that is not like any other and is characteristic only of it.[1]

It was precisely European *culture* that Dostoevsky loved and valued. He was tied to it by his memories of youth and childhood; from Schiller and Balzac, Hoffmann and George Sand, he learned the artistic interpretation of life, from them he received the first impetus to reflect upon his environment. Towards the end of his life he recalled them with rapture, and joyfully maintained that "we had implanted in our own organism very much of what we took from Europe, as our "flesh and blood, and the rest we experienced and even suffered independently." He noted with satisfaction that "all the literatures of the European nations are almost native to us, are almost our own, and have been reflected in Russian life as fully as in their own lands." In his remarkable articles about Russian literature in the journal *Vremia*, Dostoevsky defended the native quality [*natsionalnost*] of the latest Russian literature in those phenomena which usually were and are recognized as being imitative — he pointed out the native quality of Russian Byronism, the true Russian character of such types as Onegin and Pechorin. "And do you really think," asks Dostoevsky, "that the Marquis Pozzo, Faust and others were useless for the development of our Russian society, and that they will be of no further use to it?"

In this capacity of the Russian genius "to respond to everything historical and common to humanity as a whole, to receive into its soul the geniuses of foreign nations, of everyone together, with sympathy and love, in this capacity to uncover the truth in every European civilization or, more correctly, in every European individual, even in spite of everything with which one cannot agree" — in this he saw the guarantee for a great Russian future, the guarantee of a culture for all mankind, which would be based on the Russian soil and would overcome all tribal differences and historical isolation. "Above all," said Dostoevsky, "it is the need to be just and to seek only the truth." In the West, "every individual nation lives solely for itself and within itself"; of the nations of Europe, "each one strives to find the universal ideal in itself, with its own individual powers." And in this respect the Russian character differs sharply from that of the European. "It has developed a superior capability that is highly synthetic — an ability for total reconciliation, for being one with all of mankind." It has the instinct for what is common to all mankind. "It instinctively intuits the universal, even in the sharpest idiosyncracies of other nations, and immediately harmonizes them, adapts them to its own idea, finds a place for them in its own conclusions, and frequently discovers the point of contact and agreement between the completely opposed, "competing" ideas of two different European nations — ideas which in their own countries, unfortunately, find no means for mutual

adaptation, and which perhaps will never be able to agree." It was in this light that Dostoevsky saw the great significance of the reforms of Peter the Great: "We saw that we too could become Europeans, not just in dress and in powdering our heads." "During the entire century and a half since Peter, we have been incessantly experiencing community with all human civilizations, sharing their history and their ideals." "Our reform, the whole Petrine achievement, consisted of this: over the course of a century and a half, our horizons expanded to an extent that is unprecedented in the experience of perhaps all other nations, whether ancient or modern." The old pre-Petrine Russia "was preparing itself to be wrong," — possessing that value which was *common to all mankind*, "preserver of Christ's truth, but of 'the real truth', of Christ's real image, which had been darkened in all other faiths and in all other nations," it decided "to passively keep its treasure, its orthodoxy, within itself, to shut itself off from Europe — that is, from humanity." This schismatic insularity had to be destroyed, and in this sense the "transformation" was unavoidable. But the forms in which it took place, in which it was carried out by Peter, were false and mistaken. It is necessary to adopt the values of European culture, not the civilization itself, the universal eternal truths within it, but only in their pure form and not in their historically-complicated and conditioned one. And they should be adopted not as the crowning point of the latest achievements of human wisdom, but rather as material which needs to be reworked into a new national synthesis, into a new independent culture and way of life. In this respect, Dostoevsky speaks about the end, the conclusion of the Petrine period. "The Petrine reform, continuing up to our time, finally reached its ultimate limits," he writes. "One can go no further, and there is no place to go; there is no road, it has been completely travelled." This does not at all mean that we should return to the old road; that would even be impossible; one cannot erase from historical memory what has already taken place.[2] The fact of the matter is "that the conversion to European civilization has already been completed in our country, and that a second [civilization] is beginning. European civilization has already completed its full cycle in our country. We have already experienced it in its entirety, we have taken from it everything which had to be taken, and we now freely turn to our native soil." "The nineteenth of February was an appropriate end to the Petrine period of Russian history," notes Dostoevsky — the period when Russians were split into the people and the intelligentsia, and the period of the European schooling of the intelligentsia.[3] The intelligentsia cut its ties with the people, it experienced prophetic ideas, it grew into them, became used to them and made them its own, and now it must include "the people" among them. But it must introduce *ideas*, not finished forms of "civilization," and ways of life, not *values* taken from Europe. "Peter's idea has been accomplished," said Dostoevsky, "and we return to our soil with an idea of our universal destiny, which has been consciously experienced and interpreted by us." "We have been led to

that same idea," he continues, "by a civilization, the exclusively European forms of which we have rejected." "We reject only *the exclusively European form of civlization*," Dostoevsky repeats for emphasis, "and we say that it is not appropriate for us." This is the reason why he sought "to set out on the path of humble communion with the people," because "justice is first and foremost within man and not in some external, set of formulas, not in some hardened historical structure, not in some established social and civil life." "Justice must be found deep in one's self-knowledge and creatively incorporated into the free collective efforts of all national forces. Only then shall healthy and organically-cultured life begin — not in the spirit of proud, national individuality, but in that of truly Christian, universal and all-European brotherhood." "Let her [Russia] take a breath, and as she feels her new strength, let her contribute her small share to the treasury of man's spirit, let her say her word for civilization." Thus does Dostoevsky formulate the current task of "Russia's obligatory relationship *vis-à-vis* Europe, humanity, and herself."

In the name of a free, conscious and creatively responsible relationship to life, Dostoevsky rejects not Europe, but *imitative* Russian "Europeanism." *European ideas*, but not the European way of life, ought to be accepted by the Russian soul. "Because, to the marvel of Europe," he says, "our lower class, our *caftan* and *tsarvul*, is in essence a unique building — not just a foundation, but a true structure, strong and unshakeable even if unfinished, built over centuries and announcing its own completely true idea, though not yet fully developed

That *new universal idea* by no means excludes other previous universal ideas: it will appear only as the nucleus of a new broader cultural synthesis. Dostoevsky went even farther: he considered that *only the Russian universal idea* was capable of engendering permanent cultural synthesis, and precisely because "European" culture lacks that permanence. But the future synthesis must be universal — "for all the tribes of the great Aryan nation." This statement reveals the uniquely-Russian service to humanity: Russia gives not only *individual* values, but also the total *reconciliation* of all the universally significant achievements of culture. This is her *service*, and it is hers alone: "our world task . . . our individuality and role in humanity" Dostoevsky sees precisely in the fact that "we shall become the servants of all." "And this is not at all humiliating," he notes. "On the contrary, our greatness lies in this very fact, because it all leads to the final union of mankind. He who wishes to be above everyone in God's kingdom, let him first be the servant of everyone. That is how I interpret Russian destiny in *its ideal form*." "But, am I speaking of economic glory, of the glory of the sword or of science?" Dostoevsky asked during his *Pushkin Address*. "I am speaking only of the brotherhood of men, and of the fact that the Russian heart is perhaps more predisposed to . . . worldwide, universal, brotherly union than is that of all other nations." "This is not an

economic characteristic, nor any other such thing," Dostoevsky repeats, "this is only a moral characteristic, and can anyone deny that it is present in the Russian people?" "I insist," he continues, "that I am not trying to compare the Russian people with Western nations in terms of their spheres of economic and scientific glory. But to maintain that our poor and unorganized land cannot contain within itself such lofty impulses until it becomes economically and civilly like the West — that is an idiotic statement. The fundamental moral treasures of the spirit, in their basic essence at least, do not depend on economic power." Dostoevsky maintained, on the contrary, that "we may contain and bear the power of the loving, all-unifying spirit even in our present material poverty, and not only under conditions as they are today; that power can be preserved and borne even during such impoverishment as reigned after the invasions of Batu or after the pogrom of the Time of Troubles, when Russia was saved solely by the all-unifying national spirit." Dostoevsky's dream was of the Kingdom of God, not of the earthly one or of the one which will come to the "earth," but of the Kingdom of God which is within us, which is built within a man's spirit and which transforms from within, renews and regenerates all of life and social relations. It is the dream of a universal religious culture, when everything will be of spirit, infused with the faith, and not of everyday life, not of any one social system, not of the *Civitas Dei* established on earth. Here we come to the basic, deepest point of Russia's separation from Europe, as it appeared to Dostoevsky.

"Ancient Rome first conceived of the idea of world unity," writes Dostoevsky, "and Rome first thought of (and firmly believed in) accomplishing it in practice in the form of a world monarchy." "An enormous structure was built, a huge anthill — the ancient Roman Empire, which also appeared as a supposed ideal and outlet for the moral impulses of the entire ancient age. Man-god appeared. The empire itself was created as a religious idea, offering in and through itself an outlet for all the moral impulses of the entire ancient world." These forms were "buried," destroyed from within by the Church; but only the formula fell, — the formula but not the idea, "because that idea," Dostoevsky notes, "is the idea of European humanity; its civilization was composed from it, it lives for it." "The clash of two ideas occurred, two ideas which could not be more opposite," he says concerning the appearance of Christianity — "Man-god met God-man, Apollo Belveder met Christ. A compromise was reached: the Empire adopted Christianity and the Church adopted Roman law and government. In the western half, the State finally completely overcame the Church. The Church was destroyed and was ultimately transformed into the State. The Papacy appeared — a continuation of the ancient Roman Empire in a new form." "The Roman Papacy proclaimed that Christianity and its idea could not be accomplished without secular rule over lands and nations, a rule which was not spiritual but governmental — in other words, without the realization on earth of the new universal Roman

monarchy, at the head of which would no longer be the Roman Emperor but the Pope. Roman Catholicism, in Dostoevsky's opinion, "from the very beginning turned all of Christ's work into a concern for its own earthly rule and for the future rule of the whole world," and all of this "was proclaimed by the new Christ, who did not resemble the previous one, a Christ seduced by the third of the Devil's temptations, the kingdoms of the earth," a Christ who already agreed to everything, a Christ proclaimed at the last, disgraceful Roman Council." "No, what is at stake here is power!" Dostoevsky exclaims, with respect to the proclamation of the "dogma" of Papal infallibility. "This is majestic; it is no joke. It is the resurrection of the ancient Roman idea of world rule and unity, which never died out in Roman Catholicism; it is the Rome of Julian the Apostate, but not defeated; rather, it has seemingly defeated Christ in a new and final battle." "Roman Catholicism has proclaimed the anti-Christ," he noted in his last diary.

One may not agree with Dostoevsky's opinions about Roman Catholicism; they may seem mean-spirited and narrow-mindedly harsh; his insistent statements about the existence of "an organized Catholic conspiracy" in Europe may be viewed as greatly exaggerated. But one thing cannot be denied here: Dostoevsky correctly understood the fundamental idea of the Western Catholic solution of the social problem — through the formula of organizations and power. And he accurately pointed out its prototype in the pre-Christian ideal of the *Imperium Romanum*. But the most important thing is that the Roman Catholic concept has disappeared among those who have become estranged not only from it but from religion in general. Socialism (Dostoevsky had in mind French socialism) "is nothing other than the forcible union of humanity — an idea with origins which may be traced to ancient Rome, and which was subsequently fully preserved in Catholicism." Here "the idea of the liberation of the human spirit from Roman Catholicism has been dressed in Catholic forms, borrowed from its heart, from its letter, from its materialism, from its despotism and from its morality." This is precisely why the idea of "the earthly kingdom" is typical of the West, of "European civilization." "The experience of the Roman monarchy has moved forward and changed continually," says Dostoevsky. "With the development of that experience, the most essential part of the Christian principle has been almost completely lost. Finally, they abandoned spiritual Christianity; the heirs of the ancient Roman world are also abandoning the Papacy. The terrible French Revolution erupted — which in essence is nothing but the final modification and reincarnation of the same ancient Roman formula of world unity." Socialism is "the inheritance of Catholicism," its secular form. And in this insight Dostoevsky reaches underground depths — the inheritance not only of the tasks of their solution, but also of its spirit. "People sought the creation of something like a flawless human anthill," the future tower of Babylon became the ideal. And not just the ideal, but the accomplished norm: contemporary liberal and bourgeois

Europe is the already-created 'anthill'." This idea also contains the tragedy of Russian Europeanism: there are no longer 'holy miracles' in Europe. The striking and mentally alarming images of Dostoevsky — *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions* — repeat the frightening, disillusioned admissions of Herzen's *Letters from France and Italy* and force one to recall Herzen's analogy: in contemporary Europe we find the same thing as the Ostrogoths must have found; whoever has read St. Augustine from beginning to end and has set off for Rome to find the Lord's City [a reference to *De Civitate Dei*; trans.] would find an empty grave. Twenty years after Dostoevsky, Shchedrin reached the same conclusion in his hopeless memoirs *Abroad* [*Za Rubezhom*]. Not the Kingdom of God, even an earthly one, but rather an anthill. "The calm of order" — that is how Dostoevsky related his impression of Paris: a certain pull toward petrification. "You feel the terrible power that united the innumerable quantity of people who have gathered into one flock from all over the world," he writes about the London Exhibition of 1863.

> You become conscious of the colossal idea, you feel that something has been accomplished here, that here there is victory, triumph. . . . Is this not the attainment of the ideal? You wonder, is this not the end? And is the 'single flock' not already here, in essence? Will one not have to accept this as the whole truth, and become mute at last? It is all so triumphant, victorious and proud that you feel oppressed and crushed in spirit. You look at these hundreds of thousands, at these millions of people, who have humbly gathered here from all parts of the globe — people who have come with one idea and who have thronged together in that colossal palace quietly, persistently and silently, and you feel that something final has taken place here, it has taken place and has been completed. This is some biblical scene, something about Babylon, some prophecy from the Apocalypse which appears before our eyes. You feel that some great, eternal, spiritual resistance and denial would be necessary in order for a man to not submit, to not surrender to the impression, to not bow to fact and deify Baal — that is, to not accept what exists as his ideal.

"In the presence of such colossalness, such gigantic pride of the sovereign spirit, in the presence of the triumphant completeness of the creations of that spirit," Dostoevsky continues, "the hungry soul not infrequently begins to fade away, as it humbles itself, submits and seeks its salvation in whiskey and vice, and it begins to believe that all of this had to happen." As a result — "the systematic, humble, cheerful loss of consciousness." If in the tragic images of his artistic works Dostoevsky subsequently uncovered with alarming persistence all the repulsiveness and horror of the idea "that man should establish himself on earth without God," if he prophesied "anthropophagy" [cannibalism;

trans.], the psychological source of these views of his must be sought in these very impressions of the "bourgeois" West. For him, it was the tower of Babylon being built, the concrete image of the "earthly kingdom" which was on its way to being realized. These impressions showed him what "the ancient Roman ideal" could lead to; the internal weakness and infirmity of that ideal, the inherent lie and illusion of it, unfolded before him. He understood that the end, the catastrophe, was near.

The end — the end of what? The end of Europe, but not of the Europe of Dante and Shakespeare, of Schiller and George Sand. Not the death of European *culture*, not the destruction of European ideas, universal and eternal, but the end of the European *way of life*, the self-destruction of historical Europe, the self-depletion of the European ideal, which is nothing but an abstract design of the existing way of life, purified and stylized. "Yes, tremendous upheaval awaits Europe, such that the minds of men simply refuse to believe that it is possible and regard it as something fantastic," writes Dostoevsky during the War of Liberation in 1877. He felt the battle to be "unavoidable and close at hand." "In Europe, in the Europe where so much wealth has been accumulated, everything has been undermined and everything, perhaps tomorrow, will collapse without a trace, for all eternity, and in its place will come something never heard of before — new and unlike anything up to now. And all the riches accumulated by Europe will not save her from the fall, because "in one moment that wealth will disappear as well." What will collapse? Culture, ideas or way of life? Of course, the way of life, "the anthill that was created a long time ago in it," in Europe. And it shall collapse because the spiritual ideal, the moral ideal, was shaken, because religious inspiration dried up and "civil ideals" are not only directly and organically tied to the moral, but "indubitably come from them alone." This had become clear to Dostoevsky while reflecting on the political and social phenomena of contemporary Europe. It was the time of the Franco-Russian War, of the fall of the Second Empire and the creation of the German Empire. Thus did Dostoevsky formulate his diagnosis: "there, in Europe, things are not going to be tied in a neat bundle; everything has become differentiated; not in our manner, but groups and individuals are maturely, clearly, distinctly experiencing their last hours, and they themselves know this; but they would rather die than relinquish something to someone else." And for this reason, "peace will not reign there to the very end." There is no inner impulse towards brotherhood, and for this reason brotherhood cannot be attained. This became especially clear to Dostoevsky in connection with the Eastern Question. "The whole of Europe," he writes in his *Diary of a Writer*, "or at least its leading representatives, the very same people and nations who screamed against slavery and eliminated the slave trade, who destroyed despotism in their own homelands, proclaimed the rights of mankind, created science and dumbfounded the world with their power, who

animated and delighted the human soul with art and its sacred ideals, who enkindled rapture and faith in the hearts of people, promising them justice and truth in the immediate future — suddenly, these same peoples and nations all (or almost all), in one given moment, collectively turned away from millions of unfortunate Christian beings, people, their brothers, perishing, shamed, and they wait with hope and impatience for the time when they will be able to squash them all like vermin, like bedbugs, when all of those desperate screams for help will finally become silent — cries which irritate and alarm Europe." And Dostoevsky understood that "this terrible fact . . . is the *last* word of civilization . . . is the result of the entire eighteen centuries of development, of the whole process of human civilization." That is why he did not believe in Europe and awaited its end.

"The end" appeared to Dostoevsky to be linked to the Eastern Question, the struggle would concern the latter and its essential content would be "the great renewal of Europe": "through the struggle, the thousand-year question of Roman Catholicism will be solved, and . . . by the will of Providence Eastern Christianity will stand reborn in its place." It [Eastern Christianity; trans.] will acquire true universal meaning, and in this replacement of not the forces but the ideals of life is contained the "world-meaning" and calling of Russia, its difference from the West. Dostoevsky was convinced that only Russia had the power to resolve the Eastern Question, because her international activity alone followed a true and just path, inspired as it was by purely religious and moral impulses and not by calculations of a political and economic nature, not even by national considerations. Russians have compassion for the Slavs not so much as members of the same race but as members of the same religion. And in their struggle for liberation they are primarily concerned with their spiritual freedom, and precisely for that reason the Russian activity is unselfish. And that is why this appears utopian to Westerners who cannot think outside the framework of "the ancient Roman idea" — while in Europe it engenders suspicion and alarm. Dostoevsky had correctly decided that Europe would not tolerate the "victory" of Russia; that in the unselfish victory of the *Russian idea*, of the Orthodox spirit, Europe would suspect aspirations towards political hegemony and power. And to a certain extent Europe would be right, because the victory of Orthodoxy will "undermine" the "man-God" idea held by the West at its very roots. Europe will not perish, but will have to be "renewed": "the martial spirit," as one medieval Russian writer expressed it, will have to be replaced by "the beneficent spirit." And so Europe is beginning to tremble, notes Dostoevsky, "on the eve of an indubitable and major renewal," it fears.

"Take a close look at Orthodoxy," writes Dostoevsky. "By no means is it religiosity and ritual, it is living feeling, which in our people has turned into one of those basic life forces without which nations do not live. In Russian Christianity, in its authentic form, there is not even any mysticism, but only love of man, Christ's image alone." "And

perhaps the most important preordained assignment of the Russian people in the fate of humanity," he exclaims, "is to preserve that divine image of Christ in all its purity, and when the time comes — to show that image to the world which has lost its way!" Dostoevsky was very conscious of the distance between reality and the ideal — no one indicated more vividly than he the theomachist and criminal abysses into which the Russian people has fallen, is falling, and can fall. But all the same, "it has preserved the beauty of that image." As much mud as there is on his past and present, "the Russian is tormented by it most of all, and he believes that all of this is only alluvial and temporary, the devil's deposit — that the end of darkness will come, and that the eternal light will shine whenever that time comes." "Lord and Master of My Life" — that prayer is *the complete essence of Christianity*, its entire catechism, and the people know this prayer by heart.[4] The overwhelming majority of the Russian people is Orthodox and lives with the ideal of Orthodoxy," says Dostoevsky, and he emphasizes: "in reality, there is no other idea in our nation except this one." And that "idea" includes within itself an independent and complex cultural-social ideal, an ideal of "the great, universal, all-national, all-fraternal union *in Christ's name*, about "the all-national and universal church, realized on earth, to the extent that the earth may contain it." Orthodoxy is namely "human progress and human civilization," the way it is understood by the Russian people, who trace everything to Christ and who personify their future in Christ and in Christ's truth because they cannot imagine themselves without Christ." This "progress" is not molded in any concrete socio-political forms, nor is it drawn from any class. The entire Russian activity consists of "planting of the idea" that Russia lives only for the idea of living an eternal life, a great life, to shine in the world with a great selfless and pure idea, to ultimately create one great and powerful organism of brotherly alliance between tribes, to create that organism not with political violence, not with the sword, but with conviction, with love, with unselfishness, with light." In its external form, perhaps, this will be a "purely political union," but in its *essence* it will be something else," because its foundation will be based not on peddling or personal profits, but on "the true principles of Christ." And for this reason it will be, as Dostoevsky expressed it, "the true establishment of Christ's truth, which is being preserved in the East, the true raising of Christ's cross and the final word of Orthodoxy." This is the true solution of the Eastern Question, from which the "renewal" of Europe will begin. "By its very essence, the Eastern Question is the solution of the fate of Orthodoxy," says Dostoevsky. In the West, Catholicism gave birth to Socialism because Socialism "naturally needed to be born in Europe, as a substitute for the Christian principle which had decayed. . . . The lost image of Christ was preserved in all its shining purity in Orthodoxy. From the East will be transmitted to the world the new word against the coming Socialism, which perhaps will again save European humanity." Thus in his

conclusion there again arises the image of a suffering and futilely-searching Europe, and love for it is revived.

But will this "universal union in the name of Christ" not be a new manifestation of that same idea of world rule which traces its origins to ancient Rome? Is "Russian socialism" not the same utopia of the "earthly kingdom," even if without rulers? Is it not the same seductive phantom of earthly paradise, of earthly organization? No, because in the first place this ideal is realizable and will be accomplished through not force but love, by not coercion but the freely-creative, personal choice of everyone. Only in Orthodoxy is the individual completely liberated, precisely because in it is proclaimed not his inherently destructive self-assertion, but rather his *self-denial*, his trial, even to the point of sacrificing his life. And indeed, only he who loses his soul will find it, not he who preserves it. "Voluntary, completely conscious and uncoerced self-sacrifice for the good of all," says Dostoevsky, "is a sign of the highest self-mastery, of the highest freedom of will." One may say that the "anthill" will be no longer. And secondly, on what earth will this universal harmony be realized? "The universal harmony about which Dostoevsky prophesied signifies not the utilitarian prosperity of the people of today's world," writes Vladimir Soloviev, "but the beginning of the new earth upon which justice exists. And the beginning of that universal harmony or triumphant Church will certainly not come about through peaceful progress, but rather through the torment and pain of a new birth, as is written in the Apocalypse — the favorite book of Dostoevsky in his final years."[5]

Throughout his entire life, in pain and great spiritual torment, Dostoevsky worked to resolve profound questions of cultural consciousness. He endeavored to "understand" and "justify the world," to explain the significance of suffering and sorrow, of human imperfections and failures, and to find the way to the realization of "a blessed life." But these problems disturbed him not only in their general and abstract form, not only as a riddle of religious and philosophical thought; they were embodied in quite concrete forms, for him they were a problem of everyday life, of undelayable action, the problem of contemporary life. And here it became clear to him that "contemporary life," the present day, is somehow a special day, a day of historical judgment and a turning point. Something has died and something has not yet been born And in the process of reflection it became clear to him that "by no means can we renounce Europe" because "Europe is our second fatherland," and for that reason "our task is for all mankind" — that means Europe, too, is ours. Moreover, he also clearly sensed that "someone is knocking on the door," that a great "balancing of accounts" has been performed and, in addition, that a new course must be taken. Europe represents a past, not a past sunk in eternal oblivion, but a beloved past of "eternal memory" for the new humanity. Only the people will be replaced, only their customs, behavior, their questioning, but their souls will remain the same. "Someone is knocking, some new

man with a new word — he wants to open the door and to enter. But who will enter — that is the question: a completely new man or someone who resembles us, the little old men!?" And Dostoevsky believed that, tomorrow if not today, there would enter a *completely new* man, a man who had found himself, who had become conscious of himself as a man, liberated and creative, who had overcome "the seduction of the inevitability of the anthill." Europe and Russia have been dreaming about him, about such a man. But he will appear in the East — "from the East will rise this star" — not just for the East, but for the West too, for the whole world. And his word to the peoples of the world will be about Christ, the God-man.

Sofia, November 22, 1922

Translated from the Bulgarian by Thomas Butler

[1]We cannot assume, it is true, that Herzen directly influenced Dostoevsky. The similarity between their evaluations and judgments is therefore even more significant and striking, especially when one takes into account the monolithicality and integrality of their world views, inherent only in the organic creations of the freely-creating spirit. Overall, one would be hard put to find a greater opposition than that between Dostoevsky and Herzen, but nonetheless the resemblance between them is based on a certain similarity of initial assumptions. I plan to analyze this question in detail in a separate essay. Here, however, I shall limit myself to pointing out that this similarity stems from their acceptance of history as a non-predestined, creative and free process.

[2]One should note that this idea was close to early Slavophilism. Thus, in his "Answer to A. S. Khomiakov" (1838), Ivan V. Kireevsky quite negatively answers the question: "Should we want to bring the past back to Russia, and can it be brought back?" He maintained that "now that *dead* form would decidedly have no importance." ("Answer to A. S. Khomiakov," *The Complete Works of I. V. Kireevsky*, M. O. Gershenzon, ed. (Moscow 1912), 120). In his remarkable "Review of the Contemporary State of Literature" (145), Ivan Kireevsky noted that it was precisely European education — as the ripe fruit of mankind's universal development, *broken off from the old tree* — that should become the food for the new life, the new impulse for the development of our intellectual activity. "And therefore," he continued, "love of European education is just the same as love of our own, and the two come together, in the final stage of their development, into one love, into one impetus towards a living, full, universal and truly Christian enlightenment. Otherwise, in their unfinished state, both of them appear false, because the former does not know how to receive what is alien without changing it into its own, and the latter strangles what it wants to preserve in its tight embrace" (*Ibid.*, 162). I have devoted a special article to an analysis of Kireevsky's ideology: "On the History of the Development of Early Slavophilism.")

[3]February 19, 1861 is the date when the Tsar Liberator, Alexander II, proclaimed the emancipation of the Russian peasants from serfdom.

[4]Note from Bulgarian Editor: This refers to the beautiful prayer of St. Efrem the Syrian, who may truly be regarded as the quintessence of the Christian ethic. The people in Russia may know it by heart, but in our country [Bulgaria] one could not say that even of the clergy, or at least not of all of them. This truly beautiful prayer touched Pushkin as well, "in the days of the sad Lenten fast (see his poem "Molitva," written in 1836: "Lord and Master of my life! Do not give me the spirit of idleness, despondency, love of power, and idle talk; but grant me, thy servant, the spirit of purity, humility, patience and love. Oh, Lord and Master, grant that I may see my transgressions and not condemn my brother, and may you be blessed unto ages. Amen.").

[5]The authority of the testimony of Soloviev, who was close to Dostoevsky during the last years of his life, in the very period when the quoted words were written, is enhanced by our knowledge that he himself was inclined toward the "earthly kingdom" — both in earlier times (the end of the '70s) when he went with Dostoevsky to the Optina Monastery, and especially when he wrote the words quoted above (1883). That was a little before the appearance in *Rus* of his "Great Dispute," with its sharply delineated Catholic-theocratic tendencies.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE DOSTOEVSKIAN CONCEPT OF HUMAN FREEDOM

Dostoevsky exposed and demonstrated the religious character of the contemporary Russian crisis. Personal experience and artistic penetration were intimately linked in his creative work. He was able to express the secret of his age and to diagnose the still unnamed religious anguish. Dostoevsky defined the goal of his "huge" projected novel *Atheism* as "to relate only that which we Russians have all experienced in the last ten years of our religious development." He endeavored to comprehend contemporary Russian experience in its totality. Everything happening around him excited him. But this was not merely idle curiosity. Dostoevsky saw and contemplated how the ultimate fate of man comes to pass or is determined in the interweaving of everyday trifles and ordinary events. He studied the human personality not in its "empirical character" or in the interplay of visible causes and effects, but precisely in the "mind-perception" or in its Chthonian depths, where the mysterious currents of primordial life flow together and diverge. Dostoevsky studied man within the context of his problematics, or, in other words, in the freedom which he was granted to decide, choose, accept, reject, or even use to imprison himself or sell himself into slavery. And it is important at this point to emphasize that only through this "problematic" does freedom truly become "objective."

Dostoevsky did not just write about himself in his novels, nor did he "objectivize" only his own spiritual experience in his artistic images, in his "heroes." He had not one single hero, but many of them. And each has not only a face, but a voice as well. The mysterious antinomy of human freedom was revealed to him quite early on. For man, the entire meaning and joy of life lies precisely in his freedom, in his will to freedom, or in his "self-will," through self-rejection. Yet this self-will is too often transformed into self-destruction. Herein lies Dostoevsky's most intimate theme.

Dostoevsky not only depicted the tragic clash when different freedoms or self-wills cross each other — when freedom becomes coercion and tyranny for others — but he also demonstrated something more terrible: the self-destructiveness of freedom. In his persistent efforts at self-definition and self-affirmation man is cut off from tradition and from his environment. Dostoevsky reveals the spiritual danger of being "without soil" [*bez-pochvennosti*]. Singularity and individualization threaten a break with reality. The "wanderer" can only dream; he cannot escape from the world of illusions which, in the form of a fatal image, his willful imagination has magically converted into a living world. The dreamer becomes an "underground man," and his personality begins to painfully decompose. Freedom in isolation becomes captivity; the dreamer becomes the prisoner of his dreams. Dostoevsky saw and

depicted the mystical collapse of a self-contained boldness that develops into audacity or even mystical insolence. He shows how an empty freedom hurls itself into slavery to either passions or ideas. He who makes an attempt on another's freedom is himself ruined. Therein lies the secret of Raskolnikov, the "secret of Napoleon."

But not in images alone did Dostoevsky demonstrate this dialectical idea-force as the ultimate and intimate theme of contemporary Russian life. He became the interpreter of the fate of that "accidental family," the radical intelligentsia of the 1860s, the "nihilists" of that time. Dostoevsky wished to reveal the mysterious fate of this quarreling and warring "family" instead of just the surface of its everyday life. Possession by a dream is even more dangerous than social misanthropy. And were not the Russian radicals and nihilists precisely possessed?

Freedom is *just* only through love, but love is possible only in freedom — through love for the freedom of one's neighbor. *Unfree love* inevitably grows into passion, becomes coercion for the loved one, and is fatal for the person who imagines that he is loving. In this idea lies the key to Dostoevsky's synthesis. With frightening penetration he portrays the dialectical antinomy of *unfree love*. "The Grand Inquisitor" actually represents first and foremost a sacrifice of love, the *unfree love* of one's neighbor which neither respects nor reverses any man's freedom, even that of the least among men. A love that exists in unfreedom and through unfreedom can only exhaust the enflamed heart and consume the imagined loved one: it murders them with deceit and spite. Is this antinomy not one of the focuses of the tragedy in *The Possessed*?

The romantic solution to this antinomy did not satisfy Dostoevsky. Organic wholeness cannot be discovered through a return to nature or to the earth, no matter how attractive such a return might be. It is impossible simply because the world is engulfed in crisis — the organic age has been shattered. The question is how to escape from a decayed and collapsed way of life. Dostoevsky depicts precisely the problematics of this collapse. His final synthesis amounted to testimony for the Church. Vladimir Soloviev accurately defined Dostoevsky's fundamental idea of the Church as a social ideal. Freedom is fully realized only through love and brotherhood, which is the secret of *sobornost*, the mystery of the Church as brotherhood and love in Christ. This was an inner response to all the prevailing humanistic quests for brotherhood and to the contemporary thirst for brotherly love. Dostoevsky diagnosed and concluded that only in the Church and in Christ do people truly become brothers; only in Christ is the danger of every harm, coercion, and possession removed. In him alone does man cease to be dangerous to his neighbor. Only in the Church is dreaminess extinguished and are illusions dissipated.

In his creative work Dostoevsky took his point of departure from the problematics of an earlier French socialism. Fourier and George Sand, more than others, revealed to him the fatal problematics of social life,

and above all the barrenness and danger of liberty and equality without fraternity. In actuality, such was the basic thesis of all "utopian" socialism, which the "post-revolutionary" generation polemically pitted against the Jacobin revolution, and all "Genevan ideas" in general. It was not only a social diagnosis, but a moral and metaphysical one as well. Utopianism, it is true, aspired to become a "religion," a "religion of humanity," but with an "evangelical" ideal nonetheless. In his period of social-utopian enthusiasm Dostoevsky remained and considered himself to be a Christian. His sharp break with Belinsky occurred primarily because the latter had "reviled Christ to him." As Komarovich aptly remarked, "Dostoevsky, the Christian socialist, departed from the positivist Belinsky."

Soon afterwards his dreamy and bookish experience was supplemented by the cruel and real experience of *The House of the Dead.* There Dostoevsky learned not only about the power evil holds over man, but more importantly that "in prison there is still one torment almost more powerful than all others: a compulsory communal life." This was a refutation of humanistic optimism. The extreme torment here lies in the fact that one is forced to live together communally, "to be in agreement with one another no matter what." The horror of compulsory intercourse with people is Dostoevsky's most important personal conclusion from his experience in *The House of the Dead.* And is the prison camp not merely a limited instance of a planned society? Even if it functions according to the best regulations, does not every highly organized society become exactly like a prison? Is it not inevitable that under such conditions "convulsive intolerance" and dreams will develop? "This is a despairing, convulsive manifestation of the personality, a purely instinctive melancholy." The transition from *Notes from the House of the Dead* to *Notes from the Underground* was fully natural.

Dostoevsky now broke with socialist utopianism. Apparently *Notes from the Underground* was written as a reply to *What Is To Be Done?* Dostoevsky saw in Chernyshevsky the dark, subterranean underside of the socialist utopia, in which he divined a new slavery. It became all the more clear for him that one cannot possibly be liberated from slavery in the name of external freedom. Such freedom is empty and pointless, and thus becomes subject to a new compulsion or possession. Possession by an idea or the power of a vision is one of the central themes in Dostoevsky's creative work. Sympathy or pity alone is not yet enough for brotherhood. It is impossible to love man simply as man — to do so would mean to love man in his arbitrarily given condition, not in his freedom. But to love man in his ideal image is still more dangerous. There is always the risk of "slandering" the living man by his imaginary ideal, stifling him with a dream, and fettering him with an invented and artificially conceived idea. Every man can stifle and fetter himself with a dream.

From humanistic dreams of brotherhood Dostoevsky moved on to an "organic" theory of society. He rethought the Slavophile and romantic

themes (here undoubtedly is the influence of Apollon Grigoriev). Yet this is not the fact of greatest importance in Dostoevsky's propagation of the "cult of the soil" [*pochvennichestvo*] as an ideology. The themes of the "soil" and the "dream" are fundamental, but precisely in his artistic creativity. For Dostoevsky, the question of the soil does not serve as a plan for daily life [*byt*]. "Soil-lessness" worries him on a deeper level. Before him stood the frightening specter of the spiritual renegade — the fatal image of one who is a wanderer more than a pilgrim. Here again is the typical theme of *romantic metaphysics* alarmed by the collapse of organic ties, by alienation from and break with the self-willed personality with his environment, with tradition, with God. And the "cult of the soil" is precisely a return to primordial wholeness, to the ideal and task of a whole life. For Dostoevsky, as for many others, it was a project for a still unrecognized *sobornost*. Division is present in all forms of life, especially in human existence. The isolation of man represents Dostoevsky's chief anxiety. All the socialist motifs — the vision of revealing or creating an "organic" epoch, escape from the authority of "abstract" principles, man's return to wholeness, to the whole life — resound anew here. The similarity between Dostoevsky and Vladimir Soloviev is much deeper than can be seen in a comparison of individual theses or views. However, one should not exaggerate their reciprocal influence. Their closeness lies in the unity of personal themes.

Dostoevsky was quick to understand that wholeness of the experience of life alone is very, very insufficient. The recovery of emotional wholeness is not enough — there must also be a return to faith. Dostoevsky's major novels are devoted precisely to this idea. He was too sensitive an observer of the human soul to remain at the level of organic optimism. Organic brotherhood, even organized from within on the basis of some "choral principle," could hardly be too greatly distinguished from an "ant-hill." But it is true that Dostoevsky never surmounted the organic temptation. He remained a utopian, he continued to believe in a historical resolution of the contradictions of life, he hoped and prophesied that the "state" would be transformed into the Church, and in doing so he remained a dreamer. His dream survived even his later genuine insights, and clashed with them.

Dostoevsky awaited "harmony," but yet he foresaw something else. History was revealed to him as an uninterrupted apocalypse, in which the question of Christ was resolved. The tower of Babel was again being rebuilt in history. Dostoevsky saw once again how Christ encounters Apollo — the truth of the God-man encounters the dream of the man-God. God struggles with the devil, and the field of battle is the hearts of men. Quite characteristically, history interested him more than anything else, even in his youth. He always had a premonition of a certain impending catastrophe, he persistently detected in history human anxiety, alarm, and, in particular, the anguish of unbelief.

Dostoevsky dreamed about "Russian socialism," but he envisioned the "Russian monk." The monk neither thought about nor wished to build "world harmony." St. Tikhon, the starets Zosima, and Makar Ivanovich certainly were not historical builders. And thus Dostoevsky's dream and vision did not coincide. He provided no final synthesis. Yet one feeling always remained firm and clear in him: "The Logos became flesh." Truth is revealed in this life, hence this triumphant hossana. Dostoevsky believed out of love, not fear, which separates him from both Gogol and Konstantin Leontiev, who were constrained in their religious experiences by the same fear, almost a despair, that there is no escape.

Dostoevsky does not enter the history of Russian philosophy because he contributed a philosophical system, but rather because he widely expanded and deepened metaphysical experience itself. He relied more on demonstrations than on proofs. Of particular importance is the fact that he carried all searchings for living truth to the reality of the Church. The reality of *sobornost* becomes especially evident in his dialectic of living images (which were more than mere ideas). With exceptional power he revealed the ultimate depth of the religious theme and problematics in every aspect of human life. And Dostoevsky's revelation was particularly timely in the agitated conditions of Russia in the 1870s.

