

THOMAS E. BIRD

## New Interest in Old Russian Things: Literary Ferment, Religious Perspectives, and National Self-Assertion

. . . *from what are we  
now most remote—  
the world of ancient Greece,  
or Orthodoxy?*

JOSEPH BRODSKY<sup>1</sup>

Mr. Haney has skimmed the surface of a vast and variegated phenomenon, the search for the spirit of the national past in those shreds of it which remain in the present. The single aspect of this large and complex problem which he develops at length is the debate between Viktor Chalmaev and his detractors. Although this discussion is well documented and analyzed, the sampling is disappointing. The question of the significance of the entire movement is, for the most part, avoided. But surely there is considerably more to the culturalist phenomenon than the disenchantment of youth with increasing industrialization, pollution, and the destruction of natural resources.

It has been pointed out elsewhere that at least since 1953 and, in secret, long before that date, the sterile dogmatic materialism of Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy ceased to be very satisfying to large segments of the multimillion population of the Soviet Union.<sup>2</sup> What is lacking in "The Revival of Interest . . ." is the clear affirmation, based on myriad documented and verified cases, of Soviet youth's indifference to party indoctrination. Underlining the unwillingness of young people to accept the underpinnings of official ideology are recent cases of request from some youth groups for permission to exist and function as autonomous auxiliaries within Komsomol structures. It is evident, in the light of the zeal with which deviationism has been traditionally combated, that such indifference must be viewed as at least incipient political opposition. Such attitudes as (1) interest in national (as opposed to international) concerns,<sup>3</sup> (2) an indifference to Marxist cant, (3) a willingness to live and let

1. Quoted in Richard H. Marshall, Jr., et al., eds., *Aspects of Religion in the Soviet Union, 1917-1967* (Chicago, 1971), p. 181 (translation by George L. Kline).

2. Richard H. Marshall, Jr., "Fifteen Years of Change: A Review of the Post-Stalin Era," in Max Hayward and William C. Fletcher, eds., *Religion and the Soviet State: A Dilemma of Power* (New York, 1969), pp. 1-18.

3. For a discussion of Soloukhin's stress of the national and Dorosh's emphasis of the international *within* the national, see Deming Brown's important article, "Nationalism and Ruralism in Recent Soviet Russian Literature," *Review of National Literatures*, 3, no. 1 (Spring 1972): 183-209.

live in the area of religion, or even (4) the possibility of examining non-materialist alternatives for one's life style must ultimately be quashed by the regime or they will have a fundamentally corrosive effect on its ideological self-justification. (There are indeed those who, even now, would accuse the regime of ideological apathy, asserting that a point has already been reached when the regime can no longer restore the halcyon monolithic *status quo ante*.) Anatolii Levitin-Krasnov's plea for "free belief, free religions, and free atheism" strikes at the heart of social and spiritual solidarity as it has been conceived of by Soviet society until now.<sup>4</sup>

The point that good scholarship has added substantial momentum to the popular interest is a good one. The best examples are the preoccupation of Soviet historians during the last decade with early Russian history, the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in particular; the nascent revolution taking place in approaches to the study of Old Russian literature; the phenomenal interest in the Old Russian book, incontrovertibly a religious document; and the scholarly elaboration in the past decade and a half of a link between the church and Old Russian culture.

It would be interesting to pursue the question of the role of the military in fostering the culturalist movement. It is difficult at this remove to know whether the armed forces have fostered the cult to strengthen their own position vis-à-vis party officialdom or whether they simply jumped on the bandwagon, already moving down the road for similar purposes. The armed forces journal, although regularly touting the "Communist conviction" of its members, has admitted to a concern about the provenance of certain ideas circulating within its ranks: "Ideological vacillations disarm a man before the ideological sabotage of the enemy. Class opponents are striving to entangle in their net politically unstable, inexperienced people, mainly the young, to dull their revolutionary vigilance with false arguments of a bourgeois-liberal slant; they are trying to inflame nationalist sentiments, and are looking for renegades susceptible to the easy life."<sup>5</sup>

Party ideologues have made serious and continuing efforts to demonstrate the validity of Marxist-Leninist responses to the spiritual needs of Soviet man.<sup>6</sup> But V. A. Zhitenev, a secretary of the Komsomol organization, confessed that this stance has not been altogether successful. At a Komsomol-

4. His essay "Neo-Humanism" was apparently written in reply to a party-sponsored statement, *Towards a Society Free from Religion* (Moscow, 1960).

