

DOSTOYEVSKY'S ATTITUDE TO INSTITUTIONALIZED RELIGION

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the University of Liverpool for the degree of Doctor in Philosophy by Angela Jennifer Slater.

September 1983

Vol I

THESIS ABSTRACT
DOSTOYEVSKY'S ATTITUDE TO INSTITUTIONALIZED RELIGION
ANGELA JENNIFER SLATER

Dostoyevsky has been acclaimed as a great Christian writer and true Russian Orthodox believer, yet his religious thought as expressed in his writings departs from the strictly Orthodox and Christian in a number of apparently minor ways. The aim of this study is to ascertain Dostoyevsky's attitude not merely to his own Church and to the other major Churches but to the very concept of institutionalized religion.

Section One examines the role of the Church in Dostoyevsky's own life; the portrayal of the Church in his writings; and the contemporary Church's assessment of him as a religious writer. His personal commitment to the Church is seen to fluctuate, but from the late eighteen-sixties the Church gradually acquires more prominence. This is not reflected in his writings of the same period. Articles in the contemporary Russian Orthodox press suggest that the Church itself was unaware that it had little relevance for Dostoyevsky's characters and that certain of its traditional functions were ignored.

Section Two analyzes the presentation of Roman Catholicism, Protestantism and Judaism. Certain features of Dostoyevsky's treatment of Catholicism and Protestantism may be attributed to the traditional enmity between Eastern and Western Christendom. But the 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor' elevates Dostoyevsky's basic criticism of Rome to a condemnation of all Churches: institutionalized religion is the work of the Devil. The Church must not mediate between Man and God: Man must live by faith, guided by the image of Christ. This message points towards Protestantism, but Dostoyevsky's response to Protestantism is inconsistent with the boldness of the 'Legend': a religion needs a 'container'; Man founders without a firm religious framework. The guiding image of Christ is strangely missing from Dostoyevsky's account of Protestantism. A similar acknowledgement of the need to institutionalize religion informs his claim that the Jews continue to flourish only because their messianic consciousness has taken the earthly form of a status in statu.

Section Three opens with a study of Dostoyevsky's response to religious dissent in Russia. He is attracted to Old Belief but does not share the Old Believers' conception of the Church; and his frequent references to extreme sectarianism do not signify approval of the form taken by the sectarians' religiosity. Their efforts to attain Churchless Christianity are greeted with scepticism. We discover that Churchless Christianity can exist, but only in a Russian Orthodox context. Dostoyevsky's yurodivye and stranniki are firmly rooted in narodny Russian Orthodox spirituality and are thus vouchsafed a correct knowledge of the image of Christ. This enables them to lead a spiritual life independent of the structures of the Church and, paradoxically, to advance ideas contrary to the teachings of the Church. In Dostoyevsky's presentation of monasticism the monks preserve the image of Christ undefiled for the world. But monasticism itself is stripped of its institutionalized character until it remains only as an inner spiritual concept and it is possible to be 'a monk in the world'. Monasticism of this type is a culmination of the trends identified in our study.

LIST OF CONTENTS

VOLUME ONE

Introduction	The historical context	1-13
SECTION ONE	DOSTOYEVSKY AND THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH	
Chapter One	The Russian Orthodox Church in Dostoyevsky's own life.	14-53
Chapter Two	The Russian Orthodox Church in Dostoyevsky's writings.	54-124
Chapter Three	The contemporary Church's assessment of Dostoyevsky.	125-191
SECTION TWO	DOSTOYEVSKY AND OTHER CHURCHES	
Chapter Four	Dostoyevsky and the Roman Catholic Church.	192-262
Chapter Five	Dostoyevsky's attitude to Protestantism.	263-307
Chapter Six	Dostoyevsky and the Jews. The attractions of messianism.	308-353

VOLUME TWO

SECTION THREE	DOSTOYEVSKY'S ASSESSMENT OF THE ALTERNATIVES	
Chapter Seven	Dostoyevsky and Russian religious dissent: the Old Believers.	354-399
Chapter Eight	Dostoyevsky and Russian religious dissent: extreme sectarianism.	400-442
Chapter Nine	Dostoyevsky's alternative hierarchy: <u>yurodivye</u> and <u>stranniki</u> .	443-518
Chapter Ten	Dostoyevsky and monasticism.	519-572
Conclusion		573-591
Bibliography		592-602

Note on Transliteration

Russian words are transliterated according to the S.E.E.R. system with certain modifications:

hard adjectival endings are simplified to 'y'.

INTRODUCTION

THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The first quarter of the nineteenth century in Russia had seen the continued appeal of religious movements which had arisen as a reaction against the rationalism and scepticism of eighteenth-century Europe: Freemasonry and religious mysticism. These trends were characterized by the desire to satisfy religious and philosophical needs, and to do so outside the official Church. To this legacy of the eighteenth century was added the spread of Pietism. Both Freemasons and Pietists were interested not in the externals of religion but in 'inner Christianity'. The Masons attached importance to self-education through reading and inner asceticism. They believed in the possibility of self-perfection and had a strong sense of moral responsibility. Their goal was the attainment of 'truth in this world: pravda, the "two-sided truth" of wisdom and justice'.¹ The Pietists preached an 'inner' Church which was universal and oecumenical. They gave the Scriptures to ordinary Christians to read and discuss: the idea that only the clergy could interpret them was abandoned, as were many items of dogma. Inter-confessional prayer meetings were held. Alexander I embodied the spirit of his reign. He read such mystics as Eckartshausen; he visited masonic lodges; he read the Bible for the first time, and became a patron of the Russian Bible Society (founded in 1813). The official Russian Orthodox Church became more and more peripheral until finally in 1824 a series of measures was taken to try to re-establish its authority. However, the appeal of the extra-ecclesiastical religious movements continued

into the reign of Nicholas I.

For the purposes of the present analysis, attention will be focused upon two figures whose views were influential in Russia during Dostoyevsky's lifetime: Vissarion Belinsky and Aleksey Khomyakov. Belinsky's views on the Russian Orthodox Church were formulated particularly vividly in his 'Letter to Gogol', his very bitter and uncensored response to Gogol's Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends (Vybrannye mesta iz perepiski s druziyami, 1846). The contents of this letter became widely known in intellectual circles in Russia and may be taken as broadly representative of the attitude towards the Church of the more radical Westernizing tendency of Russian thought. Since in addition the letter played no small part in the fate of Dostoyevsky himself, it would seem fitting to examine Belinsky's dispute with Gogol more closely.

Ever since Gogol's spiritual crisis in Vienna in 1840, the Church had occupied an increasingly important place in his religious thinking, and this process came to a climax in Selected Passages. The letters and essays which constitute the book deal with two main themes: the Christian social structure; and Christian art. The Orthodox Church is given the task of effecting a reconciliation of all the different interests in nineteenth-century Russia: 'There is in our land a conciliator which still has not been recognized by all - our Church . . . In her is contained everything necessary for every area of truly Russian life, from matters of State to simple family concerns.'² Gogol defends the Russian Orthodox Church's practice of not getting involved in the world: only thus, he

maintains, has it kept itself pure and holy. He defends the clergy from those who say that they should mix more freely in society: on the contrary, maintains Gogol, the clergy are more effective as a result of their life apart from society. Finally, he defends Church ritual and dogma; and he calls on all Orthodox believers to live according to their faith.

Gogol's vision for society and his stress upon self-improvement as a means of bringing about social change provoked the ire of the radicals, including Belinsky. The essence of Belinsky's response is contained in the question: 'But why have you mixed Christ up in all this?'³ He implies that the Church and the Church-centred society advanced by Gogol in Selected Passages have nothing to do with the teaching of Christ. The Russian Orthodox Church has, in Belinsky's opinion, become a rigid, hierarchical body, intimately connected with the establishment, and thereby associated with the evils of serfdom and bureaucratic corruption. It has taken to heart Uvarov's slogan 'Orthodoxy, autocracy and nationality'. The clergy have become servants of the temporal powers and are completely indifferent to matters of religion. Belinsky attacks Gogol's Church in the name of Christ. Admittedly, Belinsky's Christ was the Christ of the French Utopian Socialists, who stressed the human, rather than the divine, element in Christ, and saw Him as a great moral teacher, who preached the values of the French Revolution. This does not, however, detract from the point the critic was making: that there was a discrepancy between Christ and the Church which claimed to represent Him.

Belinsky goes one stage further in his letter, however.

He tries to dissociate Christ from any Church whatsoever: .

4

'What have you found in common between Him and any Church, let alone the Orthodox Church?'⁴ He claims that at the point when Christ's teaching was 'organized into a Church', that same teaching ceased to be effective for salvation. Again it should be made clear that Belinsky's conception of 'salvation' was coloured by the humanist tradition: to him it suggested the restoration of man's dignity to man, by according him his rights and improving his lot. Nevertheless, the point is of interest: Belinsky felt that an 'organized' or 'institutionalized' Church was not what Christ intended, and that it rendered His teaching ineffective.

Where, then, is true Christianity to be found, so far as Belinsky is concerned? His answer is that Christianity is immanent: one either 'bears Christ in one's breast', or one does not.⁵ Proof of this 'inner' Christianity is the suffering one experiences at the sight of the sufferings of one's fellow-men. Belinsky offers little help to those who lack this: he certainly does not suggest that the official Church can be of use. On the contrary, the Church's methods, as represented by Gogol's planned pilgrimage to Jerusalem, are interpreted by the critic as an indication of the absence of Christianity in a person, and a vain attempt to rectify that situation. Belinsky identifies one area of genuine and deep spirituality, however: the raskolniki (sectarians), although he does not consider them to be at all representative of the Russian masses.

The same anti-ecclesiastical streak was displayed by other 'men of the forties' who belonged to the radical tradition.