Konstantin Leontiev trenchantly attacked Dostoevsky on the occasion of his "Pushkin Speech" for preaching a new and "rosy" Christianity.

> All these hopes for earthly love and peace on earth can be found in the odes of Béranger, even more so in George Sand, and in many others as well. Not only the name of God, but even the name of Christ, is often recalled in the West in this connection.

Elsewhere Leontiev refers to Cabet, Fourier, George Sand once again, the Quakers, and the socialists. Vladimir Soloviev could hardly succeed in defending Dostoevsky's memory from Leontiev's denunciations by reinterpreting the "universal harmony" of the Pushkin Speech in the spirit of a catastrophic apocalypticism. Leontiev found no difficulty in parrying such an apology. Dostoevsky's phrase carried no such direct meaning, and it could hardly be taken in such a sense.

In his religious development Dostoevsky actually proceeded from the same impressions and terms of which Leontiev spoke. But he did not disavow this "humanism," because in spite of its ambiguity and insufficiency he divined in it the possibility of its becoming genuinely Christian, and he strove to bring humanism into agreement with the teachings of the Church. Where Leontiev found complete contradiction, Dostoevsky saw only a lack of development. To Dostoevsky's "fabricated" Christianity Leontiev opposed contemporary monastic life or organization, particularly that of Mount Athos. He insisted that at Optina the Karamazov brothers do not confess in accordance with the

"correct Orthodox writings" and that Starets Zosima does not answer to the spirit of contemporary monasticism. Rozanov very accurately observed in this connection that "if this did not correspond to Russian monasticism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, then it perhaps — or even certainly — corresponded to the monasticism of the fourth through ninth centuries." In any case, Dostoevsky is actually closer to Chrysostom, than Leontiev, and precisely in his special motifs. Rozanov adds:

> All of Russia read his *Brothers Karamazov* and believed in the portrayal of Starets Zosima. In the eyes of all Russia, even those of its unbelievers, the "Russian monk" [Dostoevsky's term] appeared as a native and thoroughly enchanting image.

Dostoevsky inspired many people with an attraction for the monastery. And under his influence contemporary monasticism itself showed progress "in the direction of love and expectation."

We now know that Starets Zosima was not drawn from nature; in this instance Dostoevsky did not proceed from the examples at Optina. This was an "ideal" or "idealized" portrait, patterned largely after St. Tikhon of Zadonsk, whose writings inspired Zosima's "Instruction" [*Pouchenie*]. "The prototype was taken from several sermons by St. Tikhon of Zadonsk," Dostoevsky himself says about the chapter entitled "On the Holy Scriptures in the Life of Fr. Zosima." Through his power of artistic penetration Dostoevsky surmised and discerned a seraphic current in Russian piety, and prophetically elaborated on this faintly visible line.

Rozanov's comments did not seem to mollify Leontiev in the least, but rather served only to arouse him once more. Leontiev was all in a terror. He was strangely convinced that happiness causes people to become forgetful and neglect God, and he therefore did not want anyone to be happy. He failed to realize or understand that one can be overjoyed about the Lord; he did not know that "love drives out fear," and he did not want love to drive it out.

It is quite wrong to consider Konstantin Leontiev a representative and exponent of the authentic and fundamental tradition of the Orthodox Church, or even of eastern asceticism. He merely wore a thin coat of asceticism. Again, how aptly Rozanov was able to define it: "A zealous encounter between Hellenic aesthetics and monastic sermons about a rigid beyond-the-grave ideal." For Leontiev, asceticism amounted to the words of exorcism with which he drove out his fear. And western or Latin motifs are more readily detected in his aesthetics (he has been aptly compared with Leon Bloy). It is very characteristic that he was ready and willing to agree with Vladimir Soloviev's *Theocracy*, and he strongly desired to openly declare himself Soloviev's disciple. He was attracted to Catholicism. However, Soloviev's famous essay "On the Collapse of the Medieval World View" genuinely outraged Leontiev as

a reconciliation with "democratic progress." Leontiev had a religious theme of life, but certainly not a religious world view, and he did not wish to have one. His only concern was that his pagan naturalism not be imputed to him or classified as a fault or sin. In a strange way this pretentious "Byzantinist" possessed an entirely Protestant view of the problematic of salvation, almost entirely incorporated into the idea of "responsibility," or rather "non-responsibility." How can it be possible to escape punishment or retribution for sin?

Leontiev neither believed nor wished to believe in the transfiguration of the world. He loved this untransfigured world, with its debaucheries of primitive passions and elements, and he did not wish to part with its ambiguous, pagan, and impure beauty. And yet he recoiled in horror from the idea of religious art. One must revere God on high. . . . Glory to God in the highest, and on earth, peace. . . . Again, Rozanov observed: "In defiance of the song of Bethlehem Leontiev, by then a monk, declared: the world is unnecessary." He had only one criterion for judging the world: aesthetics, which for him coincided with fathoming the power of life. In life he sought the powerful, the diverse, the lustrous — every "plurality in unity." In the name of this magnificence he frequently protested against what is good, and even against what is moral. "Christianity does not deny the deceitful and cunning elegance of evil; it only teaches us to struggle against it, to recant, and to help us it sends an angel of prayer and renunciation." This is so characteristic of Leontiev. He rejects evil because the Church demands it, but he also refuses to pass judgment on evil and even tries to infer that refusal without judgment is more difficult and therefore more praiseworthy. "Even if the heart is dry and the mind indifferent, a forced prayer is greater than one that is light, joyous, charitable, and burning." Most characteristic are the senseless (by his own estimation) aphorisms which he formulated in a letter to Rozanov not long before his death. He openly admits and demonstrates the discrepancies in both of his standards — the aesthetic and the Christian.

The power of life is outwardly attested "in visible diversity and with palpable intensity," while "the more or less successful daily preaching of Christianity must inescapably and significantly diminish this diversity." In this regard Christianity and European "progress" actually lead to the same place. The world will tarnish and fade if everyone converts to Christianity. "By their combined efforts, Christian preaching and European progress are striving to kill the aesthetics of life on earth; namely, life itself." Again, on the occasion of Dostoevsky's "*Pushkin Address*," Leontiev irritably exclaimed: "The final word! . . . There can be only one final word — the end of everything on earth, the cessation of history and life." This does not mean that history will simply end and be judged. No, Christianity itself will cease, history will be somehow paralyzed, and men will be deprived of power and passion. From this clash of his two standards Leontiev knew only one way out: submission. "What is to be done?

Even at the expense of our own beloved aesthetics we must, out of transcendental egoism and for fear of judgment beyond the grave, help Christianity." Such a poisonous compound, at once from Nietzsche and Calvin! And it is possible only in a deliberate ambiguity, in the twilight of intellectual conscience.

Translated from the Russian by
Robert L. Nichols

THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV: AN EVALUATION OF KOMAROVICH'S WORK

The new volume of the German edition of the manuscript legacy of Dostoevsky is extremely interesting. And once again, it is regrettable that the original text remains inaccessible and that we are forced to use a translation where it would have been important to follow every turn of thought, every nuance and suggestion. By their very nature, these newly republished materials do not lend themselves to a brief overview. These are fragmentary remarks, excerpts and sketches. What is needed here is a thorough analysis, frequently down to the last tiny detail. It has partly been accomplished by V. Komarovich in his introductory article and notes — this is half of the entire book. Komarovich is interested above all in historico-literary questions: in composition, in the genesis of types. But through this he enters into the inner history of the work of Dostoevsky. It is basically impossible not to agree with Komarovich.

And above all, the very composition of Dostoevsky's last novel is indisputably connected with the ideas of N. F. Fedorov. It is not accidental that the tragic center is patricide — this is the direct antithesis of that "common cause or task" of brotherhood and love which, according to Fedorov's thought, must culminate in the universal reunification and resurrection of ancestors. In the original drafts, Dostoevsky speaks twice about the resurrection and revival of ancestors as a problem. In the final text this idea no longer exists, but a resurrection tone and motifs permeate the entire novel. The "unbrotherliness" of brothers, murder and resurrection — these are the tragic themes in *The Brothers Karamzov* which are presented by Fedorov. It has long been known that Fedorov's ideas had produced a vivid and powerful impression on Dostoevsky. Komarovich also conveys new biographical details. However, the influence of Fedorov was temporary. It was an impetus, through which certain long-standing concepts of Dostoevsky were crystallized — those concerning the transformation of passionate eros into a reunifying force. And in the creative synthesis of Dostoevsky, Feodorov's motifs were uniquely transformed. In this synthesis another influence was strongest of all — a long-standing impression from the image of St. Tikhon of Zadonsk.

Komarovich speaks in detail about the repeated attempts of Dostoevsky to draw his image, which, as he himself admits, "I had taken into my heart" already in 1861. The image of Starets Zosima is not the portrait of St. Tikhon. Dostoevsky rejected the idea of "portrait-design." This is an ideal image, an artistic synthesis, a prophetic dream — but it was formed under the overwhelming impression of the Zadonsk starets. This is the source of that joyful spirit which Leontiev took for an artificial "rosy Christianity" and rejected as humanism. Leontiev was right about one thing: Dostoevsky did not copy Zosima

from Starets Amvrosy. When he went to Optina in 1878, he was already carrying in his heart and in his creative imagination the image of a meek and holy starets; and what he saw there did not destroy his dream, and he inserted the already forming image into the framework of the Optina Wilderness. Komarovich convincingly shows how facts from the saint's life of St. Tikhon are transformed and repeated in the biography of Starets Zosima — and in the teachings of Zosima, transformed and resurrected motifs of the instructions of the Zadonsk miracle worker may be heard, and words and expressions are even frequently repeated. On the other hand, Komarovich shows that much was given to Dostoevsky by the *Legends* of monk Parphenius, with which he had long been familiar.— in his time Apollon Grigoriev was passionately attracted to them. It is possible to agree that the language of Parphenius helped Dostoevsky find the right style for the teachings of Starets Zosima, that his stories could influence and arouse his imagination. But Parphenius himself is too remote from Zosima, and there is little light in his *Legends*. Komarovich does not take his analysis to the very end. In any case, it is impossible to see a representative of early *Rus* in St. Tikhon. This is precisely where his originality lies — in the fact that by spiritual type, he was a man of the new, post-Petrine epoch, that he had passed through the "Latin" school and did not shun Western religious literature (compare Arndt). This was a man of the troubled eighteenth century. Both the type of his piety and the nature of his theology were very far from the average Muscovite type of the seventeenth century. In St. Tikhon, radiant contemplation of the early Byzantine mystics is unexpectedly renewed — the vision of the Tabor light, the pathos of the Transfiguration, and all the inundating joy, so strongly shading him by frequent grief from confusion. And in a certain sense, he was a precursor to St. Serafim. Here was revealed to Dostoevsky not the early, but the inner *Rus*.

In the commentary of Komarovich the chapter on Alesha and Grushenka about their apparently mystical marriage is very interesting. He restores the creative pre-history of this motif in Dostoevsky (above all through *The Possessed*) and traces it further, to Gogol's "Terrible Vengeance." Moreover, it is possible to argue about the meaning of this scene in Dostoevsky's plan. It is connected with the meaning of the image of Alesha, and this image still remains unclear. Komarovich does not mention the entry in Surovin's diary which deals with Dostoevsky's remark that Alesha must henceforth go all the way to terror and to the scaffold. This demands clarification — how did Doestoevsky envision the "brothers Karamazov" in the future?

Komarovich does not analyze the creative history of the "Legend of the Grand Inquisitor," putting this chapter of his commentary into a separate essay. This is a distinctly felt gap in his research, since the "Legend" is one of the essential tragic points of the novel. Its meaning has still not been completely resolved, and what Dostoevsky wanted to say in it may be disputed. It is now possible to decisively state that his

long-standing themes were synthesized and crystallized in it. In particular, in "The Hostess" (1847) Murin is already saying almost the same thing as the Inquisitor: "No problem is more tormenting for man than that of finding someone to whom he could turn over as soon as possible that gift of freedom with which he was born, poor unfortunate creature. But only he who calms peoples' conscience has true control over their freedom. There are three forces, only three, on earth, forever able to vanquish and captivate the conscience of these weak rebels for their happiness — these forces are: miracle, mystery and authority. We will tell them that every sin will be expiated, if it will be done with our permission" (compare the article of A. L. Bem: "Dramatizatsiia breda" [The Dramatization of the Dream] in the Prague collection: *O Dostoevskom* [On Dostoevsky], I/1929). It is possible to think that the composition of the "Legend" was suggested to Dostoevsky by the medieval parodies of the papacy: *Initum Sancti Evangelii secundum marcus argenti. In illo tempore dixit Pap ramnio: Si Filius hominis venerit ad sedem Majestatis Nostrae, dicite: amice, ad quid venisti? et si pulsans perseveraverit nihil dans vobis, ejicite cum in tenebras exteriories* (from *Carmina Burana*, see the article of I. Il. Lapshin: "Kak slozhilas Legenda o Velikom Inkvizitore?" [How was the Legend of the Grand Inquisitor Formed?] in that same Prague collection). The question concerns not the source of individual motifs in the "Legend," however, but what Dostoevsky wanted to express. It has long since been admitted that he was speaking not only about Roman Catholicism. It is possible to put it even more strongly — the "Legend" was written first and foremost not about Roman Catholicism. And in it Dostoevsky is speaking not about the contradictions of Christian life, not about a "double truth," but about the plan for founding well-being on coercion — and this design is broader and older than Catholicism. This is the "Roman idea," vanquishing in Catholicism the precepts of Christ. But Dostoevsky encountered it above all in socialism, and was shaken by the tragedy of coercion and the double-edged tragedy — greater for those compelling, perhaps, than for those compelled. And the observation was generalized: in socialism Dostoevsky saw secularized Catholicism — thus did he approach the Catholic problem. He struggled with Catholic ideas in order to overcome socialist chiliasm, the "third temptation" — Apollo rising against Christ. And the "Legend" is a parable about the "Roman idea."

In his commentary Komarovich shows that the antithesis of East and West, of "Byzantium and Rome," is woven into the intimate composition of the novel: Ivan, Katia, Smerdiakov — these are manifestations of the Western spirit. In the novel there is an inner dialectical polemic with the "Geneva ideas" (an oft-repeated theme of Dostoevsky) and with "Georges Sandism" — the novel includes a kind of parody on the sentimental novel above all on Mauprat, many of whose compositional motifs are repeated in the scenes of the murder and the trial. Thus, the ideological polemic turns into a literary one. And it

is namely on the level of Dostoevsky's inner struggle with the "Geneva ideas" and the principles of '89 — that is, with the secular ideas of freedom, equality and brotherhood —.that the "Legend" must be explained. With the image of the Inquisitor Doestoevsky wanted to say that well-being can be grounded in coercion only through a lulling of one's conscience, both one's own and others'.

The newly published materials do not fully explain the design of *The Brothers Karamazov*. One important observation may be made: in the original drafts Dostoevsky calls the characters of the future novel by the names of his own former heroes — so the future Alesha is designated as "Idiot." This shows the continuity of his creative thought. He always lives in the unified world of creative visions, of original symbolic myths — and at times put his current thoughts down on paper. And he is always thinking about one thing: about the individual personality and his environment, freedom and necessity, reconciliation and dissension. This is his basic aporia. Dostoevsky seemingly always depicts one and the same picture — all his novels are only a study for it. And *The Brothers Karamzov* is also a study — the canvas remained unfinished. The creative path of Dostoevsky was not direct, it meandered. And all the flourishes and zigzags he creatively incorporated into his synthesis as its dialectical moments and motifs. Dostoevsky was strongly disturbed by the temptation of chiliasm; he was not always able to vanquish it. Nor was he able to vanquish it in his last novel. But he did brightly illuminate the path of the outcome. The mysterious vision of Alesha over the grave of the starets goes beyond the edge of history. The "Galilean Cana" is the end of history illuminating historical toil with serraphic light. This is not a synthesis, but rather the theme of synthesis: not chiliasm, but transformation and resurrection. The works of Dostoevsky are raw metaphysical ore; they both await and demand speculative processing. Perhaps the time for this is already upon us.

Translated from the Russian by
Roberta Reeder and Catherine Boyle

ON THE ORIGINS OF THE TOLSTOYAN WORLD VIEW

Tolstoy is a very private writer, and his creative development may be fully understood only on the basis of his life experience. In his creative work there is the continuation of his private life, of its search for meaning. It is not accidental that Tolstoy came to literature through keeping diaries, and that he began to write in just such an intimate way. "The diary, therefore, must be seen not only as a typical book of notes and thoughts, but also as a collection of literary exercises and raw material." (B. Eichenbaum, *Lev Tolstoy*, I. 35).

The early diaries of Tolstoy create an unexpected impression. It is as though they were written by a contemporary of Zhukovsky, if not of Karamzin. They are typical diaries of the sentimental age. Spiritually, Tolstoy is somehow lagging behind in the previous century. His diary is always moralizing, a diary of behavior and of morals, a book "Franklin-like," a "journal for weaknesses," almost a "conduct-book" register for recording sins and faults, along with plans for their correction. It is a book of self-analyses, a means of keeping track of oneself. It is the writings of a man who is very discontent with himself. He knows that he is living and acting badly, and now wants to mend his ways. This means establishing strict rules for life and acting in accordance with them. This is the "morality of law." "The diary must contain a table of laws, and in it my future actions must also be determined." (Entry for 7. IV. 1847; XLVI. 20). In Tolstoy's writings there is the idea of composing a schedule for life.

> I would like to become accustomed to determining my way of life ahead of time, not for a day but for a whole year, for several years, even for my whole life; it is too difficult a task, almost an impossible one; I will try, however, at first for a day, then for two days — for however many days I may be sure of my designated schedule I will 'assign' my time in advance. By these 'designations' I do not mean moral rules independent of both time and place, rules which are unchanging and which I myself compose; instead it is namely to temporal and local designations that I am referring: where and how long to stay, when and what to do" (Entry for 14. VI. 1850, XLVI. 34).

This characteristic propensity for living by a schedule remained with Tolstoy his entire life. It gives his moralism a kind of casuistic character. He was particularly disposed to moralizing, to drawing a moral out of everything. "It would really not be a bad idea, as in fables, to write a moral for every literary composition — its purpose." (Entry

for 18. XII. 1853, XLVI. 214). From his youth Tolstoy believed that the "moral purpose" of literature was the only one. It was for precisely this reason that he wanted to write sermons. "I want to write sermons" (6. IV. 1851, XLVI. 58; Entry written on Good Friday). "I wrote a sermon, lazily, weakly and faint-heartedly" (18. IV. 1851, Easter). "To publish a newspaper dealing with moral issues. To establish religious leadership for the common people in sermons. . . . To amend prayers. . . . To write general rules for life. . . . To use time in exile towards the perfecting of character" (*Rules and Propositions*, XII.1853 — I.1854, XLVI.293).

It is customary to present Tolstoy's life as an example of crisis, of sudden and profound change, of "conversion." One day, at the end of the seventies, "and my life suddenly changed altogether" — just as if a traveller had turned back, gone "home," and found everything that was once on the left suddenly on the right. This depiction is accurate only in part. The crisis of the seventies was a definite shock. This violent spiritual upheaval, however, did not signify a change in world view or a psychological change. It was like a convulsion within an unbroken spiritual circle. The circle itself, however, did not open up. Only his general situation changed, the tone of life, his sense of life. But a "new person" was not born. There was no mystical revelation, meeting or breakthrough. And no change in views. Indeed, entirely to the contrary, how distinctive is Tolstoy's adherence to a single idea, the persistent and even stubborn uniformity of his thought. His spiritual style, moreover, remains unchanged from his youth until the very end of his life. Is it not surprising that in 1855 Tolstoy was already able to write in his diary: "A conversation about the deity and about faith led me to a great thought, a colossal thought, to the realization of which I feel capable of consecrating my life. This thought is the foundation of a new religion corresponding to the development of humanity — a religion of Christ, but one that is cleansed of faith and mysteriousness, a practical religion which does not promise future bliss but instead brings it to earth. Bringing this thought to fulfillment — this task, I understand, may be accomplished only by generations of people consciously working towards this goal. Each generation will bequeath this thought to the next, and at some point fanaticism or reason will bring it to fulfillment. Consciously acting to further the unification of people by religion, this is the foundation of the thought which, I hope, will carry me away" (Entry for 5. III. 1855, Biriukov, I [1906], 250).

The religious motifs in these "youthful diaries" are generally very strong. On the basis of the diaries we may also judge what Tolstoy was reading. All his sympathies are with the eighteenth century: Rousseau, Stern, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, Buffon, Goldsmith's *The Vicar of Wakefield* and, of the Russians, Karamzin. Tolstoy also read Catherine the Great's "Instruction" and Montesquieu. He even translated *Sentimental Journey* and quotes *Paul et Virginie* more than once in his diary. Most characteristic of all is his passion for Rousseau. "I read all

of Rousseau, all twenty volumes, including his *Dictionary of Music*. I more than admired him, I worshipped him. At age fifteen I would wear around my neck a locket with his portrait instead of a cross. Many of his pages are so close to me that it seems as though I wrote them myself." (Biriukov, I. 124). This was not simply a matter of influence, nor even of assimilation. In this sentimental element Tolstoy recognized that which was native and personal to him, in it he found himself. He was very whole-hearted in this "sentimental" style (compare with his letters to T. A. Ergolskoy in the 59th volume of the Jubilee edition).

That which is customarily called "sentimentalism" was not only a literary movement or trend. At first it was namely a spiritual movement, a psycho-religious shift in thinking. Its sources may be sought in the Spanish, Danish and French mysticism of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It was an awakening of the heart, the discovery of an inner world, the discovery of emotional depths in everyday, domestic family life. The books of sentimentalist writers became like a religious "divine word." Young's well-known book *The Complaint or Night-Thoughts* is not only a deeply-felt poem, not only the confession of a sentimental person, but also the mystical guide of a new "awakened" generation. The wave of Pietism in the eighteenth century spread throughout all of European culture. Moreover, the historical influence or significance of Pietism in the formation of a new spirit has not yet been sufficiently taken into consideration. We must recall its influence on Goethe (see especially *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*). We must remember that both Novalis and Schleiermacher came from Hernnhut circles. In addition, we must remember that Rousseau as well, historically and psychologically, was merely a "worldly pietist." The fundamental category here is one and the same: "the beautiful soul."

The influence of Western Pietism on Russian culture was generally very strong, beginning with Karamzin and Zhukovsky. Tolstoy belongs to the same historical succession. Moreover, the extent of his religious and moral influence is evidence of the tremendous strength of the impression made by Pietism on the Russian soul, one which was by no means eliminated or exhausted at the time. It was not by chance that Tolstoy began to take an interest in the Alexandrine period. Furthermore, even if he does seemingly make Pierre Bezukhov fit into the context of his own (Tolstoy's) time, was he really any less eager to fit himself and his time into the canons of the Pietism of ancient times!

Tolstoy preaches "conversion" — ["*obrashchenie*"]. That which may be called "Tolstoyism" is in fact a sermon on conversion. Man must go through a "break," through abrupt and profound change, and not simply "convert" but rather live through the conversion process, become conscious of and feel himself as "converted" (or "saved" — ["*spasennym*"]). In other words: he must begin a "new life," consciously and willingly — he must make up his mind and resolve to

carry out the decision. Other terms may be substituted in place of "conversion": "rebirth," "awakening," "resurrection." The primary Western form would be *Erweckung* or *revival*, the fundamental terms of German and Anglo-American Pietism. *Resurrection* is constructed entirely in accordance with Pietist models. Tolstoy's sympathies for the Anglo-Saxon sectarians may be explained by his identification with this very deeply-felt piety.

In Tolstoy's work sentimentalism once again penetrates into the upper historical strata of Russian culture. And in this particular instance Tolstoy's work turns out to be an anachronism.

Psychologically, Tolstoy turns out to be outside of his century, of the present time and of history. In part he simply turns out to be this way, in part he consciously leaves modernity, retreats or takes shelter in a rather far-fetched past. In addition, Tolstoy solidifies his historical "backwardness" by renouncing history. This aspect of Tolstoy's work is successfully demonstrated by B. Eichenbaum in his immense book about Tolstoy (2 volumes, 1928 and 1931). "Tolstoy is a militant anarchist who in the middle of the 19th century was upholding principles and traditions of the departing (and to some extent, departed) 18th century culture" (I, 11). The "archaism" of Tolstoy is a highly complex concretion, in which all the individual elements cannot immediately be made out. "Archaism" as a system does not signify mere "lateness" or a delay in development. It has its own volitional emphasis, even stubbornness, a quarrel with or breaking away from "modernity," from "reality." All of Tolstoy is in this break, this hostility towards the historical milieu and towards history itself, in this "resolution-against."

> It may be said that the artistic creation of Tolstoy out of this archaic pathos — like a demonstration against 'modernity' — is, for this reason, nihilistic at heart, inspired by the negation of 'convictions' about which he is always ready to ask: 'is not all of this nonsense'? and, contrarily, by the affirmation of original, absolute 'truths' which exist outside of history and fit man into nature. (I. 291).

In the circles of his literary contemporaries Tolstoy felt like an outsider. To him "fathers" and "sons" were equally foreign — people of the forties and sixties. "Practically speaking, Tolstoy stood with his back to all of Russian culture after the twenties, and lived more by his own original 'transplant' of several Western traditions and movements, choosing from among them namely that which was most alien to the Russian intelligentsia of the new times. Along with Rousseau, he used several tendencies of Western free-thinking (Proudhon, Michelet, literature that spoke out against Napoleon I), changing them in such a way that they turned out to be directed against Russian radicalism and assumed the same nihilistic character (I. 282). He denied all the

achievements of the Russian intelligentsia and built his own system (if not of convictions, then of concepts) on the foundation characteristic of the 18th century (Novikov, Radishchev, Karamzin). Moreover, since Russian court culture was insufficient and not independent, the West acquired tremendous significance for him. It may be directly stated that in his sources, his traditions, his "school," Tolstoy is the least Russian of all the Russian writers." (I. 288).

The outer manifestation of this break with modernity was Tolstoy's first retreat to Iasnaia Poliana in 1858, the "first Tolstoyan crisis," a Tolstoyan "departure from literature," a withdrawal into country life and then into "family happiness." This was indeed a withdrawal or an exodus — from the city to a village, from history to nature, from intellectuals to the people. Eichenbaum justly notes that during these years "populism and radicalism take on an almost pogrom-like character" in Tolstoy's work (I. 374). There are definitely autobiographical traits in the psychology of Levin, in his provincial hostility towards urban culture. "The so-called 'cultured person,' the erudite, he who 'follows' what is happening in the sciences and absorbs diverse kinds of knowledge, is for Tolstoy a mysterious person, if not a downright charlatan or almost an idiot." (I. 283).

In this there are, however, other depths. Tolstoy was a kind of apocalyptic — indeed, he was always in the future and the necessary, in inevitabilities, possibilities and hopes. And the "apocalypse," as usual, washes away "history." That which is "nihilism" in one sense is namely an "apocalypse" in another. One "reality," *the false one*, is negated or refuted for the sake of another, one which has not yet arrived but is *true. Tolstoy deceives history for the sake of the truth he is seeking.* The dynamics of Tolstoy's creation are that everything which is given, all of history and all of modernity, are in his eyes one *great lie*, the deception and self-deception of humanity. Not only is there a lie *in* history, and also much that is false and untrue, but *everything is a lie*, and there is no longer truth in anything. This is the source of Tolstoy's pain and anxiety — for himself, for others, for the entire historical world. This rigoristic nihilism constitutes the "religion" of Tolstoy. Psychologically, Tolstoy always remains in the unbreakable circle of the Reformation, with its shock at the incurability of the sinful world. Man is saved by "faith" or by "conversion" — that is, by renunciation and hope. But in his empirical or historical condition there has not yet been any change. For precisely this reason it is necessary to continually negate, speak out, leave history.

Tolstoy's strength is in his revealing candor, in his moral anguish. His "call for confession" has been heard, like a kind of "alarm-bell" of the conscience. But it is also at this point that his narrow-mindedness and his infirmity are felt particularly sharply. For Tolstoy is not able to explain the origin of the impurity and falseness of life. His explanation is at once too simple and too radical. He simply denies culture and history as being unworthy of existence and therefore unjust. History

cannot be amended, only left. Moreover, Tolstoy oversimplifies the reality of evil, as if everything could be reduced to misunderstanding or rashness alone, could be explained by "foolishness" or "deception," or by "evil intentions" and "conscious lies." These are all typical traits of the "Enlightenment," of the eighteenth century, that was at once both "sensitive" and "free thinking." Tolstoy even lags behind his own personal experience, from which he knew all too well of the tempting power of the passions — but even to passions he opposes rules and more rules, bans from without and the condemnation of laws. There is a striking lack of correspondence between the aggressive maximalism of Tolstoy's socio-ethical denunciations and denials and the extreme poverty of his positive moral teachings, which may be reduced to common sense and practical sensibility. The optimism of common sense inevitably turns into simplifying nihilism. The fundamental contradiction in Tolstoy's writings is namely that in his eyes the falseness of life may ultimately be overcome, strictly speaking, only by *renouncing history*, by "leaving" culture and "adopting the simple life," — that is, through removing questions and renouncing problems that remain to be solved.

Tolstoy left history more than once. The first time was at the end of the fifties, when he shut himself up at Iasnaia Poliana and devoted himself to his pedagogical experiments. This was an "exodus from culture," since at the time Tolstoy was thinking least of all about having an influence on the people. *The will of the people* had to be recognized and fulfilled. In the very "opposition of the people to our education" Tolstoy discerned a fair judge of this useless historical culture. After all, peasants really did not need technical equipment or elegant literature, or even printed books. The demand for such things is created only by the vain and dangerous complication of all of life. Some time later, Tolstoy came to believe that even all philosophy and all science were only a useless superfluity. He sought shelter from such excesses in the *laboring* life of the common people. In his well-known article: "Who Should Teach Whom to Write: Should the Serfs' Children Learn From Us or Should We Learn From Them?" (1862), Tolstoy is in many respects already anticipating his future pamphlet on art (1897). The same conception appears in *War and Peace*. Ovsianiko-Kulikovsky very aptly designates this genre as the *nihilistic epic*. For Tolstoy, great history is only a game. And in this game there are no heroes and no characters, there is only an invisible fate and the march of impersonal events. It is as though everything were a dream. Everything has disintegrated and been spread out into a system of scenes and situations. They are like "masks" of life. In history nothing is attained. One must take shelter from history. And the final bout of Tolstoy's nihilistic struggle was his religious crisis. *He rejected the Church because he had rejected history and man.* He wanted to remain in private. Pride and self-humiliation strangely alternate in this *nihilism from common sense.*

In the pathos of this "*historical doing-nothing*" Tolstoy is unexpectedly in agreement with Pobedonostsev. Even given the vast difference in temperament and attitude, they come together in their initial premisses, in the same way that Rousseau and Edmund Burke were ideologically close. Pobedonostsev, like Tolstoy, was an "archaist," and he too had the dream of and strove to keep "the people" outside of culture and of history, thereby saving them from corruption and ruin. Pobedonostsev believed in the people and did not believe in history. He believed in the durability of the patriarchal way of life, in the "vegetable wisdom" of the folk element, and did not trust individual initiative. He believed in the common people, in the strength of their simplicity and primitiveness, and did not want to corrupt this naive integrity of feeling with a poisonous inoculation of rational Western civilization. Of course, Pobedonostsev's entire cult of mediocrity was contrary to his own nature. Pobedonostsev himself was far from being a mediocre person, and certainly did not live by instinct or "by scent." He was seeking "treatment," an "anecdote," for his own abstractness in the common people's simplicity. He wanted to find refuge from his own "absence of life" in the common people's lifestyle, to return to the "soil." He was certain that their faith was strong and would stand fast with its lack of reasoning (compare with Burke's "prejudice"). He valued the *native* and the *primordial* more than the true. Pobedonostsev feared the "enlightenment" of the people, the awakening of religious *consciousness* among them, because in his eyes these were negative and false elements. He believed in the *protective* solidity of patriarchal principles, but did not believe in the creative force of the truth, the verity of Christ. He was apprehensive of *all* actions, *all* movements — protective *inactivity* seemed to him to be more trustworthy than any kind of action, *even heroic deeds*. He did not want to complicate life — "only what is simple is right." Furthermore, it should be added that Pobedonostsev was intrigued by the same deeply-felt Anglo-Saxon Pietism, the same sentimental spirit, as was Tolstoy — it is enough to consider his *Moscow Conversations*. The inner freedom of the Orthodox religion frightened and repulsed Pobedonostsev. It is for this reason that he was so insistent about the role of the government as a guardian. He did not perceive the holiness of St. Seraphim, and liked neither Bishop Feofan (the Hermit) nor Father John of Kronstadt.

Similarity does not necessarily mean agreement. Similarity signifies belonging to a single psycho-cultural type. The similarity between Tolstoy and Pobedonostsev was not accidental. Moreover, in many ways they identically *believed in nature and did not believe in man* — they believed in laws and did not trust creative work. It is important to note that during these years (the sixties to the eighties), Russian society in general was experiencing a strange recurrence of something which may immediately be called both "enlightenment" and "pietism." This was the source of the interest in Rousseau, the attraction to the earth and the withdrawal into the countryside, the kind of distrust of history,

the "nihilism," and often the disappointment as well. A psychological history of Russian society has not yet been written. But future historians will have to devote particular attention to the history of the complex type to which Tolstoy belonged.

Translated from the Russian by
Catherine Boyle

VLADIMIR SOLOVIEV AND DANTE
THE PROBLEM OF CHRISTIAN EMPIRE

quella Roma onde Cristo è romano
Purgatorio XXXII, 102

I

In 1883 a series of articles by Vladimir Soloviev appeared in the Slavophile weekly *Rus'*, of which Ivan Aksakov was the editor, under the general title, "The Great Controversy and Christian Politics." The "Controversy" was that between the East and the West, and in particular between the Christian East and the Christian West — that is, between Byzantium and Rome. The split between the Eastern Empire and the Church of Rome was the root and core of the controversy. Russia, as the "Third Rome," was charged with the task of reconciliation. Her task was namely to prove that she was not merely a replica or continuation of Byzantium, the "Second Rome," but was indeed the *Third* Rome, which could therefore reconcile and bind together the First and the Second. It was to be a kind of historical dialectics: thesis, antithesis and synthesis — Rome, Byzantium and Russia. This was the first time that Soloviev disclosed his new conviction: the age-old historical tension between the East and the West could only be resolved by a "Reunion of the Churches," and only in alliance with the Roman Church could Russia fulfill her historical vocation and solve the burning problems of her national existence. In her essence, as the mystical Body of Christ, the Church was not divided. In spite of the visible separation between the two "ecclesiastical societies," the Church was still One. There was no mystical split, but only a historical estrangement. The East had preserved the sacred treasure of faith, yet lacked the structure and organization which alone could make Christianity a historical power and force. The Roman Church was indeed just a part of the Church Ecumenical, but the center of the Christian *Oikoumene* was still in Rome. It was but a part, a part in which only the basic structure of the Church, as Body and Society, had been preserved and actualized. The Christian East had no historical prospect unless it were reconciled and reunited with the Catholic West.[1]

All of this was utterly embarassing for the editor of a Slavophile review. Soloviev was strongly urged by Aksakov to re-examine his views and in any case to redraft his paper. Finally, he decided to discontinue Soloviev's articles altogether. The printed text of the "Great Controversy" is obviously an "edited" and incomplete text. Much of what Soloviev intended to say was left unsaid. Certain chapters that were already written had to be omitted or replaced by new versions. The

printed text gives but an inadequate picture of the views Soloviev actually held in 1883.

Some additional information can be gathered from his letters to Aksakov, written when his articles were appearing in Aksakov's journal.[2] In reply to Aksakov's objections, Soloviev frankly stated his firm belief in the *Eternal Rome*, which was not to be identified with "Papalism."

> I contemplate first of all *the great, holy, and eternal Rome*, the basic and inalienable part of the Church Universal. In this Rome I do believe, before her I bow, I love her with all my heart, and with all the powers of my soul I wish for her restoration, for the sake of the unity and wholeness of the Universal Church. And may I be cursed as a parricide if I ever pronounce a word of condemnation against the sanctity of Rome.

Aksakov apparently suggested that certain changes be made to the draft submitted by Soloviev. The latter was unwilling to comply and decided to compose a whole new chapter.[3] The writing of the new chapter was delayed for a while, and in the meantime Soloviev continued his studies. At the time, he was reading the Uniate polemics of the sixteenth century in Polish and Dante in Italian.[4]

It appears that in the draft rejected by Aksakov there was a certain "passage on the Empire" to which Aksakov had especially objected. Soloviev was ready to excise it, "not because I have abandoned that idea but because, if presented briefly and fragmentarily, it might have suggested some false and crude conceptions." But there was nothing "crude" in the idea itself.

> One must remember that such comprehensive principles as "Universal Emperor," "Ecumenical Pontiff" and the like are primarily banners or symbols; and any symbol, when detached from its ideal and living content, is crude and material.

Moreover, the idea of a "Universal Monarchy" was by no means Soloviev's own invention; rather, it was a perennial expectation of the nations, *vekovechnoe chaianie narodov*. In Russian the phrase has an obvious Messianic connotation, and reminds one of the prophesy in Genesis 49:10, where these very words are used to render the Greek *προσδοκία ἐθνῶν* (only in the Septuagint).

> Among intellectuals, this idea inspired *Dante* during the Middle Ages, *for example*, and in our own age *Tiutchev* supported it — and he was, as you well know, a man of fine mind and feeling. In the complete edition of the "Great Controversy" *I intend to expound upon the idea of Universal Monarchy primarily in the very words of Dante and Tiutchev.*[5]

No complete edition of the "Great Controversy" was published. In his *The History and the Future of Theocracy*, published in 1887, Soloviev did not speak of the Empire. In his French book *La Russie et l'église universelle*, written in 1887 and published in Paris in 1889, Soloviev does speak of the Empire in the introduction. Tiutchev is not mentioned here at all. Dante is quoted once ("*le plus grand des écrivains catholiques*"), with a special reference to some "immortal lines" in the *Divina Commedia*.[6] This should not surprise us. The French book was written for a special purpose and a special audience, and on the advice of his Catholic friends Soloviev restricted himself to a historical and polemical vindication of the Primacy of Peter. All "general considerations and remote speculations" had to be omitted, and certain chapters that had already been written were suppressed, much to Soloviev's disappointment.[7]

Thus, the promised exposition of the conception of the "Universal Monarchy" in the "very words of Tiutchev and Dante" was never written.[8] Yet we cannot easily dismiss Soloviev's statement that, at least at one time, he had been deeply impressed by the ideas of these two writers. The brief historical overview of the destiny of the Christian Empire — with a glimpse into the future — which Soloviev gives in the introduction to his French book definitely reminds one of Tiutchev at certain points, even though their views are often widely divergent.[9] It seems that Dante's influence on Soloviev was quite considerable, and one can detect certain Dantian themes and motifs in his theocratic schemes. This does not imply that Soloviev was at any time a servile follower of Dante.