5. *Kommunist vooruzhennykh sil*, 1968, no. 22, p. 6.

6. See A. I. Arnoldev et al., eds., *Stroitel'stvo kommunizma i dukhovnyi mir cheloveka* (Moscow, 1966); F. V. Konstantinov, ed., *Dialektika material'noi i dukhovnoi zhizni obshchestva v period stroitel'stva kommunizma* (Moscow, 1966); L. V. Sokhan, *Dukhovnyi progress lichnosti i kommunizm* (Kiev, 1966); and the popular writings of A. G. Myslivchenko.

Znanie conference held in June 1971 he said: "Sometimes there are found among atheists those who assert that religion does not exert any influence upon the generation growing up. Facts testify to the contrary."<sup>7</sup> Levitin-Krasnov prefers to speak of his fellow-citizens as living in a pre-Christian state, not denying Christianity but being ignorant of it and curious.<sup>8</sup>

In his discussion of the countryside and the ruralist literary movement,<sup>9</sup> Mr. Haney implicitly states that a main focal point is traditional religious belief and the church.<sup>10</sup>

### *Russian Chauvinism Among the Dissenters*

The Twelfth Congress of the Party in 1923 determined that "talks about the advantages of Russian culture and propositions about the inevitable victory of the higher Russian culture over the cultures of more backward peoples (Ukrainian, Azerbaijani, Uzbek, Kirgiz, etc.) are nothing but an attempt to confirm the domination of the Great Russian nationality."<sup>11</sup> The virus which prompted this resolution continues to complicate Soviet nationality policy. Zbigniew Brzezinski opines, "It is not inconceivable that in the next several decades the nationality problem will become politically more important in the Soviet Union than the racial issue has become in the United States."<sup>12</sup> It is at the point where the extremist *rusity*, the Russian Patriots, spill over into the dissident movement that the darker side of the culturalist movement emerges. Their credo, *Slovo natsii*,<sup>13</sup> claiming to speak in the name of the Russian people, "the real Russian people by blood and spirit," declares that the national question is the "fundamental question of the present time." They espouse a "strong government based on national traditions," and lamenting the "disproportionately small role" played by Russians in the USSR (an echo of the backlash reaction

7. "Vospityvat' ubezhdeniia," *Nauka i religii*, 1971, no. 11, p. 3.

8. "Moe vozvrashchenie," *Grani*, no. 79 (1971), p. 62, and *passim*.

9. For an extended discussion of this movement see Gleb Zekulin's two articles, "Aspects of Peasant Life as Portrayed in Contemporary Soviet Literature," *Canadian Slavic Studies*, 1, no. 4 (1967): 552-65, and "The Contemporary Countryside in Soviet Literature: A Search for New Values," in James R. Millar, ed., *The Soviet Rural Community: A Symposium* (Urbana, 1971), pp. 376-404.

10. Solzhenitsyn's "Prose Poems" provide ample evidence of this motif and for at least one writer, reality. See especially "In Esenin Country," "A Journey Along the Oka," and "We Will Never Die."

11. *KPSS v rezoliutsiakh*, vol. 1, p. 713 (reprinted 1968).

12. In his foreword to *The Chornovil Papers* (New York, 1968), p. vii.

13. See *Chronicle of Current Events*, no. 17 (April 1971), "Samizdat News," p. 93. See also Ludmilla Thorne, "The Democratic Movement and *Samizdat* as Forces Eroding Traditional National, Ethnic, and Religious Hostilities in the Soviet Union," read at the Eleventh Annual Central Slavic Conference, at Liberty, Missouri, in November 1972; and "Russian Racialists," *Patterns of Prejudice*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 19-20.

to the latest census), they foresee a new government in which the Russians will become in fact "the ruling nation."