Alexander Herzen's memoirs, My Past and Thoughts (Byloye i dumy, 1861), bear witness to his religious nature as a young man and reveal his love of the New Testament. These factors did not, however, result in a close attachment to the Russian Orthodox Church. His assessment of the Church is made clear in a letter to Ogaryov in 1833: 'Take the pure foundation of Christianity - how exquisitely beautiful and lofty it is; but observe its adherents - dark and sombre mysticism'.⁶

Mikhail Bakunin was also untouched by the Church. The first part of his life was characterized by a romantic and extra-ecclesiastical religiosity: he wrote to a friend in 1836 that 'the goal of life is God - not the God to whom men pray in the churches . . . but the God who lives in mankind and is exalted with the exaltation of man'.⁷ When Bakunin's religious faith gave way to atheism and materialism, his opposition to the Church continued in another form. He no longer challenged the Church in the name of genuine Christianity, but rather because he associated it with those institutions which must be destroyed in the fight against all forms of authority and oppression.

Such negation of the Church was characteristic of the later radicals: the 'men of the sixties'. Nikolay Chernyshevsky was the son of a priest and had himself completed theological studies. In his youth he was faithful to his religious upbringing, and the rites of the Church were very important to him. Gradually, however, his faith became modified, and by the time he read Feuerbach's The Essence of Christianity (Das Wesen des Christentums, 1841) in 1849, he was already convinced of the worthlessness of rites and exterior Church forms. In 1850 Chernyshevsky became a follower of Feuerbach,

and his religious faith was transformed into political activity completely detached from the tradition of the Church.

With the spread of nihilism and the accompanying atheism and materialism, the Church was no longer challenged in the name of genuine or immanent Christianity, but in the name of revolution. Bakunin had pointed the way ahead, and he it was who, jointly with Sergey Nechayev, wrote Revolutionary Catechism (Katekhizis revolyutsionera, 1869). The Church had by now been definitely identified as an enemy: 'We must ally ourselves mainly with those elements of the people's life which ever since the foundation of the State of Moscow have never given up protesting . . . against anything directly or indirectly tied to the State; against the nobility, the bureaucracy, the priests . . .'⁸

One area of religion continued to exercise an attraction for the radicals: sectarianism. Belinsky had singled out the sectarians for their genuine and deep religious feelings. The later radicals were primarily interested in them as a symbol of revolt against the Russian State, and they interpreted the seventeenth-century schism as a democratic protest. Extremists like Bakunin were anxious to exploit the sectarians for their own destructive ends: in a letter to Herzen in 1866, for example, Bakunin dismissed the idea of evolutionary change and said that the radicals should instead harness the forces of revolt: 'of Stenka Razin, Pugachov, the raskol'niki'⁹. Herzen himself believed that he might be able to spread his ideas of peasant socialism based on the obshchina (commune) to the villages with the help of the Old Believers, and he sent Kelsiyev to establish contacts.¹⁰ Afanasy Shchapov studied the

social and political significance of the sects, and the development of the movement since the schism. He published his findings in The Schism of the Old Believers (Russkiy raskol Staroobryadstva, 1859).¹¹ Shchapov saw in the increasing differentiation of sectarianism the degeneration of religion into formulae and rites. Most of all, however, he saw in the sects a demand for democracy and, at a later stage in his research, a defence of the spirit of decentralization and regional autonomy. These were the forces which, he believed, would lead to change.

Some of the later radicals saw in the sectarians more than just a force which could usefully be harnessed to bring about their own political changes. The Populists (Narodniki), inspired by Nikolay Mikhaylovsky, actually shared many of the religious beliefs of the sectarians. They were opposed to the idea of an authoritarian and hierarchical Church, and they had a vision of 'true Christianity', 'the Christianity of morals rather than metaphysics'.¹² They saw this 'true Christianity' embodied in the sectarians. They also shared the latter's belief that all spiritual truth could and must be realized on this earth, not in some other-worldly sphere. Billington writes that the Russian Populist movement 'can be said to represent for Russia a unique form of protesting, if not Protestant, Christianity'.¹³

Thus we can see that Belinsky's 'Letter to Gogol' contained in embryo all three main strands of the radical attitude towards the Church in nineteenth-century Russia: the challenge to the Church in the name of Christ and 'true' Christianity; the accusation that the Church had become

associated and even identified with an unjust social structure; and the singling out of the sectarians as providing a desirable alternative to the religion of the official Russian Orthodox Church.

The other main trend of thought in nineteenth-century Russia was Slavophilism. The Slavophiles believed that the life of a nation was determined by its religious principles, and that Orthodoxy embodied distinctive spiritual qualities. This did not automatically lead to a defence of the Russian Orthodox Church, however. As Hare implies: 'One is tempted to say that the value of Orthodoxy in [the Slavophiles'] eyes turned rather into a sacred manifestation of emergent Russian national character than into an organized form of Christianity'.¹⁴ It is to Khomyakov, who most clearly formulated the Slavophile beliefs concerning the desired nature of the Church, that one must turn to determine the accuracy of Hare's judgement.

The key to understanding Khomyakov's doctrine of the Church lies in the concept of sobornost'. Khomyakov himself did not attempt a formal definition of the word: indeed, some would say that it is in the very nature of the concept that it cannot be formally defined. Christoff writes, for example:

Because to [Khomyakov] sobornost' symbolized the spirit of Christianity, it defied definition; because the Christian Church embodying the concept of sobornost' was a spontaneous brotherhood of men at all times, it could not be cast into a rigid institutional form; because the individual Christian, lay or clergy, could not find true fulfilment except as a willing member of a Christian commune, strict definitions of personal rights, prerogatives and functions were neither useful nor appropriate.¹⁵

In thus explaining why sobornost' cannot be defined, Christoff draws attention to its important features. Khomyakov himself describes the relationship between the individual and the Church as follows: 'The unity of the Church follows of necessity from the unity of God, for the Church is not a multitude of persons in their separate individuality, but a unity of the grace of God, living in a multitude of rational creatures, submitting themselves to grace'.¹⁶ Khomyakov considered that the Head of the Church should not be an earthly potentate, but Christ; and that the guardianship of dogma had been entrusted not to the Church hierarchy, but to the whole Church: dogma, he wrote, 'is protected by the totality, by the whole body of the people who make up the Church, which is the body of Christ'.¹⁷ Another important concept in Khomyakov's doctrine of the Church was obshchinnost', the abstract noun derived from obshchina. He often used the term obshchina to designate 'Church': in so doing, he wished to emphasize the qualities of the Russian commune which he felt were appropriate to a Christian community - the qualities of fellowship and the sharing of the common life. This word was also free of the connotation of a formalized, stratified, institutionalized structure which had come to be associated with the image of the Church. Khomyakov did not wish to do away with the Church hierarchy completely, but he redefined its role. The specific role allotted to the clergy was the wielding of sacramental and disciplinary power. Apart from this, all of the members of the Church were equal.

The Slavophiles can be criticized for seeing things as they should be, rather than as they were in reality. However, Khomyakov did not consider the Russian Church to be the perfect

embodiment of sobornost', and he denied that any official Church had ever been successful in that respect: 'Christianity in its perfect form has never yet been the religion of any nation'.¹⁸

Not all of the Slavophiles were in complete agreement with Khomyakov's image of the Church. Whereas Khomyakov defended the Orthodox tradition of a Church foreign to the world, for example, Aleksandr Koshelyov considered that the Church should be involved in this world: 'Our Church can and must borrow from the Western Church its knowledge of this world, its influence on this world, in a word its activism, whereas the Western must acknowledge the dogmatic Orthodoxy of the Eastern Church'.¹⁹

Where the Slavophiles agreed was on the question of the relationship of Church to State. They regarded any form of government as a necessary evil, but considered autocracy to be the least objectionable of the available options. At the same time, they maintained that the Church should be entirely free from the State. In their view, the Tsar's position as Head of the Church gave him no authority where matters of doctrine were concerned, and the Church could thus retain its inner freedom. That they realized that this was not quite the case in fact is illustrated by a letter from Khomyakov to his correspondent William Palmer, in which he expresses the wish that there might be 'a little less official, political religion' in Russia.²⁰ Ivan Kireyevsky outlined the desired relationship between Church and State as follows: the State must have as its aim 'to be perpetually permeated more and more by the spirit of the Church, and not only not to consider the Church as a means for making its own existence more comfortable

but, on the contrary, to see in its own existence only a means for the most complete and convenient establishment of the Church of God on earth'.²¹

It would thus appear that there is some justification for Hare's claim that the Slavophiles were not concerned with Orthodoxy as 'an organized form of Christianity'. Khomyakov did see some role for the Church hierarchy, albeit a somewhat reduced one. His general tendency, however, was to remove the rigid distinction between 'clergy' and 'lay', and in so doing to challenge the idea of the Church as an institution possessing an autonomous existence, independent of its members. For Khomyakov, the Church was the whole body of believers, united in the spirit of sobornost, and without them there could be no Church.

Opposition to the official Russian Orthodox Church was thus not uncommon in intellectual circles in the nineteenth century. The reasons behind the opposition varied, depending upon whether those concerned were atheists or believers. But even those who took Orthodoxy as the very basis of their thinking did not commit themselves wholeheartedly to the official Church. The extra-ecclesiastical religious trends which opened the century clearly had exerted more than a passing influence. Such is the background as we move on to consider the role of the Russian Orthodox Church in the life of Dostoyevsky.