II

The belief in an Eternal Rome was one of the basic presuppositions of Soloviev's theocratic conception. In his opinion, ancient Rome itself, the Roman Empire of the Caesars, intrinsically belonged to the history of salvation. Discussing the vision of the Four Kingdoms in the Book of Daniel, Soloviev concludes: the Roman Empire

> was not a part of the monstrous colossus doomed to destruction, but was the abiding material framework and mould of the Kingdom of God (*le cadre et le moule matériel du royaume de Dieu*). The great powers of the ancient world were merely passing figures upon the stage of history; Rome alone lives forever (*Rome seule vit toujours*). The rock of the Capitol was hallowed by the stone of the Bible, and the Roman Empire was transformed into the great mountain which sprang from that stone in the prophetic vision.[10]

It was characteristic of Soloviev to consider Christian theocracy as having a double foundation: Biblical and Roman. It was more than a

rhetorical paradox when he suggested that Simon Peter should be regarded as the successor to Julius Caesar:

> And while dethroning the false and impious absolutism of the pagan Caesars, *Jesus confirmed and made eternal the universal monarchy of Rome by giving it its true theocratic basis. In a certain sense, it was nothing more than a change of dynasty; the dynasty of Julius Caesar, supreme pontiff and god, gave way to the dynasty of Simon Peter, supreme pontiff and servant of the servants of God.*[11]

Nor was it merely poetical exaggeration when Soloviev suggested that "Father Aeneas," along with the "Father of the Believers," Abraham, should be regarded as an ancestor of Christianity. At the very time that he was working on his French book, Soloviev wrote to Nikolai Strakhov:

> *I regard "Father Aeneas," along with the "Father of the Believers," Abraham, as true ancestors of Christianity, which (from the historical point of view) was but a synthesis of these two parentalia.*[12]

In other words, there were two parallel lines of theocratic preparation: one in the history of Israel, the other in the history of Rome.

It is curious to learn that while Soloviev was working on his French book he was also translating the *Aeneid* in collaboration with A. Fet.[13] These two engagements were not unrelated.

> Now, while translating *The Aeneid* in my hours of leisure, I feel with especial vividness the mysterious and at the same time natural necessity which made of Rome the center of the Church Universal.[14]

Of course, Soloviev could easily read Vergil without any connection to Dante, but if we take into account that at almost the same time he was also translating Dante, it would not be too audacious to suspect a connection.[15] On the other hand, parallel allusions to the two histories, Jewish and Roman, was one of the most characteristic features of Dante's style.

> The most casual reader, [says Edward Moore], cannot fail to have noticed in all three parts of the *Divina Commedia*, but especially in the *Purgatorio*, how habitually the examples of vice and virtue are taken alternatively, or in alternate groups, from Scripture or profane literature. . . . The explanation for this practice on the part of Dante is to be sought in the fact that *he considered the people of Rome to be as much God's "chosen people" as the Jews, the one leading up to the realization of a Universal Empire, the other to that of a*

> *Universal Church. Roman and Jewish history were equally "sacred"* for Dante . . . Vergil, "divinus poeta noster," is quoted side by side with Scripture, and his well-known lines "*Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento*" etc., are cited as a proof of God's purpose of a Universal Empire for Rome, as we should quote Scripture.[16]

The most conspicuous example of this deliberate parallelism is to be found in *Inferno*, II, 13-33, when Aeneas and St. Paul are introduced as the only privileged visitors to the unseen world (*"Io non Enea, io non Paulo sono"*), the one on behalf of the future Empire, the other for the sake of the Church, in anticipation of that "sacred place" where the successors to the Great Peter will hold their see. The coming of Aeneas to Italy coincides, according to Dante's chronological calculations, with the birth of David: thus the two "*parentalia* " were providentially related.

The whole passage on this subject in *Convivio*, IV, 5, is characteristic and extremely interesting. Here the foundation of Rome is directly related to the sublime mystery of the Incarnation. There had to be a suitable habitation and receptacle for the Son of God descending to earth. The Earth itself had to be "in the best condition," in *ottima disposizione*, for His coming, and the best condition is "Monarchy." And therefore, "Divine Providence ordained the people and the city which should fulfill this condition, namely glorious Rome" — *ordinato fu per lo divino provedimento*. On the other hand, "a most holy family was ordained" from which the mother of the Incarnate was to be born in due time — that is, the family of David.

> *And all of this, the birth of David and the birth of Rome, happened at the same juncture (in uno temporale) — namely, at the coming of Aeneas from Troy into Italy*, as the records testify. *Thus the divine choice of the Roman Empire (la divina elezione) is sufficiently proved by the birth of the holy city (de la santa cittade), which was contemporaneous with the roots of the family of Mary . . . O, inexpressible and incomprehensible wisdom of God, who at the same hour both yonder in Syria and here in Italy madest Thy preparations for Thy coming (che a una ora, per la tua venuta, in Siria suso e qua in Italia dinanzi ti preparasti).*[17]

The whole Second Book of Dante's *Monarchia* is devoted to the proof of the providential "legitimacy" of the Roman Empire, and the argument is to a great extent theological. "If the Roman Empire was not founded upon right (*de jure non fuit*), then Christ would have consented to an injustice by his very birth." As this is obviously impossible, Dante concludes that Christ did testify to the "justice" of Rome. He chose to be born *sub edicto Romani Imperatoris*, that He "*might be enrolled as a man in that unique register of the human race (in illa singulari generis*

humani descriptione homo conscriberetur), and thereby He recognized its validity." Accordingly, He testified to this validity by chosing to die under the sentence of the Roman authority. The sentence would not be valid if the Roman Caesars did not rule *de jure*. Thus "*the Bridegroom Christ* acknowledged [the Roman Empire] at both ends of His warfare on earth (*in utroque termino suae militiae*).[18] The phrasing, again, is highly significant: *Sponsus Christus* is correlative with *Sponsa Ecclesia*, and Rome is *Sedes Sponsae* (*Epist.* VIII, alias XI, "Cardinalibus ytalicis," 11).

It is against this background that we may fully assess the exalted belief of Soloviev in the "Eternal Rome." He wrote only the first of his "History of Theocracy," in which he dealt with the Biblical preparation of Theocracy. Three more volumes were projected, and they were to be historical. Soloviev could not have avoided a discussion of the "Roman" ancestry of the Church.[19] Of course, this is merely a conjecture. The question, however, cannot be evaded: how did Soloviev come to his singular *belief* in Eternal Rome? Dante and his *Duca* and *Dottore* Vergil are the most natural source of such a belief. The image of Eternal Rome did not play any role in Soloviev's early speculations before the year 1883 when, as we know from his own testimony, he read Dante and recognized in him a prophet of the Empire. Moreover, in Dante the concept of the Empire was rooted in the conviction that humanity — that is, the human race or mankind — was, or should be, an organic unity, a whole — this idea which was so dear to Soloviev and always dominated his thinking. God must have had a specific purpose for all mankind — *finis totius humanae civilitatis*. This was Dante's starting point in *Monarchia*.

> There must be some particular function (*propria operatio*) which is proper to the human species as a whole and for which the whole species in its multitudinous variety was created.

The purpose of the human race is peace, and the Emperor is accordingly first and foremost *rex pacificus*, the custodian of unity and concord. But Peace can be only founded on Justice, and the Monarch is to be "the purest incarnation of Justice." Finally, it is "charity" or *recta dilectio* that sharpens and illuminates justice. Governed by charity and justice, the Monarch is "the minister to all" (*minister omnium*). This is the course of argument in the First Book of *Monarchia*, and Dante concludes:

> *Est igitur Monarchia necessaria mundo . . . Ad optimam dispositionem mundi necesse est Monarchiam esse . . . Ad bene esse mundi Monarchiam necesse est esse.*

It is well said that "the Empire that Dante discusses is a theoretical proposition, not a living reality."[20] It is also true, as Bryce has aptly stated, that in the West

> the Holy Empire was a dream, a sublime conception, half theology and half poetry, of the unity of mankind, the unity of men who are themselves the children of God, as realized in one Church which is also a State and in one State which is also a Church.[21]

Dante's Empire was indeed a dream or a utopia, but it was a dream of hope and faith. It was, in a sense, a projection of the past into the future. His Empire, as was recently suggested,

> was not the Holy Roman Empire of Western feudalism, nor was it the pagan empire of Augustus or Trajan. It was the empire of Constantine, Theodosius and Justinian, whose splendors were recorded at San Vitale and Sant' Apollinare in Classe.[22]

It was Justinian who, in the sixth Canto of *Paradiso*, was made to narrate the story of the Roman Eagle, *il sacrosanto segno.*

In Soloviev's introduction to *La Russie et l'église universelle*, the main emphasis was namely on justice and unity or "solidarity." The instinct of international solidarity has existed throughout human history, and has been variously expressed — in the tendency towards universal monarchy which culminated in the idea and reality of the *pax Romana* or, among the Jews, in the conviction of the natural unity and common origin of the human race. Here again there is parallelism between Roman and Jewish development. The new and higher ideal of a Christian spiritual fellowship was but incompletely realized during medieval times. The main interest of the Christian state should be namely the maintenance of peace. Yet the Byzantine transformation of the Roman Empire, begun by Constantine and completed by Justinian, was only nominal. The State was in fact still pagan in its inspiration, and it then fell into a heresy of life, *Caesaropapism*. The mission to found a Christian State, refused by the Greek Empire, was transferred to the Romano-Germanic world by the authority of the Pope. Yet in the final analysis the Holy Roman Empire proved to be nothing but a "fictitious empire" — *l'empire romain fictif*. For lack of an imperial power that was genuinely Christian and Catholic, the Church was also unable to enforce peace and justice in Europe.

Now, Soloviev submitted that it was Russia who was historically prepared and predestined to supply the "political power" required by the Church for the salvation of Europe and of the world. This was obviously a dream, a utopia, an illusion. Nevertheless, it was a utopia and illusion of hope and faith. There was the thrill of a gigantic idea. Soloviev's reading of Dante could only confirm and strengthen him in

his theocratic dreaming. Peace and unity was and had to be a perennial "expectation of the nations," *chaianie iazykov*.

III

The only direct reference to Dante in *La Russie et l'église universelle* is highly significant. In spite of his wholehearted commitment to the "Monarchy of Saint Peter," Soloviev wanted to maintain a balance between the "human" and the "divine." His theocratic formula was in fact "dualistic" or rather "triadic." *Sacerdotium* should not absorb *Imperium*, just as the State should not have subordinated the Church. No "Nestorian" separation of "religion" and "politics" was permissible. But no "fusion" or "confusion" of powers and authorities could be permitted either. The problem was delicate. In the context of the Kingdom of God there is obviously no room for a separate secular power. If the absolute value of the divine principle is acknowledged, no other principle can be admitted as having equal weight. When the Caesar enters the Kingdom of God, his position is radically changed: in the unity of the Kingdom there is no room for two equal and independent powers.[23]

Yet even in the Kingdom of God, as manifested in history, there should be Caesars. There is a "social trinity," the trinity of Messianic powers. The second Messianic power is Christian kingship.

> The Christian king, prince or emperor is pre-eminently the spiritual son of the supreme pontiff. If the unity of the Church is centered and realized in the supreme pontiff and if there is a father-son relationship between the Christian State as such and the Church, this relationship must exist, truly and, so to speak, hypostatically, between the head of the State and the head of the Church.

The "second Messianic power," the Kingship, is "begotten" (in principle) by the first, by that spiritual fatherhood which is centered in the Pope. And yet it has its own sphere of action and authority.

> As the divine Father acts and manifests Himself in creation through the Son, His Word, so too the Church of God, the spiritual fatherhood, the universal papacy, must act and manifest itself externally by means of the Christian State, through the Kingship of the Son. *The State must be the political organ of the Church; the temporal sovereign must be the "Word" of the spiritual sovereign. In this way, the question of supremacy between the two powers is resolved: for the more each is what it should be, the greater is their mutual equality and freedom.*

Soloviev was convinced that in practice, adequate coordination of the two Messianic powers could be achieved only through mediation of the

third, of the Prophecy — "only in this prophetic future of which they themselves are the necessary premises and conditions."[24]

In any case, according to Soloviev the Church should not directly interfere in the world, lest she compromise her sacred dignity in the practical struggle against evil. And for that very reason, in the absense of an adequate instrument of Kingship or Empire, the Church is unable to accomplish peace and justice in human relations. It is dangerous for the Church when she is induced or compelled to function as an Empire. This is precisely what happened in the Middle Ages during the "Papal Empire" or "Imperial Papacy" of Innocent III and Innocent IV. For such power men of exceptional quality were needed, but the great Popes who had raised politics to the height of moral action were succeeded by many others who degraded religion to the level of material interest. It is here that the reference to Dante is inserted: he "who in immortal lines calls upon a second Charlemagne to put an end to the fatal confusion of the two powers in the Roman Church."[25]

Soloviev quotes *Inferno* XIX and *Purgatorio* VI and XVI. In *Inferno* XIX Dante indicts the Simoniacs and exposes the avarice of the lawless Popes, *un pastor senza legge*. He rebukes Constantine for his "Donation," for "the dower the first rich Pope received from thee as heir" (*quella dote che da te prese il primo ricco patre*). Dante deplores time and again the fatal consequences of this mistaken action, although he is willing to admit that Constantine meant well. Yet he had no right to do so. He refers to the Donation repeatedly in *Monarchia* and explains that, first of all, the Empire cannot be divided; he then reiterates that to alienate any privileges from the empire is equivalent to "tearing that seamless garment which even those who pierced Christ, God himself, with the lance did not dare to divide." It would have been impossible to emphasize more insistently the autonomy of the Empire. "*The Empire is not allowed* to destroy itself" — *ergo Imperio se ipsum destruere non licet*. Moreover, "the Church was no more able to accept it as a possession than the Emperor to make an outright grant of it."[26]

In *Purgatorio* VI Dante denounces and deplores the internecine struggles which divide Italy. Justinian is mentioned again: "What boots it that Justinian rearranged thy bridle, if the saddle vacant be?" There is no Emperor, and the garden of the Empire lies in waste (vs 88-89, 104-105). The sixteenth Canto of *Purgatorio* is of special relevance for our purpose. It contains the discourse of Marco Lombardo on the misdirection of temporal power. "The laws are there, but what hand makes them good?" There is no Emperor, and the shepherd who leads the flock is not fit for the task. The allusion is to the Pope. The world is so ill-behaved because it is ruled improperly. The Church of Rome sinks into the mire, and *by striving to combine two powers in one* (*confondere in sè due reggimenti*) only befouls herself. In the past, "when Rome reformed the world" *there were two suns to illuminate the double way* — that of the world and that of God (*due Soli aver, che l'una e l'altra strada facean vedere, e del mondo e di Deo*). But the one

has now extinguished the other, the sword and the crook are united, and their confusion produces bad government (vs. 94-127). Dante rigorously insists on the duality of powers: *there should be Two Suns* — i.e. *duo luminaria magna*, the Pope and the Emperor. Any confusion of powers breeds trouble. In *Monarchia* Dante pleaded for the essential independence of the Empire, since the Emperor "stands in immediate relationship to the Sovereign of the world, which is God" (*immediate se habere ad principem universi qui Deus est*) (III, 16). Yet even then he did not deny a kind of "subordination" of the Roman Prince to the Roman Pontiff, "since our temporal happiness is subordinate, in a sense, to our eternal blessedness" (*quodam modo ad immortalem felicitatem ordinetur*).

> Caesar is therefore obliged *to observe towards Peter the reverence which a first-born son owes to his father*; so that when he is enlightened by the light of paternal grace he may the more powerfully enlighten the world, at the head of which he has been placed by the One who alone is ruler of all things spiritual and temporal.

In the *Commedia* Dante sees human history in another light and in a wider perspective. He is even more vigorous in his invectives against the degenerate Church, which he puts in the mouth of Saint Peter himself (*Paradiso*, XXVII, 40-66). "*O difesa di Dio, perchè pur giaci*"? (see Psalm XLIII, 23: *Exsurge, quare obdormis, Domine*). But now he stresses the need for purification more for the recovery of the Church than in order to secure the independence of the Empire. It is significant that Soloviev quoted these particular Cantos of the *Commedia*. In spite of his insistence on the absolute plenitude of the authority of Saint Peter, he wanted to keep the *Sacerdotium* out of politics and to secure for the *Imperium* an ultimate sanction of the Truth. So much he could have learned from Dante.[27]

IV

The theocratic scheme of Soloviev was a composite conception. One may discern traces of various influences and impressions which Soloviev experienced in rather rapid succession. Certain inconsistencies in the scheme may be easily detected. Does the East stand for immutable tradition, and does its limitation consist precisely in that it is so immured in the past as to not be capable of any historical action, whereas the West represents the power of human action? Such was his position in the *Great Controversy*. In *La Russie et l'église universelle* it is the East — namely, Russia on behalf of all the Slavs — that is expected "to take up the work of Constantine and Charlemagne," to take the lead in temporal activities, while the past is embodied in Eternal Rome, in the paternity of the Supreme Pontiff. Was Soloviev aware of

this reversal of roles and positions? His Messianic dream should be more carefully analyzed in the perspective of his evolution. The purpose of this brief sketch is to suggest that more attention should be paid to the impact Dante may have had on the formation of Soloviev's theocratical views.

[1]"The Great Controversy" was first published in *Rus* (1883), Nos. 1, 2, 3, 14, 15, 18 and 25. It is reprinted in the *Sobranie sochinenii* of Soloviev, vol. IV.

[2]First published in *Russkaia Mysl* (December, 1913) and then reprinted in Soloviev's *Pisma* (Petersburg, 1923), hereafter cited as *Pisma*, IV.

[3]*Pisma*, IV, 21, March, 1883, letter 9.

[4]*Pisma*, IV, 22, June, 1883, letter 11.

[5]*Pisma*, IV, 26-27, November, 1883, letter 14. Italics mine.

[6]*La Russie et l'église universelle*, 3rd ed. (Paris, 1922), p. LVI; English translation, *Russia and the Universal Church* (London, 1948), p. 30.

[7]See Soloviev's letters to Fr. Paul Pierling, S.J., in *Pisma*, III (1911), 148-153), and in D. Strémooukhoff, *Vladimir Soloviev et son œuvre messianique* (Paris, 1935), Appendix, p. 308 and 309; cf. also text, pp. 206ff. See the English translation by Büchervertriebsanstalt of Strémooukhoff 's book, entitled *Vladimir Soloviev and His Messianic Work*, trans.from French by Elizabeth Meyendorff.

[8]See, however, his later article "Vsemirnaia Monarkhiia" in the *Brockhaus Encyclopedia*.

[9]See my two articles on this subject: "The Historical Premonitions of Tiutchev" (in this volume) and "Tiutchev and Vladimir Soloviev," *Put* , No. 41, 1933, 3-24 (in this volume). Tiutchev's principle political treatise, *La Russie et l'Occident* (1849), is available only in the excerpts cited in the biography of him written by Ivan Aksakov, "Biografiia Fedora Ivanovicha Tiutcheva," *Russkii Arkhiv*, 1873; separate edition, Moscow, 1886. (This biography is of course in Russian, but many of Tiutchev's texts are cited in the French original.) Three political articles by Tiutchev, published on his own initiative, were also reprinted first in *Russkii Arkhiv* and later in his collected works (*Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, St. Petersburg, 1913). The most important of these articles for our present purposes is the one entitled "La Question romaine," which originally appeared in *La Revue des deux mondes* in 1849. After expressing his hope that Christendom may be reunited, he concludes by recalling the deep emotion evoked by the visit of Nicholas I to Rome in 1846: "l'apparition de l'Empereur Orthodoxe revenu à Rome après plusieurs siècles d'absence," (*Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, 363). Here a contemporary witness may be quoted: Gogol speaks of the same experience in his letter of January 2, 1847, to Count Aleksander P. Tolstoy: "He was everywhere called simply *Imperatore*, without the addition of *di Russia*, so that a foreigner might have thought that he was the legitimate sovereign of this land" (N. V. Gogol, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, Akademiia Nauk SSSR, XIII, 24). Soloviev himself mentions that Tiutchev at one time believed in Reunion of the Churches "through an agreement between the Tsar and the Pope," but later abandoned this idea. See "Poèziia F. I. Tiutcheva," *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, VII, 133.

[10]*La Russie et l'église universelle*, 144; English translation, 114.

[11]*La Russie et l'église universelle*, 143; English translation, 113. Italics mine.

[12]*Pisma*, I (1908), 36, May 20, 1887, letter 27. Italics mine.

[13]*Pisma*, II (1909), 253-254, to Count Dmitrii Chertelev, September, 1887, letter 30. Soloviev translated Cantos 7, 9, and 10, and also the Fourth Eclogue; see in *Stikhotvoreniia*, Teol., 1921, pp. 194-6.

[14]*Pisma*, III, 155-156, to Fr. Pierling, Aug. 7-19, 1887.

[15]Two *sonetti* of Dante are known in Soloviev's translation: in his *Stikhotvoreniia*, 7th ed., 1921, pp. 195 f. (Sonetto 8, "Vita Nuova," XV, 4-6, and Sonetto 6, "Vita Nuova," XIII, 8-9).

[16]Edward Moore, *Studies in Dante*, First Series: Scripture and Classical Authors in Dante (Oxford, 1896), 26, italics mine; see also Nancy Lenkeith, *Dante and the Legend of Rome* ["Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies," ed. Richard Hunt and Raymond Klibansky, Supplement II, The Warburg Institute) (London, 1952), 89: "Dante, in effect, makes the Romans a chosen people having a position and role in providential history which is analogous to that of the Jews."

[17]English translation by W. W. Jackson (Oxford, 1909), 205. Italics mine.

[18]*Monarchia*, II, 11 & 12: English translation with an Introduction by Donald Nicholl, "Library of Ideas" (New York, n.d.), 56-59. "Recognized the validity" is a rather "liberal" rendering of the Latin phrase *quod fuit illud prosequi*. Gustavo Vinay also inserts "*la validita*" in his Italian translation (Firenze, s.d.).

[19]See *Pisma*, III, 148, 150 — to Fr. Pierling, June 20 and July 14, 1887, letters 7 and 8.

[20]A. P. d'Entrèves, *Dante as a Political Thinker* (Oxford, 1952), 34.

[21]James Viscount Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, new edition [1904] (New York: Macmillan, 1928), 343.

[22]George Every, *An Essay on Charles Williams*, quoted by Dorothy L. Sayers in her "Commentaries" on the translation of *Purgatory* (Penguin Classics, 1955), 194, ad XVI, 106. See d'Entrèves, *op. cit.*, 35: Dante's notion of the Empire "closely corresponds to the Roman, or rather the Byzantine, idea of the Prince which emerges from Justinian's law-books." On the other hand, Williams was right in linking the image of the Emperor in Dante with "Father Aeneas." "The image of that prince then is, for Dante, no modern image, deriving only from the five-century-old Charlemagne. It comes from Charlemagne certainly, but (eight hundred years before Charlemagne) from Julius Caesar himself; and even before Julius, though there is no emperor, yet there is the nobility of the Roman people, and right back at their beginnings is Aeneas, beyond Aeneas is Troy. . . . A key to the *Commedia* is in the *De Monarchia*, but the key to the *De Monarchia* is in the Aeneid." Charles Williams, *The Figure of Beatrice* (London, 1953), pp. 93f.

[23]"Kritika otvlechennykh nachal," *Sobranie sochinenii*, II, 164.

[24]*La Russie et l'église universelle*, 314 ff; English translation 203 ff. Italics mine.

[25]*La Russie et l'église universelle*, pp. LV-LVII; English translation 29-30. Italics mine.

[26]*Monarchia*, II, 12, 13; III, 10, 13.

[27]It was beyond my competence to attempt a review of the various interpretations of Dante's political views. The interpretation given by Professor d'Entrèves, in his book quoted above, seems convincing. There are valuable bibliographical suggestions in his notes. There is competent guidance in the *Handbook to Dante Studies*, by Umberto Cosmo; English translation by David Moore (Oxford, 1950). One should also refer to E. Gilson's *Dante the Philosopher*; English translation by David Moore (1949), and his *Les Metamorphoses de la cité de Dieu* (Paris, 1952).

THE RATIONALISTIC RELIGION OF TOLSTOY

The 1870s witnessed a sharp religious and moralistic awakening at all levels of society. The "return to the people" movement was one of its results. Moreover, the sectarian movement had been growing stronger and stronger among the people since the 1860s. Two motifs converged. First, there was a "search for truth," an anxiety about untruth in social and personal life, which was frequently combined with an apocalyptical uneasiness, fear, or hope — fear before the Anti-Christ or hopeful anticipation of the Second Coming. Second, there was a thirst for "conversion" or "awakening," a decisive turning point in life or a thrust toward something better. This was a new wave of pietism, now spilling over into new social strata. Stundism developed significantly in South Russia, under the direct stimulation of similar movements in the German colonies where, after all, it was precisely sectarians who were the settlers (among them the "Awakeners" from Bavaria and Würtemburg in the 1820s). It is interesting that Jung-Stilling's *Victorious History* circulated widely among the Molokans.

This moral sensitivity, the heightened impressionability of the conscience, characterizes all the sects of the period. It was the residue of sentimentalism, a new paroxysm of the oversimplified spiritual utopianism which by good feelings and counsel resolves too one-dimensionally the tragic clashes and contradictions of life. A similar movement is observable in the higher social circles. Such, above all, was the "high society schism" provoked during the 1870s in St. Petersburg by the sermons of Lord G. V. Redstock. His was the typical sermon on "conversion" or "revival," the "awakening" of the heart, "justification by faith," the stimulation of good Christian feelings. Apparently Redstock gave most of his sympathies to the Plymouth Brethren. He greatly valued Guyon and Jung-Stilling, and had apocalytical premonitions. An interesting comment about him was made by Countess A. A. Tolstaia. She wrote with great sympathy about him to Lev Tolstoy that he is "the gentlest, kindest sectarian." But his weak side quickly became apparent. "He knew nothing at all about human nature, and paid not the slightest attention to it, for according to his system each person can in a single moment shed his passions and base inclinations simply by desiring to come to the Lord." "He was a complete unbeliever. I spoke with him in the garden, we prayed together, and he went away a Christian." These last are Redstock's own words.

In 1876 Redstock's followers in Russia founded the Society for the Promotion of Religious and Moral Reading. The chief members were Vasilii A. Pashkov, Baron Modest M. Korf, Count A. A. Bobrinskoy, Princess M. M. Dondukova-Korsakova, Fedor G. Terner, and sometimes Nikolai S. Leskov. In their style the new group

approximated the former Bible societies, but with something added from the "return to the people" movement. A philanthropical element was also vividly expressed (for example, in the visitation of prisons and the reading of Holy Scripture to the prisoners). It was no accident that various pamphlets originally written in Russian or translated into Russian during the time of Alexander I were now reissued for distribution. At first the new preachers did not openly differentiate themselves from the Church. But sectarian exclusivity soon began to grow, and contacts with other sects started (with the Dukhobors, the Baptists, etc.). Then the authorities stepped in and the "Pashkovite" prayer meetings were suppressed, with the chief leaders being forced to leave Russia in 1884.

In such historical circumstances the religious crisis and "conversion" of Lev Tolstoy (1828-1910) at the end of the 1870s ceases to appear as an individual and isolated episode, and his psychological influence becomes comprehensible. In his *Confession* Tolstoy recounts his life in terms typical of the "conversion" scheme, although his was not an instantaneous one. He was depraved and vile, but behold, he recovered his sight, saw his error, and understood. The essay is a commentary, not a story. His entire life is usually presented in terms of such a decisive revolution. From a "pagan" he becomes a "Christian"; from an artist he is transformed into a preacher and moralist. This conventional scheme is highly imprecise. The *Confession* is above all an artistic work, not a naive admission, and it was written in a style long characteristic of Tolstoy, beginning with his youthful diaries, his "Franklin journals," the "journal of weaknesses." Of course, he experienced a very significant shock at the end of the 1870s — his "religious crisis." It was not, however, the first "crisis" in Tolstoy's life, and this stormy spiritual shock did not mark any change in his world view. It was an upheaval within a closed psychological sphere. The experience was tormenting, but it did not shatter the sphere.

Two elements combined to produce Tolstoy's crisis. First, there was a certain perplexity.

> Moments of doubt began to come upon me, moments when life seemed to stop, as if I did not know how I could go on living or what I was to do, and I became lost and fell into despair. These moments of perplexity began to recur more and more often, always in the same form. In the moments when life seemed to stop, the same questions were always posed: Why? Well, and then?

This was an acute attack of reflection, an exhausting self-interrogation about the meaning of life, about the meaning of individual actions. The answer was always the same. "The truth was that life is meaningless." The second element was more profound. It was a pull toward death — a tug, an attraction, a fatal and captivating power.

> I did not necessarily wish to kill myself. The power of drawing me away from life was stronger, more complete, and more general than a desire. It was a power similar to my earlier aspiration for life, only in the opposite direction. With all my might I struggled against life. I myself did not know what I wanted. I feared life, fought against it, but at the same time I hoped for something from it and, being afraid of death, I had to use every trick against myself in order not to deprive myself of life.

What is so characteristic here is the dual mental instability of fear, of metaphysical despair. "I cannot see the days and nights that are guiding and driving me towards death. I see death alone, for it alone is true. All else is a lie. The only truth is death." This was fear before an ultimate disappearance or annihilation. "Is there any meaning in my life that will not be destroyed by my inescapable and approaching death?" This made life itself impossible. What for? "Death will come and destroy everything." This was the horror of non-being, fear of being abandoned or forsaken in the world. "It was the feeling of fear of being orphaned, of being left alone in an utterly foreign world — and of hope for some kind of help."

The crisis was resolved when a new feeling for life was born, when the conviction that man is not alone in the world returned. "Strangely, the life force that returned to me was not a new one, but the old one, the same that had captivated me in the earliest days of my life." This last admission is especially important. Tolstoy himself acknowledges and testifies to the fact that nothing new was born, that he himself remained unchanged. There was no encounter, mystical experience, revelation, or rapture. It simply became clear that "to know God and to live are one and the same thing. God is life. Live seeking God, and then there will be no life without God." This is the limit of the "fiercest imminence," without any hope, any break whatsoever; everything is complete.

Tolstoy's experience contains one decisive contradiction. He undoubtedly had the temperament of a preacher or moralist, but he was utterly lacking in religious experience. Tolstoy was completely irreligious — he was religiously ungifted. Dmitrii Ovsianiko-Kulikovsky noted this point quite boldly in his day. In Tolstoy's doctrine he saw only the surrogate of religion, suitable only "for educated sectarians." Ovsianiko-Kulikovsky made his judgment as an irreligious humanist, but his observation is accurate. "His doctrine is dry, rational, rationalistic. It is a religion not of the Spirit, but of the syllogism." Tolstoy taught a special brand of moral positivism which is somewhat reminiscent of the Stoics. He genuinely valued both Epictetus and Seneca. "This is the alphabet of Christian truth." When, following his "crisis," Tolstoy continued to seek faith, he did not in

reality seek as much as try out the beliefs of others, proceeding from his own long-standing and unchanging presuppositions.

In no way did Tolstoy draw his "Christian" world view from the Gospels. He collated the Gospels with his own views, which is why he found it so easy to reduce and adapt them. For him, the Gospels are a book composed many centuries ago "by ill-educated and superstitious men," and it is impossible to accept them in their entirety. He did not have scientific criticism in mind, but simply personal selection or choice. In one of his last essays he demonstates a highly characteristic method. With pencil in hand, let each person read the Gospels and mark that which he can understand, using red for the words of Christ and blue for other passages. Only that which is marked, "that which is completely simple and understandable," is essential in the Gospels. And through the power of the unity of reason, all of the passages in such a selection must roughly coincide. "One must first of all *believe in reason*, and then select from among all scriptures — Jewish, Christian, Moslem, Buddhist, Chinese, and modern secular ones — all that *agrees with reason*, throwing out everything that does not agree with it." The naive trust in common sense expressed here is surprising. "There can be error in everything except reason. Men can remain separated only when they believe in various human traditions instead of in reason which, coming directly from God, is one and the same for all."

Tolstoy undoubtedly sought the spiritual life, but his unrestrained rationalism immediately disfigured that which he undertook. He was able to divine a "beautiful book" in Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain's *Unseen Warfare*, but he measured it by the obligatory standard of "understandability" and decided that it was necessary to "eliminate that which was superfluous and untrue." Tolstoy read the lives of the saints and the works of the fathers and ascetics. But once again he chose and selected, omitting dogmas and miracles. His is precisely a system of reworked Christianity. There is a characteristic passage in his diary for 1862: "I believe in a singular, unattainable, and good God, in the immortality of the soul, and in eternal rewards for our deeds. I do not understand the mystery of the Trinity and the birth of the Son of God, but I respect and do not reject the faith of my fathers." Tolstoy later corrupted the "faith of the fathers" precisely by this "non-understanding," which was his basic and most repeated line of reasoning.

His basic religious design, interestingly enough, gained definition long before the "crisis." There is a very important entry in the diary under March 5, 1855:

> Conversation about the divine and faith has led me to a great, colossal idea, to the realization of which I feel myself capable of dedicating my whole life. This idea — the foundation of a new religion — is commensurate with the development of mankind, a religion of Christ, but one purified of faith and

> mystery, a practical religion, one not promising future bliss but conferring bliss on earth. I understand that bringing this idea to fulfillment can only be accomplished by generations consciously working towards this goal. One generation will bequeath the idea to the next, and some day either fanaticism or reason will bring it to fulfillment. To act consciously for the union of men of religion is the foundation of the idea that captivates me.

It remains unclear what impression prompted the recording of this entry. The idea bears a certain similarity to French utopian socialism which, however, Tolstoy hardly ever studied. A remark in the diary for 1860 (on the occasion of his brother's death) is still more unexpected: "The idea occurred to me to write a materialist gospel, a life of Christ the materialist." In any event, the religious theme attracted Tolstoy long before his final "conversion." His spiritual life developed entirely within changing semi-closed spheres set off from one another by "revolutions" or "interruptions of life."

Tolstoy was a highly personal, "egocentric" writer. He apparently proceeded to literature from the diary, and his first literary effort *Childhood* [*Detstvo*, 1852] has an autobiographical character. His "diaries of a youth" are themselves a literary work. "Tolstoy made the transition to literature directly through the diary, and vice versa. The diary must, therefore, be viewed as not merely the usual notebook of entries, but as a collection of literary exercises and raw materials" (Eikhenbaum). This is a very important source for understanding Tolstoy.

In the diaries he wrote as a young man, one detects not simply the influence but the very spirit of the eighteenth century, the spirit of the Enlightenment and sentimentalism. It was as if some contemporary of Zhukovsky or even Karamzin himself had written them. In some strange way, Tolstoy spiritually lagged behind in the eighteenth century, and he therefore seems to stand outside of history and contemporary life. He consciously left the present for an invented past. In this connection, all of his creative work is an unrelieved moralistic Robinson Crusoe sonata. Pavel Annenkov had earlier dubbed Tolstoy as a man with a sectarian mind. "He tried to clarify within himself all phenomena of life and all questions of conscience, without knowing or wanting to know any aesthetical or philosophical explanations, without admitting any traditions, historical or theoretical, on the grounds that they were deliberately invented by men in order to deceive themselves and others." An insensitivity to history characterizes Tolstoy, and he therefore approached a negation of culture as a historical formation and sequence, as something made coherent by sequential experience. Sequentiality for him is enigmatic. As one recent investigator noted, "the full meaning of his position and system lay in surmounting the onslaught." Tolstoy struggled "with history as such, with the very fact

of the historical process." He had "no wish to agree with it or allow it any possibility." He protested against the very existence of history. To that extent he was a follower of nihilism, but his is a very peculiar "nihilism," a nihilism of common sense: "common sense" versus "history" (Eikhenbaum).

Tolstoy's sympathies lay entirely in the eighteenth century, above all with Rousseau, Sterne, Bernadin de St. Pierre, and even with *The Vicar of Wakefield.* (It is interesting that Tolstoy later suggested to an "intermediary" that *The Vicar of Wakefield* be republished for the people.) After these writers come Stendhal, Xavier de Maistre, Rudolphe Toepffer (who wrote in the style of Sterne), and finally Proudhon. Tolstoy said of Rousseau: "Rousseau was my teacher from the age of fifteen." As a young man he wore a locket with a portrait of Rousseau on his breast in place of a cross. Tolstoy was aptly known as "*un Emil réalisé.*" In his younger days he wrote literary and psychological exercises in sentimentalism, imitations of Sterne, and letters in the style of Mlle. Genlis. Among Russian writers he was most attracted to Karamzin, followed by Novikov and Radishchev. By the 1850s he had read Karamzin, as well as such morally edifying journals of the previous century as *Morning Light* [*Utrennyi svet*]. Most characteristic is the remark in his diary for 1853 that "it would not be a bad practice to include a moral in every literary work, as is done in fables." The diaries of the young Tolstoy give very sharp expression to his need for and inclination towards moral regulation — a peculiar form of moral casuistics, an incessant self-analysis and dissatisfaction with himself, and the elaboration of plans and schedules. The stylization of his inadequacies later found in the *Confession* is already present.

It may be said that the *Confession* was written in the moralistic style of the eighteenth century and was developed entirely within the categories of sentimentalism. In Tolstoy's creative work, sentimentalism once again erupted towards the upper historical layers of Russian culture. Yet sentimentalism is merely a secularized pietism, a variation of the same psychological type. Tolstoy's religio-moralistic influence and popularity testify to the great power this pietist temptation held over the Russian soul, a power that had not been entirely exhausted and overcome in his day. It is no accident that Tolstoy studied the Alexandrine era — in many ways he felt at one with it. And if he stylized the Pierre of *War and Peace* as his contemporary, then did he not have an even greater wish to portray himself in that contemporary age as the pietist and moralist of bygone days? It is interesting that Tolstoy loved to read Fénélon, and in his time read Angelus Silesius. Tolstoy's affinity with Kant exists within the limits of that same eighteenth century. The affinity lies in the fact that Kant also stood outside the boundaries of his age. Influence is less at issue here than is the immediate identity of design: "a religion within the limits of reason alone" ["*innerhalb des bloßen Vernunft*"], with the

deadest "regulation" and rule of law, excluding anything "mysterious" or "miraculous." In Tolstoy, the good itself disappears beneath the category of the law. "Do not do the good, do the lawful. This alone is satisfying, this alone is necessary, important, joyous." For Tolstoy, God is not so much the Father as the Master [*Khoziain*], and man is his laborer. This is a step backward, a return from sonship to slavery.