Philosopher and Orientalist Grigorii Pomerants's views come as a cool breeze after such impassioned rhetoric. He condemns the hysteria he sees and rejects the very notion of patriotism; he equates patriotism with evading a moral choice.<sup>14</sup>

However, the mainstream of the dissident movement provides a certain consensus on the question of Russian prerogatives. Of three major programmatic statements, two representing the reformist faction, A. Sakharov's statement and his letter (written with V. Turchin and R. Medvedev), articulately espouse individual rights for the sake of human dignity; the third, representing the center-right, the Program of the Democratic Movement of the Soviet Union,<sup>15</sup> declares bluntly that "the Soviet Union is the forcible unification of peoples around the Great Russian national nucleus" and goes on to urge that "every people should be given the right and real possibility of asserting itself as an independent political, economic, and cultural entity." Andrei Amalrik asserts that the regime regards the new nationalism with a certain mistrust, yet at the same time with considerable tolerance. If the campaign to preserve historical monuments is the bright side of the culturalist movement, groups such as Rodina and Rossiia, whose views are ultraconservative and include thinly veiled anti-Semitism, are the darker side.<sup>16</sup>

### *The Great Russian Language*

Two years before Stalin's death Academician V. Vinogradov claimed in an article in *Pravda*, "The Great Russian language has become an inexhaustible source for all the languages of all the peoples of the Soviet Union."<sup>17</sup> The process of introducing Russian words (and whole terminologies) into the non-Russian languages of the USSR has continued systematically since that time.<sup>18</sup> It has fallen to two young Ukrainians to present coherent critiques of the abuses involved in Soviet language policy. The most thorough is unquestion-

14. "Chelovek bez prilagatel'nogo," *Grani*, no. 77 (1970), pp. 171–98.

15. *Progress, Coexistence and Intellectual Freedom* (New York, 1968). The letter of the trio is found in *Le Monde*, Apr. 1, 1970; the Program of the Democratic Movement in *Posev*, 1970, no. 7.

16. See Peter Reddaway, *Uncensored Russia: Protest and Dissent in the Soviet Union* (New York, 1972), pp. 430–33.

17. *Pravda*, June 20, 1951.

18. Yaroslav Bilinsky has provided an excellent analysis of Soviet policy toward non-Russian languages and literatures in his essay in Erich Goldhagen, ed., *Ethnic Minorities in the Soviet Union* (New York, 1968). See also Bilinsky's *The Second Soviet Republic: The Ukraine After World War II* (New Brunswick, 1964), especially chap. 5 on Soviet linguistic policy.

ably Ivan Dziuba's *Internationalism or Russification?*<sup>19</sup> His compatriot, Sviatoslav Karvansky, accused the regime of bias in favor of admitting Great Russians and Russified non-Russians to *vuzy*. His argument was that to be admitted one must pass entrance examinations in Russian language and Russian literature. The regime's response was to sentence him to eight years and seven months in a strict-regime labor camp without investigation or trial.<sup>20</sup>

Solzhenitsyn has provided what is probably the most eloquent example of nationalist concern for language in *The First Circle*,<sup>21</sup> where Dmitrii Sologdin insists on what he calls "plain speech"—language in which non-Russian words are banished. (The fact that puzzling, unrecognizable neologisms must, as a result, be coined, does not concern him.) Whenever he uses a foreign word in Russian where there is no absolute necessity, he gives himself "penalty" marks and punishes himself accordingly.