1. J. H. Billington, The Icon and the Axe (London, 1966), 300.
2. N. V. Gogol, Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy (14 volumes; Moscow/Leningrad, 1940-52) (hereafter: Gogol, PSS), VIII, 283-4.
3. V. G. Belinsky, Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy (13 volumes; Moscow, 1953-9) (hereafter: Belinsky, PSS), X, 214.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid., 218.
6. A. Herzen, Sobraniye sochineniy (30 volumes; Moscow, 1954-65), XXI, 20.
7. As cited in V. V. Zenkovsky, A History of Russian Philosophy, trans. G. L. Kline (London, 1953), I, 248.
8. As cited in F. Venturi, Roots of Revolution. A History of the Populist and Socialist Movements in Nineteenth Century Russia, trans. F. Haskell (London, 1960), 367.
9. Pisma M. A. Bakunina k A. I. Gertsenu i N. P. Ogaryovu (St. Petersburg, 1906; Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, The Hague, 1968); 284.
10. See R. M. Davison, 'Dostoevskij's "Devils" and the Sects', Die Welt der Slaven, XXVI, Pt. 2, 1981 (274-84) (hereafter: Davison, 'Sects'), 276.
11. The full title of Shchapov's work is: Russkiy raskol Staro-obryadstva, rassmatrivayemy v svyazi s vnutrennim sostoyaniyem Russkoy Tserkvi i grazhdanstvennosti v XVII. veke i v pervoy polovine XVIII. Opyt istoricheskogo issledovaniya o prichinakh proiskhozhdeniya i rasprostraneniya Russkogo Raskola (Kazan, 1859).
12. J. H. Billington, Mikhailovsky and Russian Populism (Oxford, 1958), 125.
13. Ibid., 120.
14. R. Hare, Pioneers of Russian Social Thought (London, 1951), 81.
15. P. K. Christoff, An Introduction to Nineteenth Century Russian Slavophilism. A Study in Ideas. I. A. S. Khomyakov (The Hague, 1961), 147.
16. A. S. Khomyakov o Tserkvi, ed. I. P. Karsavin (Berlin, 1926), 21.

17. A. S. Khomyakov, Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy (hereafter: Khomyakov, PSS) (3rd edition: Moscow, 1886), II, 385.
18. Khomyakov, PSS (4th edition: Moscow, 1911-14), VII, 224.
19. Cited in Christoff, op. cit., 148 fn. 25.
20. Khomyakov, PSS (3rd edition), II, 386.
21. I. V. Kireyevsky, Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy (2 volumes; Moscow, 1911), II, 271.

SECTION ONE

DOSTOYEVSKY AND THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH IN DOSTOYEVSKY'S OWN LIFE

The aim of this chapter is to ascertain, so far as is possible, the part played by the Russian Orthodox Church in Dostoyevsky's own life. This will be done with a view to making some preliminary suggestions about Dostoyevsky's understanding of the role of the Church, and of the relationship between the Church and the individual believer.

For those studying the religion of Dostoyevsky, there is a temptation to go far back into the ancestry of his family, since there is on the paternal side an interesting history of Roman Catholics and Uniates. This may be explained by the fact that the family originated in Lithuania. If it could be demonstrated that Dostoyevsky himself had a marked awareness of his religious heritage in this respect, this could clearly be of great importance in the present study. Certainly Aimée Dostoyevsky, in her memoirs of her father, places considerable emphasis upon his Lithuanian background. Writing of the 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor', for example, she reveals that it was a traditionally held view in the family that Ivan Karamazov was Dostoyevsky himself, and continues:

It is curious to note Ivan's religious beliefs, his poem, 'The Grand Inquisitor', and his immense interest in the Catholic Church. It must not be forgotten that only some three or four generations intervened between Dostoyevsky and the Catholicism of his ancestors. The Catholic faith must have been still alive in his soul.¹

However, although Aimée is admittedly writing of her own father, it would seem advisable to introduce a note of

caution into her assessment of the Catholicism in Dostoyevsky's soul. Dostoyevsky himself rarely talked about his family background, either in his published or in his unpublished writings, and did not draw attention to any Lithuanian or Catholic elements in it. Furthermore, his mother's side of the family had an unbroken commitment to the Russian Orthodox Church, and the religious upbringing which he himself received was very much in keeping with the Russian Orthodox tradition. It would, therefore, seem unwise to attach undue importance to the Catholic element in Dostoyevsky's family history, and advisable to say with Onasch that 'it may, with some caution, be acknowledged as a background phenomenon'.²

The memoirs of Dostoyevsky's brother, Andrey, who was four years younger than him, are a rich source of information about the religious upbringing Dostoyevsky received.³ They reveal that, unlike the situation in most educated families at the time, the rites and beliefs of the Russian Orthodox Church were a natural part of everyday life in the Dostoyevsky household. The family went to Church services on Saturday and Sunday, and each evening prayers were said before the family icons. A deacon was engaged for the religious education of the children: according to Andrey, he gave very vivid accounts of the Bible stories, captivating not only the children, but also their mother. In addition, the deacon also taught the children the 'Rudiments' (Nachatki) of Metropolitan Filaret, thus providing them with some sort of philosophical grounding for their faith. It is interesting to note that Filaret's catechism was criticized by some conservative circles in the Russian Orthodox Church for being insufficiently Orthodox. It was claimed, for example, that not enough attention was paid to icons.⁴

However, although Andrey recalls the 'Rudiments' in his memoirs, Dostoyevsky himself does not, and it would be wrong to attach any lasting importance to them in the formulation of his religious views.

The Church seems to have been a natural and constant point of reference in the Dostoyevsky household. Little of importance could happen before a priest was called in to bless the occasion. Thus we read of the local priest, Father Barshev, blessing the family's journey to Darovoye for the summer; and a few years later he it is who blesses Dostoyevsky and his brother Mikhail as they go off to study in St. Petersburg. Andrey relates a cunning ruse resorted to by his mother to stop the peasants plundering the fish-pond at Darovoye: a priest was called in to lead a procession with banners and icons round the pond, thus making it a holy place. The children's lives were punctuated by religious festivals, which seem to have provided an even more solid framework for an already solid family life. In their minds the festivals were associated with treats: Shrovetide meant trips to the theatre or to a local fair-booth; Easter brought with it the fun of egg-rolling. Each year the children made a pilgrimage with their mother to the Monastery of the Trinity and St. Sergius, another religious occasion which made a great impression upon their minds. A rather different aspect of their religious education was undertaken by their nurse, Alyona Frolovna. She may be said to have introduced them to the more unorthodox side of Russian Orthodoxy: though not over-zealous when it came to keeping the fasts, for example, she considered it a religious duty always to eat a mouthful of bread before letting any other food pass her lips. To the young children she must have seemed to have a very special relationship

to the Church, for did she not claim to be 'the bride of
Christ'?⁵

It would be unwise to draw too many conclusions from the nature of Dostoyevsky's childhood contacts with the Russian Orthodox Church, or to assume that he had consciously formulated ideas about the Church at this stage. Yet children are impressionable, and it is possible that the way the Church appeared to Dostoyevsky in childhood would to some extent affect his attitude towards it in later life. Dostoyevsky's memories of his religious upbringing appear in two forms. Sometimes they are represented artistically in his novels. In The Brothers Karamazov (Brat'ya Karamazovy, 1879-80) Zosima's description of a childhood visit to Church with his mother recalls Dostoyevsky's own experiences, and shows the extent to which Dostoyevsky - like, one suspects, many other children - was affected by the aesthetic qualities of the Orthodox Church liturgy.⁶ The writer evokes the beauty and the holiness of the occasion: particularly effective is his description of the incense slowly winding its way upwards to meet the grace-bearing rays of sunlight and dissolve into them. This re-creation of a Church service through the eyes of a child is one to be enjoyed by the senses and the heart, rather than the mind. It is notable that when, through the words of Zosima, Dostoyevsky recalls the religious instruction he received, he mentions not Filaret's catechism, but Hübner's One Hundred and Four Holy Stories from the Old and New Testaments (Sto chetyre svyashchonnye istorii Vetkhogo i Novogo zaveta), in which theology was embodied in vibrant Biblical characters. These were the aspects of religion which meant the most to him, as they probably would to most children.

Occasionally, Dostoyevsky introduces his memories of childhood into his Diary of a Writer (Dnevnik pisatelya). An oft-quoted extract from the 1873 article 'One of the contemporary falsehoods' reveals how closely in the young Dostoyevsky's experience religion was entwined with other aspects of life, such as the family, Russian history and patriotism:

I descended from a pious Russian family. As far as I can remember myself, I recall my parents' affection for me. We, in our family, have known the Gospel almost ever since our earliest childhood. I was only ten when I already knew virtually all the principle episodes in Russian history - from Karamzin, whom father used to read aloud to us in the evenings. Every visit to the Kremlin and the Moscow cathedrals was, to me, something solemn.⁷

The Church as an institution does not feature either in the memories as they appear in the novels or in Diary of a Writer, but then the Dostoyevsky children had no reason to consider the Church as an external body: it played such a natural part in their lives that they probably would not have been able to conceive of a religious faith which in some way existed independently of the Church.

From 1834-8 Dostoyevsky was at school at Chermak's, one of the best schools in Moscow. The crude speech and behaviour of his schoolfellows provided a striking contrast to the life he had previously enjoyed. Since he returned home at weekends, however, it would seem reasonable to assume that his religious experience did not alter significantly during this period of his life. Yet the religious sentiments Dostoyevsky expresses in letters home to his father seem unnatural, even insincere, as illustrated by this typical extract where he piously invokes God and appeals to Providence: 'You are well - thank God! If

only He would grant that your affairs be remedied! But He will grant this, He will send down His kindness upon us, too.'⁸ This declamatory style may simply reflect Dostoyevsky's enjoyment of Romantic literature, but it would also seem to indicate a conscious adoption of a religious tone for his father's benefit, and it suggests that the unconscious bond between religion and life which had characterized Dostoyevsky's earlier years had been eroded to some extent.