Tolstoy's power lies in his accusatory frankness, in his moral anxiety. A summons to repentance, a tocsin of the conscience, may be heard in him. Yet his limitations and weaknesses are thereby felt more acutely. Tolstoy could not explain the origin of the impurity of falseness of life; he did not adequately notice the radicalness of empirical evil. He naively attempted to reduce everything to incomprehension or irrationality, and to explain everything by "stupidity," "deception," or "evil intention" and "conscious lies." These are traits which are entirely characteristic of the Enlightenment. Tolstoy knew about man's baseness, and spoke of it with aversion and loathing (note the *Kreutzer Sonata*, 1890). Nevertheless, he had no sense of sin. Shame is still not repentance. There is a striking discrepancy between Tolstoy's aggressively maximalist socio-ethical polemic and negation and the extreme poverty of his positive moral teachings. For him, all morality leads to common sense and worldly prudence. "Christ teaches us precisely how we are to be delivered from our unhappiness and how to live happily." All the Gospels point in that direction! At this point his insensitivity becomes painful, and "common sense" is mindlessly turned around. His fundamental contradiction lies in the fact that for him the falsity of life, strictly speaking, can only be overcome by renouncing history, by escaping from culture, and by simplification; namely, by removing questions and renouncing tasks. In Tolstoy, historical nihilism turns moralism around. And in this is the psychological root of his religious apostasy, his falling away from the Church.

Tolstoy left history more than once. The first time came at the end of the 1850s, when he confined himself to Iasnaia Poliana and devoted himself to pedagogical experiments. This was an escape from culture. Least of all did he give any thought at that time to influencing the people On the contrary, one had to learn the will of the people and fulfill it. In the "opposition of the people to our education" he could see only a just verdict on this useless culture. After all, the *muzhik* has no real need for technology, abstract literature, or even printing. Tolstoy's populism [*narodnichestvo*] acquires an almost pogrom-like texture. Somewhat later he became convinced that all philosophy and science were merely useless, empty words, from which he sought to conceal himself in the working life of the simple people. In the essay "Who Should Teach Whom to Write: We the Peasant Children or the Peasant Children Us?" (1862), Tolstoy had already foreshadowed the essentials of his future pamphlet on art. *War and Peace* contains the same conception. Ovsianiko-Kulikovsky quite aptly labeled this genre as

"nihilistic epos." For Tolstoy, Great History is merely a game which has no heroes and no actors, only invisible fate and a succession of impersonal events. Everything is asleep. Everything crumbles and breaks up into a series of scenes and situations. This is more a mask of life. Nothing is achieved in history. One must conceal oneself from it.

Tolstoy's religious crisis marked the final stage in his nihilistic struggle. He rejected the Church, for he rejected man. He wished to remain alone with common sense. Pride and self-destruction undergo a strange fusion in this nihilism of common sense. Even such an observer as Maksim Gorky was able to discern and distinguish an "infinite, unmitigated despair and desolation" in this "cunning nihilism." Tolstoy's followers exhibited the same need to leave history and settle in a pious utopia on the nether side of history. Such is the whole object of the Tolstoyan "colonies." This was an attack of a peculiar asceticism, a flight from the sinful world, but at the same time an aspiration to create a new world. The sharp aftertaste of apocalypticism in this movement is obvious. The movement failed; its "cultured sketes," dying from inner weakness, very quickly became empty. But it is no accident that for many, in terms of their personal fate, "Tolstoyism" proved to be a path of return to the Church (one need only mention Mikhail A. Novoselov and, later, Prince Dmitrii A. Khilkov). The Orthodox Working Brotherhood of the Elevation of the Cross, founded by Nikolai N. Nepliuev on his Chernigov estate, should be mentioned here.

As a current and as a symptom Tolstoy's influence is characteristic. "The system of reworked gospels has little wisdom — like many other errors it is easily refuted. But these errors will continue to be alluring and infectious as long as the truth, as long as Orthodoxy, exists only in books and sermons or is realized only in rustic backwaters and in the hermitages at Valaamo or Mount Athos." (Metropolitan Antonii Khrapovitsky).

Translated from the Russian by
Robert L. Nichols

AN UNPUBLISHED ESSAY BY VLADIMIR SOLOVIEV

Some manuscripts by Vladimir Soloviev have been preserved among the papers of A. F. Pisemsky. They were preserved amidst the "materials for the novel 'Masony'" [Masons] because, during his work for that novel, Pisemsky turned to these materials for advice and information on some personalities, *inter alia* also on Soloviev himself. At that time, at the end of the 70s, Soloviev lived in Petersburg. When he occasionally went to Moscow, he also visited Pisemsky, and then they discussed details of the novel. Pisemsky expected above all of Soloviev information about the faith, the theory and the customs of the Russian freemasons.[1] Elpidifor V. Barsov, then librarian of the Rumiantsev Museum, F. A. Giliarov, Professor S.A. Usov, and M. N. Lopatin also took, in addition to Soloviev, a "lively interest," as Pisemsky put it, in the novel.[2]

According to Pisemsky's plan, the ecclesiastic Vasilii, who also belonged to the freemasons' order, should deliver a lecture on the scene of Marfin's wedding. The sermon, which was inserted in the novel (Part II, Chapter 12), was written by Soloviev. Soloviev's autograph in a fair copy is to be found among the "materials."[3]

Marfin's poem (Part II, end of Chapter 10) is also by Soloviev.

Kak v iasnoi lazuri zatikhshogo moria
Vsia slava nebes otrazhaetsia . . .

[As in the clear azure of the calm sea
All the glory of the heavens is reflected. . . .]

The manuscript for this poem is missing amidst the "materials"[4] but there is another poem by Soloviev,on an unnumbered single paper which was not inserted in the novel:

Kolebletsia volia liudei, chto volna . . .[5]

[The will of the people vacillates, like a wave . . .]

Pisemsky apparently tried at first himself to write the poems he needed but they did not satisfy him. He obviously conferred then with Soloviev, and Soloviev added a stanza to the verses by Pisemsky:

Ia znaiu: serdtsem ty stremishsia k Bogu
I ia k Nemu stremlius, ishchu ego davno;
Itak nam put odin k nebesnomu chertogu,
Pred nami obshchii trud i schastie odno.

[I know: you strive toward God with your heart,
I too strive toward Him, having sought him for so very long;
Thus there is one path for us to the heavenly chamber,
Before us a common labor, and one and the same happiness.]

But this text did not satisfy Pisemsky either. The whole page is crossed out in the manuscript.[6]

Furthermore, the "materials" contain a short note by Soloviev about the notion of the idea in Hegel. It was published in the appendix to the new edition of the letters by Pisemsky. It had no application to the text of the novel.[7]

Pisemsky asked Soloviev in the middle of March 1889: "Prishlite/pozhaluista/ili sami zavezite ob/samoi/makhinatsii Umnogo delaniia" ["Send/please/or you yourself tell of/the actual/machinations of Intelligent Activity'].[8] The essay about the "Umnogo delaniia" [Intelligent Activity] was written by Soloviev. The autograph is to be found in the "Materialy." But the essay was apparently not finished. The manuscript breaks off in the middle of the page: "Teper dolzhno skazat ob etikh predvaritelnykh priemakh, a zatem i o samom protsesse umnogo delaniia" ["Now one must speak of these preliminary methods, and then about the actual process of intelligent activity"]. It is difficult to decide if the essay was finished. As it can be seen from his letters to Soloviev, Pisemsky was especially interested in the practical side of the "Umnogo Delaniia," in its "makhinatsiia" [machinations]. But it is precisely that with which Soloviev does not deal in the preserved manuscript; he only enters there into the particulars of the theological presuppositions in which Pisemsky was not interested. In the tenth chapter of the second part, Mafin thinks about the "umnaia molitva" [intelligent prayer] during a discussion with Piletsky in which he refers to "our ascetics": "My imeem primer v nashikh asketakh i priznaem vsiu blagodetelnuiu silu putei umnogo delaniia" ["We have an example in our ascetics, and recognize all the beneficial strength of the path of intelligent activity"], which is followed by a short description of the methods of "Umnogo Delaniia." We do not know if any information by Soloviev was utilized for this. In the seventh chapter of the same part, Speransky reads to Marfin a paragraph from his old letter to one of his friends. The text of the letter in the novel is composed of letters by Speransky himself which just appeared in print at the beginning of the 70s. The beginning is taken from a letter to T. A. Slovtsov of 6 August 1813 with unimportant changes in the last sentence.[9] This is followed immediately by a piece from a letter to F. I. Zeyer.[10]

The final sentence is taken from the letter to Bronevsky of 18 February 1818: "Sie sostoianie vostochnye ottsy nazyvali bezmolviem, a zapadnye suspension des facultés de l'âme" ["This state the Eastern Fathers called silence, and the Western [Fathers] suspension of the faculties of the soul"].[11]

Soloviev's essay is important in any case. He somehow unexpectedly defines the "Umnoe Delanie" [intelligent activity] as the "inner union of man with the divine corporality of Christ." The theme of divine corporality [nebesnaia telesnost] in its various aspects is characteristic of the whole tradition of European mysticism and apparently goes back to the Kaballa. Soloviev occupied himself with this mysticism during the second half of the 70s — in any case since his journey to England in 1875, but probably even earlier. N. I. Kareev, a schoolmate of Soloviev, who was closely connected with him in younger days, remembered a characteristic conversation from the spring of 1875; that is, immediately prior to Soloviev's journey abroad. "Soloviev developed the idea that man has a special body, a sidereal one, with the peculiarity to be overcome by atrophy if man does not communicate for a long time."[12] Perhaps,[13] Kareev repeated Soloviev's saying inaccurately after so many years. Soloviev could have taken the idea of the "sidereal" body from occult or spiritualistic literature with which he was very well acquainted at that time. In any case, the connection he creates between the "sideral" body of man and the Eucharistic Body of Christ is very characteristic. During his stay abroad Soloviev had occupied himself mainly with reading mystical literature, including cabalistic literature.[14]

In his well-known letter to the Countess Sofia Andreevna Tolstaia, born Bakhmeteva, the widow of the poet Aleksei Konstantinovich, of 27 March 1887, Soloviev admits that he had found "in the mystics" a confirmation [podtverzhdenie] of his own thoughts. He mentions three major names — Paracelsus, Böhme, Swedenborg.[15] This evidence by Soloviev himself is important. But did he only find a confirmation in them? During the second half of the seventies the influence of this mystical tradition is obviously present in all works by Soloviev. Even in later it does not grow less. The exposition of the theological ideas in *La Russie et l'église universelle* is in a high degree "theosophical" and shows a still stronger "gnostic" color than the earlier work, *Chteniia o Bogochelovechestve* [Readings on Godmanhood]. One must not forget that Schelling also belonged to the same tradition, and not just during the period of his "Positive Philosophy." But especially Baader belonged to this tradition, with whom Soloviev had many things in common. But behind the persons mentioned above, there were Jacob Böhme and the Cabbala. In accordance with Böhme Soloviev claims, in his short essay about the "Umnoe Delanie," that "one must not think that God was without a body because, in that case, he would not have the variety of actual existence." Of course, that is "a special, eternal, incorruptible body, a divine existence, different from the visible and real world."[16] Soloviev said the same in the *Chteniia o Bogochelovechestve*. Of course God is different from the world, from "our world," the visible and real. "But precisely for that reason, in order that God differs without fail from our world, from our nature, from this visible reality of ours, it is necessary to acknowledge this special nature in Him, his special

eternal world. In the contrary case, our idea of divinity would be poorer and more abstract than our idea of the visible world."[17]

However, according to Soloviev, "our world," the "natural world" and the "divine world" correspond completely with each other according to their composition, and they only differ in the interrelationships of these elements.[18] The human elements form a complete and universal individual organism, the "necessary realization and vessel" of the living Logos, "as *eternal body of God* and the eternal soul of the world" or of Sophia.[19] The idea of "divine corporality" had been developed in connection with Böhme and under a strong and direct influence of the Cabbala by Friedrich Christoph Oetinger (1702-1782) and later on also by Baader. It is significant to point out the well-known aphorism by Oetinger: "Corporality is the end of the ways of God."[20] Thereby, of course, the strict and exact difference has to be made between "corporality" and "reality" or matter. The "body" must not be in every case "material." There is also a "spiritual" body. "Corporality" is from the beginning a "spiritual" one, the material is already a distortion, and the "spirituality" of the body has to be restored — it is restored in Christ, and it will be finally restored and become evident during the general resurrection. That is one of the most important themes and motifs of Soloviev in his *Chteniia o Bogochelovechestve*. "Corporality" enters completely the structure of divine existence itself. It reveals itself in manifold theophanies, and it is obvious in the Incarnation of the Logos. "The Incarnation of the Logos," says Soloviev in his final "lecture" (which was already written in 1882) "is only the last link in a long chain of other physical and historical incarnations," only a more complete and more accomplished theophany in a series of other incomplete, preparatory and ideal theophanies."[21] Nature looses in the second Adam, Christ, "its real division of time and heaviness, it becomes a direct expression and tool of the divine spirit, a truly spiritual body." Soloviev concludes: "Christ rises from the dead and appears to His Church in such a body." And the Church itself is "the body of the Divine Logos."[22] In this connection — from Soloviev's point of view — the categorical statement that the "Umnoe Delanie" is an "inner union of man with the divine corporality of Christ" becomes completely comprehensible. Corporality is the end of the ways of God. The question of Soloviev's "sources" is complicated and difficult. He wrote almost always without references; in any case without exact references. He used to mention his opponents only when he criticized them. We learn something about Soloviev's reading only because of occasional mentions in his letters — and there are few of them — and because of recollections by his friends which are likewise accidental and not always reliable. On the other hand, Soloviev was generally considered as a very frank and impressionable thinker. That is the reason for the great extent of his synthesis, for his power and, at the same time, for his unquestionable eclecticism, his inner discord, and the inconsistency of his views. This is said even by those who esteemed

Soloviev's philosophy very much: Prince Evgenii Trubetskoy; and relatively recently also Fr. Vasilii Zenkovsky. The combination of single thoughts and motifs of Soloviev with the views of other thinkers is an unreliable and insufficient method. The question of the type of the conception of the world, of the "basic attitude," of the scheme of the interpretations, is much more important. Konstantin V. Mochulsky made this very observation in his very well-written book.[23] But Mochulsky tries in too simple and naive a manner to eliminate the fact of the "influences" by hinting at Soloviev's "Christian conception of the world." Schelling is said to have exerted no influence on Soloviev because Soloviev's conception of the world was "Christian." But Schelling also considered his conception of the world as "Christian" and the goal of his "positive philosophy" was "to overcome Idealism" in the name of Christian truth. Therein lay the historical significance of his last philosophy and, in that way, it was then understood by his opponents and friends. That was also the attitude of Baader. Schelling, Baader and Soloviev represented the same "intellectual standpoint." Despite individual differences, they belonged to the same intellectual type, and the basic idea of their philosophical synthesis was the same. That has already been referred to in a convincing manner by Prince Evgenii Trubetskoy in his critical presentation of Soloviev's philosophy[24] and recently also by Fr. Vasilii Zenkovsky in his *Istoriia russkoi filosofii* [*History of Russian Philosophy*].[25] Soloviev's basic situation and accordingly also the scheme of his metaphysical construction was the intuition of "supreme unity," in which God and the world are perceived as belonging to each other undividedly and from eternity, so that the whole fate of the world presents itself as a uniform, connected "theogonic process." The tradition of the mystics was, so to speak, congenial to Soloviev, especially in its starting position, in the "intellectual attitude."

Soloviev's philosophical attitude becomes historically comprehensible from the perspective of that "crisis of Western philosophy" with which he himself dealt so much. The philosophy of Hegel had sharply raised the question of the relation between "Idealism" and "Christianity." In the light of new research the philosophical significance of that counter-current against Hegelian Idealism, which was introduced by Schelling, becomes always more obvious. Kurt Leese characterized quite aptly this whole movement as "late Idealism."[26] Schelling, Weisse, Fichte (the younger), and Immanuel Herman must be mentioned as the most important representatives of this movement. Baader and Richard Rothe were closely connected with it. Fechner and Lotze were partly connected with it. There was no breach with "idealistic" presuppositions and neither with the method. But "Idealism" itself was subject to an examination concerning the foundations of Christian tradition. After all, Soloviev set himself the same task, and in this respect he also belongs to the tradition of "late Idealism." It is no matter of "influence" but of the basic idea and the

kind of solution. However, one can say that Soloviev knew the works of the most important representatives of this movement. They were then popular in the theological circles of Russia, especially in the Moscow Spiritual Academy.

Does that not account for the unexpected and mysterious decision of Soloviev to join the Spiritual Academy as a student after finishing university and even to exchange the "master of philosophy for the master of theology," of which Soloviev himself informed N. I. Kareev by letter in the summer of 1873?[27] In any case, many things in the philosophical attitudes of Soloviev become more comprehensible and clearer considering the philosophical attitudes of "late Idealism." The short essay by Soloviev about the "Umnoe Delanie," occasionally written at Pisemsky's request, offers us some new essential points for the comprehension of the religious thought and the religious experience of Soloviev.

The "Materialy dlia Romana Masony" ["Materials for the Novel on Masons"] are now to be found in the collection of the Institute for Literature of the Academy of Science in Leningrad. The essay about the "Umnoe Delanie" contains five pages, the papers 105-109. The manuscript is a fair copy with some corrections (some lines are crossed out). The title is written by another hand, probably by Pisemsky.

I express my gratitude to the administration of the Institute for Literature for the possibility of using this interesting material and to Professor P. N. Berkov for his kind assistance.

Translated from the German by
Claudia Witte

UMNOE DELANIE [INTELLIGENT ACTIVITY]

An Article by Vladimir Sergeevich Soloviev

Intelligent activity is a significant and experiential perception of Divine Grace or the inner unification of man with the divine corporality of Christ.

Even though every man possesses a part of Christ and his spiritual body or contains within himself an element of divine corporality, in the normal state of man's existence this element exists only secretly (potentially) and is only a "promise of the Holy Spirit," but not actual possession by it..

According to the teachings of the mystics, this kernel of Grace or of spiritual corporality, which is received by every Christian in the mystery of his christening, is consequently nourished and matures through the communion of the body and blood of Christ in the mystery of the Eucharist, for it is here that the heavenly tincture (the spiritual corporality of Christ) is joined with the bread and wine, under the

transformation of which it enters the organism of man. But such a reconciliation with the celestial essence, created for the benefit of man's infirmity, is purely for the purposes of suffering and does not have inner palpability for the spirit. Therefore, for the people who have attained higher stages of spiritual life there must exist a more direct and effective method of reconciliation with the divine essence or the perception of celestial corporality. This method *is* intelligent activity. To understand of what it consists, we must at first learn what celestial corporality (God's nature) is in and of itself, and then we must establish its relationship with human essence.

1) One cannot suppose that God was without a body, for otherwise he would not have been full of real existence. But, on the other hand, we cannot identify the body of God with our visible, material world, for the latter is subject to change and decay, which contradicts our understanding of Divinity. Thus we must allow that beside our physical elements there exists a special permanent and imperishable body — the celestial essence (*essentia*). This body, being impervious to decay and decomposition, cannot be a dead and stagnant substance; that is, a mechanical aggregate of parts. It must by necessity contain the force of life; that is, it must be *dynamic*. The celestial body is nothing other than the perceptive life of divinity; life is fire and light together. Fire is the eternal *beginning* of life, light is the eternal *result* of life. Fire is impetus and motion, light is satisfaction and repose; fire is desiring and desire, light is perception and understanding. The perceptive life of divinity exists indivisibly in both of these forms — fire and light. And even though these forms are indivisible in divine essence, one must however distinguish by reason the force of life which is fire, from the very body of life, which is light.

The existence of celestial corporality has not only always been supported by the divine wisdom of reason as the essential for the reality of Divinity, but was also learned from experience in various theophanies, the greatest of which is the manifestation of God the Logos. Even though the celestial body was at first obscured by the earthly one, it nonetheless continuously demonstrated its miraculous and curative power, and at the time of the transfiguration on Mount Tabor it appeared and became visible in all its glory. By the death and resurrection of Christ it [the celestial body] completely absorbed into itself his earthly nature. And now it will do likewise with the earthly nature of entire humanity after its death and resurrection; that is, after the Final Judgment and the reinstatement of all things.

2) In God's nature fire and light are always indivisibly joined; the fire is always permeated with light; it always rests in the light. It was likewise in man's nature before its separation from Divinity; that is, before the fall by sin, in which the fiery basis of life desired to be by itself and divorced itself from the eternal light (the real beginning separated itself from its own idea) as a result of which the luminous essence ceased to shine in this world; it [the essence] removed itself

from it into the Divine sphere, where it remains as the celestial body of the Lord. Man, having directed the fire of his desire toward external appearances, has thus fallen prey to the power of external constellations; that is, under the power of celestial (astral) spirit, and then under the power of material elements. Manifesting himself in them, he also gave them the opportunity to manifest themselves in him; that is, to create for him an external image or body in their likeness; specifically, the celestial spirit of the external world created a celestial or magical corporality in man, which is known as the vital spirit or the *arche* and the material elements fashioned the visible physical form of man. In this fashion man became susceptible to suffering, falling prey to external life; that is, to the slavery of vanity, fickleness, and decay. To rid oneself of these, one must be born anew; that is, to receive anew the lost luminous image (the idea) or the celestial body, and since the reason for the loss of the latter was the ignition of the inner flame of selfness and its external expression, thus man must lead his will away from selfness and its external expression away from the external life. One must gather together all of the disjointed forces of the spirit and cleanse them of all irrelevant additives, to make a place in oneself for the celestial essence, to make one's being completely permeable for light. To enter the sphere of Divine life one must first depart from external life; by the necessity of this departure or ecstasy all the preliminary methods of intelligent activity may be explained.

Enough said now of these preliminary exercises and of the process of intelligent activity itself.

Translated from the Russian by
Vladimir Perlovich

[1]Pisemsky asks Soloviev, for example, on 13 February 1880 to visit him before his departure for Petersburg in order to confer with him about a scene. The novel was printed at that time in the periodical *Ogonek*. See A. Pisemsky, *Pisma*, edited by the Literary Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (Moscow-Leningrad, 1936); Letter number 806; p. 439 ff.

[2]*Ibid.* Letter Number 742 of 11 or 12 August 1879, p. 414. See the annotation, *ibid.*, p. 776.

[3]See "materials" on pp. 177-182. The deviations of the printed text from the original in longhand are unimportant.

[4]First printed in the 6th edition of the *Stikhotvoreniia* of Soloviev [The Poetry of Soloviev] (1915), according to the text of the *Albom* [Album] number 1 into which Soloviev wrote his poems in his own hand since 1874. In the *Albom* the poem bears date on March of 1875. I use here the 7th edition of the *Stikhotvoreniia* of Soloviev which was edited with a preface by S. M. Soloviev (Moscow, *Russkii knizhnik* [Russian Scribe], 1921), p. 224. See the annotation, p. 300. S. M. Soloviev thought that the technique of this poem leads to doubts as to Vladimir Soloviev's authorship of this poem (S. X.). But Vladimir Soloviev would have hardly inserted strange poems in his *Albom*. Other cases of this kind are unknown to us. Moreover, the third stanza of this poem is quoted by Soloviev in his *Chteniia o Bogochelovechestve*. See *Sobranie sochinenii* [Collected Works], 2nd

2nd edition, vol. III, p. 89. The second and third one in the *Filosofskie nachala tselnogo znaniia* [Philosophical Principles of Integral Knowledge], *ibid.*, vol. I, p. 351. A variant in the first stanza has to be stressed: in the *Masony* it is "Kak v *iasnoi* lazuri" ["As in the *clear* azure"]; in the *Albom* it is "v *chistoi* ["in the *pure*"]. S. M. Soloviev stresses still another variant: "v *svetloi*" ["in the *bright*"]. See *Stikhotvoreniia*, p. 353.

[5]It was first published by I. I. Lapshin in *Zakony myshleniia i formy poznaniia* [Laws of Thinking and Forms of Knowledge], (Petersburg, 1906), appendix II with special pagination: "O misticheskom poznanii i 'vselenskom chuvstve'" [On mystical knowledge and 'universal feeling'], (p. 27). Reprinted in Soloviev's *Pisma*, vol. III (1911), p. 167. Inserted also in the 6th edition of the *Stikhotvoreniia* according to the text of the Albom, number I, with the title "Iz Shillera" ["From Schiller"] and dated 3 September 1877 (p. 206). I mention as variants line 4 of *Stikhotvoreniia*: *Krasoiu* siiaet ["Shines with beauty"] . . . Ms. *Kak solntse* siiaet. ["How the sun shines"]; Lines 5 and 6 of *Stikhotvoreniia*: I v *burnom volnenii* odin nedvizhim Dukh vechnyi vse dvizhet pokoem svoim ["And in the stormy agitation one immovable Spirit eternal keeps moving calmly"];. . . Ms: I v *vechnoi trevoge* . . . Dukh *moshchnyi*.["And in eternal anxiety. . . . Spirit powerful"]. See *Stikhotvoreniia*, 7th edition, p. 347.

[6]*Materialy*, paper 173, published in Pisemsky's *Pisma*, p. 770.

[7]Pisemsky, *Pisma*, pp. 769-770, annotations.

[8]*Ibid.* Letter 719, p. 405.

[9]The letters to Slovtsov and M. Bronevsky were published in the omnibus volume *V pamiat Grafa M. N. Speranskogo* [In Memory of Count M. N. Speransky]., edited by the Imperial Public Library (Petersburg, 1872). Compare p. 413; 416-417: the whole paragraph from "Nachatki dukhovnoi zhizni vo Khriste . . . tak tochno, eto On, Gospod, Bog moi" ["The Beginnings of Spiritual Life in Christ . . . Yes, this is He, the Lord, my God"] was taken literally.

[10]The letters to Zeyer had been published in Russian translation in the *Russkii Arkhiv* [The Russian Archive], vol. I (1870). Pisemsky made use of this translation. The French originals have not been edited yet. Compare pp. 176-178 from "Togda sleduet ostavit molitvu umnuiu" [Then one must leave the intelligent prayer] to "Eto ne knizhnoe uchenie" [this is not book learning] inclusive.

[11]Compare *Sbornik* (at the top of p. 18, annot. 4), p. 488.

[12]S. M. Lukianov, *O Vl. Solovev v ego molodye gody* [About Vladimir Soloviev in his Early Years] (ZhMN, 1917; September), p. 18. Oral information by Kareev. In his annotation Lukianov mentions Paracelsus with a reference to Du Prel.

[13]Compare Hans Joachim Schoeps, *Vom himmlischen Fleisch Christi: Eine Dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchung* [About the Divine Flesh of Christ: A Dogmatic-Historical Investigation] (Tübingen, 1951).

[14]See D. Strémooukhoff, *Vladimir Soloviev et son œuvre messianique* (Publications de la Faculté de Strassbourg, fasc. 69; 1935), pp. 39-118 [English translation by Büchervertriebsanstalt]. The observations by Strémooukhoff have to be examined in many respects in connection with new research — results concerning the history of mysticism and German Idealism, especially with reference to the cabalistic motifs in Schelling's philosophy. Compare in this respect the interesting essay by W. A. Schulze, "Schelling und die Kabbala" ["Schelling and the Cabbala"] (*Judaica*, vol. 13; 1957), pp. 65-99; 143-170; 210-232.

[15]*Pisma V. S. Solovieva*, vol. II, p. 200.

[16]See Ernst Benz, *Der vollkommene Mensch nach Jacob Böhme* [The Perfect Man According to Jacob Böhme (Stuttgart, 1937), pp. 37 f; 40ff.

[17]Soloviev, *Sobranie sochinenii* [Collected Works], 2nd edition, vol. III, p. 116. See also p. 84 f.

[18]*Ibid.*, p. 132.

[19]*Ibid.*, p. 127. Italics mine.

[20]See also Karl August Auberlen, *Die Theosophie Friedrich Christoph Oetinger nach ihren Grundzügen* [The Theosophy of Friedrich Christoph Oetinger in Its Main Features] (Tübingen, 1847), p. 147 ff. See also W.A. Hauck, *Das Geheimnis des Lebens: Naturanschauung und Gottesauffassung Friedrich Christoph Oetinger* [The Mystery of Life: View of Nature and Conception of God of Friedrich Christoph Oetinger] (Heidelberg, 1947), p. 84 ff; Ernst Benz, *Die christliche Kabbala* [The Christian Cabbala] (Zürich, 1958); David Baumgardt, *Franz von Baader und die philosophische Romantik* [Franz von Baader and Philosophical Romanticism] (Halle/Saale, 1927), p. 241 ff; 275 ff; Julius Hamberger, *Physica Sacra oder der Begriff der himmlischen Leiblichkeit und die sich aus ihm ergebenden Aufschlüsse über die Geheimnisse des Christentums* [Physica Sacra or the Notion of Divine Corporality and the Resulting Explications about the Mysteries of Christendom] (Stuttgart, 1869).

[21]*Soloviev, Sobranie sochinenii* [Collected Works], vol. III, p. 165.

[22]*Ibid.*, p. 177. See also *Dukhovnye osnovy zhizni* [The Spiritual Bases of Life], ibid., p. 374.

[23]Konstantin Mochulsky, *Vladimir Soloviev: Zhizn i uchenie* [Vladimir Soloviev: Life and Teachings] (2nd edition, Paris, 1951), pp. 117-120.

[24]Prince Evgenii Trubetskoy, *Mirosozertsanie Vl. S. Soloveva* [The World Contemplation of Vl. S. Soloviev], two vols. (1913).

[25]Prot. V. V. Zenkovsky, *Istoriia russkoi filosofii*, vol. II (Paris, 1950); see the chapter on Soloviev, pp. 11-72.

[26]Kurt Leese, *Philosophie und Theologie im Spätidealismus* [Philosophy and Theology in Late Idealism] (Berlin, 1929); *Krisis und Wende des christlichen Geistes* [Crisis and Change of the Christian Mind] (2nd edition; Berlin, 1944); see also Horst Fuhrman, *Schellings Letzte Philosophie* [Schelling's Last Philosophy] (Berlin, 1940).

[27]Soloviev, *Pisma*, vol. IV (Petrograd, 1923), p. 147. Letter of 2 June 1873.

AN UNPUBLISHED LETTER BY GONCHAROV

The rough copy of a letter by I. A. Goncharov to Vladimir Soloviev has been preserved in the archives of Je. A. Ljackij, now in the Institute of Russian Literature of the Soviet Academy of Science in Leningrad. The letter is undated, but its time of creation can be discovered without difficulty.

Goncharov writes about Soloviev's "Lectures on God-Manhood," lectures which were published in 1882 as a separate edition. Soloviev probably sent his work to Goncharov and thus caused his writing. But it cannot be determined with certainty if Goncharov really posted his letter.

Little is known of the personal relations between Goncharov and Soloviev. There is no doubt that they occasionally met. During Soloviev's residence in St. Petersburg (from the end of 1877 until the beginning of 1882) both associated with the same circles of literary interests and they both had common friends and acquaintances. Both were closely connected with the Countess Sofia Andreevna Tolstaia, the widow of the poet Aleksei Konstantinovich Tolstoy.

Soloviev esteemed Goncharov as an artist and put him on a level with Tolstoy. He wrote that "they take surrounding life as they found it, as it was put together and expressed itself — in its complete, fixed and clear forms," which had partly outlived themselves or were disappearing. "A special peculiarity of Goncharov is the power of his artistic generalization which enabled him to create such a generally Russian type like Oblomov; we do not find in any other Russian writer a type similar to his variety." And Soloviev further adds: "Compared to Oblomov, the Famusovs as well as the Molcalins, the Onegins and Pechorins, the Manilovs and Lobakeviches, not to mention the characters of Ostrovsky, have all only a special meaning."[1]

The letter by Goncharov reveals some traits of his conception of the world, and that is important because Goncharov was very reserved, if not refusing, in his relations, especially during his last years. He did not like to talk about his inmost convictions except with very close friends, and even that only in his younger days. As far as religious themes were concerned, he used to express himself very rarely. It seemed as if he was not interested in philosophical problems.

The question of Goncharov's religion is also only briefly touched upon by A. G. Cejtlin in his book on Goncharov. "The outer piety which was characteristic of Goncharov must by no means be mistaken for a religious feeling in its real sense . . . Goncharov's heroes also have no belief in God."[2] Goncharov's nephew, A. N. Goncharov, expressed himself about his uncle in the same manner: "His religious views were formed under the influence of the domestic, Byzantine environment and the views of his mother Avdotia Matveevna. He

preserved precisely this religion until the end of his life, even if he did not perform its rituals and customs. He did not go to Church and avoided conversations about religion. But if anybody in his presence did not acknowledge the existence of an Allmighty God, he became angry and contradicted the person. But in reality, the nature of Christianity was strange to him, and he did not understand the significance of the Gospel as a book which looks with the same eyes at the Hellene as well as at the Jew, at the Roman citizen as well as at the slave. Yes, he probably never thought about these questions."

This evidence by A. N. Goncharov has to be treated with great caution. His "recollections" are written with an envious mind. It was above all himself who vexed Goncharov with provoking utterances of his infidelity, and it was with him that Goncharov avoided to discuss religious themes. But in reality he talked and quarrelled about it. "He talked with irritation of Renan." What, instead of Christ,will be given to the people? "Finally, he lost his temper . . . It could be felt that it is not a Christian who speaks, but any officer from the time before the Reforms. It seems to me that in him everything amounted to the *comme il faut*."[3] A. N. Goncharov's evidence needs a correction. Goncharov's niece, D. A. Karmalova, confirms that "he avoided conversations about religion with those who braved atheism," and A. N. Goncharov belonged to their number. Religious questions were sacred for Goncharov, and a disrespectful attitude towards them offended him. According to her words, Goncharov went to Church and prepared himself every year to receive Holy Communion in the Panteleimon parsonage by fasting and attendance at Church.[4] We learn from other sources that Goncharov had a steady father confessor in St. Petersburg, the Protoierei of the Panteleimon Church, Gavriil Vasilevich Krylov, and that close friendly relations existed between them.[5] In any case, Goncharov did not think little about religious themes.

In this respect his remarks in the planned "Preface" to the novel "Obryv," which he wrote in 1869, are of interest. He had the intention to publish it in the separate edition of the novel, but M. M. Stasiulevich did not agree to this.[6] It was not published until after his death in 1938. Goncharov thought about the increase of infidelity and the decrease of faith of the new generation. "The explanation of religion, even its rejection, set in with religion itself and proceeds in parallel with it. One can excuse only the ardent youth if it dreams that these two parallel streams were already united at their feet. In disputes about that, the truth become clear; science, thought, philosophy win while religion does not lose its power over the majority. The source of knowledge is inexhaustible: what progress mankind may make on this way, the abyss of ignorance will always be in front of it — mankind will always have to search, to discover and to perceive. But Buckle and thinkers of his kind want in vain to measure human progress only with the measure of knowledge — and let the perfection of mankind flow together in this alone! Moral imperfection is certainly connected partly

with ignorance — but for the most part with bad and evil will. However, the victory is attainable and not by knowledge alone but also by strength of will! That is why the Commandments and the Gospel will be the only leaders! The thinkers are of the opinion that neither the Commandments nor the Gospel said anything new and do not say anything while science adds every hour new and true facts. But in moral development it is no matter of the discovery of something new, but of the approach of every man and all mankind to the ideal of perfection which is required by the Gospel, and that may be certainly more difficult than the acquisition of knowledge. If the way of the last is inexhaustible and endless, then the degree of human perfection according to the Gospel is also unattainable, if not even impossible. Consequently, both ways are parallel and endless, both are likewise difficult to overcome."[7] The Gospel remains for Goncharov "the only leader" of moral life and growth.

On the other hand, Goncharov was occupied very much with the problem of religious art — "religious" according to the theme or the intention of the artist. He discusses this in detail in the article "'Christ in the Desert,' A Painting by Kramskoy," which was written in 1874. He saw this picture in the "itinerant" exhibition in 1874. The article was not printed and was only published for the first time in 1921. On the occasion of Kramskoy's painting, Goncharov raises the general question of the representation of religious themes. "According to the mind of many people, the same denial and scepticism which broke into everything else, into science, all arts and into life, penetrated lately into the attempts of artists to represent persons and events from the Holy Scriptures. Under the influence of these undermining principles, the artists pretend to offer us personalities and events of religious content, being divested of their sacred character." For that reason, for example, the painting by Gay, "The Lord's Supper," was received with hostility. Goncharov does not dare to accuse the contemporary artists of infidelity. He sees in Gay "the tendency to apply the principles of artistic, reasonable criticism to these representations, to escape the constraint of rule of the old-fashioned devices of the historical school and to convey one's own part of realism to the latter." The artist can, of course, illuminate the personalities and events of the Gospel "with any other light, not with that in which they appear in the content of the Gospel." But in this case he will simply represent something else." In his representation, not this event, not these personalities, but something else will be the result, not that which he wanted to paint, and he will not represent his concealed intention." They say that a painting called "The Resurrection of Christ" represents how money was given to the guards so that they would say that the body was carried off by the disciples. The lie, Goncharov says, is here not in the painting, but in the title. One should call the painting "The Bribery of the Guard," or, as it was also called later, "The First Announcers of Christianity." But if thereby the types of the Jews and the local color are right, then the

painting achieves its artistic aim. For artistic criticism, the question of the faith of the artist is irrelevant. "Painting is limited in time," for it can represent a person or an event only in a fixed moment "and also only a moment." "The painting has no past and no present," as Goncharov puts it, and regardless of how wide its frame may be, "time is concentrated on a selected point." Gay was reproached with his "Lord's Supper." But nobody is able to represent this Lord's Supper in its full dimension from beginning to end. "Just as no paint brush will be able to represent the entire Christ as God Incarnate whose Divinity is only accessible to our understanding and our religious feeling — which do not flow from his material shape but from his entire life and teaching." Goncharov does not share the opinion of those who expect to find an ikon in every religious painting and therefore understand everything, except the "old style," except the Byzantine tradition of ikon painting, as heresy. "The elegant image of a saint" of official painting "with its open, nowhere-looking, indifferent glance" is obviously insufficient. "For the majority of the faithful onlookers, the fully known idea of the aspect of Christ has been formed since their childhood, as a petrified historical remembrance which was transmitted by the text of the Gospel or the painting of ikons, and a likewise quiet though reverential feeling has been established with which they listen to the reading of the Gospel. And with just that feeling they approach every theme on the painting which is borrowed from the life of the Savior."