Articles aimed at teachers and designed for use in the secondary classroom appear regularly in *Russkaia rech'*; their emphasis is on older (and ancient) vocabulary and terminology. In the spring 1972 semester a doctoral dissertation on the Church Slavic elements in the Russian language was defended at Moscow State University. P. Antokolsky writes in *Iunost'*, "A knowledge of Old Church Slavic is not such a complicated and cumbersome matter as is usually imagined."<sup>22</sup> He extols the importance and usefulness of OCS and remarks upon the honored place its study enjoyed in the prerevolutionary Russian gymnasium.<sup>23</sup>

### Literature

As early as 1957 N. K. Gudzy, the sometimes mildly independent cultural historian of Old Russian literature, took N. S. Tikhonravov to task and with him, by implication, his adherents, the anti-aesthetic school. Gudzy deplored the fact that scholars such as Tikhonravov have obscured the fact of the artistry of Old Russian literature. When this article appeared abroad, in England,<sup>24</sup>

19. *Internationalism or Russification?: A Study in the Soviet Nationalities Problem*, 2nd ed. (London, 1970).

20. Biographical background and data surrounding his case are found in *The Chornovil Papers*, pp. 166–226.

21. *V krughe pervom* has not, of course, been published in the Soviet Union.

22. *Iunost'*, 1972, no. 8, pp. 68–72.

23. The whole area of speech culture, orthoepy, and stylistics is one which has taken on new importance and become available to a wide audience in recent years. Consider the series *Etimologicheskie issledovaniia po russkomu iazyku: Voprosy kul'tury rechi* and the writings of E. A. Bakhmutova, T. A. Degtereva, V. P. Murat, and D. E. Rozentel. For an overview consult the annotated bibliographies published by the Lenin Library, *Kul'tura russkoi rechi*.

24. "The Artistic Heritage of Early Russian Literature," *Oxford Slavonic Papers*, vol. 7 (1957).

it served as a trial balloon; and many other writers, such as D. S. Likhachev and I. P. Eremin, have lately begun to express similar sentiments. One of the most striking and articulate statements has been made by Ia. S. Lurie in his introduction to *Istoki russkoi belletristiki*.<sup>25</sup> In effect Lurie admits, after thirty years of loyal toadying, that an error has been made and tolerated: literarily extraneous restraints have been placed on the study of Old Russian literature. The impact of such a public confession can only be guessed at. G. M. Fridlender's statement in *Sovetskoe literaturovedenie za 50 let* is even more outspoken in scoring the succession of Soviet literary dogmatisms.<sup>26</sup>

Mr. Haney seems to slight the dimension of this literature constituting, often consciously, always Aesopically, a quest for an alternative set of values. The phenomenon of how this openness to purely literary study manages to go unchecked needs considerably more exploration. This is an area of constant potential clash: the party's dilemma whether to clamp down decisively or respond with single thrusts in piecemeal fashion.<sup>27</sup> We must hope that when (and if) the nationalist-culturalist movement is brought into line and Marxist-Leninist views are reasserted in areas of investigation, these fragile beginnings will not be shattered and swept aside; but given the history of the "pernicious literary dogmatisms" of the last several decades, it is difficult not to anticipate that the party's literary watchdogs will at some point call a halt to studies which ignore too blatantly the political implications of Old Russian literature.<sup>28</sup>

### *Societies for Cultural Preservation*

The relegation to the category of "other related phenomena" of the All-Russian Voluntary Society for the Preservation of Monuments of History and Culture lacks balance. In view of its grassroots provenance, the continuing broad base of support which it enjoys, and the amounts of money which it collects and expends on preservation and maintenance, it must be counted among the more significant manifestations of popular participation in the culturalist movement.<sup>29</sup>

25. *Istoki russkoi belletristiki*, ed. Ia. S. Lur'e (Leningrad, 1970), pp. 3-30.

26. "Osnovnye etapy sovetskogo literaturovedeniia," in V. G. Bazanov, ed., *Sovetskoe literaturovedenie za 50 let* (Leningrad, 1968), pp. 5-33.

27. See Jonathan Harris, "The Dilemma of Dissidence," *Survey*, 16, no. 1 (1971): 107-22.

28. One cannot help but wonder what the ultimate effect will be of Dr. Hist. Sci. A. Iakovlev's article, "Protiv antiistorizma," *Literaturnaia gazeta*, Nov. 15, 1972. The tone of his discussion of how the past *is* reflected and *ought* to be reflected in literary works is ominously prescriptive.