In 1838, at the age of seventeen, Dostoyevsky entered the Engineering Academy in St. Petersburg. Whereas he had been a lively child while at home, his contemporaries at the Academy remember him as a withdrawn and unsociable student. He was also remembered for one other reason, which may be connected: his extreme devotion to religion. Dostoyevsky was regarded by his fellow students as a religious fanatic. He received the nickname 'Foty', after Photius, an archimandrite of the Russian Orthodox Church who was revered as a holy man 'not of this world'. Konstantin Trutovsky, who entered the Academy a year after Dostoyevsky, and whom Dostoyevsky befriended, attributes this nickname simply to Dostoyevsky's isolated way of life.⁹ However, the memoirs of Aleksandr Savelyov, who was an officer on duty at the Academy during Dostoyevsky's time there, reveal that he did indeed lead a very religious life:

Fyodor Mikhaylovich behaved modestly, and carried out his drill and his studies irreproachably, but he was very religious, and zealously fulfilled the obligations of an Orthodox Christian. You could see him with the Gospels, Zschokke's The Hours of Devotion, and so on. After the lectures in religious knowledge given by Father Poluektov, Fyodor Mikhaylovich would stay behind talking to his teacher for a long time. All this struck his fellow students to such an extent that they nicknamed him after the monk Photius.¹⁰

Thus we see the young Dostoyevsky as a faithful servant of the Church, carrying out all the rites, and earnestly discussing religious matters. Such behaviour contrasts with his behaviour a few years previously: Andrey reveals, for example, that when in 1837 Dostoyevsky and his brother Mikhail made a trip to the Monastery of the Trinity with their aunt they had little to say on religious themes, but spent the journey declaiming poetry.¹¹ The intensity of Dostoyevsky's religious devotions at this time seems to have arisen at least partly as a defence mechanism against the circumstances he found himself in at the Academy. He was repelled by the worldly nature of those around him and by the lack of any higher values, and he seriously tried to apply his religion to his actions: he was remembered by contemporary students as the defender of the meek and the ill-treated.¹²

From what has been seen above it is possible to identify several strands in Dostoyevsky's religion while at the Academy. One is represented by his reading of Zschokke, who preached 'a sentimental version of Christianity entirely free of dogmatic content and with a strong emphasis on the necessity of giving Christian love a social application'.¹³ Dostoyevsky's behaviour as a student clearly reveals the influence of such teaching. At the same time, as we have seen, he was a zealous member of the Russian Orthodox Church. Finally, he devoted much time to reading the Bible: a decidedly Protestant trait.

If at this stage in his life Dostoyevsky saw Christian faith, Christian action and membership of the Church as phenomena which were intrinsically linked, the situation was shortly to change. In 1841 he moved from the Engineering Academy to private lodgings, and it would seem that his Church-centred piety

became less prominent. Andrey visited his brother during this period, and his memoirs reveal that Dostoyevsky was enjoying rather more of a social life than previously. Andrey mentions card parties; and it also seems likely that Dostoyevsky was enjoying the company of women.¹⁴ There is, however, no mention of religion.

For a short time in 1843 and 1844 Dostoyevsky lived with Aleksandr Riesenkampf, a doctor. He too remains silent about Dostoyevsky's religious life, revealing only that he was not partial to Protestant culture: of a trip to Revel which Dostoyevsky made in his friend's company Riesenkampf writes that the town oppressed Dostoyevsky 'with its traditional, caste-ridden spirit, its nepotism and bigotry, its pietism, kindled by the fanatical sermons of the then fashionable Herrnhut pastor Huhn [Gun], and with its intolerance, especially towards military personnel'.¹⁵ Dostoyevsky's readings of Zschokke do not, on the surface, seem to have made him sympathetic to the German style of religion.

There is thus little evidence in biographical material for this period of any commitment to Christianity, and no sign of Dostoyevsky's previous attachment to the Russian Orthodox Church. If one turns to what Dostoyevsky was reading at this time, however, there are indications of the way his thinking on religious matters was developing. The eighteen-forties was the decade of the 'Natural School' in Russian literature. In the early years of the decade, Dostoyevsky had been reading (and writing) Romantic tragedy. Gradually Gogol began to feature more largely in his literary tastes. The exposure of the realities of Russian life in Gogol's writings caught the imagination not only of Dostoyevsky, but of a whole generation

of writers and critics. At the same time the works of French Utopian Socialist writers, with their emphasis upon social Christianity, were widely read. The Utopian Socialists were critical of the religion of the official churches, and contrasted it with what they called 'new' or 'true' Christianity:

Christianity in its pure and undefiled state. They considered the official Church to be a source of obscurantism and political reaction. It is known that Dostoyevsky himself read, and even translated, certain works of George Sand, such as The Uscoque (L'Uscoque, 1838) and The Last Aldini (La dernière Aldini, 1847).

Frank suggests that he may also have read Spiridion (1838), in which the teachings of Christ are identified with the tenets of the French Revolution.¹⁶ The association of Christianity with Socialism in Spiridion went hand in hand with a denunciation of the established Church. Thus we see the process by which Dostoyevsky's attitude towards Christianity and the Church was possibly being shaped during these years.

Utopian Socialist ideas became increasingly important in Dostoyevsky's intellectual development. At the end of 1846 and the beginning of 1847 he attended the Beketov circle, which was a forum for Utopian Socialist ideas. The Beketovs themselves were Fourierists, while Dostoyevsky's other friends in the group, Aleksey Pleshcheyev and the Maykov brothers, also preached a blend of Christianity and Socialism. That Dostoyevsky's ideas were in keeping with the general trend of the group would seem to be attested by a letter to his brother Mikhail in November 1846, in which he reveals that he has suggested that the group live together, share expenses, and enjoy 'the great benefits of association'.¹⁷

Less clear is the extent to which Dostoyevsky was also

influenced by the German Left Hegelianism which was attracting followers in Russia at that time, and which was very anti-religious. At first, this movement had concentrated its attack upon the historicity and divinity of Christ, while leaving the moral teachings of Christianity intact. It then, however, began to call into question the entire religious foundation of Utopian Socialist thinking: this was to be replaced by the truth of economic and scientific doctrine, allegedly a more rational basis for the values according to which society was to be built. The question of Dostoyevsky's commitment to such ideas is intrinsically linked to his relationship with Belinsky, who embodied the shift from Utopian Socialism to German Left Hegelianism.

Although in the first half of the eighteen-forties Belinsky had adhered to the Utopian Socialist line of thought, by 1845 he was writing to Herzen the oft-quoted words: 'In the words God and religion I see darkness, gloom, chains and the knout, and now I like these two words as much as the four following them'.¹⁸ It was in that year that Dostoyevsky's acquaintance with Belinsky began, after Belinsky's rapturous acclaim of Poor Folk (Bednye lyudi, 1846).

Writing in Diary of a Writer in 1873, Dostoyevsky looks back on this period of his life, in an article entitled 'Old People'. Referring to the first year or so of his acquaintance with Belinsky, he depicts Belinsky mocking him for his distress over the former's attacks on the figure of Christ.¹⁹ Clearly at this time the views of the two men differed considerably. In the same article, however, Dostoyevsky claims that by 1848 he had 'passionately embraced' Belinsky's teaching.²⁰ This would mean that he had rejected Christianity altogether to embrace atheism, since that was the stage Belinsky himself had reached

in 1848, before his early death.

25

Dostoyevsky again identifies himself with Belinsky's complete rejection of Christianity in an article written shortly after 'Old People'. This time the date given for his 'conversion' is even earlier: 1846. He refers to 'convictions about the immorality of the very bases (Christian) of contemporary society and about the immorality of religion' which he had been unable to overcome.²¹ Such thoughts are characteristic of German Left Hegelianism. Yet in the same article Dostoyevsky presents Belinsky's teaching in the tradition of Utopian Socialism, as 'a correction and improvement' of Christianity.²² Dostoyevsky's confusion of the two stages in Belinsky's development and his implication that he himself adopted Belinsky's atheism may be the result of his polemical concerns in the article in question. He was trying to demonstrate that Christianity and Socialism never could be, and never had been, compatible: he could not, therefore, represent himself as an exception, but he also had to appear to have been an atheist at the time of his involvement with Socialism.²³

It would appear that Dostoyevsky's own memories of his religious beliefs at this period of his life are not as conclusive as might be expected. Further light is shed, however, by his involvement in the various literary/political discussion groups which he attended after the Beketov circle, at the end of the eighteen-forties. The history of Dostoyevsky's involvement with these groups is complex. The group with which his name is most commonly associated is the Petrashevsky circle, which he began to attend in the spring of 1847. Petrashevsky himself was a Fourierist, but he did not accept Fourier's religious teaching. He considered religion to be harmful since, he thought,

it robbed man of his highest attributes. However, the circle embraced a wide variety of views, and Petrashevsky's own were certainly not accepted by all. Dostoyevsky himself is said to have been repelled by Petrashevsky's atheism, and by the way he mocked the Christian faith.²⁴ This contradicts his representation of himself as having accepted Belinsky's atheism. The subjects upon which Dostoyevsky is known to have spoken at the meetings are not directly related to religion, although he is remembered for passionately attacking social injustices. Something about his religious awareness at the time is, however, revealed by the list of books he is known to have borrowed from Petrashevsky's impressive library: the list includes several works of Proudhon; a popularization of Fourierism; Cabet's True Christianity according to Jesus Christ (Le vrai Christianisme suivant Jésus-Christ, 1846) and Strauss's Life of Jesus (Das Leben Jesu, 1835).²⁵ Clearly Dostoyevsky was aware of what both Utopian Socialists and Left Hegelians had to say about religion.