Then Goncharov asks the basic question: "Was the Divine in the earthly figure of Christ — and who saw it?" And he answers: "it was not in that, for otherwise the world would know about it." Goncharov touches here, probably without knowing it himself, on one of the most acute and deepest theological and metaphysical problems of Christian art which was being raised and discussed with full power during the time of the controversies of iconoclasm. Can Christ be represented as God Incarnate? But if his Divinity cannot be represented or "cannot be described" by the means of human art, is it then allowed at all to paint his portrait which inevitably drives him into the merely human dimension? Goncharov feels the acuteness and the religious sense of this question. There was no conspicuousness in the aspect of Christ, otherwise the world would know about his Divinity. "If Jesus Christ, after assuming human shape, had imparted traits of his Divine nature on it, then not only all Jews but all human beings — the entire world — would at once kneel down before him and recognize God in him. Consequently, there would be no struggle, no great deed, no suffering, no redemption. Where would be the merit of faith which the teaching of Christ alone demands?" Christ appeared in "Divine form" only to the three disciples at the Transfiguration and he forbade them to tell others of this appearance. Consequently, Goncharov concludes, Divinity cannot be represented. The artist cannot go beyond the boundaries of the "human," for this precisely is the field of the artist. The artist has to

represent Christ "in the clearest and finest human traits and cannot go further."

Art becomes powerless "if it thinks of entering from the human boundaries into the sphere of the miraculous and supernatural." However, that does not mean that faith or infidelity have no influence on the execution of an artistic plan. On the contrary, the Sistine Madonna was created by the union of faith and genius." And it is this in which the merit of Raphael consists: in the Incarnation, in the Blessed Virgin and the child Jesus; not the divinity, but the most tender and finest beauty of the mother which expresses itself in the love for the child and in the grace and faultlessness of the eternal child-like beauty." "There is nothing superior to Christian religion," Goncharov stresses — "all other creeds give mankind nothing but darkness, bleakness, lack of edification and education, and confusion." But faith without talent does not create art. On the other hand, the artist will never be able, without the stimulus of faith, to advance to those living and tangible shapes, as they appear to the faithful onlooker in the Gospel." Goncharov insists on the uniqueness of Christianity. "Almost all artistic geniuses belong to Christianity. After absorbing ancient civilization and exposing the endless field of the intellect to mankind, Christianity alone established on the foundation of ancient plastic art those new and eternal ideals after which mankind strives and will always strive. And there is no other civilization besides the Christian one."

Goncharov defends realism in art. But realism has its limits; an "absolute truth" in art does not exist. "In art the object does not appear as such, but in its reflection by imagination which imparts precisely that shape, the colors, and the shade on it which the historical glance determined and which imagination illuminated. The artist also does not paint according to the object itself which does not exist any more but according to this reflection. Therefore, he has to submit to this glance if he wants to remain faithful. But if he does not submit, he becomes unfaithful to historical truth; that is, to his own realism, by substituting it by his own invented truth. Hence it also follows that those artists believing in the Divinity of Christ were closer to the real truth than those who did not believe. For the contemporary realists, there remains only the possibility of adhering to historical truth and of illuminating it only by their artistic imagination, which they certainly do, without the admixture of a religious feeling — and therefore perhaps their figures will be appropriate by expressing the event but it will also be dry and cold without those beams and the warmth which the feeling imparts. That is why it would be better for them to abstain from the representation of sacred themes which, with them, will always result in unreality, in misrepresentation." Faith discloses the meaning; that is, the "truth" of the persons and events.[8]

An unexpected side of his conception of the world becomes a little visible in this quite short article which Goncharov finally did not dare to let be printed. Goncharov starts from the acknowledgment of the

absolute truth of Christianity — Christ, God Incarnate. From this point of view he judges the problems of art. For him, "realism" is justified and at the same time limited by precisely this presupposition: "the Divine" in the conditions of "human" life was revealed in Christ, without removing these conditions, but by giving them a new meaning. The eye is still limited by the field of the "visible," but faith sees "the invisible," and the visible is also perceived in a new way, in its last truth, in the variety of its reality by this vision. The self-sufficient "realism," which is restricted only to the visible, inevitably turns out to be "unreal" and does not perceive the real "truth" of the "visible" itself.

Concerning his aesthetic views, Goncharov remained within the limits of the new Western art. He did not understand and feel "the ikon painting of the Byzantines," just like the majority of the people of his generation in Russia and in the West, although he considerably approached its problems, especially the problem of "ikon painting" as a religious art. Goncharov had nobody with whom he could have talked about these problems. He certainly could not discuss these themes in the circle of the "Neva Sceptics," in the editor's office of *Vestnik Evropy*, in the drawing room of M. M. Stasiulevich! It is obvious that Goncharov was not satisfied with traditional outer piety but thought a great deal about religious themes, whether for himself alone or in company with those few in whom he had confidence, who could not make him embarrassed by disrespect or by lack of comprehension for the themes and questions which were sacred to him. He obviously felt more at liberty in the circle of the Countess S. A. Tolstaia.

Goncharov's letter to Soloviev does not seem unexpected in connection with his rare confessions about religious themes. The sincerity of the letter also admits of the idea that something more connected him with Soloviev than just a simple acquaintance and meeting in the circle of high society. It is already significant that Goncharov had attentively read the "Lectures on God-Manhood" and had realized the seriousness and significance of the questions raised by Soloviev. Lev Tolstoy and N. N. Strakhov found only nonsense and foolishness in the "Lectures."

Especially the first "lectures" in Soloviev's book must have been interesting for Goncharov. Soloviev spoke here precisely of that with which Goncharov himself was occupied in those years: of the present crisis of faith, of the divergence and the collision of faith and reason, of the possibility of their unity in a higher synthesis. Soloviev's speculative deductions in the second part of the book could hardly have won the heart of Goncharov — as he himself writes, the speculation in this field belongs to the field of the inexpressible, the unuttered. For Goncharov, faith is above all feeling. Contemporary man cannot return to "childlike faith." Soloviev's attempt to justify faith by reason, to strengthen religious feeling by philosophical thought, could so much the more attract and be of interest. He writes precisely about that to

Soloviev. Goncharov was not inclined to abstract thought — perhaps he was not even capable of it. But he doubtless saw the reality of the philosophical problems. On the other hand, he was convinced that the crisis of faith has inevitably as its consequence the crisis of culture and civilization.

Goncharov's letter is printed here in compliance with the original from the Institute of Russian Literature in Leningrad (cipher-F 163, N. 863). On the whole, it is easily legible with the exception of some sentences being crossed out and words being not written in full. In the text printed here, these were omitted: they are unimportant for the comprehension of the letter.

Translated from the German by
Claudia Witte

COPY OF THE LETTER

Page 1

Your book has made a great impression on me, my dear Vladimir Sergeevich: the proof of that — this pen, which has long been idle in the inkwell, is now impatiently writing these lines to express to you my impressions, and what is more, to tell you what is lacking in your book, in you yourself, myself as well as in every reader who believes in Christian teachings.

Speaking objectively of your work, I am obliged to express my (admiration) for the clear, precise process of philosophical reasoning that develops before the reader. At times the analysis of the subject (for example, in the 6th and 7th readings) is so clairvoyant, so spiritual, so to speak, that at times I fear for the author: how will he perceive, how will he formulate his conclusion, when the conclusion, it seems, cannot be uttered, but can only be guessed at in one's own mind, to look at it with the inner eye and to languish at the inability to express it. But you emerge victorious, in the entire domain accessible to the human mind and logic . . .

And even if it [the mind] cannot always succeed in your chosen subject, it is not you who is to blame but the subject.

Page 2

[The first lines are crossed out. They do not contain any connected sentences. Goncharov evidently deals there with faith.]

, It [the mind or intellect] possesses the sole and . . . the implement for believing — the feeling . . . that is all that it needs.

The human intellect has nothing but the primary knowledge necessary to live at home and on earth; i.e. the alphabet of omniscience. In the perspective that is uncertain, distant, and hazy — there is hope for the daring pioneers of science to unravel the mysteries of creation by dependable scientific means. (So far. But meanwhile by the way of faith.)

The present science glows with such a weak, unsteady light that can only illuminate the depths of the abyss of ignorance. It [science], like a hot-air balloon, barely rises above the earth's surface, only to fall helplessly back to the ground.

In the first reading you admirably identified the favor that the newest civilization has (so to speak) unconsciously bestowed upon the last religion. Yes, the society of men cannot live by these acquired results of positivism and socialism, and even by the foreseeable (the further future successes of both of them: (we cannot live) we must turn to religion, you say (and the rest of us along with you), among other things because man will always be ignorant of many things, no matter how long he lives or how much he studies.

We must turn (to religion) to the other authority, which was abandoned by the vain minds, to the authority of the Lord of the Universe. But how? The feelings of infant faith cannot be returned to adult society: the analogy of certain Biblical tales with the tales from the Greek and other mythologies (not to speak of the new science) has undermined the faith in miracles and the developed human society has abandoned all that is metaphysical, mystical, and supernatural.

All that was left was to choose a different path, a path that was chosen by many, a path that you pursued so brilliantly, i. e. the very same path that science wants to pursue — to reach the opposite goal.

It seemed natural that the joint force of feeling and philosophical reasoning must have dealt a decisive and irreversible blow to the pretended knowledge subject to constant, almost barometric perturbations.

And it is this foundation of science that became the basis for the creation of religion and that could lead humanity by a safe (promised by Revelation) path to the state of being betoken by Revelation.

Marginal Note

Page 3, Marginal Note

But meanwhile there remain unanswered questions (1st, 2nd, 3rd) because attempts are being made to explain the unexplainable mysteries of creation, hypotheses are being constructed but faith itself is not being analyzed: What can it cure! One can only be convinced by learning from the experiences of all mankind (. . .).

[the end of the sentence is illegible, many things in it are crossed out]

I express my gratitude to the administration of the *Institute of Russian Literary Academy of Science* for giving me the possibility to publish this interesting letter. I thank P. N. Berkov and V. M. Setchkarev for their kind cooperation.

Russian Text of Letter Translated from the Russian by Vladimir Perlovich

[1]Vladimir Soloviev, *Tri rechi v pamiat Dostoevskogo, pervaia rech* (1881), published separately for the first time in Moscow in 1883 and in *Sobranie sochinenii*, 2nd ed., vol. III, p. 191.

[2]A. G. Cejtlin, *I. A. Goncharov* (Moscow, 1950), p. 325. As exceptions the following are mentioned here: Aleksandr Adiyev, Vera in "Obryv," especially in the scene in the chapel.

[3]M. Superansky, Ivan Aleksandrovich Goncharov i novye materialy dlia ego biografii in *Vestnik* (1908; November, pp. 40-41. The mention of Renan is characteristic. Renan vexed Goncharov. He thinks of Renan in his "Evening of Literature": "You think, according to Renan, . . . the Savior brought an excellent theory to the world and was himself a good man, but no god." *Sobranie socinenii*, vol. CIXL (Moscow, 1954), p. 141. Compare his unpublished letter to K. R. of 3 November 1886 which is quoted by Cejtlin on page 483.

[4]Superansky, p. 41. In younger days Goncharov obviously really avoided the Church. Compare his letter from Simbirsk to N. A. Maikov and his family of 13 July 1849: "One is shocked about my not going to Church and one intends, I think, to lend me to the Divine Liturgy one of these days. There is a rejected and cursed family in town, everything because of the not going to Church." *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. VIII, p. 245.

[5]N. I. Barsov, "Recollections of I. A. Goncharov" (in Russian) in *Istoricheskii Vestnik* (1891; December), pp. 624-636. Compare Goncharov's letter to S. A. Nikitenko of 4/16 June 1869 in *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. VIII, CIXL (Moscow, 1955), p. 411 and following.

[6]Compare Goncharov's letter to P. V. Annenkov in 1870 in *Sobranie Sochinenii*, VIII, pp. 428-429.

[7]Printed for the first time in the omnibus volume I. A. Goncharov, *Literaturno-kriticheskye stati i pisma*, ed. by A. P. Rybasov (Leningrad, 1938). I quote according to *Sobranie sochinenii*, vol. VIII, pp. 156-157.

[8]The article about Kramskoy was printed for the first time in the omnibus volume *Nachala* I (1021. I quote according to *Sobranie Sochinenii*, vol. VIII, pp. 183-196. Goncharov touches the theme of religious art already in the "preface" to the "Obryv." He remembers here the painting by Aleksandr Ivanov. The painting did not turn out well and had no success "because of the inaccessibility of the theme for the paintbrush." Ivanov "had wanted to paint the meeting of two worlds, of two civilizations, of the dead and the newly arising, and he failed by painting only a group of bathing people, and even that not successfully because he neglected the direct and regular effect of painting." In Gay's painting, on the contrary, "the acute truth of life of the represented figures" satisfies the onlooker. See *Sobranie sochinenii*, VIII, p. 163. Goncharov also speaks about Ivanov's painting in his note "intentions, tasks and ideas of the novel "Obryv," which was written "for a person of high office," probably in 1876. Ivanov had withdrawn from the direct aim of plastic art — to represent — and had become the slave of dogmatism. See *Sobranie sochinenii*, VIII, p. 216; first printed in *Russkoe obosrenie* (1895, January).

THE CRISIS OF FAITH IN TURN-OF-THE-CENTURY RUSSIAN POETRY

A renaissance in Russian poetry occurred in the 1890s. This was not simply a literary or poetical movement, but a new experience; once again, poetry and literature took on a special and vital significance. It was the relapse of Russian consciousness into romanticism — the "thirst for eternity" [*der heisse Durst nach Ewigkeit*] once again blazed.

Everything was strangely confused in the early Russian "symbolist" and "decadent" movements; everything had a double meaning or sense; everything was ambiguous. Russian symbolism began in revolt, rejection, and renunciation. The old, boring world was denied and denounced. One can sense here the delirium of the "underground man." Contradictory feelings peculiarly succeeded one another: "complete self-assertion," then weariness, indifference, and helpless anguish. Motifs of French symbolism were added to those of Nietzsche. An aspiration to cross the frontier "beyond good and evil" — that is, to overcome ethics with aesthetics, is characteristic of the entire movement. This was a new antithesis to the customary morality of the preceding generation. And this typically decadent feature was later to reappear in the more mature experiments in religious and mystical synthesis. "To say that there are two paths, good and evil, is wrong. There are two paths of good. . . . The beauty lies in the fact that it makes no difference which path one takes." (N. M. Minsky). "Evil and good are two paths, but both lead to the same goal, and it does not matter which way you are going." (Merezhkovsky).

This was not a "reassessment of values," but rather the direct subversion of "all values." Mournful and faded tones, "songs of twilight and night," dominate the poetry of the nineties. Yet in this weariness, in this characteristically deep, heavy, creeping anguish, new depths were being explored. Because too much was said about it at the time, it seemed insincere. And there was too much egotism — this sad, grieving consciousness too willingly tore itself away from daily reality and ran off down dark, blind alleys. "My cave is cramped and wet, and there is nothing to warm it with. Far from the terrestrial world, I must die here." (Fedor Sologub). People began to live in a world of shadows, half-tones, and "uncreated creations." Nevertheless, this was a religious longing, a mysterious presentiment, a thirst for faith, a "desire for a spring that has not yet come," for a miracle that has not yet happened. "But the heart wishes and begs for a miracle, a miracle! O, let that which has never been now come to pass" (Zinaida Gippius).

Neither psychologically nor sociologically is it possible to explain such desire or anguish by the disintegration of the bourgeois way of life. One senses here a blind and confused religious anxiety. The fear was genuine — it was fear in the face of chance, fate, destiny, and the

blind or dark forces of existence. Such were the characteristic artistic themes "on the frontier of the century." The senselessness and illusions of the world and the frightful desolation and solitude of man were revealed. And yet there remained no escape, but only anguish, agony, and searching. People once again began to read Schopenhauer as a mystical writer, and to this was added the influence of Ibsen and Maeterlinck. Dostoevsky was read and re-experienced more than the others. Merezhkovsky's book on Tolstoy and Dostoevsky (1902) was written on a recurrent theme, and was more about religion than about literature.

The anguish was resolved in foreboding and expectation. "I was recently told in secret that Christ will soon return." At the beginning of the century Andrei Belyi said that "the mists of anguish were suddenly pierced by the red dawn of days that were utterly new." Presentiment reigned; the world appeared transparent. "I was amazed at everything, and on everything I detected a seal." This marked a special return route to faith through aesthetics and Nietzsche. But such a faith retained a residue of the aesthetics, art, and literary cultivation. There had already been a return through philosophy to faith (to dogmatism), and through morality (to Evangelicalism). The path through art was new. Vladimir Soloviev had taken it part way in the 1890s. In addition, there was one more typical feature: the new return to religion occurred through Western inspiration and was not nourished by Eastern or Slavophile sources. "There is no other route to take. The historical road has been traveled. Ahead is a precipice and an abyss, a fall or chasm. It is the supra-historical road: religion" (Merezhkovsky).

The creative work of Merezhkovsky is most typical of this turn of the century transition from literature to religion. He began with the poetry of sorrow and disillusionment and with a thirst for faith. From Nietzsche he learned about liberation through beauty, and from Nietzsche he took his basic antithesis: Hellenism and Christianity, not the "Olympian" principle and the "Galilean"; the "sanctity of the flesh" and the "sanctity of the spirit." Merezhkovsky had a morbid attachment to logical schemes, and even more to antinomies. But instead of dialectical antitheses they were aesthetic contrasts, which do not submit to resolution through synthesis. One should recall at this point Berdiaev's perceptive remark: "Merezhkovsky's secret is the secret of divided thought." Merezhkovsky built his entire world view upon the opposition of Greece and Christ. For him, Greece was a revelation and a liberation.

> I took one glance and immediately saw everything, I understood the cliffs of the Acropolis and the Parthenon, the Propylaea, and I felt something that I shall bear within me until the day I die. The joy of that great liberation from life given by beauty burst into my soul.

Greece is beauty, but more than a living beauty, it is the beauty of art: "the white marble body of Greece." Liberation from life comes as the "sweet repose of death." Yet the whiteness of the marble and the blue of the southern sea do have their charms, and against this radiant background the "black, colorless shadows of the monk" seemed ominous.

Christianity for Merezhkovsky was precisely monasticism, asceticism, rejection and hatred of the world. In short, it was a deep and heavy shadow. Christianity represented the excess of the spirit, just as Hellenism stood for the excess of the flesh. In his historical novels he tried to have his characters express this contrast. But here one immediately notices the artificiality of his design. In the fourth century, of course, the Church possessed all the power of life, while Hellenism was inwardly dying. However, these decadent people of a dying antiquity fascinated him, for they reminded him so much of his contemporaries, all those refined and solitary aesthetes, sophists, and gnostics. They were people of a decline, not a renaissance.

Merezhkovsky went even further. To his theme he added a synthesis. How could these "two abysses," the higher one of the spirit and the lower one of the flesh, be combined? How could the ascetic narrowness of "historical Christianity" be overcome? There was an obvious dualism in this conception. Merezhkovsky was correct in saying that Christianity consecrates the flesh, for it is the religion of the incarnation and the resurrection. Asceticism is therefore only one path. But he wished to reunite and sanctify all the ecstasies and passions of the untransfigured flesh. A synthesis would have been possible only in transfiguration, but such transformation and spiritualization of the flesh was exactly what he did not want. Spirit and flesh "are not fused, but interwoven." The result is a deceptive mixture, a seductive flame, a temptation. Merezhkovsky was aware of this danger and hoped to avoid it.

> I know that in my question is hidden the danger of heresy, which might be called — in opposition to asceticism — the heresy of Astartism, i.e. not of a holy union, but of a blasphemous mingling and polluting of the spirit with the flesh. If that is so, let me be warned by the guards on watch, for, I repeat, I am not teaching, but learning; I do not hear confessions, but make my own. I do not want heresy, and I do not want schism.

Merezhkovsky hardly succeeded in avoiding this "mingling," this tempting ambiguity.

"Historical Christianity," in any event, was never "fleshless," as is required by Merezhkovsky's artificial antinomial scheme. He was completely converted to the Coming Kingdom, to the Third Testament. He foresaw a "great cosmic revolution" half-way to the second coming.

"Historical Christianity" is finished, and is the epoch of the Western Church also not over? The "breaking away from paganism" — the historical task of the West — has been fulfilled. Is it not now the turn of the Eastern Church? "Will it not be called to some great act which will perhaps contain some still undisclosed word of the Lord on the Holy Spirit and the Holy Flesh?" At the time, however, Merezhkovsky did not wish to abandon the "historical" Church, for he believed in its creative possibilities. This belief led to meetings with "churchmen" in the "Religious and Philosophical Meetings" held in St. Petersburg from 1901 to 1903. He talked about a "Christian Renaissance" which would counterbalance the overly pagan Renaissance, and he asked whether this renaissance had not already begun in Russian literature and whether a religious return must not begin in literature. He also asked whether this renaissance would not be a mere revival of paganism instead of a rediscovery of Christianity. All the same, he was closer to Nietzsche and Goethe than to Dante or St. Francis of Assisi. Merezhkovsky simply did not know "historical Christianity," and all of his schemes turned out to be extremely transparent. They were precisely schemes, and not an intuitive understanding.

Merezhkovsky also had a second and special theme concerning Russia: the theme of the Petrine Reform. "Never in the history of the world has there been such a cataclysm, such an upheaval in the human conscience, as Russia experienced during Peter's reforms. It was not only the Old Believers who were reminded of the Antichrist." From here it was a short step to the religious justification of revolution which was so characteristic of Merezhkovsky's later development. He lived wholly in expectation of the second coming. Would not Orthodoxy, as freedom and through love, reconcile Catholicism and Protestantism, faith and reason, "as one catholic and apostolic and genuinely universal Church of the Holy Sophia, the Wisdom of God, whose head and pontiff is Jesus Christ himself?" Merezhkovsky possessed schemes rather than experiences, but in these schemes he often captured and reinforced typical and prevailing moods.

Merezhkovsky was the first in Russia to formulate the theme of Christianity and Hellenism, but it was not his own personal theme. Viacheslav Ivanov (1866-1949) later posed the same question and developed it with more penetration.

The path of Viacheslav Ivanov somehow led around Christianity, although in his later years it curved back and served as his passageway to the Roman Church. Ivanov was entirely immersed in antiquity and art. He came to Christianity from the cult of Dionysius, from the ancient "Hellenic religion of the suffering God," which he had studied for many long years as more than just a historian or archeologist. He reinterpreted Christianity in the spirit of Bacchus and orgiasm; he created a new myth. His scheme was more aesthetic than religious, as his religious thirst was sated by his aesthetic falsifications.

Viacheslav Ivanov's primary vision was *sobornost* and catholic action. He wished to religiously assimilate the problem of the "people" and the "collective," yet he always remained a solitary dreamer, too absorbed in his poetic ecstasies. Genuine "catholicity" is not the mystery of some mystical collective, but the revelation of the one Christ in whom all are one, each and every individual being with him. Such was also the chief danger of "symbolism," the fact that religion is transformed into art, almost into a game, and its devotees hoped to break into spiritual reality by an assault of poetic inspiration, avoiding the labor of prayer. There were too many dreams and too little sobriety. Ivanov's truth lies in the fact that he had a genuine feeling for the religious reality and significance of history. This was demonstrated with particular clarity in his famous polemic with M. O. Gershenzon, in their remarkable *Corner-to-Corner Correspondence* [*Perepiska iz dvukh uglov*, Petrograd, 1921]. It was entirely the same typical Russian polemic about historicism and moralism in a new form. Ivanov maintained the religious meaning of history against moralistic nihilism.

Under the combined influences of Merezhkovsky and Ivanov, the theme of a dual religious rebirth was again posed most energetically by N. A. Berdiaev.

> We are captivated not only by Golgotha, but by Olympus as well. We are summoned and drawn not only by the suffering God who died on the cross but also by the god Pan, the god of earthly elements, the god of the joys of life; and also by the ancient goddess Aphrodite, the goddess of plastic beauty and earthly love. . . . And we bow in reverence not only before the cross, but also before the divinely beautiful body of Venus.

The seductively alluring idea of weaving together the two abysses could not have been more powerfully expressed. Christianity is an "incomplete truth," for it is fleshless and ascetic. "The crimes of the Church against the earth, against the truth of the earth, against its culture and freedom, are too terrible, too unendurable." For Berdiaev himself such moods only represented a passing stage, but they typified the period. It was an outburst of a dark and very passionate naturalism. These dreams of a sinful imagination arrested and captivated the Russian soul during its return to the Church.

Translated from the Russian by
Robert L. Nichols

FROM THE ASCETIC MYSTICS OF SOLOVIEV TO THE MYSTICAL ROMANCE OF BLOK

For his contemporaries Soloviev was first and foremost a philosopher: a religious idealist, the confessor and prophet of a definite world view. For the younger generation he was a mystic and a poet. The latter were more interested in his experiences than in his views. In his *Memories* of Blok, Andrei Belyi describes the intimate gatherings at the house of M. S. Soloviev, the philosopher's younger brother. Most of the interest was centered precisely on his mysticism. "In 1901 we lived in the atmosphere of his poetry, as the theurgical conclusion to his teaching about Sophia-Wisdom." They strove to grasp the connection between his erotic lyrics and his theosophy. "Soloviev's book *The Meaning of Love* best explains the quest to realize Solovievism as a way of life." Belyi compares Soloviev's doctrine to the "lyrical philosophy" of Valentinus, whom Soloviev greatly esteemed. "By uniting the wisdom of the gnostics with the hymns of the poets, Vladimir Soloviev conveyed a new message about the imminent coming and appearance before our eyes of the Eternal Feminine."

At that same time Aleksandr Blok began to sing his own songs about the "Beautiful Lady." "The keen mystical and romantic experiences in Vladimir Soloviev's poetry captured my whole being." Blok's poetry is a unique commentary on the poetry and mysticism of Soloviev. As Belyi aptly remarked:

> A. A. Blok was the first among us to reveal the design of Vladimir Soloviev's lyric poetry, when he recognized the immensity of its philosophical meaning. He also carried "Solovievism" to an extreme, nearly making a "sect" out of it. Even if it was subsequently said that this marked the extreme point of Soloviev's despair and his unhealthy erotic roots . . . nevertheless, Blok revealed himself in Soloviev, and without this revelation much in Soloviev would have remained unintelligible — for example, the themes of the *Third Testament* and the *Confession* of A. N. Shmidt.

Anna Shmidt considered herself the incarnation of Sophia, and in her *Third Testament* she developed a very complicated system of gnostic teachings. In the last year of Soloviev's life she tried to arrange a personal meeting with him, and actually did meet him, causing him great embarrassment with the resoluteness of her professions. She maintained that Soloviev was the second incarnation of the Logos. In anxiety Soloviev replied: "Your confession arouses the greatest pity, and sorrowfully intercedes on your behalf before the Almighty. It is all right that you once wrote such a confession, but I beg of you to return

to this subject no more. . . . Please, do not talk about me to anyone. It would be better if you spent all of your free moments praying to God."

After Soloviev's death, Shmidt turned up with Blok both in the countryside and in the editorial offices of the *New Way* [*Novyi put*]. Georgii Chulkov, then secretary of the editorial board, recalls that:

> She appeared as a living warning to all who would travel Soloviev's path. . . . Around "Eternal Femininity" arose mirages which could addle weak and strong minds alike. The "exalted" turned out at times to be a "bottomless pit." The old woman Shmidt, believing with insane sincerity that she was the incarnation of Sophia and confronting Soloviev with this strange news just before his death, stood as a retribution to the mystic, who had dared the risk and terror of affirming a new dogma. I now [1922] have the opportunity of studying several of Vladimir Soloviev's previously unpublished manuscripts, which were written in a special type of notation that the poet-philosopher devised automatically during a trance. Such trances, in which Soloviev served as a medium from time to time, were characteristic of him. The theme of his notes is always "Sophia" — but whether she is real or imaginary is another question. In any event, the character of these notes is such that there is no doubt about the "demonism" experienced by those who would share the spiritual experiment of this worshiper of the Virgin of the Rainbow Gates.

Blok's experience likewise testifies to the dangers of Soloviev's path. One cannot, of course, equate Blok's experience with Soloviev's, but Blok did proceed from Soloviev. He isolated a number of Soloviev's themes and thereby made all their weak points particularly obvious. This was especially true for Soloviev's cosmic themes. "I await the universal life of a vernal world." Such an expectation was taken out of its Christian context, even though the epigraph from the Apocalypse was retained: "The Spirit and the Bride say, 'Come'." (*Revelations* 22:17).

Blok, unlike Soloviev, was not at all a rationalist, and in his alogical lyricism he remained totally under the influences of the impressions he was experiencing at the time. He was all attention and hearing, and a medium through and through. S. M. Soloviev tried to define the differences in the following way: "Vladimir Soloviev chose ascetic effort and mystical knowledge; Blok preferred lyrical and chaotic freedom." As Blok himself said in 1906, "Mysticism is the Bohemia of the soul; religion is standing on guard." Blok never mastered his lyrical emotions, and allowed himself to be driven by their tempest from "standing on guard" to orgies of "snowy nights." Hence the gloomy despair of his last poems. But such distinctions are only partly true, for Soloviev's asceticism must not be exaggerated. "There really was no

actual asceticism," Blok remarked. The question revolves around exactly whom Soloviev saw and encountered in his mystical experiences.

The most surpising thing about Blok's experience is his irreligion; his mysticism was by no means religious. It lacked faith, and was totally devoid of God. Although he read Soloviev's books, Blok had no interest in his theological views. He simply did not feel the historical reality of the Church. In some strange way he remained entirely outside of Christianity. Perhaps because he was seized and restrained by his own experience, the face of Christ was hidden from his sight by the face of Sophia. Andrei Belyi maintained that "'She' was more significant for Blok than Christ, and also nearer to him." Blok was absorbed in the cosmic experience, "But I fear — you will change your form." This foreboding came to pass, for the "form" was plastic and multifaceted.

Blok's experience consisted of his mystical romance. As required by Vladimir Soloviev's theory in *The Meaning of Love*, he achieved awareness through falling in love. "This romance possessed all the characteristics typical of a religious act. In essence it was sacred and liturgical. Blok spoke, felt, and thought like one ordained" (P. Medvedev). Yet was such an "act" not a sign of despairing zeal? And were not features of the blasphemous parody readily apparent in the lyrical confessions of this "act"? "The image of this hypothetical lady began to merge and become confused with the clearly etched image of a harlot" (Viacheslav Ivanov). This merging was simply the result of dividing a seductive image that had seemed indivisible — the original ambiguity was revealed. "You went off to the fields, never to return." This was the inevitable ruin of his experiment without grace. "But let it go. The raptures of a voracious life once again drive me insanely on in blindness and intoxication, in gloom and anxiety."

Blok's downfall may be compared with the fate of Vrubel. He shared the same mystery and the same motif of temptation: "demonism" in art (the "violet worlds"). Can artistic intuition penetrate the spiritual world? Is there any reliable criterion for "testing the spirits"? Precisely at this point comes the downfall of romanticism, for there is no objective criterion: artistic vision cannot replace faith. Neither meditation nor rapture may be substituted for religious experience. Everything inevitably begins to dissipate and meander. Such is the path "from Novalis to Heine." "Free theurgy" turns out to be a false and suicidal path. Blok knew that he was walking on the brink of the demonic. In 1916 he read the first volume of the Russian *Philokalia*, making notes in the margins. About the "spirit of sorrow" he wrote, "Such a demon is necessary for the artist." It was certainly his own demon.

Soloviev claimed to be not only a philosopher but also a "theurgist." He dreamed of a "religious act," and a religious act through art. Soloviev must be judged not only on the basis of his philosophy but also on the merits of his religious life. After all, it is impossible to be a Christian by one's world view alone. The development of Solovievian

themes by Blok and others serves as an imminent critique (and exposure) of his experiment, and calls into question all "religion of romanticism," religious aestheticism, or aesthetic religion. Temptation yields to seduction. Sometimes it does not yield, but is conquered. Some enter the Church not to pray but to dream. And the religious life of those among the intelligentsia who returned to the Church was stricken and poisoned by this temptation.

The entire significance of the "beginning of the century" was in the transition from "religious thought" to "religious life." The need for asceticism was more acute than ever. "He who passed from religious thought to religious life had to kindle a lamp before the ikon and fall down on his knees in prayer," as Berdiaev wrote in 1910. Delay was much more dangerous now, for new searchings were being taken up as a quest, and people were becoming lost.

Translated from the Russian by
Robert L. Nichols

V. V. ROZANOV AND THE NATURALISTIC FALLACY

The temptation of religious naturalism was expressed sharply and keenly in the creative work and world view of V. V. Rozanov (1856-1919). He was a writer of great religious temperament, but he was religiously blind — not to religion, but in religion. Rozanov was a man of religious passion, not thought, nor even faith. His dreadful lack of feeling was even more astounding than his insight. The fact is that he could not even see the obvious. In a peculiarly awful way Rozanov not only failed to see Christianity, he also failed to hear the Good Tidings. He heard only what he wished to hear, what he was willing to hear. He interpreted everything in his own way. Rozanov himself even admitted that from childhood he was "swallowed up by his imagination." Everything for him was only a bridle. He had no center. His life was a chaotic mixture of fleeting moments, episodes, and flashes. All of his books read like a diary. His most characteristic writings were aphorisms, short phrases, fragments, and scraps. Rarely was he able to paint on a larger canvas. He had a dislocated and dislocating consciousness — dislocating because it was capricious and destructive in details and trifles. All of a sudden some irritating associations (irritating probably because of their juxtaposition) would flash before him. "I was never able to concentrate. . . . Some thought or subject was always pricking me." At bottom he concealed a defective will power, for he had no sense of responsibility towards his thoughts, but did not master them. He reached the limit of subjectivism and romantic capriciousness. Rozanov wrote his later works with an importunate and unnecessary intimacy that became mannered and careless.

Rozanov's outlook was shaped by his own personal sorrows and humiliations. Beginning with the Hegelianism of his early years, he remained receptive to a wide variety of intellectual currents. He read Dostoevsky (and Gogol) and assimilated in part (but only in part) the ideology of *pochvennichestvo*. Leontiev made a more powerful impression, and Rozanov wrote a very penetrating essay about him while he was still alive. In that essay one can detect the style characteristic of Rozanov's later thought and themes. Most typical of all was his "Aesthetic Understanding of History" (the title of the first of the essays written in 1892). All other standards were abolished for the sake of the aesthetic. The motifs of romantic naturalism, such as the charms of the primitive cults of the ancient East, always worked powerfully on him. To all this he rather unexpectedly added an extreme sentimentalism of philistine emotions. He rejected dogma for the sake of tender feelings of the people for God. God is the "center of world feeling."

Rozanov's acute psychologism, which destroys the very reality of religious experience, was not accidental. "What is He for me? My eternal sorrow and my joy, a special joy, not connected with anything." The last chapters of the Gospels seemed unreal and unconvincing to him, for they lead people astray. From such a psychological perspective the Good Tidings of Christianity could not be seen. Rozanov's religion can hardly be termed the religion of Bethlehem. The true mystery of Bethlehem is the fiery mystery of the Divine Incarnation, not Rozanov's pastoral scene or picture of family devotion. The joy is not so much that of human birth, but rather that of the glory of God's condescension. The Logos became flesh! Rozanov could never understand this. He did not understand Bethlehem or accept the mystery of Godmanhood with either his mind or his heart, which explains his hostility towards and revolt against the cross. "Christianity is a culture of funerals." He thus remained entirely outside of Christianity and condemned it from without, as an outsider.

Rozanov's naturalism cannot be called "Christian." After all, is Christian naturalism even possible? Rozanov accepts the world as it has been given — not because it has already been saved, but because it has no particular need of salvation. Existence itself is exceedingly pleasant. Such is his "raw substance of earth." The untransfigured world is so dear to him that for its sake he rejects Jesus — for, beside the sweetness of Jesus, the world is rancid. Pagan joy and primitive life are equally impossible in Christianity. This is why Rozanov considered Christianity mortifying and reached the point of *The Dark Face* [*Temnyi Lik*, the title of his book published in 1911].

Rozanov's blindness is striking — whether it is in his essays on "a-dogmatic Christianity" delivered at the Religious and Philosophical Meetings (1902), in his later essay entitled "Sweet Jesus and the Bitter Fruits of the World" (1907), or in *The Dark Face*. After this last book came out Rozanov began to suspect something (in connection with the inevitability of death), but he still remained blind. And yet, in his *Apocalypse of Our Times*, published just before his death, he retained his earlier hostility. He called Christianity "nihilism," because Christ "did not accept" the royal power offered to him during the temptation in the wilderness. Nonetheless, Rozanov died as a member of the Church.

Rozanov had an unquestionable feeling for life, for its banality and trivialities. Berdiaev aptly called him "an ingenious man-in-the-street." But his was a decadent feeling for life, and not for simple ordinary life. He was involved in a love affair with existence which derived from a spiritual lack of customary life. The vision of flesh and sex with which Rozanov was undoubtedly endowed was also diseased and unhealthy, for he was incapable of seeing the whole, integral man. For him, man was split into spirit and flesh, and only the flesh was ontologically convincing. "We rename the holy land, the sacred root of existence, the land of the Karamazovs."

Rozanov deserted the New Testament for the Old, but he also understood the Old Testament in his own selective and whimsical way. In the Bible he found only legends about families and births and a song of passion and love. He read the Old Testament not with biblical eyes, but rather with the eyes of an eastern pagan or servant of some orgiastic cult. He religiously opposed Christianity, and his anti-Christianity proved to be an entirely different religion. He religiously retreated to pre-Christian cults and reverted to primitive worship and lamentations; he withdrew into fertility cults. As in the case of the Gospels, Rozanov failed to hear what was actually fundamental and central to the Old Testament revelation. He understood blood sacrifice, for "blood is mysticism and a fact." But he did not understand the "sacrifice of a contrite spirit to God," and he lamented that an idea had been substituted for a "fact"! In vain did he bemoan the fact that the "existence of dogma stifled the possibility of prophecy." To be sure, no prophecies sounded for him.

Rozanov is a seductive and passionate psychological riddle. He was a man hypnotized by the flesh and lost in biological experiences and desires. The riddle contained something typical. Rozanov could impress, captivate, and lure others, but he was bereft of positive ideas. He belonged to the older generation. During the 1890s he wrote for the *Russian Messenger* [*Russkii vestnik*], and in St. Petersburg he joined the circle of the newest generation of Slavophiles: N. P. Aksakov, S. F. Sharapov, A. Vasiliev, and N. N. Strakhov. He drew close to the "Symbolists" very late, at the beginning of the present century, but he and the Symbolists soon found common themes: the theme of the flesh, *la réhabilitation de la chair*, and the argument against asceticism.