29. It is instructive to observe the development of these societies in the three Slavic republics. The early sixties saw the rise of the Rodina society among Moscow students. Its goal, the restoration and preservation of Old Russian monuments, especially churches,



*Scholarship and Religion*

My most serious reservation about Mr. Haney's analysis is that an overall focus has been missed: the link between the church and the study of Russia's cultural roots has been omitted.

The patriarchate of Moscow has resumed its place in Russian society as a patron of serious study and research. Scholars of the patriarchate work in the Lenin and the Saltykov-Shchedrin Libraries. *Bogoslovskie trudy* (1960–),<sup>30</sup> published by the patriarchate's two theological graduate schools in Moscow and Leningrad, has become a significant scholarly publication, regularly publishing and analyzing newly discovered manuscripts. Private individuals send items from their personal collections to the seminary libraries at Zagorsk, Leningrad, and Odessa.<sup>31</sup> Issues of the *Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarkhii* and *Stimme der Orthodoxie* periodically carry descriptions of the treasures found in the *arkheologicheskie kabinety* of the three seminaries.

The thirst for émigré *Religionsphilosophie* among Russian citizens has frequently been remarked upon. N. M. Zernov's *Russian Religious Renaissance* has a wide circulation in *samizdat*, and the typescript of G. V. Florovsky's *Puti russkogo bogosloviia* has found its way outside the walls of the patriarchal

---

was soon taken over by the All-Russian Voluntary Society for the Preservation of Monuments of History and Culture. (Such a society now exists in each union republic.) The All-Russian Society claims over seven million individual and some forty-one thousand collective members. Parties made up of student volunteers continue to be active in restoring and conserving existing monuments. In the years 1967–72 approximately 130 million rubles were spent on the upkeep of monuments in the RSFSR. See *Soviet Union*, 1972, no. 10, p. 4.

The republic congress of the Ukrainian Society petitioned the government for official status on Dec. 21, 1966, and was confirmed on June 12, 1967, as a civic organization with its statutes confirmed by the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR. The initiative for organizing the society seems to have come from a broadly based sector of the population. Since its confirmation (and consequent integration into more official planning), the society has been criticized in print for not zealously pursuing the goals of its original organizers.

The Belorussian Society was also established in December 1966. On Dec. 26, 1969, the Supreme Soviet of the Belorussian SSR adopted a law "On the Preservation of Cultural Monuments" and in 1970 the society began to publish *Pomniki historyi i kul'tury Bielarusi* (*Monuments of Belorussia's History and Culture*). Its first ten issues have ranged in content from descriptions of archeological findings to contemporary items concerning history and culture of the Belorussian people. See *Zviazda*, Minsk, Aug. 18, 1972, and *Belaruskaja Savetskaja Entsyklapedyia*, vol. 2 (Minsk, 1970), pp. 15–16, "Akhova pomnikaŭ historyi, mastatsva i kul'tury."

30. By the end of 1972 seven volumes had appeared; two more are ready for publication and awaiting a paper ration.

31. The exhibit memorializing Archimandrite Leonid Kavelin (1822–91), held during the fall of 1971 at the Moscow Theological Academy, brought private contributions of artifacts from many persons, including academicians (anonymously, since a professor is not permitted to be a believer). See the appreciation of Kavelin in the *Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarkhii*, 1972, no. 6, pp. 70–79.

academies. A party analyst discussing the interests of Soviet youth reported recently, "Students who are drawn into the orbit of religious ideas are struck, as a rule, by their modernistic, refined forms. They are attracted by religious idealistic literature, by the works of S. Bulgakov, Berdiaev, Frank, and by the search for moral ideas in religion."<sup>32</sup>

The serious research which is being conducted into the role of the church in Russian history needs to be stressed. The rich and extensive collection *Tserkov' v istorii Rossii* in the Lenin Library is being systematically worked by numbers of people.<sup>33</sup> The ranks of recognized scholars who find a state outlet for their religious and church-related research include such figures as N. D. Uspensky and A. Ivanov, both faculty members at the Leningrad Theological Academy,<sup>34</sup> and Iu. M. Lotman of the University of Tartu.<sup>35</sup>