Dostoyevsky did not become deeply involved with the wider Petrashevsky circle. However, he committed himself rather more to the next group he became involved with. This was a secret society which grew up in the winter of 1848-9, under the leadership of Nikolay Speshnev, at a time of increasing radicalism within the Petrashevsky circle. The aim of the society was to spread discontent with the existing social order by establishing contact with already discontented groups such as the serfs and the raskol'niki (sectarians). Like Petrashevsky, Speshnev was not influenced by the 'New Christianity' of the Utopian Socialists, but looked to materialism and atheism as the basis upon which society should be built. The tone of the group was

radical and revolutionary. That Dostoyevsky agreed to become a member of such a group, and tried to enlist new members for it, shows that he was attracted towards political activism, rather than mere theoretical discussion. It does not necessarily indicate that he had also adopted the atheism of some of the other members of the group. Indeed, if one turns to the next group with which Dostoyevsky's name is associated, the Palm-Durov circle, with which the Speshnev group merged, then one sees that his interest in the Christianity of the Utopian Socialists had not died. This may be illustrated with reference to two pieces of literature which were read out in the group. One was Aleksandr Milyukov's translation of Lamennais' Words of a Believer (Paroles d'un croyant, 1834), which was an attack on social injustice and inequality in the name of the New Christianity. Milyukov's memoirs tell us that Dostoyevsky responded enthusiastically to the book.²⁶ The second was Belinsky's 'Letter to Gogol', which was read out on more than one occasion by Dostoyevsky himself. We have already seen how this, too, spoke out in the name of 'true' Christianity.²⁷ It would seem, therefore, that moral-religious values continued to play an important part in Dostoyevsky's thinking at the time of his involvement with the various discussion groups mentioned above.

Even this, however, is not the last word on Dostoyevsky's religious beliefs at this period. Further complications arise when one steps outside the discussion groups to consider the memoirs of another friend of Dostoyevsky at the end of the eighteen-forties: Stepan Yanovsky. Yanovsky was a doctor who saw Dostoyevsky (not always in a professional capacity) almost every day from 1846 to 1849. He writes that he and Dostoyevsky talked a great deal about religion, and he depicts Dostoyevsky

as a firm defender of the truth of the Gospels: he claims that Dostoyevsky never put forward a political or sociological argument which was in disagreement with the Gospels.²⁸ This in itself does not necessarily contradict the Utopian Socialist conception of Christianity. However, Yanovsky also claims that in 1847 and 1849 he and Dostoyevsky fasted together in a state of genuine piety for the Feast of the Ascension.²⁹ Such observance of the rites of the Russian Orthodox Church certainly has little to do with the Left Hegelianism of Belinsky which Dostoyevsky claimed to have espoused. But neither is it particularly consistent with the Christianity of the Utopian Socialists, for whom the formalities of religion were not important. Although Dostoyevsky's Christian faith at this stage in his life was largely shaped by the social Christianity of the Utopian Socialists, it seems that he still felt ties with the more formal aspects of religion.

The ultimately ambiguous nature of Dostoyevsky's attitude to Christianity and the Church at the end of the eighteenthies is well illustrated by his behaviour in the months leading up to, and on the morning of, his planned execution in December 1849. Religious matters had, it would seem, frequently been on Dostoyevsky's mind during his imprisonment in the Petropavlovsky Fortress: among his reading matter were accounts of visits to the Holy Places, and the writings of St. Dmitry of Rostov; and he had requested his brother Mikhail to send him a copy of the Bible.³⁰ Furthermore, one of those sentenced alongside Dostoyevsky says that, when Dostoyevsky was awaiting execution, he spoke as a believing Christian, who had by no means abandoned hope in the Christian afterlife.³¹ Thus far, one might be talking of a traditional Russian Orthodox believer.

Yet the memoirs of D. D. Akhsharumov, another of those sentenced, reveal that what happened after this was far from typically Orthodox.³² Of the men due to be executed, only one responded to the priest's invitation to confess, and that one was not Dostoyevsky. All of the men, however, kissed the cross offered to them by the priest. Such action might appear to be a perfect example of the 'New Christianity': a rejection of the formality of confession and at the same time devotion to the central doctrine of Christianity, the cross. Yet it might equally well have been prompted by the opinion that they had nothing to confess: their revolutionary involvement had, after all, been in keeping with their interpretation of Christianity.³³ It would be wrong to place too simplistic an interpretation upon the events of that morning.

The next stage in Dostoyevsky's life was the time he spent as a convict, a period which is represented artistically in Notes from the House of the Dead (Zapiski iz myortvogo doma, 1861-2). Dostoyevsky's description of the Easter service and the spiritual preparation leading up to it, powerfully conveys the importance of the Russian Orthodox Church in the life of the convicts while in prison.³⁴ When they are in Church, taking part in the service, the convicts experience a sense of oneness and community with the whole body of Orthodox believers. No longer do they feel outcasts. The Church is seen to be helping to bring about reconciliation between morally isolated groups of people. It must, however, be remembered that Notes from the House of the Dead is an artistic representation of Dostoyevsky's time in prison: whether the Church meant this much for Dostoyevsky himself is another matter.

Aimée Dostoyevsky has no doubts about the strength of her father's religious faith during his years in prison. She presents him as a great Christian influence among the other convicts: 'The Moujiks saw before them their ideal - a true Christian, a wise and modest man, who placed God above all. . . . At each word Dostoyevsky spoke, the eyes of his companions opened more widely'.³⁵ A less effusive, but perhaps more accurate, assessment may be found in the memoirs of P. K. Martyanov: 'The convicts didn't like him, but they acknowledged his moral authority, and silently kept away from him'.³⁶ Whatever the precise nature of Dostoyevsky's relationship with the other convicts, it would seem that Christ and Christianity were of importance to him at this time. Milyukov writes that when Dostoyevsky later recalled his time in the prison camp, and regretted that he had been cut off from literature while there, he would add that since he had had only the Bible to read, he had come to a much clearer and deeper understanding of the essence of Christianity.³⁷ And when Dostoyevsky left the camp, he immediately wrote to his brother Mikhail, asking to be sent the writings of the Fathers of the Church.³⁸ He also wrote his oft-quoted letter to Fon Vizina, in which he talks of his creed: 'that there is nothing more beautiful, more profound, more appealing, more rational, more courageous and more perfect than Christ'.³⁹ It is in the same letter that he declares he would prefer to stay with Christ than the truth, 'if Christ were outside the truth'.

After his release from prison, Dostoyevsky did military service in the town of Semipalatinsk. He became friendly with Aleksandr Vrangeli, the Procurator of the town. Vrangeli's memoirs reveal that the public Dostoyevsky was not very religious:

'Dostoyevsky and I didn't talk about religion much. He was quite devout [nabozhen], but he didn't go to Church very often, and he didn't like priests, especially Siberian ones'.⁴⁰

However, Vrangél also writes that Dostoyevsky 'would talk elatedly about Christ'.⁴¹ This distinction between Christ and the official Church is reminiscent of the Utopian Socialist Christianity Dostoyevsky had encountered before his convict days. Although in the prison camp Church services had apparently meant much to him, he did not seem to consider that he needed them now.

Vrangél's association with Dostoyevsky coincided with the latter's romance and marriage with Mariya Isayeva, and his affair with Polina Suslova. The spiritual would not appear to have played a very prominent part in either of these relationships, which cover the period from 1855 to approximately 1864. Yet the theme of Dostoyevsky's 'Meditation' upon his wife's death (April 1864) is Christ-like self-sacrifice as the ideal of mankind.⁴² This perhaps unexpected appearance of Christian-orientated thinking may be more easily explained if one turns to Dostoyevsky's writing at the time. During the first half of the eighteen-sixties he was involved with the journals Vremya (Time) and Epokha (Epoch). The ideology behind these journals was pochvennichestvo, which is rendered by Zenkovsky as 'the cult of primitive immediacy' and by Dowler as 'Native Soil conservatism'.⁴³ What this actually involved is explained by the wording on the subscription form for Vremya in its first year of publication (1861):

We have at last persuaded ourselves that we too are a separate nationality, independent and original in the highest degree, and that our task is to create for

ourselves an indigenous form native to our own soil . . .
We foresee that . . . the Russian idea may well be a
synthesis of all the ideas which have developed in Europe.⁴⁴ 32

For the pochvenniki, the secret of Russian nationality lay in Orthodoxy. Here we find the religious element we are looking for. Christian ethics featured increasingly in pochvennichestvo, as is illustrated by the change in the nature of Vremya which occurred in approximately 1862. Before this date, political and economic reforms had been advocated as a solution to Russia's problems. By the autumn of 1862, however, the solutions offered by Vremya tended increasingly to be situated in the world of metaphysics, rather than politics.⁴⁵ A further indication of Dostoyevsky's concern with spiritual matters at this time is to be found in a letter to his brother Mikhail about the censorship of Notes from Underground (Zapiski iz podpolya, 1864). Dostoyevsky complains that the censors have left in all the blasphemy which, he says, was there only 'for form', and have omitted the parts where the underground man points to the need for faith and Christ.⁴⁶ Finally, in 1865 and 1866 Dostoyevsky was working on Crime and Punishment (Prestupleniye i nakazaniye, 1866), a novel in which Christianity plays not an insignificant part: Raskolnikov's resurrection results from the influence of the meek Christian Sonya, and the novel ends on a note of Christian hope. Christian themes were clearly much in Dostoyevsky's mind at this period. At the same time there is little evidence of him professing or practising Christianity in his private life. Even such a devoted biographer as Sofya Kovalevskaya does not mention religion;⁴⁷ and it would appear that the nearest Dostoyevsky came to the Church during the years in question was when he borrowed money to pay his gambling debts from the Russian Orthodox priest in

In February 1867 Dostoyevsky married for the second time. His second wife, Anna Grigoryevna Snitkina, was a devout Russian Orthodox believer, and it has been suggested that this explains why, during the last twelve or so years of his life, Dostoyevsky seemed to come back to the Russian Orthodox Church.⁴⁹ The first four years of Dostoyevsky's second marriage were spent abroad. Anna Grigoryevna recalls this period in her Reminiscences: 'Bless those wonderful years I was lucky enough to spend abroad in close company with this man, so remarkable for his lofty qualities of spirit!' Despite their financial worries, she continues, 'so protracted a life of solitude had a fruitful effect on the appearance and development in my husband of the Christian ideals and feelings which had always been present in him'.⁵⁰ However, the Reminiscences are very much a retrospective account, and if one looks at Anna Grigoryevna's short-hand diary for their first twelve months abroad, which was written actually at the time, then rather a different Dostoyevsky emerges. The man we see here displays few 'lofty qualities of spirit', but is irritable, unreasonable and completely dominated by his passion for gambling. The 'Christian ideals' with which Anna Grigoryevna endows her husband in retrospect may perhaps have existed, but they certainly did not manifest themselves in the form of Church attendance. Apart from the second day of their travels, when husband and wife attended an Easter Saturday service together in Vilna, there is no mention of Dostoyevsky going to Church during the whole twelve months, other than in the capacity of a tourist interested in architecture. Meanwhile, Anna Grigoryevna herself was a frequent Church attender, and she searched out the Russian Orthodox Church in each town they came

to. However, she eventually seems to have been affected by her husband's failing in this respect, since she notes on 23 August that she has not been to Church at all since their arrival in Baden-Baden, even though that was two months ago.⁵¹