Translated from the Russian by
Robert L. Nichols

A CRITIQUE OF THE DOSTOEVSKY AND HAWTHORNE COMPARISON

by Richard S. Haugh

One of the popular topics in the relatively recent study of comparative literature, both in published form and in the classroom, is that of Dostoevsky and Hawthorne.[1] The purpose of this brief article is to show that the alleged basis for comparison between the two great 19th century writers, Feodor Dostoevsky (1821-1881) and Nathaniel Hawthorne (1804-1864) is superficial, contrived, and illegitimate.[2] In fact, seldom have two writers been so essentially different. Their world of fiction should be approached from a *contrastive* rather than a *comparative* perspective.

I

Did Hawthorne influence Dostoevsky? Hawthorne's works were translated into Russian shortly after their English publication. *The Scarlet Letter* (1850), which primarily concerns us here in contrast with *Crime and Punishment*, was translated into Russian in 1856 and published in *Sovremennik*.[3] But the very fact that Hawthorne's works were accessible to Dostoevsky does not establish that he either read Hawthorne or was influenced by him. Dostoevsky never mentioned Hawthorne in any of his writings, a fact which in and of itself proves nothing,"[4] although the *argumentum ad silentium* is noteworthy, especially when one considers the astonishingly breathless and sweeping statement made by Vladimir Astrov, who suggests that Dostoevsky's entire religious transformation was the direct result of his reading of Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*. Astrov writes:

> These new experiences took rather a long time to crystallize into definite insights and images. Dostoevski's biographers have sometimes wondered why his writings remained so long, as it were, ideologically vague and neutral. Only in the *Notes from Underground* (1863), and especially in *Crime and Punishment* (1866), did his new religious and moral attitudes come into full shape. Then, as it happened, Dostoevski's main ideas showed such a remarkable kinship with the problems and solutions of *The Scarlet Letter* . . . that the assumption of his acquaintance with Hawthorne appears natural and well-nigh inescapable. . . . The inference seems, therefore, plausible enough that F. M. Dostoevski did read the main novels of Hawthorne . . . the meeting with Hawthorne's ideas seems to have deeply fertilized Dostoevski's moral consciousness and his psychological imagination.[5]

This article maintains that Hawthorne, even if Dostoevsky had read his works, could not have influenced Dostoevsky in any essential way; this position must now be substantiated in this brief article. It must be remembered that Astrov has brought forth not one concrete piece of evidence; he has merely conjectured and drawn some seriously faulty conclusions from such wild ruminations.

II

There are, of course, certain comparative aspects, albeit rather insignificant ones. First, both 19th century novelists were interested in utopianism.[6] Secondly, both wrote novels which treated the problems of conscience, sin, and guilt (*The Scarlet Letter* and *Crime and Punishment*), although the very nature and essence of these problems is different. And, thirdly, both were interested in a certain discrepancy between the intellect and the heart; they both distrusted the intellect. *Here, however, the comparison ends.*

III

Those who attempt to prove that Dostoevsky and Hawthorne "shared substantially the same underlying philosophy"[7] see the greatest similarity in the two novels, *The Scarlet Letter* (1850) and *Crime and Punishment* (1866). Are such novels comparable?

RASKOLNIKOV AND DIMMESDALE

May the puritan minister, Arthur Dimmesdale, be compared with Rodion Raskolnikov? One critic writes that Dimmesdale is "racked and torn by tortures worthy of Raskolnikov, as he tries to maintain his self-assurance and to atone for his sin in every way other than confession. . . . Salvation must come for him, as for Raskolnikov, from confession."[8] But objectively the situation is precisely the reverse. Raskolnikov confesses and yet experiences no penitent guilt. Dimmesdale feels the guilt and refuses to confess on principle. Having confessed to Sonia, having symbolically bowed and kissed Mother Earth, and having finally confessed to the police, Raskolnikov nevertheless still "intellectually" holds to his idea,[9] an idea which permits the extraordinary individual to overstep all "moral" barriers which, according to the deepest logic of his relativistic idea, have after all only a sociological and not a metaphysical origin. Raskolnikov's only regret is that he was not "extraordinary" enough to bear totally the consequences of his action.[10] Although experiencing moments of instinctive, existential guilt,[11] Raskolnikov's "repentance and renewal" come only after his various confessions and are the result of the confluence of the following: (1) his isolation from others;[12] (2) Sonia's

influence and faithfulness; (3) the atmosphere of Lent;[13] and (4) his terrifying nightmare and its concomitant vision. It is, therefore, inaccurate to claim that Dimmesdale must confess as did Raskolnikov. Dimmesdale, the "*subtle, but remorseful hypocrite*,"[14] will not confess before men on principle.[15]

> The heart, making itself guilty of such secrets, must perforce hold them, until the day when all hidden things shall be revealed. Nor have I so read or interpreted Holy Writ, as to understand that the disclosure of human thoughts and deeds, then to be made, is intended as a part of the retribution. That, surely, were a shallow view of it. No; these revelations, unless I greatly err, are meant merely to promote the intellectual satisfaction of all intelligent beings . . .[16]

Dimmesdale is incapable of grasping the purgative and ontologically essential aspects of confession; for him the final, universal confession finds its purpose only in satisfying the curiosity of the intellect.

Not only is the nature of their guilt and repentence different, but the very nature of their sin or crime also differs radically. Raskolnikov's crime is rooted in a metaphysical view of the world; he murders because of his idea.[17] It is precisely in this central area of the novel that Dostoevsky's creative skill reaches its height of spiritual perception. His perceptive creativity reveals Raskolnikov's crime as the result of an intellect uprooted from its natural, spontaneous source, an intellect which is only sporadically in contact with the life-giving symbol of the heart. The final repentance of Raskolnikov flows from those streams of existence which are in contact with the "heart," that symbol of the fountain of life. From the subconscious realm of dreams, from the instinctive desire for others, from the spontaneous respect for loyalty and self-sacrifice (in this case, of Sonia), from the aching existential anguish and guilt of an ontologically disoriented life, and probably from that strange, mysterious, and mystical atmosphere of Lent — from these areas, from these sources flow the emotive forces to which he finally surrenders his intellect and its demonic creation with the result that "life . . . step(s) into the place of theory."[18]

It is different with Dimmesdale. While conceding that Hawthorne intended to portray Dimmesdale as one who also was too abstract and too aloof from the concerns of the human heart, the contention here is that the source of Dimmesdale's transgression is not the intellect; his transgression is not abstract, it is rooted in the symbol of the heart and is the result of a misguided desire for the love and contact of another person; as such, of course, it is a perversion of personal relations. One essential difference is that there is nothing hypocritical about Raskolnikov. While Dimmesdale, in accordance with his Calvinistic faith, knows he has broken an extrinsic law even though he too thought it had a "consecration of its own," Raskolnikov accepts his idea as

good. Although Raskolnikov's idea alienates and destroys and in itself is a perversion of the deepest laws of human existence, he believes it is good. In the execution of his crime Raskolnikov affirms the idea he has come to accept and believe in; in the committing of his sin Dimmesdale hypocritically betrays his Calvinistic faith.

Raskolnikov's idea, replete with earth-shaking consequences, expresses the logical conclusions of any serious philosophy of relativism. Raskolnikov shakes his fist at the moral and ontological structure of being and finds that his idea leads to moral bankruptcy. Dimmesdale's transgression is incomparable; it is on a totally different scale.Dimmesdale himself views his transgression as slight.

> We are not, Hester, the worst sinners in the world. There is one worse than the polluted priest! That old man's revenge has been blacker than my sin. He has violated . . . the sanctity of a human heart. Thou and I, Hester, never did so.[19]

The moment Rakolnikov entertains the heinous idea and accepts it as his own[20] is the moment of the *real* crime and punishment.[21] The punishment is simultaneous with the crime because he commits himself to something which is not simply contrary to the laws of society *but is so precisely because it is in essence contrary to the ontological structure of human nature.* Because he accepts into the depths of his being something so essentially contrary to it, his own being begins to decompose. His punishment comes in the form of inner torment, of anguish and guilt which he experiences in the deepest recesses of his existence. Suffering existential agony without penitent guilt, Raskolnikov chips away at the positive substance of his being with each new step along his new path. Dimmesdale's sin is quite unlike Raskolnikov's, and even the nature of his self-imposed penance is qualitatively different. Readily admitting his minor guilt, Dimmesdale prescribes his own punishment, which is the consequence of his intellectual understanding of the relationship between God and man. With Dimmesdale the sin of the heart is punished voluntarily through the guidance of the intellect; with Raskolnikov, the metaphysical sin of the intellect is involuntarily punished by the depths of existential guilt and alienation.

The community views these characters differently in the two novels. The community sees Raskolnikov as he really is and there is nothing hypocritical about him. There are moments when Raskolnikov is spontaneously kind and this is readily acknowledged. There is, however, the other Raskolnikov, the one who tries to control or smother the natural, spontaneous side of his character, the one who attempts to govern his life by his intellect and its idea. Razumihin informs, and quite objectively, Raskolnikov's mother and sister about Raskolnikov.

> I have known Rodion for a year and a half; he is morose, gloomy, proud and haughty, and of late — perhaps for a long time before — he has been suspicious and fanciful. He has a noble nature and a kind heart. He does not like showing his feelings and would rather do a cruel thing than open his heart freely. Sometimes, though, he is not at all morbid, but simply cold and inhumanly callous; it's as though he were alternating between two characters. Sometimes he is fearfully reserved! He says he is so busy that everything is a hindrance, and yet he lies in bed doing nothing . . . He never listens to what is said to him. He is never interested in what interests other people at any given moment. He thinks very highly of himself and perhaps he is right . . . he loves no one and perhaps he never will."[22]

In *The Scarlet Letter* the community considers Dimmesdale as "the godly youth," "the saint on earth."[23] In the eyes of the community few have attained the vertiginous heights of Dimmesdale's sanctity: the "purity of his thought" when he preached was "like the speech of an angel."[24] Hawthorne himself is quite aware that there is something radically wrong in the community, for its principles of judgment breed and then nourish hypocrisy. It must not be forgotten that it is Hawthorne, not the community in the novel, who describes Dimmesdale as the "subtle, but remorseful hypocrite."[25] Indeed, is it not Hawthorne's purpose, and arguably not a very profound one, to show that the puritanical community is inevitably hypocritical?

For Dimmesdale, guilt finally leads to public confession, but only when he is already "dying." For Raskolnikov, confession brings him closer to the acknowledgment of his inner guilt, which in turn leads to repentance. He repents and lives;[26] Dimmesdale confesses and dies.

SONIA AND HESTER

Is there really a profound similarity between Sonia and Hester? One critic writes that they are "both sinners . . . and flout the judgment of the world . . . and seem unaware of the extent of their transgression."[27] This applies to Hester but not to Sonia. Sonia is very aware of the extent of her transgression. After becoming a prostitute, Sonia returns, gives the money to her step-mother, lies on the bed with her face to the wall, and weeps and shudders. It is precisely the essence of Sophia's wisdom that she considers herself a transgressor and feels it; yet she remains spiritually unpenetrated by the atmospheric life of prostitution.[28] If Sonia (restricting this to only one example) "flouts the judgment of the world," why is she so terribly uneasy and distressed when Raskolnikov asks her to sit with his mother and sister? Raskolnikov tells her: "I said just now to an insolent man that he was not worth your little finger . . . and that I did my sister honour making her sit beside you."[29] And what is Sonia's response? "Ach, you said that

to them! And in her presence? . . . Sit down with me! An honor! Why, I'm . . . dishonorable . . . Ah, why did you say that?"[30] This is neither the language nor attitude of one who "flouts the judgment of the world."

Sonia is lowly, humble, intellectually certain of nothing but intuitively and experientially certain of the ontological necessity of God's existence.[31] Hester is proud and intellectually sure, especially at the end of *The Scarlet Letter*. When she finally returns to New England, Hester becomes a quasi-prophetess; people flock to her with all their "sorrows and perplexities," begging for her counsel.[32] And what does she tell them? "She assured them . . . of her firm belief . . . that a new truth would be revealed, in order to establish the whole relation between man and woman on a surer ground of mutual happiness."[33] This assuredly is far from the spirit of Sonia. For Sonia believes in an "old" truth and surrenders herself for others in self-sacrificial love. Intellectually simple but spiritually wise, Sonia's "old" truth is deep, comprehensive, universal and cosmic; Hester's "new" truth limits itself to the social order. Sonia is much too intellectually humble to proclaim with assurance "a new truth." Her "old" truth is capable not only of unifying man and woman but of unifying the entire cosmos. Sonia is the living witness of one who approaches that love which is "patient and kind . . . not jealous or boastful . . . not arrogant or rude," that love which "does not insist on its own way . . . is not irritable or resentful . . . does not rejoice at wrong . . . which bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things."[34] For Sonia, there is a path; she could never say, as does Hester, "there is no path to guide us out of this dismal maze"[35]

Hester hates Chillingworth. "Yes, I hate him. . . . He betrayed me! He has done me worse wrong than I did him." Sonia loves Katerina Ivanovna, at whose suggestion and request she became a prostitute. "Love her? Of course . . . Ah, you don't . . . If you only knew. . . . You know nothing, nothing at all. . . . She is so unhappy . . . ah, how unhappy." Not Hester, but rather the force of a *deus ex machina*, is the cause of Dimmesdale's final confession. Sonia's influence, however, directly contributes to Raskolnikov's final repentance. Hester's advice to Dimmesdale minimizes his guilt and responsibility. "What we did had a consecration of its own. We felt it so! We said so to each other! Hast Thou forgotten it?" Sonia fully realizes the tragic dimensions of Raskolnikov's transgression, acknowledging his responsibility and begging him to confess and be reconciled with the earth he has defiled.

The external condition of the apparent suffering of Hester is caused by an act of adultery which necessarily entailed the betrayal of her husband.The inner suffering of Sonia is the result of her immense self-giving for others in an extraordinary kenotic act. Hester appears not to bear that "inner suffering" and at times seems proud of her adultery. At this point the opinion expressed here is shared by another critic:

> Hester's . . . innermost self . . . did not condemn her. Her conscience remained clear . . . and she did not believe either him (Dimmesdale) or herself deserving of damnation. To her mind their "legally" forbidden relationship had a "consecration" of their own. It was almost as if a new moral law . . . had obtained sway over her mind. She felt herself not degraded, because she seemed to belong to some other culture — "unchristianized," or no more Christian.[36]

Although there are many essential differences between Sonia and Hester, the scope of this brief article restricts attention to only a few. The most essential difference which must be stressed is that Hester does not feel the guilt and shame when she *is* morally wrong, while Sonia *feels* the guilt and shame when the "sin" has not really penetrated her existence.[37] This illustrates the pride of Hester and the humility of Sonia.

SVIDRIGAILOV AND CHILLINGSWORTH

"Did Dostoevsky ever draw a more tragic figure?" than Chillingworth asks one critic,[38] claiming that Chillingworth becomes a "mere Svidrigailov." Actually, all Dostoevsky's negative characters are more tragic than Chillingworth. In fact, Dostoevsky was incapable of drawing a character like Chillingworth because the latter is the passive object of a cosmic determinism quite foreign to Dostoevsky's world of spiritual freedom. Precisely because his acts are determined by a mysterious fate, or a "dark necessity,"[39] Chillingworth's tragic aspect is undermined and diminished. Chillingworth is arguably one of the most negative characters in Western literature; he is Iago-like, but without the Shakespearean dimension which makes Iago's evil real and tragic — freedom.[40]

The very lives and deaths of both Svidrigailov and Chillingworth are different. Chillingworth "had made the very principle of his life consist of the pursuit and systematic exercise of revenge."[41] Svidrigailov had rooted his existence in sensualism. Chillingworth becomes progressively worse, and *not of his own will.* Actually, he was mysteriously committed to the slow, pernicious destruction of another man's life; there is no remorse, and in such fated evil activity his very existence becomes so parasitical that at the death of Dimmesdale "all his strength and energy — all his vital and intellectual force — seemed at once to desert him."[42] Within the year of Dimmesdale's death "dehumanized" Chillingworth shrivelled away .. .. like an uprooted weed that lies wilting in the sun."[43]

Svidrigailov becomes more "humanized" as his end approaches. Having lived only for selfish sensual pleasures, and allegedly being responsible for others' deaths, Svidrigailov begins to respond to the inner promptings of the "heart" precisely when he is about to rape

Dounia. Upon hearing the tone of finality in her declaration that she could never love him, "there followed a moment of terrible, dumb struggle in the heart of Svidrigailov."[44] Later, when already at that wooden hotel in that "God-forsaken place," Svidrigailov recalls "how at that instant (with Dounia) he felt almost sorry for her, how he had felt a pang at his heart."[45] Even in his last dream there is enough of something positive in Svidrigailov, enough of the core of human nature which enables him to feel disgust, especially towards the last dream of the five year old child whose facial appearance suddenly transforms itself into the face of a French harlot. The corrupt Svidrigailov can still experience the dream as a horror: "There was something infinitely hideous and shocking in that laugh, in those eyes, in such nastiness in the face of a child."[46] Unlike Chillingworth, Svidrigailov realizes the sickening vanity of his principle of life — corruption has penetrated his being so deeply that even innocent children appear corrupt and sensual — and yet the years wasted in corrupt sensualism leave him too powerless to begin the extremely arduous task of extricating himself from his bondage to sensualism and preoccupation with himself. Svidrigailov approaches his end in despair, disgust, and perhaps sorrow. Chillingworth remains callous. Svidrigailov does not deny his own responsibility for his life. Chillingworth feels no responsibility, stating: "I am . . . a fiend! Who made me so?"[47]

IV

Not only are the characters essentially different in Dostoevsky and Hawthorne, but there is also a more important, and far deeper element of difference between them — atmosphere, an atmosphere which presupposes and reflects interpretations of reality which are fundamentally and historically different — Puritan New England and Orthodox Russia.

HAWTHORNE AND PURITANISM

Although many have claimed that Hawthorne favored Puritanism,[48] others, including Hawthorne's own wife, son, and closest friends, have rejected this statement.[49] The correct position is probably the following:[50] (1) Hawthorne did in fact reject and despise many aspects of Puritanism,[51] excepting its ironic involvement in the struggle for American political freedom (ironic because Puritanism was thoroughly deterministic; is it not ironic that a system of thought which deprived man of any spiritual and hence ultimate freedom should concern itself with the quest for political freedom?); and (2) his novel, precisely because he chose to write about Puritan New England, exude the atmosphere of Puritanism. If one reads Hawthorne carefully, it is not difficult to detect a mocking Hawthorne, a Hawthorne who holds the

sombre Puritanical gloom in contempt, a Hawthorne who describes Puritans as "stern-visaged men" and "unkindly-visaged women," a Hawthorne for whom Puritanism is a "lump of lead." It is his own rejection of Puritanism and artistic use of Puritan New England which account for that "power of blackness in him,"[52] that morbidity, and that pessimism which permeate his fiction.

THE SOURCE OF THE "POWER OF BLACKNESS"

The expression, "the power of blackness," describes a certain ethos which pervades not only the works of Hawthorne but much American literature in general.[53] In this sense, American literature is unique; early America was the only country with an indigenous Calvinistic culture. Because of the brevity of this article, attention is restricted to only two areas of Calvinistic thought, two areas which, however, account for one aspect of the radical difference in atmosphere between the novels of Hawthorne and those of Dostoevsky — determinism and the results of original sin, especially in reference to the theme of the child. These aspects of the Calvinistic vision of man are ultimately rooted in the post-Cassiciacum thought of St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430), whose indirect but substantial influence on American literature has never been fully evaluated. St. Augustine, even before the outbreak of the Pelagian controversy, taught absolute predestination and the total depravity of human nature. St. Augustine did not, as is often claimed, develop his doctrine of man in the heat of the Pelagian controversy, but rather very early in his ecclesiastical life. One has only to read *Sermon* 214: 3, *De libero arbitrio*, III, and the pivotal work, *De quaestionibus ad Simplicianum*, II, as well as his own statements about the early development of his doctrine in *De dono perseverantiae*, 52; *De praedestinatione sanctorum*, 8; and *Retractationes*, II, 1.

Although St. Augustine distinguished between freedom and free choice, and although he speciously claimed that man sinned voluntarily, in the totality of his thought salvation is determined by the arbitrary and absolute will of God. Freedom is only a psychological reality because the Divine Will mysteriously and irresistibly attracts those whom it has decreed as elect. Although his doctrine of man was never fully accepted by the Roman Catholic Church, the leaders of the Reformation, Martin Luther (1483-1546) and John Calvin (1509-1564), fully embraced the darkest elements in St. Augustine's doctrine of man. In fact, John Calvin, the Father of Calvinistic Puritanism, was so heavily influenced by St. Augustine that in his *Institutio Christianae Religionis* alone he quotes St. Augustine more than 4100 times.[54] Transmitted by John Calvin, the Augustinian doctrine of man found its way into America along with her earliest settlers, contributing greatly to the shaping of the American mind.[55]

Contrary to a common but uninformed view, Augustinian thought is ultimately deterministic. Mankind consists of two classes — the elect and the reprobate. The cause of the election of the elect and the damnation of the reprobate is ultimately the eternal, mysterious Decree of the Divine Will. The elect, in no way deserving their election, bare eternal witness to God's gratuitous Mercy; the reprobate, deserving damnation because of the total depravity of human nature, witness eternally to God's Justice.[56]

Fallen in Adam, mankind became totally depraved, capable of being referred to as a "lump of sinners," a "lump of sin," a "lump of iniquity," a "lump of wrath," a "lump of death," a "lump of perdition," a "lump of damnation," a "lump of disgust," a "lump of the damned," and a "lump of just damnation."[57] Children naturally belong to the realm of Satan,[58] and all unbaptized children are justly given over to the damnation of perdition.[59]

It must be stressed that St. Augustine's doctrine of man departs radically from the thought of the Greek Fathers and the earlier Latin Fathers. *It is precisely this departure from a common Christian understanding of man which ultimately separates the atmosphere of Hawthorne's fiction from that of Dostoevsky* — Hawthorne inherited the Augustinian-Calvinistic atmosphere, while Dostoevsky inherited the atmosphere of Eastern Christianity.

Admittedly in the hands of John Calvin and the Calvinists St. Augustine's doctrine of man became more severe, more sombre, and more frightening. To feel the reality of this atmosphere in its living context it is enough to quote from a sermon by one of the "greatest" American theologians, Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758).

> There is nothing that keeps wicked men, at any one moment, out of Hell, but the mere pleasure of God. I mean his sovereign pleasure, his arbitrary will. The bow of God's wrath is bent, and the arrow made ready on the string, and justice bends the arrow at your heart, and strains the bow, and it is nothing but the mere pleasure of God . . . that keeps the arrow one moment from being made drunk with your blood . . . he looks upon you as worthy of nothing else, but to be cast into the fire; he is of purer eyes than to bear to have you in his sight; you are ten thousand times so abominable in his eyes as the most hateful venomous serpent . . . there is nothing you can do to induce God to spare you one moment. That God will execute the fierceness of his anger, implies that he will inflict wrath without any pity: when God beholds the ineffable extremity of your case, and sees your torment to be so vastly disproportioned to your strength, and sees how your poor soul is crushed and sinks down, as it were into an infinite gloom, he will have no compassion upon you . . . there shall be no moderation or mercy . . . he will have no regard to your welfare, nor be at all careful lest you should suffer too much . . . God will be so far from pitying you when you cry to him . . . that

> he will only laugh and mock . . . If you cry to God to pity you, he will be so far from pitying you in your doleful case, or shewing you the least regard or favour, that instead of that he'll only tread you under foot: and tho' he will know that you can't bear the weight of omnipotence treading upon you, yet he won't regard that, but he will crush you under his feet without mercy; he'll crush out your blood, and make it fly . . . He will not only hate you, but he will have you in the utmost contempt; no place shall be thought fit for you, but under his feet, to be trodden down as the mire of the streets . . . and then will God call upon the whole universe to behold that awful majesty and mighty power . . . you shall be tormented in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb.[60]

Much of American literature echoes these lines.[61]

DOSTOEVSKY AND EASTERN CHRISTIANITY

If the ultimate source of the atmosphere of Hawthorne's works is St. Augustine of Hippo, the vision of man in the works of Dostoevsky is inspired by Eastern Christianity. Dostoevsky's idea of freedom and his preoccupation with the innocence of the child and the spontaneity of human nature are ultimately rooted in the Eastern Christian tradition. For those who are unfamiliar with the thought and spirit of Eastern Christianity it is often difficult to grasp Dostoevsky's affinity with Eastern Christianity. The French scholar Henri de Lubac accurately presents the situation:

> Dostoevsky's type of genius is at once profoundly human . . . and profoundly Christian; he is human *because* he is Christian. . . . His Christianity is genuine; it is, at bottom, the Christianity of the Gospel, and it is this Christianity which . . . lends so much depth to his vision of man. . . . Dostoevsky was a child of Orthodoxy. Theologians of his own country may not have been wholly satisfied as to the correctness of his beliefs. But it would be risking a grave mistake in the interpretation of his work to forget that he *breathed the atmosphere* of Orthodoxy and profoundly assimilated its spirit.[62]

THE SOURCE OF DOSTOEVSKY'S VISION

Eastern Christianity does not regard humanity as totally depraved.[63] Recognizing mankind as ill, Eastern Christianity sees this very illness as relative — there is illness and evil but there is also health and goodness. In fallen humanity freedom, although weakened, still exists, and man is still the architect of his spiritual life and destiny. Indeed Eastern Christianity cannot conceive of man without his possessing a spiritual freedom in the very depth of his being. So foreign was such

thinking to St. Gregory Nazianzos that he termed any deterministic philosophy as "monstrous reasoning."[64] Eastern Christianity always considered the process of salvation as synergistic, *always assuming the Divine initiative*. Eastern Christianity is not Pelagian. If the term "semi-Pelagian" means that man takes the first step to God, then Eastern Christianity is most emphatically *not* "semi-Pelagian." Eastern Christianity recognizes that graces initiates, accompanies, and completes all that is good, but it rejects absolutely any notion of an irresistible grace.[65] In Eastern Christian theology God is at every moment and in every way *pushing, not forcing*, each person to goodness; but in order for this *push* to be effective man must welcome and co-operate with it. The Augustinian stress on the Power and Decree of God is radically different from the Eastern stress. In Eastern Christian thought it is impossible for God to save a man who does not want salvation, and it is impossible despite God's omnipotence precisely because the omnipotence of God in Eastern Christian thought can never be considered apart from the plenitude of Divine Perfection. To state the Eastern theological position in the language of the Augustinian-Calvinistic milieu, it is precisely God's Will that man possess spiritual freedom. It is the very Will of God not to overpower man, *not to force a man to come to the good*. This free co-operation of man in the process of his salvation is assumed in the theology, the ascetical writings, and the liturgical texts of Eastern Christianity. In the understanding of Eastern Christianity the results of the fall of mankind were seen ontologically and not juridically.[66] St. Augustine and Calvin stressed a God of Wrath whose justice demands the existence of hell. In fact, it is this very Augustinian idea which finds expression in Canto III of Dante's *Inferno*, and here it is shockingly apparent in a poetic vision, *in literature*. It is Justice which has moved the Divine Power to create hell: "*Giustizia mosse il mio alto fattore; fecemi la divina potestate, la somma sapienza e il primo amore*." Such an idea is alien to Eastern Christianity which has stressed the Love of God whose forgiveness extends to all who will receive it. Just as Jonathan Edwards's sermon, quoted above, typifies a certain Calvinistic ethos, so also does the sermon attributed to St. John Chrysostom and read at every Easter service in the Eastern Orthodox Church typify a certain ethos of Eastern Christianity.

> Whosoever is a devout lover of God, let him enjoy this bright and beautiful Festival. And whosoever is a grateful servant, let him rejoice and enter into the joy of his Lord. And if any be weary with fasting, let him now receive his reward. If any have toiled from the first hour, let him receive his due reward. If any have come after the third hour, let him with gratitude join in the Feast. And he that arrived after the sixth hour, let him not doubt, for he too shall sustain no loss. And if any have delayed until the ninth hour, let him not hesitate, but let him come too. And he that hath arrived only at the eleventh hour, let him not

be afraid by reason of his delay, for the Lord is gracious and receives the last even as the first. He gives rest to him that cometh at the eleventh hour as well as to him who has toiled from the first. Yea, to this one he giveth and upon that one he bestoweth. He accepts works as he greets the endeavor. The deed he honoreth and the intention he commendeth.

Let all then enter into the joy of our Lord. Ye first and last receiving alike your reward; ye rich and poor, rejoice together. Ye sober and ye slothful, celebrate the day. Ye that have kept the fast, and ye that have not, rejoice today, for the Table is richly laden. Fare ye royally on it. The calf is a fatted one. Let no one go away hungry. Partake ye all of the cup of faith. Enjoy ye all the riches of his goodness. Let no one grieve at his poverty, for the universal Kingdom has been revealed.

Let no one mourn that he hath fallen again and again, for forgiveness hath risen from the grave. Let no one fear death, for the Death of our Savior hath set us free. He hath destroyed it by enduring it. He spoiled Hades when he descended thereto. He vexed it even as it tasted of his flesh. . . . It is vexed, for it is even done away with. It is vexed, for it is made a mockery. It is vexed, for it is annihilated. It is vexed, for it is now made captive. It took a body, and, lo! it discovered God. It took earth, and, behold! it encountered Heaven. It took what it saw, and was overcome by what it did not see. O death, where is thy sting? O Hades, where is thy victory? Christ is risen, and thou art annihilated. Christ is risen, and the evil ones are cast down. Christ is risen, and the Angels rejoice. Christ is risen, and life is liberated. Christ is risen, and the tomb is emptied of the dead.

THE LITERARY DIFFERENCE: DETERMINISM AND FREEDOM

The determinism which weaves its way so consistently through American thought, exclusive of political thought, is the real source of Chillingworth's actions. When Hester challenges him to purge himself from the hatred "that has transformed a wise and just man to a fiend," he responds:

> It is not granted me to pardon. I have no such power as thou tellest me of. My old faith, long forgotten, comes back to me, and explains all that we do, and all we suffer. By thy first step awry, thou didst plant the germ of evil; but since that moment, it has all been *a dark necessity*. Ye that have wronged me are not sinful, save in a kind of typical illusion; neither am I fiend-like, who have snatched a fiend's office from his hands. *It is our fate.*[67]

With Hawthorne there is not only a general tendency to make use of determinism but also, when decisions are possible, there is a de-emphasis of the personal element and responsibility in the process of decision-making. With Dostoevsky,[68] on the contrary, the idea of freedom is at the center of his philosophy of life, and moments of decision fill the pages of his works. "For Dostoevsky, the theme of man and his destiny is first and foremost the theme of freedom . . . freedom is the centre of his conception of the world . . . his hidden pathos is a pathos of freedom."[69] Whereas Chillingworth is the helpless, passive object of an inexorably determined fate, the center of the drama in *Crime and Punishment* concerns Raskolnikov's free acceptance of an idea whose origin disturbs him. It is noteworthy that Sonia, fully realizing for the first time that Raskolnikov is a murderer, falls on her knees before him, stating: "What have you done — what have you done to yourself?"[70] This most interesting but often overlooked statement is noteworthy in two respects. First, it acknowledges that Raskolnikov is responsible for his actions and thoughts. Secondly, it presupposes an ontological perspective of evil — that is, that the greatest victim of evil is the perpetrator. In words that echo the spiritual literature of Eastern Christianity, Sonia exclaims with empathy: "There is no one — no one in the whole world now so unhappy as you!"

HUMAN NATURE AND THE CHILD

The Augustinian-Calvinistic doctrine of a totally depraved humanity is personified in *The Scarlet Letter* by the character of little Pearl, whose "perversity" is "ten-fold" that of other children,[71] whose "composition" knows "no law, no reverence for authority, (and) no regard for human ordinances."[72] Pearl, the "sin-born child," the "little elf," the "airy sprite," the "born outcast," the "imp of evil," the "emblem and product of sin," with a "fiend-like face full of smiling malice . . . so perverse . . . so malicious" and with her "unhuman laugh," contains within her "the bitterest hatred that can be supposed to rankle in a childish bosom. . ." and "all this enmity . . . (she) had inherited by inalienable right." So perverse is little Pearl that her mother Hester exclaims: "What is this being which I have brought into the world!" Hester "could not help questioning whether Pearl was a human child" because Pearl was so "like a thing incapable and unintelligent of human sorrow." So perverse is she that her own father, Rev. Dimmesdale, is uncertain whether she is "capable of good." "What, in Heaven's name, is she?" asks Chillingworth. "Is the imp altogether evil? Hath she affections? Hath she any discoverable principle of being?" The community considers this little child, whose "nature had something wrong in it," as a "witch-baby," as a "demon offspring," as a

child of the "Prince of the Air." Pearl, unfortunately, is not the only "unhuman" character in the works of Hawthorne.[73]

Is such an atmosphere Dostoevskian? Assuredly not. For Dostoevsky the child-theme is almost a sacred subject.[74] In *Crime and Punishment* there is the unforgettable scene when Raskolnikov is a child. In Raskolnikov's dream of Mikolka, Dostoevsky vividly portrays the innocence and the spontaneity of the child. The same center and bearer of existence, the person of Raskolnikov, simultaneously possesses his present corrupt state of existence and ineluctably retains and bears all his past events, impressions, and attitudes. Beneath the surface of the corrupt, cynical adult is the simple, innocent goodness of the child. The child, who will soon as an adult lift the axe to slay human life, is utterly shaken as he sees the perverse brutality of Mikolka towards his "thin little sorrel beast" and is incapable of containing his grief. He shouts, he begs them to stop, he runs to them, he hits them, and finally he "made his way screaming through the crowd to the sorrel nag, put his arms round her bleeding dead head and kissed it, kissed the eyes and kissed the lips . . ."[75] Instead of being the personification of an utterly depraved human nature as in Hawthorne, the child in Dostoevsky spontaneously feels and intuitively knows the good.[76]

It must not be forgotten that Dostoevsky did not imbibe that atmosphere in which human nature was considered to be a "lump of perdition," etc. Instead he imbibed an atmosphere in which fallen human nature, as nature, was considered good.[77] Dostoevsky heard children described as — "this spotless child," "this uncorrupted child," "this child most pure," "this blessed child," and "the citizen of Paradise." He heard them compared to "a pure little bird" because "they are not accounted sharers in life's evil."[78]

VI

CONCLUSIONS

First, there is no evidence that Dostoevsky ever read Hawthorne or was influenced by him.

Secondly, although there is an alleged similarity between the characters in Hawthorne and in Dostoevsky, these characters are essentially different. The origin, nature, and scope of Raskolnikov's transgression, the nature of his guilt and repentance, and the community's view of him — these separate him essentially from Dimmesdale. The cause and nature of Sonia's transgression and her attitude towards it, her humility and her influence on Raskolnikov — these qualitatively contrast her with Hester. And Svidrigailov's sensualism and Chillingworth's "unhuman" callous revenge differ. Although this brief study restricted its comparison to three characters

from *Crime and Punishment* and *The Scarlet Letter*, the essential difference is found in other characters also.

Thirdly, the greatest difference between Dostoevsky and Hawthorne is that of ethos, of atmosphere. The Augustinian-Calvinistic heritage, against which Hawthorne rebelled, and the spirit of Eastern Christianity account for the profound difference in the atmosphere of their respective works.

Finally, there are many other areas of difference which the limited scope of this article could not focus on. For example, Dostoevsky was an interesting political thinker; Hawthorne cared little about political theory. Although it is true that Hawthorne was once interested in utopianism, he soon outgrew this interest, while Dostoevsky's early political radicalism and socialism grew into a profound spiritual utopianism based on the repentance of all. Secondly, Dostoevsky was a metaphysical thinker. The ultimate questions of existence were Dostoevsky's chief concern and his works and his *Notebooks* abound with such seethingly urgent problems. Hawthorne's works and *Notebooks* lack any preoccupation with the central mysteries of human existence. Thirdly, it would be interesting to compare types in the works of both authors. For example, in Hawthorne there are no positive clergymen (excepting Rev. Dr. Burroughs, who is characterized as a "most genial old clergymen . . . with nothing Calvinistic about him"). An interesting study would be to compare Starets Zosima and Rev. Hooper in "The Minister's Black Veil." Fourthly, there is a cosmic dimension and a cosmic vision in Dostoevsky which is entirely lacking in Hawthorne. Fifthly, there is great humor in Dostoevsky, which it is difficult to discover in Hawthorne. And lastly, Dostoevsky's "Romantic Realism" differs greatly from the stylistic technique of Nathaniel Hawthorne, the "Romantic Allegorist."

This brief study in no way wishes to denigrate Hawthorne, who remains for the author of this article a great American writer and who is read by this author with interest and enjoyment. It is precisely in a false comparison with someone like Dostoevsky, a writer whose thought is immensely deeper and of a vaster scope than Hawthorne's, a writer with whom few authors can compare, that Hawthorne's reputation illegitimately suffers.

[1]Reference here is restricted to two of the pioneering articles because (1) they initiated the comparison, and (2) they contain the important alleged "comparative" elements. See Vladimir Astrov, "Hawthorne and Dostoevsky as Explorers of the Human Conscience," *New England Quarterly*, XV (1942), 296-319; and Clarence A. Manning, "Hawthorne and Dostoevsky," *Slavonic Review*, XIV (1936), 417-24. See also F. O. Matthiessen, *American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman* (London: Oxford Press, 1968), pp. 343 ff.

[2]The criterion here of a serious "comparative" study is two-fold. First, it should be capable of establishing either authentic influence on the writer in question or the latter's influence on the others. Secondly, if there is no direct influence, it should be able to unearth independent similarities of style, structure, or idea.

[3]*Sovremennik* also published *The House of the Seven Gables* in 1852; and in 1853 it published "The Snow Image," "The Birthmark," and "Rappaccini's Daughter." Hawthorne's novel, *The Marble Faun*, appeared in *Russkoe Slovo* in 1861.

[4]Dostoevsky never mentioned Edgar Allan Poe either, but according to Astrov Dostoevsky did author an anonymous article on Poe in *Vremia*. See V. Astrov, "Dostoevsky on Egdar Allan Poe," in *American Literature*, XIV (March, 1942), 70-74.

[5]Vladimir Astrov, "Hawthorne and Dostoevsky as Explorers of the Human Conscience," *op. cit.*, 298.