If only because of the impact which the religious thrust is having upon wide circles of the intelligentsia today, it cannot easily be dismissed as an exotic extravagance or reactionary obscurantism. The problem of religious culture is being rediscovered in a variety of creative contexts. Some of the intelligentsia are turning to religion; others are developing a more receptive attitude toward the notion of religious beliefs and practices and are pursuing these interests by consultation with *uchenye monakhi* in monasteries and parishes. Father Vsevolod Shpiller's virtual chaplaincy at Moscow University is the best known instance of such guidance. The publication of Solzhenitsyn's works in the early sixties, notable for their deeply Christian ethics, represented an event not only in the world of letters but in the sphere of religious concern as well. Two other major pieces are the memoirs of Solzhenitsyn's first wife, Natalia, which have begun appearing in *Veche*, the nationalist, Slavophile, Christian *samizdat* journal; and Father Sergei Zheludkov's apologetics, *Why I Too Am a Christian*, which circulates in *samizdat*.<sup>36</sup>

32. "Ovladevat' teoriei, nesti znaniia v massy," *Nauka i religii*, 1971, no. 11, p. 7.

33. S. S. Dmitr'ev's research (*Istoriia SSSR*, 1966, no. 7-8, pp. 20-55) constitutes the first significant work on the history of the church since N. M. Nikol'sky's *Istoriia russkoi tserkvi* (Moscow, 1930), itself a reprint of research he had done in the early twenties. The symposium *Tserkov' v istorii Rossii*, ed. N. A. Smirnov (Moscow, 1967), and A. A. Shishkin's *Sushchnost' i kriticheskaiia otsenka 'Obnovlencheskogo' raskola russkoi pravoslavnoi tserkvi* (Kazan, 1970), represent serious archival research in the history of the church.

34. N. D. Uspensky is author of the two-volume study of Russian church music, *Drevne-russkoe pevcheskoe iskusstvo* (Moscow, 1965) and *Obraztsy drevne-russkogo pevcheskogo iskusstva* (Leningrad, 1968). These studies are supplemented by M. V. Brazhnikov's compilation, *Novye pamiatniki znamennogo raspeva* (Leningrad, 1967). The rector of the Moscow Theological Academy, Archbishop Filaret Vakhromeev, is an energetic patron of Russian church music and encourages the serious study of the subject among the seminarians and graduate students at Zagorsk.

35. For some time Lotman has been advocating virtually a Formalist literary position. His university is publishing the writings of Father Paul Florensky, and Lotman himself works in the field of the history of Freemasonry in Russia.

36. Publication of Father Zheludkov's manuscript has been promised by *Posev*.



A stunning example of the philosophical-political opposition which is represented by the religious intelligentsia is Boris Slutsky's poem, "A Footnote to the Debate About Andrei Rublev":

No, not everything fits into a scheme,  
however much you try:  
Rublev, when he took the vows,  
Was scarcely an unbeliever.

He fell on his knees  
before the Word—the one  
that was in the Beginning.

. . . . .  
He was saved not by a swineherd  
—symbolizing Labor—  
but quite simply

by the Savior.<sup>37</sup>

The remarkable upsurge of interest in the Old Russian book is a separate chapter in the story of culturalism. In evaluating the studies going on in the history of the Old Russian book (and in the personality and career of *pervopecthatnik d'iak* Ivan Fedorov), it should not be overlooked that these books were destined for use in the liturgical services of the Russian Orthodox Church. Moreover, many of the first monuments of Old Russian letters were printed in religious journals published by one of the four theological academies of the empire.<sup>38</sup> As persons not interested in (indeed, at some levels, antipathetic to) the content of the Old Russian book, Soviet historians have traditionally been concerned with scrutiny of the form. A study of the literature surrounding the history of the Old Russian book, especially the articles by Sidorov,<sup>39</sup> will re-

37. *Half-way to the Moon*, ed. Patricia Blake and Max Hayward (New York, 1965), pp. 107–8 (translation by Max Hayward). For more detailed analyses see Zinaida Shakhovskaya's "The Significance of Religious Themes in Soviet Literature," in William C. Fletcher and Anthony J. Strover, eds., *Religion and the Search for New Ideals in the USSR* (New York, 1967); and Albert C. Todd's "Spiritual Elements in Recent Soviet Literature," in Hayward and Fletcher, *Religion and the Soviet State*.