The short-hand diary comes to an end in December 1867, and after this date one must return to the Reminiscences for information about Dostoyevsky's frame of mind during the years abroad. He is depicted as a very caring husband, taking great joy in the birth of his daughter Sonya, and suffering immeasurable grief upon her death. It is clear that he still feels some sort of commitment to the Russian Orthodox Church, for in 1868, before Sonya's death, we see him writing to Maykov, anxious because his little daughter has not yet been christened, and asking Maykov to be godfather.⁵² In fact, Dostoyevsky's correspondence with Maykov is evidence that he was thinking very much along Christian lines at this time, even if what we know of his private life does not immediately bear witness to the fact. He writes of his self-appointed task of depicting the positively beautiful man; and of his planned novel, Atheism (Ateizm), the subject of which was to be one man's tortuous route to 'the Russian Christ and the Russian God'.⁵³ His nationalism comes to the fore in letters which sing the praises of Russia's moral superiority over Europe, and which contrast Russia's Christian faith with Europe's atheism.⁵⁴ He writes enthusiastically of the loving relationship which exists between the Tsar and his subjects.⁵⁵

It would appear that Dostoyevsky attended Church quite regularly during the last two years of his European exile, which were spent in Dresden. Anna Grigoryevna writes of good friends she and her husband made 'among the Russian permanent residents of Dresden who used to come after mass to the house of the priest's

family, who were very hospitable'.⁵⁶ Indeed, the Russian Orthodox Church seems to have provided quite a focal point for the Dostoyevskys at this time. We read, for example, of them joining the other Russian residents at the priest's home to compose a letter to send to the Russian Chancellor (sic), expressing their joy that Russia was to maintain a fleet on the Black Sea.⁵⁷ This impression of Dostoyevsky as a veritable pillar of society is enhanced when Anna Grigoryevna describes his attitude towards the resident Russian Orthodox priest in Dresden at the time, Father Rozanov. 'Due to the liveliness of his personality and a certain levity of judgement', she writes, 'he did not embody the ecclesiastical type as my husband conceived it'.⁵⁸ That Dostoyevsky should allegedly have a specific conception of 'the ecclesiastical type' in itself seems to mark a change, since during the time of his involvement with Utopian Socialist thought and the 'New Christianity' such figures as priests did not feature at all prominently in his religion.

The fact that Anna Grigoryevna was a sincere Russian Orthodox believer could well have been a factor in Dostoyevsky's apparent return to the Orthodox Church. However, Dostoyevsky's own tendencies must not be ignored: as has been seen above, his correspondence and his writings of the time reveal a man who was moving in this direction of his own accord.

Upon Dostoyevsky's return to Russia in July 1871, many of his friends noticed a change in him. He seemed to be more considerate, more tolerant, gentler. Strakhov bears witness to this change:

He would constantly bring the conversation around to religious themes. Not only that: his manner changed, acquired greater mildness, sometimes verging on utter gentleness. Even his features bore traces of that frame of mind, and a tender smile would appear on his lips . . .

It was evident that the highest Christian feelings dwelt in him, those feelings which were expressed in his works ever more often and distinctly. This was the man who returned from abroad.⁵⁹

Dostoyevsky's Christianity was indeed very much in evidence during the last decade of his life. In the Reminiscences we see him as a man who prays at important moments in his life; who teaches his children the prayers he himself was taught as a child; and who joins other Russians for a service in the Kazan Cathedral on the outbreak of war with Turkey.⁶⁰ His letters reveal that he attends Church even when Anna is not with him, and makes friendly visits to the local priest.⁶¹

At this point we might usefully take an overall look at Dostoyevsky's personal relations with the hierarchy of the Church at various stages in his life. Two priests featured in his childhood, as we have seen: the deacon/tutor whose vivid Bible stories so impressed his young audience; and Father Barshev, whose presence marked the occasion of any journey of note. Neither man features in Dostoyevsky's memories of his childhood. Father Poluektov at the Engineering Academy evidently made an impression at the time,⁶² but he, too, is passed over in silence by Dostoyevsky. There is then a long gap until 1865, when Father Yanyshv of Wiesbaden helped Dostoyevsky both financially and emotionally after heavy gambling losses. Dostoyevsky's subsequent references to, and correspondence with, Yanyshv are full of respect. Writing of the priest to Maykov in 1868, he refers to him as 'a rare being - dignified, humble, with a feeling of his own worth, with an angelically pure heart, and passionately believing'.⁶³ It was probably the sympathetic response he had had from Yanyshv in 1865 which prompted Dostoyevsky to search for the resident Russian Orthodox priest

when he next had a gambling crisis in Wiesbaden, six years later. He describes his state of mind at the time in a letter to his wife: 'As I was running to find [the priest] in the darkness, along unknown streets, I thought, "After all, he is God's pastor, I will speak to him not as I would to an ordinary individual, but as if I were at confession"'.⁶⁴ Dostoyevsky got lost in the unfamiliar streets and did not find the priest, but it is interesting to see that at this stage he apparently regarded priests as a special group of people, who stood apart from the stream of normal life. However, it is clear from the letter that Dostoyevsky thought that Yanyshév was still the resident priest in Wiesbaden at the time: his positive sentiments about the role of priests may, therefore, be at least partly a reflection of the great respect he felt for Yanyshév as a person. Certainly Dostoyevsky regarded Yanyshév as an exception to the general rule, and he was by no means so well-disposed towards other priests he came across. He was, for example, convinced that the priest in Geneva in 1868, Father Petrov, was working for the Russian secret police and was⁶⁵ keeping a watch on him.

Dostoyevsky's attitude to the priests he encountered seems to have depended very much upon the personal qualities of those involved. Just as he took a dislike to Father Rozanov at Dresden, so he was less than friendly to a priest whose acquaintance he made in Staraya Russa, where the Dostoyevskys spent their summers after their return to Russia. In a particularly jaundiced letter from Ems in 1874, where Dostoyevsky was taking the waters and experiencing an extreme hatred of all things German, he refers to the resident Russian Orthodox priests at Wiesbaden and Dresden in such generous

terms as 'arrogant beast' and 'scoundrel', declaring that 'they outdo each other in their ignorance'. The highlight of the letter comes in the postscript, where Dostoyevsky tells his wife to greet everyone for him: everyone, that is, 'except the Cathedral priest'.⁶⁶ There was, however, another priest in Staraya Russa, in whose cottage the Dostoyevskys stayed the first time they were there. This was Father Rumyantsev, and he and his family became firm friends of Dostoyevsky. The relationship between Father Rumyantsev and Dostoyevsky was not on the theological level, but seems to have been based on much more domestic concerns: it was Rumyantsev's considerate help to the Dostoyevsky family in a series of minor domestic problems which so endeared him to them. Thus we can see that Vrangel's claim that 'Dostoyevsky didn't like priests' did not apply to all those he met.⁶⁷

Another source of information about Dostoyevsky's religious life in the last decade of his life is again provided by the memoirs of his daughter Aimée. She gives the following account of the part Dostoyevsky played in the religious life of his family:

Dostoyevsky superintended our religious education, and liked to worship in company with his family. In Russia we communicate once a year, and we prepare for this solemn event by a week of prayer. My father performed his religious duties reverently, fasted, went to Church twice a day, and laid aside all literary work. He loved our beautiful Holy Week services, especially the Resurrection Mass with its joyful hymns. Children do not attend this mass, which begins at midnight, and ends between two and three in the morning. But my father wished me to be present at this wonderful ceremony when I was barely nine years old. He placed me on a chair, that I might be able to follow it, and with his arms around me, explained the meaning of the holy rites.⁶⁸

Aimée's tendency to idealization apart, Dostoyevsky

is seen here as a father setting an example to his children by his devotion to, and observance of, the Orthodox rites. He is bringing up his children to be thoughtful members of the Church, while ensuring that they also enjoy the beauty and inspiration of the Orthodox liturgy, as he himself had enjoyed it as a child.

So far as Dostoyevsky the public figure was concerned, Christianity was featuring increasingly in his writings. In 1872 he became editor of the reactionary journal Grazhdanin (The Citizen). It was during his association with Grazhdanin that he began his Diary of a Writer column, and the articles he wrote are evidence of his religious orientation, particularly after the Diary began to appear as a separate publication (1876, 1877 and, briefly, in 1880 and 1881). The themes of Russian nationalism, Russian Orthodoxy and Slavic unity inform almost every page of the Diary. When social problems are discussed, Dostoyevsky invariably advocates Christianity as the ultimate solution: Christianity is the only source of morality; Christian self-perfection is the only way truly to improve society. Sectarianism attracts Dostoyevsky's attention to a significant degree. At the same time, the official Russian Orthodox Church is mentioned relatively infrequently: when Dostoyevsky writes of the future role of Orthodoxy in decaying Europe he does so in sweeping and all-embracing terms, and tends not to talk of the Russian Orthodox Church as an institution.