[6]On Hawthorne's interest in utopianism see the chapter on the Brook Farm in A. F. Tyler's *Freedom's Ferment: Phases of American Social History* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1944), pp. 175-185; H. Wish, *Society and Thought in Early America* (New York: McKay, 1950), pp. 459 ff. Even here, however, there is a difference. Hawthorne outgrew his utopianism; Dostoevsky's political utopianism grew into a profound spiritual utopianism which was based on the repentance of all. While it is true that Dostoevsky's apokatastatic dream sometimes expressed itself non-eschatogically, it must be admitted that Hawthorne had no such vision.

[7]Manning, "Hawthorne and Dostoevsky," *op. cit.*, 420.

[8]*Ibid.*, 418 f.

[9]Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, Epilogue II. (The English text used throughout is that of Constance Garnett). "But he did not repent of his crime . . ." Sentenced to Siberia, he still finds his "actions . . . not so blundering and grotesque."

[10]*Ibid.* "It was only in that that he recognized his criminality, only in the fact that he had been unsuccessful and had confessed it."

[11]There are numerous examples of this. For example, to Polenka he states: "Polenka, my name is Rodion. Pray sometimes for me, too." His conversations with Sonia presuppose instinctive feelings of guilt; and, of course, nowhere are the feelings of guilt more apparent than in the dreams, especially his being a child witness to Mikolka's brutal slaying of his horse.

[12]Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, Epilogue II: "What surprised him most of all was the terrible gulf that lay between him and all the rest."

[13]The efficacious role of the atmosphere of Lent in Dostoevsky is seldom taken seriously. It is more than fortuitous that Raskolnikov undergoes his religious metamorphosis during and directly after Lent. It should be not be forgotten that Markel, the brother of Starets Zosima in *The Brothers Karamazov*, experiences his spiritual regeneration during Lent also.

[14]Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The Scarlet Letter*, XI. (All quotations from Hawthorne are taken from the Centenary Text).

[15]This principle is theological and stems from the thought of the Reformation with its stress on the individual and God, resulting *de facto* in the minimizing of the role of the community. This principle is ultimately rooted, as is much Reformation thought, in St. Augustine of Hippo (354-430). Strikingly absent in the thought of St. Augustine is a cosmic perspective. Henri Marrou has aptly commented on this, writing that one finds no work "On the Cosmos" in St. Augustine's thought. St. Augustine was more interested in the soul's direction toward God. See his *Soliloquies* I, 2, 7 and II, 1, 1.

[16]Hawthorne, *op. cit.*, X.

[17]It is clear that on one level Raskolnikov entertains the idea and commits the crime because he wants to assert himself. But the idea itself and its metaphysical meaning cannot be taken from the novel; it is there, just as is the existential level of self-assertion.

[18]Dostoevsky, *Crime and Punishment*, Epilogue, II.

[19]Hawthorne, *op. cit.*, XVII.

[20]The origin of thoughts interested Dostoevsky. Raskolnikov himself questioned the origin of his idea: "How loathsome it all is! . . . And how could such an atrocious thing come into my head?"

[21]Raskolnikov's crime as the acceptance of the idea is quite illustrative of Christ's teaching of the *interiorization of the law*. See Matthew 5:21-22, 27.

[22]Dostoevsky, *op. cit.*, III, 2.

[23]Hawthorne, *op. cit.*, XI.

[24]*Ibid.*, III.

[25]*Ibid.*, XI.

[26]Konstantin Mochulsky's interpretation of Raskolnikov is rejected by this author. Responding to the last lines of *Crime and Punishment*, Mochulsky writes: "The novel ends with a vague anticipation of the hero's 'renewal'. It is promised, but is not shown. We know Raskolnikov too well to believe this 'pious lie'." See K. Mochulsky, *Dostoevsky*, trans. by M. A. Minihan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), p. 312. If Mochulsky's interpretation is correct, then the entire novel collapses into meaninglessness. The difference between Dostoevsky's *Notebooks* and his finished product is the result of the final, creative effort of an inspired writer.

[27]Manning, *op. cit.*, 419.

[28]Raskolnikov understands this well, realizing Sonia has three future possibilities if she remains a prostitute: (1) real prostitution, i.e. surrendering and accepting into her inner being the total dimension of prostitution; that is — "to sink into depravity which obscures the mind and turns the heart to stone."; (2) suicide; and (3) insanity. See *Crime and Punishment*, IV, 4.

[29]*Ibid.*

[30]*Ibid.*

[31]*Ibid.*

[32]Hawthorne, *op. cit.*, XXIV.

[33]*Ibid.*

[34]*I Corinthians* 13: 4-7.

[35]Hawthorne, *op. cit.*, XIV.

[36]Astrov, *op. cit.*, 306.

[37]Raskolnikov thinks to himself: "What held her up — surely not depravity? All that infamy had obviously only touched her mechanically, not one drop of real depravity had penetrated to her heart." *Crime and Punishment*, IV, 2.

[38]Manning, *op. cit.*, 419.

[39]For the textual evidence see *The Scarlet Letter*, XIV.

[40]See *Othello* I, iii, 319-331; see also Edmund's interesting comment on freedom in *King Lear* I, ii, 115-129. Shakespeare glimpses the same core of personal spiritual freedom, which became a center of the Dostoevskian dialectic.

[41]Hawthorne, *op. cit.*, XXIV.

[42]*Ibid.*

[43]*Ibid.*

[44]Dostoevsky, *op. cit.*, VI, 5.

[45]*Ibid.*, VI, 6.

[46]*Ibid.*

[47]Hawthorne, *op. cit.*, XIV.

[48]James Russel Lowell called him a "Puritan Tieck"; others claim he shared certain Puritan beliefs such as predestination — see A. Cowie, *The Rise of the American Novel* (New York, 1948), p. 356; A. Warren, *Nathaniel Hawthorne: A Biography* (New Haven, 1948), pp. 244 ff; A. Turner, "Hawthorne and Reform," *New England Quarterly*, XV (1942), 708.

[49]For example Carl Van Doren writes ("What is American Literature?" in *The Viking Portable Van Doren*, p. 590): "He had little Puritanism left in him. Dealing with many of its problems, he reached his own verdicts." Yvor Winters (*In Defense of Reason*, p. 174) writes that "he had turned his back upon the excessively simplified conceptions of his Puritan ancestors."

[50]The best article on this specific topic is Joseph Schwartz, "Three Aspects of Hawthorne's Puritanism," *New England Quarterly*, XXXVI (June, 1963), 192-208.

[51]It is noteworthy that Hawthorne was raised a Unitarian, not a Calvinist. Hawthorne rejected both Calvinism (calling it a "lump of lead") and Unitarianism (calling it a "feather"). In his short story "The Celestial Railroad" it is Unitarianism which is satirized. On Hawthorne's religious attitudes see F. O. Matthiessen, *op. cit.*, pp. 193 ff; Edward Wagenknecht, *Nathaniel Hawthorne: Man and Writer* (New York: Oxford Unversity Press, 1961), pp. 172-201; and Hyatt H. Waggoner, *Hawthorne: A Critical Study* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1963), pp. 12-15; 141; 214 ff; 258-264.

[52]Herman Melville used this expression in reference to Hawthorne, writing that the "great power of blackness in him derives its force from its appeals to the Calvinistic sense of Innate Depravity and Original Sin, from whose visitations, in some shape or other, no deeply thinking mind is always and wholly free." See Matthiessen, *op. cit.*, p. 190.

[53]See Harry Levin, *The Power of Blackness: Hawthorne, Poe, Melville* (New York: Vintage Books, 1960).

[54]See L. Smits, *Saint Augustin dans l'œuvre de Jean Calvin*, 2 vols. (Assen: van Gorcan, 1957).

[55]See Perry Miller, *The New England Mind*, 2 vols. (Boston: Beacon, 1961).

[56]Although St. Augustine thought is at times infralapsarian, the logic of his thought place the cause of reprobation in the Divine Will. Thomas Aquinas and John Calvin understood this well and interpreted Augustinian in this way. See Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, I, question 23 and John Calvin, *Institutio Christianae Religionis*, III, xxi-xxiv.

[57]*massa peccati* (*De div. quaest. ad Simpl.* I, I; *Sermon* 22:9; 301, c. 6; *Ep.* 194:14, etc.); *massa luti* (*De divers. quaest.* 83, etc.); *massa peccatorum* (*In Ps.* 70; *Sermon* 1:15, etc.); *massa iniquitatis* (*ibid.*, etc.); *massa irae* (*Sermon* 22:9; 293:8, etc.); *massa mortis* (*Ep.* 188:7, etc.); *massa perditionis* (*Ep.* 214:3; *Sermon* 26:17; 71:3; *In Joh. Ev. Tract.* 109:2; *Enchir.* c. 92; 90; *De pecc. orig.* c. 29, n. 34; c. 31, n. 36; *Contra duas ep. Pelag.* 1. II, c. 7, n. 13; *Contra Jul.* 1, V, c. 4, n. 14; etc.); *massa offensionis* (*Ep.* 194:4); *massa originis vitiatiae atque damnata* (*Contra Jul.* 1. IV, c. 8,n. 46); *massa tota vitiata* (*Op. imperf. c. Jul.* I, I, 136; *massa damnabilis* (*Serm.* 165:9; *Ep.* 194:30, etc.); *massa damnata* (*De civ. Dei* 1. XIV, 26; *Ep.* 190:9; *Ep.* 194:23; *Enchir.* c. 27, etc.); *massa iustae conspersio damnata* (*De pecc. orig.* 31, etc.), and *damnabilis stirps* (*Ep.* 190, 11, etc.). It is noteworthy that one reason God elected only a small portion of the vitiated mass of humanity, according to St. Augustine, is to show his utter indifference to number. See *Ep.* 190.

[58]See *De Nupt.* 1, 23.

[59]See *Op. Imp.* 6, 31; *De Pecc. Mer.* 2, 25; *De Pecc. Orig.* 2, 18.

[60]From Jonathan Edwards' sermon, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," preached at Enfield, Connecticut on 8 July 1741. In connection with Edwards'

Calvinism, it should be noted that he wrote a lengthy volume in which he tried to prove: (1) that *determinism* is compatible with moral responsibility; (2) that moral responsibility *logically requires determinism*; and (3) that the *denial of determinism* is self-contradictory. The original title of this volume was *A Careful and Strict Enquiry into the Modern Prevailing Notions of that Freedom of Will Which Is Supposed to be Essential to Moral Agency, Vertue* [sic!] *and Vice, Reward and Punishment, Praise and Blame.* Perry Miller's assessment of this work as "the most powerful piece of sheer forensic argumentation in American literature" is dubious. See Perry Miller, *Jonathan Edwards and the Visibility of God* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967), pp. 45-64. A more perceptive view is found in Arthur E. Murphy's "Edwards on Free Will," *Philosophical Review* (April, 1959), pp. 181-202.

[61]See, for example, the famous poem by Michael Wigglesworth, "The Day of Doom" ("Doomsday") (1662), especially lines CLVII-CLXXII, which New England children were required to memorize along with the catechism. Most Colonial literature reflects the Calvinistic milieu, while Unitarianism and Transcendentalism are understandable only as reactions to Calvinism. Many authors for whom Calvinism was anathema ultimately fall back on the philosophical assumptions of Calvinism in interpreting their own characters. For example, Herman Melville in his *Billy Budd* can understand Claggart's evil only in terms of determinism: "Then would Claggart look like the man of sorrows. Yes, and sometimes the melancholy expression would have in it a touch of soft yearning, as if Claggart could even have loved Billy but for fate and ban." (18); "Now . . . such an one was Claggart, in whom was the mania of an evil nature, not engendered by vicious training or corrupting books or licentious living, but born with him and innate, in short 'a depravity according to nature'." (11); "With no power to annul the elemental evil in him, tho' readily enough he could hide it; apprehending the good, but powerless to be it . . . a nature like Claggart's . . . what recourse is left to it but to recoil upon itself and, like the scorpion for which the Creator alone is responsible, act out to the end the part alloted it." (13) The later works of Mark Twain are also only understandable within the context of a rebellion against Calvinism and its cultural milieu (see "The Five Boons of Life"; "Was It Heaven? or Hell?"; "The Mysterious Stranger," and the *Letters from the Earth*). The same cynical rebellion pervades Edgar Lee Masters' Spoon River Anthology (1915) — see, for example, the epitaphial stories of Wendell P. Bloyd, Yee Bow, Calvin Campbell, Roger Heston, Lyman King, Rev. Abner Peet, Amos Sibley, and Louise Smith in the Spoon River Anthology. For the change from Calvinistic determinism to biological, sociological and psychological determinism see the chapter "Determinism in Literature" in H. S. Commager's *The American Mind* (New Haven: Yale Press, 1950).

[62]Henri de Lubac, The Drama of Atheist Humanism (New York:

[63]See St. Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 88; *First Apology*, 10; 61; 28; Tatian the Syrian, *Address to the Greeks*, 8, 11; Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolycum*, 2:21; 24, 25, 26, 17, 27; Athenagoras of Athens, *A Plea Regarding Christians*, 24; St. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, II, 35, 5; III, 18, 1; 18, 7; 22, 4;23, 1, 2; 23, 8; IV, 4, 3; 22, 1; 33, 4; 37, 1, 4; 38, 1, 2, 3, 4; 41, 2; V, 1, 3; 2, 1; 6, 1; 15, 3; 16, 1, 2, 3; 17, 3; 19, 1; 21, 1; 27, 2; 28, 4; 34, 2; 41, 2; Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, 1, 17; 2, 3; 2, 4; 4, 13; 4, 23; 6, 12; 6, 13; Origen, *On First Principles*, 1, 8, 1; 3, 1, 1-3, 1, 8; 3, 1, 10; 3, 1, 12; 3, 1, 17; 3, 1, 15; 3, 1, 19; 3, 1, 20; 3, 1, 21; 2, 10, 3. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesis*, 2, 7; 2, 5; 13, 2; 4, 19; 2, 1; St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio Catechetica*, 5; 6; *De virginitate*, 12; *De infantibus qui praemature abripiuntur*; St. Gregory Nazianzos, *Oratio* 45, 8; 45, 12; 39, 9; 14, 25; 37, 21; St. Basil the Great, *Hom.* 9, 7; 9, 9; *Homilia dicta tempore famis et siccitatis*, 8, 7; St. John Chrysostom, *In Genes. hom.*, 19; *in Rom. hom.*, 12; *hom in ps. 51*; *in Heb. hom.*, 12; *in Rom. hom.*, 16;

in Joh. hom., 17; St. John Cassian, *Conference XIII*; St. John Damascene, *De Fide Orthodoxa*, II, xii and xxx.

[64]See St. Gregory Nazianzos, *Oration*, 37, 13-15. It is noteworthy that St. Gregory is commenting on one of the precise texts used later by St. Augustine in justifying absolute predestination. St. Gregory's response to the Biblical text is that God forbid, lest some "monstrous reasoning" on this subject enter the Church.

[65]See the often unread and mostly misunderstood work by St. John Cassian, *Conference XIII*. See also my books, *Augustine and Eastern Christianity* and *St. Augustine and St. John Cassian: The Controversy over Predestination, Nature & Grace.*

[66]The "original sin" led to suffering and death precisely because sin is a dissolution of human nature, a process of decay which can only lead in the direction of non-existence. Since man turns from the source of life, he ontologically directs himself towards death. The favorite Augustinian notion of "sinning in Adam" must be seen as a "sinning with" rather than literally "in" Adam.

[67]Hawthorne, *op. cit.*, XIV.

[68]The English translation of Garnett is inaccurate in two texts. Marmeladov's statement ". . . such is my fate and I am a beast by nature" is misleading. The Russian text is: "но . . . такова уже черта моя, а прирожденный скот." Also the English translation in reference to Raskolnikov's seeing Lizaveta in the Hay Market is misleading ("it always seemed to him afterwards the predestined turning-point of his fate." In the Russian text the word "предопределением" is restricted by "как бы" and "каким-то."

[69]Nicholas Berdyaev, *Dostoevsky* (New York: Meridian/World, 1957), p. 67.

[70]Dostoevsky, *op. cit.*, V, 4.

[71]Hawthorne, *op. cit.*, VIII.

[72]*Ibid.*, X.

[73]Among others see Beatrice in "Rappaccini's Daughter," and Hilda in *The Marble Faun.*

[74]See the study by W. W. Rowe, *Dostoevsky: Child and Man in His Works* (New York: New York University Press, 1968)

[75]Dostoevsky, *op. cit.*, I, V.

[76]It is not accidental that Dostoevsky describes Sonia as "child-like." She attracts children. Svidrigailov, on the contrary, finds that "the children all ran away in indescribable terror." (VI, 6).

[77]Some Protestant interpretations of Dostoevsky, which claim that he viewed human nature as depraved, totally unreasonable, and incapable of good, are quite mistaken. It is quite astonishing that a thinker such as Karl Barth could claim that without having read Dostoevsky he could not have written his *Commentary on Romans.*

[78]From the English translation of the Order for the Burial of a Child in the Eastern Orthodox Church.

DOSTOEVSKY'S VISION OF THE GOLDEN AGE AND HUMAN FREEDOM

by Richard S. Haugh

I

According to Philip Rahv in his article "The Other Dostoevsky,"[1] Dostoevsky "cannot be fully understood" unless his "minor vision," "*atheistic in essence,*" is taken into consideration. Mr. Rahv's fullest description of his interpretation of this "minor vision" is that it is

> an earthly paradise marked out for the distant future when men, having abandoned their faith in God and immortality, nonetheless secrete from the very finality of their disenchantment, and from their absolute conviction of their forlorn situation in the universe, a new and as yet unheard of innocence leading to genuine peace and happiness.

This minor vision, "cunningly dispersed in Dostoevsky's later work," allegedly reveals the "*essential vulnerability of his version of the Christian world view.*"

Does this "minor vision" in fact support the claim that Dostoevsky was a "reluctant atheist"? Does the vision of the Golden Age undermine Dostoevsky's "only half-believed-in formulas of deliverance from evil, Christian renewal, and ultimate salvation?" Mr. Rahv, usually a perceptive critic, has allowed his bias to cause him to mishandle the theme of the Golden Age in Dostoevsky.

II

In his younger days Dostoevsky seemed to believe that his secular vision of utopian socialism could usher in the Golden Age of an earthly paradise.[2] The position this article seeks to substantiate is that Dostoevsky always believed in a form of the vision of an earthly paradise, but that there are various visions of this Golden Age in the thought of Dostoevsky. First, there is the vision of an earthly paradise which can be established as the result of science and education, an earthly paradise usually associated with the symbol of the Crystal Palace. Secondly, there is the vision, expressed most fully in *A Raw Youth*, of an earthly paradise which is established as the direct result of atheism: no longer believing in God, mankind will be forced to unite in

love. Although there are variations of these two visions, they are united in that they are atheistic visions. There is, however, a third and triumphant vision of an earthly paradise in Dostoevsky and that vision is inspired by and based upon Christianity.

While never abandoning a vision of paradise for humanity, Dostoevsky found as a result of his experiential encounter with reality that his atheistic visions of a Golden Age were bankrupt, that all variations of an atheistic earthly paradise were in utter contradiction with one of the most basic elements of human ontology — freedom. If man is free, which becomes axiomatic for Dostoevsky, he is free to create evil *ex nihilo* through a perversion of the will. In all his works after his imprisonment, all versions of an atheistic paradise are thoroughly mocked by Dostoevsky and shown to be inane. The vision of a Golden Age transforms itself into a vision of a human paradise ushered in by the repentance of all through the transformation of mankind and the transfiguration of the entire cosmos, the result of the final triumph of Christ.

Although accounts of Dostoevsky's "conversion" are often overly simplified,[3] it is undeniable that Dostoevsky *began* to realize the impossibility of his secularistic, atheistic vision of a Golden Age during his imprisonment. It was in prison — while, along with other works, Dostoevsky was reading the Bible and the Fathers of the Church — that he confronted "the most monstrous facts," for he encountered a deeper and far more frightening dimension of man — the "hell" and "outer darkness" of the misuse of spiritual freedom. In addition to good, kind prisoners, Dostoevsky met a specific group of convicts who, had they lacked work, "would have devoured one another like *spiders* in a glass jar."[4] In *The House of the Dead* Dostoevsky vividly portrays this "type." For example, the "horrible creature" Gazin presented quite a problem for Dostoevsky's utopianism.

> This Gazin . . . made a terrible and painful impression on everyone. . . . I sometimes felt as though I were looking at a huge, gigantic *spider* of the size of a man. . . . It was said that he had been fond of murdering small children for pleasure: he would lure the child to some convenient spot, begin by terrifying and tormenting it, and after enjoying to the full the shuddering terror of the poor little victim, he would kill it with a knife slowly, with deliberation and enjoyment.[5]

How is one to reconcile a utopian Golden Age with a man who, in the use of his freedom, "murders little children for the pleasure of killing, of feeling their warm blood on his hands, of enjoying their terror, and their last dove-like flutter under the knife"?[6]

It is in *Notes from the Underground* that Dostoevsky devastates his earlier utopian view that a Golden Age could be established as a result

of science, education, and the wise management of a predictable mankind.

> What is important is that this good (i.e. freedom) is so remarkable just because it sets at naught all our classifications and shatters all the systems set up by the lovers of the human race for the happiness of the human race. In fact it plays havoc with everything. . . . you believed *this theory of the regeneration of the human*. . . . Then . . . new economic relations will be established . . . so that all sorts of problems will vanish in a twinkling. . . . It is then that the Crystal Palace will be built. Then — why, in fact, the Golden Age wil have dawned again. . .[7]

The "Crystal Palace" and the "Golden Age," symbols in Dostoevsky's work of the atheistic attempt to establish an earthly paradise, are, of course, mocked as fully as possible. And why? Because they cannot be reconciled with the fact of human freedom.

> One's own free and unfettered choice, one's own whims, however wild, one's own fancy, overwrought though it sometimes may be to the point of madness — that is that same most desirable good which we overlooked and which does not fit into any classification, and against which all theories and systems are continually wrecked. . .[8]

It is indeed interesting that in *Notes from the Underground* Dostoevsky's intended answer to the bankruptcy of his earlier utopian vision was Christ. In a letter to his brother about the censorship of the tenth book of the first part of *Notes from the Underground* Dostoevsky wrote:

> The misprints are terrible, and it would have been better not to print the next to last chapter at all (the most important one, where the essential thought is expressed), than to print it as it is, i.e., with sentences torn out and full of self-contradictions. . . . Those swines of censosrs — *where I mocked at everything and sometimes blasphemed for form's sake* — that's let pass, but where from all this I deduced the need of *faith and Christ* — that is suppressed.[9]

III

The vision of the Golden Age, specifically connected with Claude Lorraine's idyllic painting entitled *Acis and Galatea*, is expressed in *The Possessed* (1871), *A Raw Youth* (1875), and in the short story "The Dream of a Ridiculous Man" (1877).

THE POSSESSED

The bearer of the dream of the Golden Age in *The Possessed* is Nikolai Stavrogin, about whom Dostoevsky wrote the following in his *Notebooks for The Possessed*: "the author's main idea is: to present a man who realizes he has nothing to stand on."[10] It is necessary to quote Stavrogin's "very strange dream" in full.

> I was in a corner of the Greek archipelago — yes, and time had slipped back over three thousand years. I remember the gentle blue waves, the islands and the rocks, the luxuriant shore line, the magic panorama on the horizon, the beckoning, setting sun — it is impossible to put it into words. This was the cradle of European civilization — the thought filled my heart with love. It was *a paradise on earth*, where gods descended from heaven and fraternized with men. This was the corner of the earth where the first mythological stories were enacted. Ah, and the people who inhabited that land were so beautiful! They awoke innocent and went to sleep at night in innocence. Their woods and glades were filled with cheerful songs; the unspent energy of their youthful vigor went into love and simple joys, and I felt all that, visualizing, as it were, all their great three-thousand-year destiny of which they had no inkling. My heart danced with joy at these thoughts. Ah, I was so happy because my heart danced like that and because, at last, I loved! The sun flooded the islands and the sea, rejoicing at the sight of its beautiful children. Oh, a wonderful dream, a noble delusion! It was the most improbable ideal, but an ideal for which men have striven desperately throughout the ages and for which they have given their lives; an ideal for which they have sacrificed everything, for which they have longed and pined and in the name of which men wouldn't want to live and could not even die. And I seemed to live through all that in my dream. . . . When I woke up . . . for the very first time in my life (my eyes) were filled with tears. I remember those tears because I was happy and quite unashamed of them. A feeling of still unexperienced happiness rushed into my heart, making it ache.[11]

But this is not the end of the matter. Stavrogin has another vision, which destroys his vision of the Golden Age: "but then, suddenly, in the middle of the bright light I saw a *tiny dot*. Gradually the dot assumed a shape and then I clearly recognized the *tiny red spider* that I had seen of the geranium leaf. . . . And then it happened — I saw before me . . . Well, I saw Matresha with her drawn features and feverish eyes and, just as she had that time, she stood in my doorway, shaking her head reprovingly and threatening me with her little fist."[12] Stavrogin's vision of the Golden Age is utterly shattered by a tiny dot which grows

into the shape of a "*tiny red spider*," the very spider Stavrogin had watched while his victim Matresha was committing suicide. The spider, a common symbol for evil in Dostoevsky's works, reminds one that evil in general excludes the possibility of a Golden Age ushered in by man. But specifically, this "*tiny red spider*" reminds Stavrogin *of his own evil*, shattering decisively his "wonderful dream" which truly proves to be a "noble delusion." How is it possible, without destroying human freedom, to bring the contemptuous, unloving Stavrogin into a world of love? Stavrogin, who possesses an "ugly fright" of ridicule but enjoys ridiculing others, finds himself *ridiculed* by his own dream. Instead of entering the life of love portrayed in his dream, Stavrogin exits lovelessly from life by committing suicide.

But that is not the last word about an earthly paradise in *The Possessed*. It is commonly overlooked that the dream of an earthly paradise is expressed elsewhere in the novel, and this time Dostoevsky connects the Godless vision of an earthly paradise with Shigalev's frightening system. Commenting on Shigalev's "irrefutable" system, the lame teacher states:

> I know his book. He proposes as a final solution of the problem to divide humanity into two unequal parts. One-tenth is to be granted absolute freedom and unrestricted powers over the remaining nine-tenths. Those must give their individuality and be turned into something like a herd, and by their boundless obedience will by a series of regenerations attain *a state of primeval innocence, something like the original paradise.*[13]

And Shigalev himself, warning that if his solution is rejected no other will be found, exclaims: "What I'm offering you is not odious suggestions, but paradise, paradise on earth; for there can be no other one on earth."[14]

Although one must certainly distinguish between a writer's notebooks and his final literary work, it is nevertheless interesting that Dostoevsky in his *Notebooks for The Possessed* writes the following concerning Nechaev and his group, on whom he based his novel.

> What is most important about those people is their faith in the coming of a golden age. It requires an unshakeable faith to reach a decision to destroy everything. Actually the decision is to destroy everything only because this is the easiest and the least difficult solution.[15]

And in his description of the conspirator Uspensky, Dostoevsky writes that "[he] wants to advertise himself, as well as to satisfy his own self-esteem, and so he is expounding his dreams of a Golden Age become real . . . "[16]

It is clear that the dream of a Golden Age in *The Possessed* is treated as illusory.

A RAW YOUTH

It is in *A Raw Youth* that the atheistic version of the dream of a Golden Age reaches its fullest atheistic expression. In general it is the same dream which Stavrogin had, but specifically it is atheism itself which draws man together in Versilov's statement of the dream.

> I picture to myself, my boy . . . that war is at an end and strife has ceased. After curses, pelting with mud, and hisses, has come a lull, and men are left alone, according to their desire; the great idea of old has left them; the great source of strength that till then had nourished and fostered them was vanishing like the majestic sun setting in Claude Lorraine's picture, but it was somehow the last day of humanity, and men suddenly understood that they were left quite alone, and at once felt terribly forlorn. I have never, my dear boy, been able to picture men ungrateful and grown stupid. Men left forlorn would begin to draw together more closely and more lovingly; they would clutch one another's hands, realizing that they were all that was left for one another! The great idea of immortality would have vanished, and they would have to fill its place; and all the wealth of love lavished of old upon Him, who was immortal, would be turned upon the whole of nature, on the world, on men, on every blade of grass. They would inevitably grow to love the earth and life as they gradually became aware of their own transitory and finite nature; and with a special love, *not as of old*, they would begin to observe and would discover in nature phenomena and secrets which they had not suspected before, for they would look on nature with new eyes, as a lover looking on his beloved. On awakening they would hasten to kiss one another, eager to love, knowing that the days are short, and that is all that is left them. They would work for one another, and each would give up all that he had to all, and by that only would be happy. Every child would know and feel that every one on earth was for him like a father or mother. 'Tomorrow may be my last day', each one would think, looking at the setting sun; 'but no matter, I shall die, but all they will remain and after them their children', and that thought that they will remain, always as loving and as anxious over each other, would replace the thought of meeting beyond the tomb. Oh, they would be in haste to love, to stifle the great sorrow in their hearts. They would be proud and brave for themselves, but would grow timid for one another; every one would tremble for the life and happiness of each; they would grow tender to one another, and would not be ashamed of it as now, and would be caressing as children. Meeting, they would look at one another with deep

> and thoughtful eyes, and in their eyes would be love and sorrow.[17]

Such is the vision which Mr. Rahv would have us believe is Dostoevsky's, stating that Dostoevsky "constructs a veritable idyll of atheism; and this idyll, however visionary, calls into question and in a sense negates the final vision of chaos induced by unbelief which is evoked in his creation of such children of darkness as a Raskolnikov and Stavrogin." Admittedly, the vision expressed by Versilov is the most *affirmative* expression of atheism in the works of Dostoevsky. But that in no way necessitates, or even implies, that Dostoevsky accepted the vision. Dostoevsky was always clever enough to give an opposing view its dialectical completeness, as in "The Grand Inquisitor." In fact, even while giving this vision its "explicitness," Dostoevsky is simultaneously mocking it from within.

Although it is quite easy to prove that the general vision is being derided, it will suffice to call attention to two thoughts within the dream. First, Versilov's statement that he has never "been able to picture men ungrateful and grown stupid" is a view mocked at all times by Dostoevsky. For example, in *Notes from the Underground*, a turning point in the thought of Dostoevsky and a work undeniably containing his own view of freedom, the narrator exclaims:

> For man is stupid, phenomenally stupid; I mean, he may not be really stupid, but on the other hand he is so ungrateful that you won't find anything like him in the whole wide world. . . . He is monstrously ungrateful. Phenomenally ungrateful. I'm even inclined to believe that the best definition of man is — a creature who walks on two legs and is ungrateful.[18]

The idea that man will be able to face death calmly because "future generations" will replace him is a thought also continually derided by Dostoevsky. In fact, in the very same novel Arkadii Dolgoruky echoes Dostoevsky's view:

> Part of my idea is that I should be left alone . . . and to do nothing — not even to work for that grand future of humanity. . . . Personal freedom, that is, my own, is the first thing . . . if I want to serve humanity I shall, and perhaps ten times as much as those who preach about it; only I want no one to dare to demand it of me. . . . And why should I be bound to love my neighbour, or your future humanity which I shall never see, which will never know anything about me, and which will in its turn disappear and leave no trace . . . when the earth in its turn will be changed into an iceberg, and will fly off into the void with an infinite multitude of other similar icebergs; *it's the most senseless thing one could possibly imagine.* That's your

> teaching. Tell me why I am bound to be so noble, especially if it all lasts only for a moment. . . . What the devil do I care for them or for the future when I shall only live once on earth![19]

In addition to the textual evidence of derision and Versilov's own recognition of the dream as a "fantasy and a most improbable one," there is the all-important fact that Versilov considers his dream incomplete. Versilov, the self-pronounced *deist*, states that "it's noteworthy ("замечательный"; "remarkable") that I always complete my picture with Heine's vision of 'Christ on the Baltic Sea'."

> I could not get on without Him, I could not help imagining Him, in fact, in the midst of His bereaved people. He comes to them, holds out His hands, and asks, 'How could they forget Him?' And then, as it were, the scales would fall from their eyes and there would break forth the great rapturous hymn of the *new and the last resurrection.*[20]

What *is* textually clear is (1) that Versilov himself considers the dream a fantasy; (2) that Versilov completes his vision with a vision of Christ; and (3) that his vision of Christ (which would exclude the Divine Person and the Nature of Christ, if one takes Versilov's "deism" seriously) identifies itself with love, and with a love which transcends that of atheistic humanism, for it is a love which possesses the *power* to transform blindness into sight and the *power* to resurrect humanity.

Mr. Rahv sharply castigates Dostoevsky's "devout league of commentators" for its "biased procedure" in which allegedly "all literary-critical distinctions are invariably lost," claiming that this "devout league" does not bother "to provide the slightest bit of textual evidence" and is guilty of "a gross misrepresentation of the text." But it is Mr. Rahv who rejects, obviously because it is ideologically unacceptable to him, the very textual evidence of *A Raw Youth*. For him, Versilov's atheistic vision "in its explicitness . . . cuts to the heart of the matter." For him Versilov's own recognition of the vision as "a fantasy . . . a most improbable one" and Versilov's vision of Christ are merely "*artificially tacked on*," an observation "obvious to the critical reader." The "critical reader" is presumably one who shares Mr. Rahv's ideology. Instead of working with the *textual evidence*, Mr. Rahv dismisses this "artificially tacked on" section:

> The Christ so suddenly and preposterously sprung upon us at the end of Versilov's speech strikes us as a strictly supposititious, or at best vestigial, figure — the phantom of *a reluctant atheist.*

Why is one so astonished to find Christ the completion of Versilov's dream? Any serious student of Dostoevsky must be prepared to find Christ everywhere. Even during his youth as a convert to the atheism of

Belinsky, the *human* figure of Christ remained dear to Dostoevsky. Belinsky once stated: "Every time I mention Christ his face changes its expression, as if he were ready to start weeping."[21] So impressed was he with the figure of Christ that in a letter to Madame Fonvizina in 1854 Dostoevsky wrote, after confessing that he was an agnostic, that "if someone were to prove to me that Christ is outside, then I would prefer to remain with Christ than with truth."Writing to his niece on 1 January 1866, Dostoevsky claimed that "there is only one positively good figure on earth, and that is Christ." The point is that Dostoevsky, even while an agnostic, believed in the figure of the *human* Christ as the ideal of beauty and goodness.

Although his earlier view of Christ was far from that of classical Christology, Dostoevsky's view of Christ became more and more conformable to Orthodox Christology. Dostoevsky's later view of the Divinity of Christ may be clearly seen in *The Notebooks for The Possessed.* Responding to the question of why one cannot revere "God as an ideal of perfection and moral beauty, while refusing to believe in Christ," Shaposhnikov, speaking for Dostoevsky,[22] replies:

> All the while disbelieving that the word was at the same time *made flesh*, i. e., that the ideal was there *in the flesh*, and so, not unattainable, but attainable to all mankind. . . Isn't this precisely why Christ came down to Earth, to tell mankind that the nature of the human spirit as they knew it might appear in such heavenly brilliance, and indeed in the *flesh*, and not only in a mere daydream or ideal. . . . The followers of Christ, who deified this epiphany of the flesh, bore witness, under the most cruel tortures, that to carry within oneself this flesh, to emulate the perfection of this image, and to believe in it *in the flesh* means great happiness indeed. . . . *The whole point is that the Word had truly "been made flesh." Therein lies the whole faith and the whole consolation of mankind.*[23]

Later in the same *Notebooks* Dostoevsky writes "that it all boils down to one urgent question: can one believe while being civilized, i. e., a European? That is, believe without a reservation in the divine nature of Jesus Christ, the Son of God? For this is what faith amounts to."

> Many people think tht it is enough to believe in Christ's moral teaching, in order to be a Christian. It isn't Christ's morality, or his teaching, that will save the world, but faith, and nothing else, faith in the fact that the *Word was made flesh . . . God incarnate.*[24]

And it is noteworthy that Dostoevsky's answer to the problem of inner duality, precisely that duality from which Versilov himself suffered, is

Christ. In a letter written in 1880 to a woman suffering from inner duality, Dostoevsky wrote:

> But now to what you have told me of your inward duality. . . . I cannot but *regard you as a twin soul, for your inward duality corresponds most exactly to my own.* Do you believe in Christ and in his Commandments? If you believe in Him (or at least have a strong desire to do so), then give yourself wholly up to Him; the pain of your duality will be thereby alleviated, and you will find the true way out.[25]

Is Dostoevsky "suddenly and preposterously" springing Christ on the poor, questioning woman? Christ, particularly the image of Christ in the Orthodox Christian tradition, became the center of Dostoevsky's thought.

There is a most interesting statement in *The Diary of a Writer* about the idea of "a happy future awaiting" mankind in relationship with Christ. Commenting on George Sand, Dostoevsky writes:

> George Sand was not a thinker but she was one of the most clairvoyant foreseers . . . of a happy future awaiting mankind. . . . George Sand died a *déiste* . . . being a Frenchwoman, in accord with the conceptions of her compatriots, George Sand could not consciously adhere to the idea "that in the whole universe there is no name other than His through which one may be saved" — the fundamental idea of Orthodoxy — yet, despite this seeming and formal contradiction, George Sand, I repeat, was perhaps, without knowing it herself, one the staunchest confessors of Christ.[26]

If Dostoevsky believed George Sand the *déiste* was unwittingly still a supporter of Christ, why should one be surprised if Dostoevsky makes Versilov, a self-proclaimed deist, complete his vision of an earthly paradise with a vision of Christ, the very idea that Dostoevsky felt was consciously lacking in George Sand?

The *conclusive evidence* that Dostoevsky was mocking Versilov's vision of the Golden Age comes from Dostoevsky's own statement. Discussing at length in *The Diary of a Writer* the phenomenon of "the Atheist Church," Dostoevsky derisively describes this "Atheist Church" as follows: "Having rejected God, they begin to worship 'Humanity'. Now they believe in Humanity; they deify and adore it."[27] And precisely in this connection Dostoevsky discusses the dream of Versilov itself.

> I take the liberty of quoting here a passage from my recent novel *A Raw Youth.* . . . I am also speaking of atheism; but this is a dream of a Russian of our times — the Forties — a former landowner, a progressive, a passionate and noble dreamer. . . . This landowner also has no faith and he, too,

> adores humanity "as it befits a Russian progressive individual." He reveals his dream about future mankind when there will vanish from it every conception of God. . .[28]

Dostoevsky then quotes from the dream of Versilov, after which he concludes: "Isn't there here, in this fantasy, something akin to that actually existent 'Atheists' Church'?"