38. Edward Kasinec and Meinrad Dindorf have provided a repertory of the most extensive holdings of these journals in the Western hemisphere, in the library of St. Vladimir's Seminary, Tuckahoe, New York. See their "Bibliographical Note: Russian Pre-Revolutionary Religious-Theological Serials in the St. Vladimir's Seminary Library," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 14, no. 1–2 (1970): 100–107. A cursory examination of a representative title, such as *Pravoslavnyi Sobesednik* or *Tvoreniia sviatykh ottsov*, will suffice to persuade one of the untapped and undescribed riches to be found in these journals.

39. See R. P. Goriacheva's bibliography of Professor A. A. Sidorov in the series *Materialy dlia bio-bibliografii sovetskikh uchenykh* (Moscow and Leningrad, 1959). Of particular interest are his *Istoriia oformleniia russkoi knigi* (Moscow, 1946), dealing with the external history of the book, and his memoirs, *Zapiski sobiratel'ia* (Moscow, 1971).

There is a certain ambiguity manifested toward the Old Russian book by those in charge of publishing: the genre is of interest as part of the national legacy, yet there

veal the sharp contradiction between form and content. Meanwhile, there is a considerable community of bookmen in the two capitals who research these materials, writing for the drawer.

In the face of this multifaceted litany of what can only be termed religious expression, it is perhaps too blithe a dismissal that "for the scholarly interest one need offer no explanation." Surely some explanation is necessary for the interest of these senior scholars in such suspect (and studiously neglected) areas. It is imperative that an essay at explanation, however provisional, be undertaken of how one manages to write and publish works on such sensitive topics as these. If "on some levels the interest has been more or less academic," culturalism is not limited to narrow or exotic circles. Quite the contrary. The varieties of response enumerated demonstrate that what is at work is not a single movement, but a number of streams, some of which are not of official inspiration, some of which function as though they were beyond official control.

#### *National/Religious Self-Assertion*

Several religious/national groups can claim some kind of historical identity of religion and people; none, in the context of Soviet reality, is in so strong a position to call public attention to that identification and to orchestrate this role to its own ends as is the Russian Orthodox Church. In studied manner the patriarchate of Moscow proclaimed this identity beginning with the first major publication permitted it in 1942, *Pravda o religii v Rossii*.<sup>40</sup> It has continued to press its case in print and in speech since that time. The *Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarkhii* regularly prints articles celebrating shrines—ecclesiastical and civil—of the Russian nation; the church's role in restoring and maintaining these national shrines is meticulously chronicled. Sentiments of deep patriotism, extolling the sacred duty to work for the well-being of the national homeland, are a permanent feature of Russian Orthodox homiletics. The Local Council of the Church held in Zagorsk during May and June 1971 served as a triumphant public festival, celebrating this role. Metropolitan (now Patriarch) Pimen gave a major report to the assembled hierarchs in which he dwelled at length on the unity of the church with the Russian people, sharing their interests, blessing their feats of battle, and honoring the memory of defenders of the Motherland—struggling for the unity of the country and contributing to

---

is an apparent anxiety not to have this literature well registered. The *Svodnyi katalog russkoi knigi grazhdanskoi pečati 18-go veka* was published in 5 volumes beginning in 1956 with a maximum edition of four thousand copies (and a recent supplement issued in one hundred fifty copies!). The *Svodnyi katalog kirillovskoi pečati 18-go veka* was published in 1969 in five hundred copies, with a recent supplement. By now the rotoprint supplements to these rare materials constitute a bibliography of rarities in themselves.