Yet in some ways Dostoyevsky was very close to the official Church at the time, since one of his closest acquaintances was Konstantin Pobedonostsev, whom he met in 1871. At the time, Pobedonostsev was tutor to the heir to the throne,

a Senator, and a member of the Council of State. In 1880 he became the highest Church official in the land, the Procurator of the Holy Synod. Pobedonostsev and Dostoyevsky became acquainted through their work on Grazhdanin, and they were close friends until Dostoyevsky's death. Pobedonostsev had well-defined views on the Church. He considered that the Church should be the servant of the State. His ideal was a stable society of obedient citizens: an autocratic state should ensure unity, and the Church should maintain it, by representing and consolidating a common faith and belief. Religion was thus to act as 'a cement for society'.⁶⁹ Byrnes writes that Pobedonostsev was 'spiritually a descendant of Nicholas I and Uvarov, and his motto or slogan should have been Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality'.⁷⁰ This is not to say that his religion was insincere: he prayed every day; attended Church frequently; often visited monasteries for periods of meditation; and was always moved by the splendour of Orthodox worship. But he never forgot that the Church had a mission to fulfil for the State, and that all the various aspects of religion must be put to this purpose. Thus, as a means of maintaining unity, the Church must actively support the traditions, ceremonies and spectacles of Orthodoxy, and encourage the revered superstitions and beliefs. Pobedonostsev did not encourage speculative thinking in the realm of religion: he emphasized tradition and the unthinking acceptance of ritual. He even lowered the educational standards for the clergy, arguing that the average peasant hardly demanded knowledge of advanced theology from his local priest, and that consequently such training was largely irrelevant.⁷¹ Religion and nationality were very closely linked in Pobedonostsev's mind, and there could be no question of there being more than one

religious creed in Russia. All Russians, he thought, were legally members of the Russian Orthodox Church: any who had been seduced away to other creeds should be encouraged to return, with a little help from the State.

The extent to which Dostoyevsky and Pobedonostsev influenced one another's thinking is debatable: by the time of their friendship, the views of both men were more or less firmly formulated. The least which may be said is that Pobedonostsev's rigid views on the nature and role of the Church formed a part of Dostoyevsky's ideological world at this period: by 1873, the two were intellectual companions, and regularly spent whole evenings together. Pobedonostsev acted to some extent as an informal censor for Dostoyevsky: he advised him, for example, not to publish Stavrogin's confession in The Devils (Besy, 1871-2), and he expressed concern at the power of Ivan Karamazov's argument in the 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor', adding that he hoped a refutation was on the way.⁷² He supplied Dostoyevsky with interesting newspaper cuttings, and gave him a book on the funeral procedure for monks, for use in the chapter about Zosima's funeral in The Brothers Karamazov. We know that Dostoyevsky valued Pobedonostsev's opinion: writing to Vladimir Solovyov in 1876 about a book by Pobedonostsev which was shortly to be published, he says: 'I am expecting this book to be very important. Pobedonostsev is a great mind'.⁷³

Without doubt, the two men held many views in common. Grigorieff follows Berdyayev in attributing Pobedonostsev's attraction to Dostoyevsky to the latter's 'nationalism and pochvennichestvo'.⁷⁴ Pobedonostsev's appreciation of Dostoyevsky's nationalism is illustrated in a letter he wrote to the Tsar upon Dostoyevsky's death: 'His death is a great loss for Russia.

He was the only one of our writers to preach enthusiastically the basic ideas of faith, nationality and love for the Motherland'.⁷⁵ Grigorieff suggests that the two men were also of like mind regarding the desired nature and role of the Church. He writes: 'Pobedonostsev considered that the Church was "a living, nation-wide institution" ("zhivoye vsenarodnoye uchrezhdeniye")'. Dostoyevsky said that "the Church is the whole nation" ("tserkov' - ves' narod")'.⁷⁶ Grigorieff implies that these two similarly-worded definitions express the same meaning. But there is one notable difference between them: the concept of institutionalism, which in Pobedonostsev's phrase is represented by the word uchrezhdeniye, is not present in Dostoyevsky's. One statement of Dostoyevsky is clearly insufficient evidence upon which to base a point of substance, but the conspicuous absence of the Church as an institution in the quotation may be noted.

Dostoyevsky himself evidently considered that he and Pobedonostsev were of like mind on many issues. Writing to him in May 1880, after preparing his Pushkin speech, he says: 'I have prepared my speech about Pushkin in the most extreme spirit of my (that is, our, if I may say so) convictions, therefore I am expecting some attacks'.⁷⁷ Yet it was on the basis of this very Pushkin speech, as will be seen in Chapter Three, that Konstantin Leontyev contrasted Dostoyevsky's attitude to the Church unfavourably with that of Pobedonostsev. Furthermore, one should recall the note of caution in Pobedonostsev's attitude to Dostoyevsky's writings which manifested itself in his response to the 'Legend'. It appears again in a letter he sent to Dostoyevsky enclosing the above-mentioned article by Leontyev: Pobedonostsev voices his concern

that Dostoyevsky sometimes does not express his ideas sufficiently clearly and firmly.⁷⁸ Evidently Pobedonostsev did not feel entirely comfortable in Dostoyevsky's religious thought: it was not dogmatic enough for him.

Another close friend of Dostoyevsky during these years was the young philosopher Vladimir Solovyov. Their acquaintance dates from 1873, but it was in 1877 that the two became close friends. Their friendship is well attested in Anna Grigoryevna's Reminiscences and in Dostoyevsky's correspondence.

Dostoyevsky and Solovyov discussed important spiritual ideas together, as is revealed in a letter from Dostoyevsky to a certain Nikolay Peterson, who had introduced him to the ideas of Nikolay Fyodorov. Dostoyevsky writes that he had read Peterson's letter to Solovyov; that they had together considered the ideas expressed in it; and that he and Solovyov shared a belief in 'a real, literal, personal resurrection'.⁷⁹ A further indication of the depth of their friendship is that when Dostoyevsky made a trip to Optina Pustyn monastery in 1878, grief-stricken after the death of his son Alyosha, it was Solovyov whom he chose as his travelling companion. In 1878 Dostoyevsky attended Solovyov's lectures on 'Godmanhood'; and in 1880 he heard Solovyov's defence of his doctoral dissertation, staying behind afterwards to congratulate him upon it. There is thus no question that Dostoyevsky was well-versed in Solovyov's thought.

Although Dostoyevsky's friendship with Solovyov coincided to a great extent with his friendship with Pobedonostsev, Solovyov and Pobedonostsev had differing views about the nature and role of the Church. Central to Solovyov's conception of the Church was the idea of synthesis. The Incarnation had been the perfect synthesis of God and nature, of the divine and the human.

All could participate in this synthesis through the Church, which was the mystical body of Christ. This was the idea of 'Godmanhood', the subject of Solovyov's 1878 lectures. True Godmanhood would not be attained until universal salvation had been achieved, and it was towards this final goal that the efforts of mankind must be directed. The striving towards Godmanhood must also affect society: social and political life must be regenerated by the spirit of the Gospel, and there must be a gradual process of 'Christianization'. This was to be brought about by 'Free Theocracy', that is, close and unforced co-operation between Church and State. Rather than the Church acting as a servant of the State, as was the case with Pobedonostsev, the State must be an instrument for the establishment of the kingdom of righteousness on earth, and must recognize the supreme authority of the Universal Church.⁸⁰

Solovyov's belief in the possibility of the establishment of a free theocratic order here on earth was met by hostility from Pobedonostsev. He stopped publication of Solovyov's book on theocracy, and Solovyov was forced to go to France for a hearing. The question of the extent to which Solovyov's ideas on the nature of the Church found a place in Dostoyevsky's sympathies has elicited a variety of responses. Sandoz tends to the view that it was Dostoyevsky who influenced Solovyov, but he does not rule out the reverse process: 'In the God-man and the man-god antinomy, as well as in the cosmic mysticism of The Brothers Karamazov the influence of Solovyov can be traced'.⁸¹

Radlov considers that, although the Incarnation is central to both, in general their views are not similar.⁸² Drouilly, while acknowledging that the theocratic ideal played a part in Dostoyevsky's religious thought, denies that it was central; and

he adds that whereas Solovyov saw the Roman Catholic Church as the centre of the theocratic unity, Russian Orthodoxy always remained central for Dostoyevsky.⁸³ Perhaps the most fruitful observation for the purposes of the present study is made by Lord, who sees in the ecclesiastical courts debate which takes place in Zosima's cell in The Brothers Karamazov, specifically in the arguments put forward by Ivan Karamazov, a direct exposition of Solovyov's concept of Free Theocracy.⁸⁴ This debate will be discussed in detail in Chapter Two.

One more aspect of Dostoyevsky's relationship with Solovyov merits attention. Solovyov recalls a conversation with Dostoyevsky during their trip to Optina Pustyn in 1878, in which they discussed the subject of The Brothers Karamazov. He presents Dostoyevsky as saying that in the novel the Church would be portrayed as 'a positive social ideal'.⁸⁵ What exactly Dostoyevsky could have meant by this is not immediately clear and can be ascertained only by reference to the novel itself, or at least to the first part of the novel, since that is all we have. The presentation of the Church in The Brothers Karamazov will be examined in detail in the final chapter of our study.

Little remained of Dostoyevsky's life after the publication of The Brothers Karamazov: the novel was completed in November 1880, and Dostoyevsky died in January 1881. Of his death it may be said that Christianity and the Church were very much in evidence. As soon as Dostoyevsky realized that death was imminent, he called for a priest, made his confession, and took communion. We may note the contrast between his actions at this point and the previous time he had faced death, in 1849. Anna Grigoryevna tells us that her husband asked that his Bible be brought to him - that copy of the Gospels presented to him so many years before:

by the wives of the Decembrists as he was on his way to
 Siberia.⁸⁶ Aimée Dostoyevsky recalls that he requested her
 mother to read out the parable of the Prodigal Son.⁸⁷ So
 Dostoyevsky died in the arms of Orthodoxy and the Church.