THE DREAM OF A RIDICULOUS MAN

Dostoevsky devoted an entire story to the problem of "The Golden Age." In "The Dream of a Ridiculous Man," the "ridiculous man" finds himself transported to "one of the islands which on our earth form the Greek archipelago."[29] The image of paradise is vividly conveyed. The "gentle emerald sea" laps the shore, kissing it with an "almost conscious love." In an atmosphere of natural holiness, trees stand in the "glory of their green luxuriant foliage" amidst "lush" grass and "fragrant" flowers. A "child-like gladness" prevails. Birds alight on the shoulders of beautiful, happy people whose eyes shine "with a bright lustre" and whose joyous faces radiate an "understanding and a serenity of mind that had reached its greatest fulfillment." These loving people had a direct, spontaneous knowledge of all things. They had an "intense love" for nature, and the animals "lived peaceably with them . . . conquered by their love for them."

Mr. Rahv writes: "Clearly, *the Christian world view* is not only unknown but also wholly superfluous to these dwellers in the earthly paradise who, as is expressly stated, have 'no places of worship' or any 'specific religion'." Curious indeed is this statement. In what possible way could a "Christian world view" be relevant when one is describing *artistically* — not theologically — an image of a prelapsarian world? Why does one need a "place" of worship when one is in cosmic harmony with nature, man, and the Divine. Mr. Rahv also thinks this vision is "pantheistic." There is, however, nothing pantheistic in Dostoevsky's artistic description. He is attempting to capture the *cosmic unity* which preceded cosmic disruption, a *cosmic unity* which is *panentheistic*, not pantheistic.

Indeed, there are only two aspects of this vision which one could object to on Christian theological grounds, both of which eluded Mr. Rahv. Of course, it is not quite fair to apply a theological criterion to an artistic vision. First, however, death exists in the vision of paradise in "A Dream of a Ridiculous Man," an idea unacceptable to traditional Christianity but expressed in Eastern patristic thought by Theodore of Mopsuestia.[30] Secondly, the astonishing statement that "the *only source* of almost every sin of our human race"[31] is sensuality is false, according to Christian theology, and it even contradicts Dostoevsky's

deepest idea of the origin of evil. Other than these two problems, there is nothing contrary to a "Christian world view" in this story.

In interpreting this story three essential facts must be kept in mind. First, there is the recognition that "it was an earth unstained by the Fall, inhabited by people who had not sinned." Secondly, and most importantly, the "modern Russian progressive" corrupts them all. This is fundamental, because it brings Dostoevsky to the problem of the origin of evil. And, thirdly, the result of the corruption *is* human history.

The "ridiculous man" awakens from his dream convinced, after having beheld "the living image" of truth, that "people can be happy and beautiful without losing their ability to live on earth. I will not and I cannot believe that evil is the *normal* condition among men." Admitting that there will be no heaven on earth, the "ridiculous man" laments:

> And really how simple it all is: one day, *in one hour*, everything could be arranged at once! The main thing is to love your neighbour as yourself — that is the main thing, and that is everything, for nothing else matters. . . . And yet it is an old truth, a truth that has been told over and over again, but in spite of that it finds no place among men! . . . If only we all wanted it, everything could be arranged immediately.

This story, with the two, above-mentioned exceptions, is profoundly Christian. Mr. Rahv, however, takes exception. Ostensibly forgetting his warnings about those who "distort" the text, about those with a "biased procedure" which undermines "all literary-critical distinctions," Mr. Rahv arbitrarily claims that "the ending cannot be taken seriously." And why? Because "it lacks credibility." This ending "can satisfy only the devout among his critics and expositors, who cannot accept the far-reaching exposure of values that precedes it." And what, one may ask, is this "far-reaching exposure of values?" As Mr. Rahv phrases it, "so much for Christian values!" On the contrary, however, there is nothing in this dream, with the exception of the two above-mentioned points, which contradicts Eastern Christian thought. The child-like atmosphere of pre-lapsarian mankind is quite similar to that of the early Eastern Fathers,[32] the philosophical implication of the origin of evil is strikingly consonant with Eastern Christianity,[33] and the description of the history of mankind is in no way incompatible with Christian thought.

After having dealt quite contemptuously with the alleged "ludicrous solemnity" of the views of Konstantin Mochulsky who, according to Mr. Rahv, does "handsprings" to *misrepresent the text*, Mr. Rahv arbitrarily states: "*Let us then disregard the factitious ending.*" Mr. Rahv's literary method, it is true, does not misrepresent the text; it rather *excludes the text*. "Indeed," he continues, "the story's implicit

logic prepares us for a different ending altogether." Mr. Rahv believes that the "ridiculous man," upon awakening with the realization that he corrupted everyone, should "finally carry out his initial resolve to kill himself."

When a critic is prepared to re-write an artist's work, the matter is reasonably serious. In response, it should never be forgotten that *the ending* is Dostoevsky's ending: Dostoevsky, not Mr. Rahv, wrote the story. One must either work with the text or advocate a theory of *revisionist* literary criticism. Secondly, why is it "implicit logic" that he commit suicide? The *whole* point of the story is that the "ridiculous man" had a vision of the holy, a vision of what man was made for, a vision in which he discovers how man has perverted his "natural" happiness — *through the irrational attraction of evil by means of the irrational, but self-determining misuse of spiritual freedom.* Indeed, the entire *inner structure* of this story is bound up with the redemption of the "ridiculous man" through his confrontation with innocence and holiness. He was intent on committing suicide, but it was the desperation of the innocent child which prevented him from pulling the trigger of his gun. Having been spared suicide because of his spontaneous feelings of compassion for the poor child whom he stamped away, he dreams of the holiness of *natural, normal human existence.* The implicit logic of the story is precisely that, having beheld this vision, he now strives to overcome the dualism within him in order to attempt to again ascend to the natural order of human existence. The two keys of the structure of the story are *the girl* and *the dream.* There is an inner chain reaction: the innocent child evokes in the ridiculous man spontaneous feelings of compassion; these positive inner feelings stop the suicide and induce the dream; the dream evokes the vision of holiness and love, which in turn inspires the man to live for this "ideal"; and the result is: "I did find *that* girl. . . . And I shall go on! I shall go on!"

Mr. Rahv, once again basing an interpretation on his understanding of Christianity, states: "Of course, according to Christian theology the idea proclaimed by the narrator upon awakening from his dream that people can be happy and beautiful without losing their ability to live on earth is wholly unacceptable. . . . Theology teaches us that it is futile for man to seek to realize the divine in the earthly." To the contrary, however, the central message of Christianity is the *realization* of the Divine in the earthly; that is, "God became man that we might become divine." And indeed, Eastern Christian theology recognizes the possibility in the here and now of *theosis* and of the vision of God. The "ridiculous man" has simply realized that the possibility of sanctity, for which he will strive and about which he will preach, does exist.

And indeed, it is noteworthy that Mr. Rahv omits the confession of the "ridiculous man" that he knows heaven will not be established on earth, but that it could be, if everyone wanted it, a teaching which is completed in *The Brothers Karamazov.*

THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV

It is often overlooked that the dream of a Golden Age is also expressed in *The Brothers Karamazov.*

> As soon as men have all of them denied God — and I believe that period, analogous with geological periods, will come to pass — the old conception of the universe will fall of itself without cannibalism and what's more the old morality, and everything will begin anew. Men will unite to take from life all it can give, but only for joy and happiness in the present world. Man will be lifted up with a spirit of divine Titanic pride and the man-god will appear. From hour to hour extending his conquest of nature infinitely by his will and his science, man will feel such a lofty joy from hour to hour in doing it that it will make up for all his old dreams of the joys of heaven. Every one will know that he is mortal and will accept death proudly and serenely like a god. His pride will teach him that it's useless for him to repine at life's being a moment, and he will love his brother without need of reward. Love will be sufficient only for a moment of life, but the very consciousness of its momentariness will intensify its fire, which now is dissipated in dreams of eternal love beyond the grave.[34]

Who is the bearer of this vision in *The Brothers Karamazov*? None other than the devil, who in the entire scene is mocking Ivan and his views! The devil continues: ". . . and so on and so on in the same style. Charming! . . . The question now is . . . is it possible that such a period will ever come? If it does, everything is determined and humanity is settled for ever." It is undeniable that this vision is the same as that expressed by Versilov in *A Raw Youth*; that is, that atheism will unite mankind and thereby usher in the earthly paradise. It is also undeniable that here such an idea is thoroughly mocked.

IV

Much evidence, from both the artistic works of Dostoevsky and from his notebooks and letters, could be brought forth to substantiate more fully the contention of this article. In conclusion, however, certain assertions must be stressed.

First, Dostoevsky abandoned his earlier utopian view that the "Golden Age" could be ushered in by "*humanism*" alone. The central reality for Dostoevsky, which rendered the "Golden Age" as expressed in its humanistic and atheistic form an utter existential impossibility, was his confrontation with *the depth of human freedom.* If man is free, then

deceit, torture, war, rape, betrayal, murder, jealousy, egoism, and the lust for power render the humanistic and atheistic vision of the "Golden Age" a "noble delusion," a most unrealistic "dream." The ineluctable fact of the reality of "one's own free and unfettered choice, one's own whims, however wild" . . . shatters all the systems set up by the lovers of the human race . . . it plays havoc with everything."

Secondly, wherever the humanistic and atheistic dream of the "Golden Age" is expressed in Dostoevsky's later artistic works, it is presented with derision and portrayed as a "delusion," however "noble" it may be.

Thirdly, although Dostoevsky abandoned his naive earlier view of a "Golden Age" or an "earthly paradise" established as the result of education, science, humanism, or atheism, he never abandoned his belief in an "earthly" paradise for mankind. But the view of an "earthly" paradise which triumphed was one which was transformed and Christianized. Even the utopianism in Dostoevsky's "Pushkin Address" is Christianized. Science, education, the wise management of a predictable mankind, atheism — these could never *unify* mankind in love, truth, beauty, and goodness.

> Look at the worldly. . . . Has not God's image and His Truth been distorted in them? They have science; but in science there is nothing but what is the object of sense. The spiritual world, the higher part of man's being is rejected altogether, dismissed with a sort of triumph, even with hatred. . . . The world has proclaimed the reign of freedom . . . but what do we see in this freedom? Nothing but slavery and self-destruction! . . . And what follows from this right of multiplication of desires? In the rich, isolation and spiritual suicide; in the poor, envy and murder. . . . They maintain that the world is getting more and more united, more and more bound together in brotherly community. . . . *Alas, put no faith in such a bond of union.*[35]

Although Dostoevsky will always hope that some type of an "earthly paradise" can be established, even this lingering utopianism is impregnated with Christianity and repentance. However, his triumphant view of an "earthly paradise" is precisely that of the resurrected, transfigured world, an "earthly paradise" ushered in by the God-Man, Christ, in whom alone can mankind become truly human and in whom alone can mankind be totally transformed, transfigured and resurrected.

> Heaven . . . lies hidden in all of us. . . . Believe me, this dream, as you call it, will come to pass without doubt. It will come, but not now. . . . It's a spiritual, psychological process. To transform the world, to recreate it afresh, men must turn into another path. And then the sign of the Son of Man will be seen in the heavens.[36]

For Dostoevsky, the unity of mankind, the "earthly paradise," the "Golden Age," can only be achieved through the transfiguration of the cosmos by the God-Man, Christ, and through the desire of man to enter this "kingdom of God" re-created *for mankind*. Only those who want to participate in the splendor of the transformed earth will participate on the basis of repentance and love. Even when Dostoevsky's lingering utopianism surfaces, as it does in his "Pushkin Address," he is calling for mankind to repent and to love in and through Christ — it is no longer the same old "utopianism" of his youth, but rather the ever-present hope that mankind will change, not through humanism, not through atheism, not through wise economic management, not through science, not through secular knowledge, but through and in Christ and in repentance and love.

Unless one understands the Christian belief in the ultimate transfigured glory of the cosmos in *panentheistic* unity, Dostoevsky's triumphant vision of this "earthly paradise" will remain incomprehensible.[37]

[1]The article, which was to appear as part of his book *Dostoevsky: The Major Novels*, appeared in the April 22, 1972 issue (vol. XVIII, no. 7) of *The New York Review of Books*, pp. 30-38. (Italics added, unless otherwise indicated)

[2]In his youth Dostoevsky was a convert to the atheism of Belinsky. He was also a member not only of the armchair Petrashevsky circle but also of the radical Durov group. He once wrote, "Fourierism is a peaceful system: it charms the soul with its refinement, seduces the heart by that love for mankind which animated Fourier when he composed his system, and astonishes the mind with its proportioned harmony. It draws adherence not through bilious assaults, but by animating with a love for mankind. In this system there is no hate." Quoted from Konstantin Mochulsky, *Dostoevsky: His Life and Works*, trans. by Michael A. Minihan (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1967), p. 115.

[3]Dostoevsky's "conversion" was much more gradual than is usually thought. For example, Simmons writes: "In prison he rediscovered Christ, and his passionate reading of the New Testament enabled him spiritually to rationalize his misfortunes. . . . As he looked round him at these human derelicts of society, he seemed to realize that Christ was their only hope. Only He could raise up the sinner, comfort the fallen, and promise the humble of heart a new life on earth." Quoted from Ernest J. Simmons, *Dostoevsky: The Making of a Novelist* (New York: Random House, Vintage, 1940), p. 59.

[4]It is noteworthy tht the image of the *spider*, always symbolic of evil in Dostoevsky, is connected with Stavrogin's dream of the Golden Age.

[5]*The House of the Dead* I, 3, trans. by Constance Garnett (New York: Dell, 1959), p. 76 f.

[6]*Ibid.*, p. 80.

[7]*Notes from the Underground* I, 7, trans. by David Magarshack (New York: Random House), p. 128.

[8]*Ibid.*, p. 131.

[9]Quoted from Mochulsky, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

[10]*Notebooks for The Possessed*, ed. by Edward Wasiolek and trans. by Victor Terras (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. 181.

[11]*The Possessed*, trans. by Andrew R. MacAndrew (New York: Signet, 1962), p. 428 ff.

[12]*Ibid.*

[13]*The Devils* II, 7, trans. by David Magarshack (London: Penguin Books, 1933), p. 405.

[14]*Ibid.*, p. 406.

[15]*Notebooks for The Possessed*, p. 172.

[16]*Ibid.*, p. 359.

[17]*A Raw Youth* III, 7, 3, trans. by Constance Garnett (New York: Dell, 1961), p. 510 f.

[18]*Notes from the Underground*, p. 131 and p. 134.

[19]*A Raw Youth* I, 3, 5; p. 78 f.

[20]*Ibid.*, III, 7, 3; p. 511.

[21]Quoted in Dostoevsky's *The Diary of a Writer*, trans. by B. Barisol (New York: George Braziller, 1954), p. 7. Also quoted in *Notebooks for The Possessed*, p. 93.

[22]This is also the opinion of the editor of *The Notebooks*, Edward Wasiolek; see p. 136.

[23]*Notebooks for The Possessed*, p. 147 f.

[24]*Ibid.*, p. 252 f.

[25]*Letters of F. M. Dostoevsky to his Family and Friends*, trans. by E. C. Mayne (London, 1914), p. 249.

[26]*The Diary of a Writer*, p. 349.

[27]*The Diary of a Writer*, p. 266.

[28]*Ibid.*

[29]All quotations from this story are from *The Best Short Stories of Dostoevsky*, trans. by David Magarshack (New York: Modern Library of Random House), p. 310.

[30]Except for one text in the extant works of Theodore of Mopsuestia, all other texts either state or imply that he believed man was created mortal. In fact, this view follows logically from Theodore's doctrine of the *two-katastases*.

[31]The Russian text is: "У них была любовь и рождались дети, но я не замечал в них порывов того *жестокого сладострастия*, которое постигает почти всех на нашей земле, всех и всякого, и служит *единственным источником почти всех грехов* нашего человечества."

[32]For example, see Theophilus of Antioch, *Ad Autolycum* 2, 25 and Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* 3, 16, 100; 6, 12.

[33]That is that mankind *irrationally and inexplicably* liked evil. Without any existential experience of or feel for evil, it allured and attracted man as a potentiality. Although evil irrationally attracted man, there was in the attraction a *real* element of self-determination.

[34]*The Brothers Karamazov*, IV, 11, 9, trans. by Constance Garnett (New York: Random House, 1950), p. 788 f.

[35]*The Brothers Karamazov*, II, VI, 2.

[36]*Ibid.*, II, VI, 2.

[37]The views in this article are consonant with those of Fr. Florovsky on Dostoevsky's vision. There are times when Fr. Florovsky mentions or emphasizes Dostoevsky's lingering utopian hopes but Fr. Florovsky also places this lingering utopianism in the broader context of Dostoevsky's thought. In his article in this volume entitled "The Quest for Religion in 19th Century Russian Literature," Fr. Florovsky writes: "only in the Church of Christ can human freedom be reconciled with the living brotherhood that brings persons together in Christ. Actually, his [Dostoevsky's] thinking evolved from two different questions, related but not

identical. On the one hand, he believed that the Church as a divine establishment is, as it were, the realm of redemption in which man's existential predicament is being solved: the wholeness of life is restored and the freedom of man is rehabilitated there. On the other hand, he continued to believe in the possibility of an ultimate historical solution for all human contradictions. There was an obvious utopian alloy in his belief in the coming general reconciliation, as is pathetically professed in his great *Pushkin Address*. Still, Dostoevsky's Christianity was in no sense "rosy," as Constantine Leontiev quite unjustly insinuated in a way that betrayed only the limitations of his own view. . . . The world of human values was being destroyed by demonic counterfeits. The new Tower of Babel was in the process of construction. Apollo would once more stand against Christ. *And if Dostoevsky still believed in the power of love, it was the love of Christ that he was preaching, the Crucified Love.*" My italics.

THE CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN TOLSTOY AND THE AMERICAN SHAKERS
INTRODUCTION AND TEXTS

by Richard S. Haugh

Although there is a paucity of literature at present on the subject of Tolstoy's interest in and correspondence with the American Shakers, the situation will, it appears, be rectified. According to the 1977 Shaker Literature: A Bibliography (No. 2116),[1] Nicholas Fersen is presently working on a monograph specifically on this topic.[2] The sole purpose of this brief introduction is to present the religious and social development of Tolstoy's later thought. This thought ineluctably led him to an interest in various sectarian movements, including the Shakers. The *possible* influence of the Shakers on *The Kreutzer Sonata* and the point of agreement between Tolstoy and the Shakers are mentioned.

I

After Tolstoy's critical year of 1879, a year in which he claims he even contemplated suicide, Tolstoy's *Weltanschauung* became increasingly individualistic and, to many, radical. While his social views and humanitarian empathy for the masses broadened, his religious views became overly restricted to moralism and to a reductionist, truncated Christianity which, as Tolstoy himself fully realized, rejected most traditional Christian beliefs and forms of worship.[3] Tolstoy's religious convictions and the energy and aggression with which they were advocated evoked, finally, a response from the Russian Orthodox Church. On 22 February 1901 the Russian Holy Synod issued a Decree of Excommunication, which, in part, reads:

> Count Leo Tolstoy preaches the abolition of all the dogmas of the Orthodox Church and of the very essence of the Christian faith with fanatical frenzy; he denies the living and personal God glorified in the Holy Trinity . . . he refutes Our Lord Jesus Christ, God become Man . . . he does not believe in the life hereafter or in the judgment after death; he refutes all the Mysteries of the Church and their beneficial effect . . . he has not feared to mock the greatest of all mysteries: the Holy Eucharist. . . . Therefore the Church no longer recognizes him among her children and cannot do so until he has repented and restored himself to communion with her.[4]

In fairness it must be pointed out that the Decree of Excommunication accurately described Tolstoy's positions and that Tolstoy was not disturbed by the excommunication.

The very views of Tolstoy which led to his excommunication also found a home in the hearts of many, both in Russia and abroad. These later convictions — a rejection of private property, a populism based on the peasantry or "the people," and a socio-religious anarchism — these views were disseminated in America where several religious groups quickly became interested in Tolstoy's ideas and, more importantly, in claiming Tolstoy as "their own." For example, the American Swendenborgians sent Tolstoy their *New Christianity* and the Mormons sent him a "Mormon Bible" and a biography of Joseph Smith. Tolstoy found the former to be spiritually devout but interpreted Mormonism as deceitful. At the same time Tolstoy became increasingly interested in "things American," especially the religious movements of 19th-century America. For example, Tolstoy was profoundly impressed by Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backwards* (1888), a novel which takes place in Boston in 2000 when the USA is under socialism. According to Belamy's novel, one works only until age forty-five, there is no poverty, and everyone is motivated by honor. Tolstoy was also deeply impressed by Adin Ballou's *Christian Non Resistance Catechism.* His letter of 30 June 1890 to Ballou reads in part:

> The non-resistant catechism I have translated and will circulate it among our friends. . . . I quite agree with you that Christianity will never enter its promised land till the divine truth of the non-resistance principle shall be recognized, but not the nominal church will recognize it. I am fully convinced that the churches are and have always been the worst enemies of Christ's work. They have always led humanity not in the way of Christ, but out of it . . .[5]

II

It was during this stage of his life; that is, during the time of his later socio-religious views and during his interest in American socio-religious movements that Tolstoy became preoccupied with the question of chastity and the problem of marriage. He received and read the writings on and by the Shakers while he was writing *The Kreutzer Sonata* [*Kreitserova Sonata*]. The same Tolstoy who once positively portrayed domestic life in *War and Peace* and who later described the deteriorization of a marriage in *Anna Karenina* now totally disavows any value in marriage. Indeed, through Pozdnyshev in *The Kreutzer Sonata* marriage is condemned as perverse.

Accounts vary concerning the origin of Tolstoy's *The Kreutzer Sonata.* What is known is that he received some inspiration[6] for this *novella* by listening to Beethoven's *Opus 47* — the *Kreutzer Sonata*[7] and that he received Shaker literature while in the process of writing the *novella.* Perhaps the most accurate account comes from Tolstoy's daughter in her book *Tolstoy — A Life of My Father.*

> It must have been on this spring evening when the young man played the Beethoven sonata . . . with especial verve. The first part, which Tolstoy particularly liked, strongly affected everyone present. They spoke of how fine it would be if Tolstoy wrote a story on the theme of the Kreutzer Sonata, and Repin illustrated it and Andreyev-Burlak acted it. This idea was not realized; Andreyev died shortly afterward. But in Tolstoy the idea continued to mature. It is difficult to say exactly when the theme of *The Kreutzer Sonata* first entered his head — that evening, under the influence of music or very much earlier, when in the 1870's he sketched out and then abandoned a story called *The Murderer of His Wife*. . . . But Sophia Andreyevna wrote in her diary in December, 1890, that the idea of making a real *story* was given to him (Tolstoy) by Andreyev-Burlak, an actor and wonderful storyteller. Then Sophia Andreyevna added: 'It was he who told about how once in a railroad train a man confided in him the misfortune of his wife's unfaithfulness and this was the subject used by Lyovochka.'[8]

III

It is noteworthy that Tolstoy's diary entry on 9 April 1889 reads: "I read the writings of the Shakers. . . . Perfect, Total chastity. Odd to receive them just when I am concerned with the question." Who, then, were the Shakers and what was the point of agreement between them and Tolstoy?

The Shakers (formerly known as the United Society of Believers in Christ's Second Appearance; the Alethians; and the Millennial Church), the largest *communal* religious society in American history,[9] actually originated in France during the time of Louis XIV (1638-1715). A group of French "prophets" claimed that the Holy Spirit had prophesied the imminent second coming of Christ and had warned that they must return to primitive Christianity. The movement, persecuted in France, spread to England where it gained converts, especially from the ranks of the Quakers. In 1758 Ann Lees Standerin (1736-1784), better known as Ann Lee Stanley or Mother Ann, joined the movement.[10] Ann Lee began to assume a position of leadership within the ranks of the sect. At their meetings the sect shaked in dance, whirled, shouted, prophesied, and sang in tongues. In 1770 Ann Lee and others were arrested for profaning the Sabbath [Sunday]. It was in prison that she claimed to have received a revelation which clearly revealed the essence of the "mystery of iniquity" — sexual participation. In 1774, after being released from prison, she came to America with seven disciples. She and her followers believed that she was the "female principle in Christ," the female counterpart of Jesus, the bride of Jesus, and worthy of honor and respect. In general, the underlying doctrine of the American Shakers was sexual dualism. If, they held, God created mankind in his image, then it clearly follows that, if there is male and

female, then God must be both masculine and feminine. The revelation in Jesus was masculine and hence incomplete. The culmination of revelation was reached in Mother Ann as female, as the mother of all spiritual things. Restoration of all things had to be sought by a simultaneous, unmixed spiritual ascent by both sexes. The key to salvation and restoration lay in sexual chastity.[11] It was the Shaker doctrine of chastity which interested Tolstoy. His letter, dated 25 August 1890, to Charles Anderson is illustrative.

> Dear Sir,
>
> I have tried to answer your question in the epilogue to the *Kreutzer Sonata*. You ask if I mean that sexual intercourse should not be indulged at all. I answer: yes. Every man and woman ought to know and believe that it would be better for him or for her to be completely chaste (in marriage or out of it) and to have no sexual intercourse at all. . .[12]

IV
TEXTS[13]

Letter 1: Tolstoy to A. G. Hollister (18 October 1889) [Spelling, punctuation and syntax are Tolstoy's]

Dear friend,

Last spring I was busy writing a book about marriage and I got quite new views of the matter. At the same time I was reading the books I could get about communiti's in America. I read Noyes book and a book of a German whose name I forgot. In those books I found quite new notions for me about the Shakers. At the same time I received a letter from a Shaker with books, treats and three photographs. I read the books and was very thankfull to the brother, who sent me them, but infortunally I lost the letter with the address, so that I could not answer and thank him. Now I received your books, and treats and letter. I read it all and thank you for it. All this strengthens my views on marriage, which I expose in my book that I am just now finishing. I think that the ideal of a christian always was and must be complete chastity and appreciate very much your books about the matter.

I know that you, shakers, speak always the truth and therefore expect the same from others. So I will tell you frankly all what I think of your religious views. I think that you profess the true christian religion and the true christian life, but you believe in two things in which I never can believe and you ought not: firstly, in the *saintity* of the whole Bible, including in it the old Testament, the Epistles and the Revelation of mother Ann, and secondly that you believe in manifestation of spirits.

The true revelation of God is only in the words of Jesus which are recorded in the Evangeliums and those only can guide us. There are no other spirits than our spirit, which is always battling with matter. Spirit is only the opposit of matter and can manifest itself only in matter. All manifestations of spirits without matters are delusions.

Please do not deprive me of your love for my boldness; I very much appreciate your good disposition to me and love you.

Leo Tolstoy

Letter 2: Frederic W. Evans to Tolstoy

[Spelling, punctuation and syntax are in the original]

Mt. Lebanon, N.Y., U.S.A.
Dec. 6th. 1890

Leo Tolstoy
Dear friend:

I am deeply interested in you & your work, so far as I understand both you & it.

Wisdom says, "I love those who love me"; & we love those who are in the same truths that we ourselves are in. It is wonderful how clear are your ideas in relation to the definition of the words Christian & Christianity. Calvin Green (some of whose writings you have seen) was an inspired man. He was spiritually impressed about the future of Russia: & he was enthusiastic upon the subject. Leo Tolstoy seems to be inspired to begin the fullfillment of the prophecies of Calvin Green.

I purpose to send you some of my writings to read & to criticise; & in so doing, I shall be much obliged. Why should not theologic problems be subject to the same rigid logic that mathematical problems are subject to? And why should not theologians be as cool & self-possessed as are mathematicians? If possible, they should be far more so: they should love each other; & that would be like oil, in all parts of a complicated piece of machinery.

You are "pained" at our ideas about "Ann Lee, & spirit intercourse" between parties in & out of mortal bodies. I suppose it to be caused by misconceptions of what our views have been & are *now*, at this present writing. What they *were*, when the 'millennial Church' was written, leave to the people of those times. Paul says, "When I was a child, I thought & spake as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things, & thought & spake as a man." Should that not be the case with those who are in the "kingdom of heaven," — of whose *increase* & government, to order & establish it in justice & judgment, "there should be no end?" The little stone cut out of the mountain, without hands — by revelation — *grew*, & became a great mountain, & filled the earth. You are exactly adapted to the present condition of the people of Russia.

At one time, the God of Israel told Moses that he would not lead the people of Israel hereafter; but that he would appoint an angel in his place, as leader. Israel, instead of increasing with the increase of God, has retrograded.

I will send you an 'Open Letter' that I wrote to Judge Thayer, who released a man that had been arrested under the ruling of the Postmaster-General Wanamaker, "that your book was immoral, & that it was unlawful to sell it." The letter to the Judge had an extensive circulation. I will also send you my Autobiography.

What is your age? Do not work too much for your age & strength: where the mind is as fully employed as is yours, the muscles are easily overdone. Why cannot you come to Mt. Lebanon, & see "what God hath wrought?" It would do you good.

A poor, illiterate, uneducated factory-woman has confounded the wisdom of all *men*-reformers, legislators, & scholars, who have come to nothing, as promoters of human happiness. Their systems have ended, in Christendom, as you see it; & as Booth & his companion who inspired him, saw it. The end has come! & Tolstoy & Shakerism remain, as the last hope of mankind.

Love to you
F. W. Evans
Mt. Lebanon, Col. Co., N.Y., USA

Letter 3: Tolstoy to Frederic W. Evans January 27, 1891

Dear Friend and Brother,

Thank you for your kind letter, it gave me great joy to know that you approve of my ideas on christianity. I was very much satisfied with your views upon the different expressions of religious sentiments, suiting the age of those to whom they are directed. I received the tracts you sent me and read them not only with interest but with profit, and cannot criticize them because I agree with everything that is said in them. There is only one question, that I should wish to ask you. You are, as I know, nonresistants. How do you manage to keep communial but nevertheless — property? Do you acknowledge the possibility for a christian to defend property from usurpators? I ask this question because I think that the principle of non-resistance is the chief trait of true Christianity and the greatest difficulty in our times is to be true to it. How do you manage to do so in your community?

I received your tracts; but you say in your letter that you have sent me books, do you mean that you have sent me books and tracts, or do you call the tracts books?

I received more than a year the Oregon paper "Worlds Advance Thought." I have several times seen your articles in it. I am very thankful to the editor for sending this paper; in every No. of it I get spiritual nourishment and if it were not for some spiritistic tendency, which is foreign to me, I would absolutely agree with all its religious views. I like this paper very much. With sincere respect and love, Yours truly,

Leo Tolstoy

Letter 4: Frederic W. Evans to Tolstoy

Mt. Lebanon, March 6/91
Leo Tolstoi

Dear friend and brother,

Your welcome letter of the 3, ult. duly received. There is much union of sentiment between us, and more union of spirit.

You are ministered unto by a Christ Spirit, as Jesus was.

It is not for yourself alone, but has reference to thousands of other souls who are ripe for the harvest sickle. The "end of the world" is coming upon them. Russia is a mighty Empire. It has produced large crops of spiritual men and woman, in the past, under the first appearing of Christ, in the male order.

They knew God as a heavenly father, but not as a Heavenly Mother. They had a male priesthood Order. They were a John the Baptist people, looking, waiting, praying, for the "coming of our Lord."

They were sincere and self-sacrificing, but "knew not how to pray," being blinded by theological ignorance and consequent error. The Mennonites & Moravians and what a noble people!!

And many others, bearing different names, but all actuated by the same Christ Spirit, down to the Quakers, as Friends. Who came nigh unto the Kingdom of Heaven.

These were the "Two Witnesses" — Male and Female — who prophesied, prayed, and practised Christian virtues, "in part." Their persecutions were not "in part," but in whole. And those who brought them to the "Holy Inquisition," or killed them by thousands, under the Duke of Alva, or by a Saint Bartholomew massacre, "thought they were doing God good service." All the great European nations are *Christian.* War is a permanent institution among them. They are exhausting their national resources either fighting, or "in Peace, preparing to fight." Do they not all pray to the same God to help them kill each other? Could the Devil do any worse by them?

You ask, "How do you manage to keep Communial, but nevertheless — property. Do you acknowledge the possibility for a Christian to defend property from usurpers?" These are important questions. Jesus said, "Be ye perfect, even as your father in Heaven is perfect." That is the *end* of our Christian travail. But is it the *beginning*? Did Jesus come to it, while yet in the body? "Jesus was not yet perfected." This is said of him after his death. If we scrutinize closely the history of Jesus, from birth to death, do we not see growth, from where he was to where he would be? "He saw the travail of his soul and was satisfied." Suppose we should have a list of the sins that he confessed to John, before he was baptised, and previous to the Christ Spirit descending upon him? And then suppose we make another list of the various transgressions and violations of the abstract principles of Christianity as you and I now see them? What would be the result? Should we not conclude that he was our "elder brother," was "touched with a feeling of our infirmities," because he had the same nature, and by it "was tempted in all respects like those whom the Christ Spirit came to redeem." He was simply "the firstborn of many brethren" just as Ann Lee was the first born of many sisters.

The Mennonites, Moravians, and Quakers, were non resistents, as were most of the "true Witnesses." Not until the separation of Church and State, by "the horns" — Infidel powers — that grew out of the "Beast," in the Am. Revolution, could "communial property" be held by non resistents. That is the "New Earth," and has it become more perfect in its righteousness, the "New Heavens" will be nearer perfect in all of the Christian virtues. It will travail from Faith to Faith, through seven Cycles, unto the perfect day. The light shining brighter and brighter until the light of one day shall be as the light of seven days. We hold and defend our Communial property under the Civil Laws of the New Earth. But in no case, or under any circumstances, should we injure a fellow being. You see that our Civil government is the voice of the people — *Vox populi, Vox Dei* — And the people who are the rulers, are more progressed than are the Rulers of Russia or of any Church-and-State Government on the face of the Earth, we — the Shakers — under the Am secular Gov't can carry out the abstract principles, taught by revelation of the Christ Spirit, more perfectly than has hitherto ever been done by mortal men and women. Just as we do carry out sexual purity, notwithstanding the sexes are brought face to face, in every day life,

life, living without bolts or bars, in the same Household of Faith. Come and see what God hath wrought.

Dear friend, Come to Lebanon and bind your joining to the Church of Christ's Second Appearing.

Then, return and found the Order in Russia, with consent of the Government, which the Shaker Order can and will obtain for you.

Calvin Green, one of our prophets, many years ago, predicted a glorious spiritual work in Russia. A Russian Minister visited Lebanon and was very friendly. He invited the Order to Russia. Has not the time arrived? And are not "Thou the Man?" In the Church of Christ Sd.[Second] Appearing, the Spirit is of God. It is not of the people. "Ye have not chosen me but I have chosen you" — and Revelation of God is the Rock upon which the Church is founded. And the Gates of Hell — religious controversy — will not prevail against it.

Frederic W. Evans

Letter 5: Frederic W. Evans to Tolstoy

Mt. Lebanon, Columbia Co., N.Y., U.S.A.

Leo Tolstoy, Dear friend, A. P. C. from you was the last we have heard. We often speak of you. And our prayers for your health and safety are unceasing. The Shakers are your fast friends. You will be a welcome visitor, if Providentially you are led to our continent to visit the World's Fair. The North Family will be your home. All Societies of Shakers are your fast friends. You are recognized as a servant of God and a friend to your race. As such, the blessing of God rests upon you. The truths that will constitute the Millenium are open to your spiritual vision. There are a few, here and there, who are with you. The fact that the whole Shaker Order live out the principles you advocate, can but be encouraging to you.

The Government does not interfere with us. One poet said, "Slaves cannot live in England. That moment their feet touch our soil, their shackles fall." Spread it then, until wherever Britain's power is felt her justice shall be as fully inherited.

That hope has been wonderfully actualized. It will be so with your aspirations regarding spiritual things. When you can see seventeen Communities of people whose every right is secured to them, whose every rational want is supplied, does it not demonstrate that all mankind may be made happy in this world?

Our sisterhood are redeemed. The Rights of woman are theirs, the rights of property we enjoy. Capital and Labor are at peace. Hygiene is religion with us.

Love to you again and again. A love that would cheerfully — gladly — give you and yours a life home.

F. W. Evans

[1]Compiled and annotated by Mary L. Richmond and published by the Shaker Community, Inc. of Hancock, Massachusetts (distributed by the University Press of New England in Hanover, New Hampshire).

[2]Nicholas Fersen's monograph will include, it is stated, "hitherto unpublished Tolstoi-Shaker correspondence." Presumably this would be the 7 letters (80 manuscript pages) written by Alonzo G. Hollister which are preserved in the State Tolstoi Museum in Moscow

[3]In the years following 1879 Tolstoy wrote an attack on the Russian Orthodox Church: *Kritika dogmaticheskogo bogosloviia [A Critique of Dogmatic Theology]*; *V chem moia vera [What I Believe]*; *Tak chto zhe nam delat? [What Then Must We Do?]*; and the important *Tvarstvo bozhie vnutri vas [The Kingdom of God is Within You]*. Tolstoy's moralistic aesthetic theory elaborated in *Chto takoe Iskusstvo [What Is Art?]* belongs to this period of his life.

[4]English translation, with modification, is from Henri Troyat, *Tolstoy* (New York: Doubleday, 1967), p. 560 f.).

[5]From L. N. Tolstoi, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 65 (Moscow, 1953), p. 113; see also pp. 34-36.

[6]In the spring of 1888 at the family's Moscow residence Tolstoy was deeply moved by Beethoven's violin and piano sonata.

[7]So named because it was dedicated to the French composer and violinist, Rodolphe Kreutzer.

[8]Alexandra L. Tolstoy, *Tolstoy — A Life of My Father* (Vaduz: Büchervertriebsanstalt).

[9]The Shakers were famous for their organization, their ingenuity, and the prosperity of their communal farms. *Few are aware of the inventions of the Shakers*: a special type of broom; a special type of non-pealing paint (the nature of which still remains unknown); the screw propeller; a rotary harrow; a turbine waterwheel; an automobile spring; a threshing machine; the circular saw; the clothespin. The Shakers were also the largest producers of medicinal herbs and were the first to package and market seeds.

[10]Illiterate, poor, and prone to ill health, Ann Lee worked at various jobs in her youth and was dismayed by the suffering condition of child labor. The wife of a blacksmith, she experienced bitterness and tragedy in marriage — her four children all died in infancy.

[11]Mother Ann died in 1784. In the early 1800's the Shakers grew rapidly until by the mid-19th century they had approximately 6,000 adults. Their growth was based on converts and the adoption of orphans. Today the sect is almost extinct.

[12]L. N. Tolstoi, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 65 (Moscow, 1953), p. 149.

[13]The first text was published in L. N. Tolstoi, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii*, vol. 64 (Moscow, 1953), p. 319. The remaining letters came from the North family at Mount Lebanon. They were published in a Shaker publication (*The Peg Board*) in 1936.