40. Succeeded the following year by *Russkaia Pravoslavnaia Tserkov' i Velikaia Otechestvennaia Voina* (Moscow, 1943) and by *The Russian Orthodox Church: Organization, Situation, Activity* (Moscow, n.d. [1958]).

the process of its development.<sup>41</sup> He pointed out that “this work has been highly appreciated by the Soviet Government” which has honored many representatives of the clergy and the laity with decorations and medals.

The structure of the Moscow patriarchate at home and its functions abroad provide a case study of how the functional demands of Russian national policy co-opt canonical practice. Orthodox canon law provides for the existence of an autonomous Orthodox Church in each nation. This has been recognized in the case of the separate nation-republic of Georgia. The autocephaly of the Georgian Church was formally recognized by the Russian Church in 1943.<sup>42</sup> However, the ideological needs of the Soviet state cannot similarly indulge the ever-present national aspirations of the Ukrainian nation-republic. The Orthodox in the Ukraine have been awarded a number of consolation prizes for their deprivation: the titular of Kiev and primate of the dioceses in the Ukraine enjoys the title “exarch,” conferred exclusively on the four hierarchs within the Moscow patriarchate who head *foreign* jurisdictions; a separate Ukrainian-language monthly journal has been published (with some interruptions) since 1946, and regularly since 1968; a majority of the fourteen sees in the Ukraine are filled with Ukrainian nationals; many of the ecclesiastical posts abroad (Berlin, New York, Buenos Aires) are filled by Ukrainians; finally, as one of his first pontifical acts, Patriarch Pimen increased to three the number of metropolitan dioceses in the Ukraine, adding Kherson and Lviv to Kiev.<sup>43</sup>

The Georgian Church serves as an interesting balance. The antiquity of this church makes it unfeasible for the Russian Church simply to absorb it, although during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was proclaimed an exarchate and headed by a Russian national. However, when the Pan-Orthodox consultative meetings commenced a decade ago the Moscow patriarchate took steps effectively to reduce this technical legal independence. A Russian was named to exercise a proxy vote in behalf of the Georgian Church, a condition apparently set down in negotiations between Moscow and Constantinople as one of the terms necessary to insure the participation of the Russian patriarchate in the consultations.<sup>44</sup>

### *Conclusion*

There is a manifest need in Soviet society to create more adequate symbols-to-live-by. Secularist sacraments have failed to pass muster. Despite the

41. His report, “Zhizn' i deiatel'nost' Russkoi pravoslavnoi tserkvi,” appeared in *Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarkhii*, 1971, no. 7, pp. 4–26; and in English translation in the English-language edition, *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate*, 1971, no. 2, pp. 3–17.

42. The most comprehensive discussion available of the Georgian Orthodox Church has been published by Father Elie Melia in Marshall, *Aspects of Religion*, pp. 223–37.

43. See *Zhurnal Moskovskoi Patriarkhii*, 1971, no. 7, p. 1.

44. Marshall, *Aspects of Religion*, pp. 232–35.

regime's assiduous efforts to supply for the spiritual side of its citizenry through rituals consonant with Marxist-Leninist doctrines, there has occurred a loss of identity and a consequent search for meaning along other avenues. The deep need to excise the entire epoch of the cult of personality presents formidable obstacles to the culturalist endeavor. The resource thinkers in the movement are an eclectic group; nor is it clear that they share a common denominator of values or goals.<sup>45</sup> The hidden agenda of the culturalist movement is the development of a historical genealogy which will produce a new mythic structure capable of bearing the weight of the psychic needs of *homo sovieticus*. The experiment is fraught with a two-fold difficulty: (1) the discontinuity of recent Soviet history, (2) the virtual impossibility in a dynamic society of returning to a more primitive myth, especially one involving the dangers of overtly elevating one segment of the Soviet nationality spectrum to most favored status.

45. The democratic movement in all its varying shades has more that binds together than separates its various segments: the value of the human person, the need to adapt politics and economics to man's spiritual needs, the supremacy of freedom as a value.