His funeral was a national event. Telegrams of sympathy poured in to Anna Grigoryevna from all over Russia, thousands of people joined the funeral procession, and entrance to the cemetery was by ticket only. The requiem mass was attended by Grand Duke Dmitry Konstantinovich, nephew of the Tsar; and there was at the funeral itself an impressive array of establishment figures, including Pobedonostsev and Saburov (Minister of Education) for the government, and Bishop Nestor and Father Yanshev for the Church.⁸⁸ The Aleksandr Nevsky Monastery offered its ceremony and its choir free of charge, and Dostoyevsky's widow was accorded a state pension. Dostoyevsky received all the accolades Church and State between them could provide: to use the words of an onlooker, 'Petersburg had never seen anything like it before'.⁸⁹ It is perhaps ironic that although the contribution of Church and State is well attested, the narod, so important in Dostoyevsky's religious thinking, 'did not participate in the funeral procession. Someone replied to the question "Who's died?" with the words "They say it's some writer or other." That shows the narod didn't know him'.⁹⁰ Another onlooker recalls that when a member of the crowd asked who was receiving such a magnificent send-off, a student present took delight in answering 'a former convict', thus drawing attention to Dostoyevsky's involvement in the Petrashevsky affair, and to the paradox of the support he was now enjoying.⁹¹ (Police surveillance on Dostoyevsky had been lifted only in 1875.) Dostoyevsky had, however, made the

transition from political prisoner to pillar of the establishment and the Church, and his funeral was a clear illustration of that fact.

This review of Dostoyevsky's life has shown that, on the whole, the Christianity and Orthodoxy into which he was born stayed with him throughout his life. He may have been deeply affected by the atheism of Belinsky in the late eighties; and he undoubtedly experienced the conflict of faith and unbelief in a very vivid way. Overall, however, the thread of Christian faith is constant, at times very much in evidence, at times very faint. Dostoyevsky clearly came into contact with many different views of the nature and role of the Church during the course of his life, ranging from the attacks upon institutionalized religion of the Utopian Socialists at one extreme to Pobedonostsev's rigid state Church at the other. He was well aware that some considered institutionalized religion to be dispensable, while for others it was the sine qua non of the true Christian life. The writer's personal commitment to the Church was not constant. There was a broad measure of consistency between the beginning and end of his life, when observation of Church rites and an apparent affection for the teachings of the Church went hand in hand. At these times the Russian Orthodox Church apparently played an integral part in Dostoyevsky's religious faith. In the intervening period this was not always the case: there were times when Dostoyevsky was not drawn to the Church. This was generally true of the second half of the eighties, when the lack of prominence Dostoyevsky accorded to institutionalized religion was arguably the result of his contact

with Utopian Socialist ideas. His Christian faith seems to have been alive at this period, but the relationship between Christianity and the official Church was perhaps not obvious to him. The decade following Dostoyevsky's prison sentence was another period when he was not, apparently, deeply committed to the Russian Orthodox Church. It is, however, difficult to say whether this was the result of a conviction about the role of the Church or simply of religious indifference, since Christianity was in any event not to the fore in Dostoyevsky's life at that time. On the basis of biography alone one is clearly not in a position to define with any degree of certainty the role Dostoyevsky assigned to the Russian Orthodox Church, and to institutionalized religion in general, in the relationship between the individual believer and God. As we now proceed to the portrayal of the Russian Orthodox Church in Dostoyevsky's writings it may, however, be borne in mind that the period of the author's most conspicuous attachment to the Church broadly coincides with the appearance of his major novels.

1. Aimée Dostoyevsky Fyodor Dostoyevsky. A Study (London, 1921), 35. Lithuania here means the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.
2. K. Onasch, Der verschwiegene Christus. Versuch über die Poetisierung des Christentums in der Dichtung F. M. Dostoiewskis (Berlin, 1976) (hereafter: Onasch, Der verschwiegene Christus), 12. All translations, unless otherwise indicated, are my own.
3. Andrey Dostoyevsky's memoirs have been published in F. M. Dostoyevsky v vospominaniyakh sovremennikov (2 volumes; Moscow, 1964) (hereafter: DVS), I, 35-95. They are used, usually without detailed reference, as the basis of much of the following account of Dostoyevsky's childhood.
4. Onasch, Der verschwiegene Christus, 21-2.
5. DVS, I, 42.
6. F. M. Dostoyevsky, Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy v tridsati tomakh (Leningrad, 1972-) (hereafter: PSS), XIV, 264. At the time of writing, publication of PSS had reached volume XXIV. For those of Dostoyevsky's writings which fall outside the present range of PSS (for the purposes of the present study this includes Dnevnik pisatelya 1877, 1880 and 1881; and Dostoyevsky's correspondence) reference will be made to earlier editions.
 Anna Grigoryevna Dostoyevsky confirms that Zosima's memories are based upon her husband's childhood experiences: see L. P. Grossman, Seminariy po Dostoyevskomu. Materialy, bibliografiya i kommentarii (Moscow & Petrograd, 1922; reprinted as No. 32 in 'Russian Titles for the Specialist', Letchworth, 1972) (hereafter: Grossman, Seminariy), 68.
7. PSS, XXI, 134.
8. F. M. Dostoyevsky, Pisma, ed. A. S. Dolinin (4 volumes; Moscow/Leningrad, 1928-59) (hereafter: Pisma), I, 41.
9. DVS, I, 106-7.
10. Ibid., 97.
11. Ibid., 86.
12. Ibid., 97-8; 106.
13. J. Frank, Dostoevsky. The Seeds of Revolt. 1821-1849 (London, 1977), 78.
14. See, for example, the implication in Dostoyevsky's letter to his brother Mikhail (Pisma, I, 65), as pointed out by Frank (op. cit., 115).

15. DVS, I, 115-6.
16. Frank, op. cit., 130.
17. Pisma, I, 103.
18. Belinsky, PSS, XII, 250.
19. PSS, XXI, 11.
20. Ibid., 12.
21. Ibid., 131.
22. Ibid., 130.
23. See Frank, op. cit., 172-98 for a detailed discussion of the relationship between Dostoyevsky and Belinsky.
24. O. Miller & N. Strakhov, Materialy dlya zhizneopisaniya F. M. Dostoyevskogo. Biografiya, pisma i zametki iz zapisnoy knizhki F. M. Dostoyevskogo (St. Petersburg, 1883), 91.
25. Frank, op. cit., 250-2.
26. DVS, I, 186.
27. See Introduction, 3-4, above.
28. DVS, I, 169.
29. See Frank, op. cit., 196. This detail is not included in the abridged version of Yanovsky's memoirs which appears in DVS.
30. Pisma, I, 124; 125.
31. F. N. Lvov, 'Zapiska o dele Petrashevtsev', Literaturnoye nasledstvo LXIII. Gertsen i Ogaryov III (Moscow, 1956), 188.
32. DVS, I, 222-34.
33. Recalling that morning in Diary of a Writer in 1873, Dostoyevsky claims that not one of those sentenced felt the need to repent of his deeds. See PSS, XXI, 133.
34. PSS, IV, 176-7.
35. Aimée Dostoyevsky, op. cit., 65.
36. DVS, I, 237.
37. Ibid., 200.
38. Pisma, I, 138.
39. Ibid., 142.

40. DVS, I, 254.
41. Ibid.
42. PSS, XX, 172-5.
43. V. V. Zenkovsky, op. cit., I, 405; W. Dowler, Dostoevsky, Grigor'ev and Native Soil Conservatism (Toronto, 1982).
44. PSS, XVIII, 36-7. See also PSS, XIX, 147-50 ('Obyavleniye o podpiske na zhurnal "Vremya" na 1862 god').
45. For a more detailed discussion of the development of pochvennichestvo see Dowler, op. cit.; and Ellen Chances, 'Počvenničestvo - Evolution of an Ideology', Modern Fiction Studies, XX, 1974-5 (543-51).
46. Pisma, I, 353.
47. Sofya Kovalevskaya's memoirs of Dostoyevsky appear in DVS, I (337-61). She was the sister of Anna Korvin-Krukovskaya, whom Dostoyevsky courted in the years 1865-6.
48. Dostoyevsky refers to the incident in a letter to the priest concerned, Father I. L. Yanshev, written upon his return to Russia. See Pisma, I, 426.
49. See, e.g., A. Boyce Gibson, The Religion of Dostoevsky (London, 1973), 34-5.
50. Anna Dostoevsky, Dostoevsky. Reminiscences, trans. and ed. Beatrice Stillman (London, 1976) (hereafter: Anna Dostoevsky, Reminiscences), 169.
51. The Diary of Dostoyevsky's Wife, ed. R. Fülöp-Miller & Fr. Eckstein, translated from the German edition by Madge Pemberton (London, 1928), 397. Dates are given according to the Old Style dating of the Julian calendar.
52. Pisma, II, 97.
53. Ibid., 61; 150.
54. Ibid., 64.
55. Ibid., 100.
56. Anna Dostoevsky, Reminiscences, 157.
57. Ibid., 161.
58. Ibid.
59. Ibid., 170.
60. Ibid., 173; 199; 242; 282.
61. E.g., Pisma, III, 37.

62. See 20, above.
63. Pisma, II, 80.
64. Ibid., 347.
65. Ibid., 130.
66. Pisma, III, 116.
67. See 31, above.
68. Aimée Dostoyevsky, op. cit., 205-6.
69. R. F. Byrnes, Pobedonostsev. His Life and Thought (Indiana, 1968), 304.
70. Ibid., 107.
71. See *ibid.*, 177.
72. Pisma, IV, 398.
73. Ibid., III, 202.
74. D. Grigorieff, Dostoyevsky i Russkaya Pravoslav'naya Tserkov' (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1958), 53.
75. Krasny arkhiv, II (Moscow, 1922), 252.
76. Grigorieff, op. cit., 53-4.
77. Pisma, IV, 144.
78. Literaturnoye nasledstvo, XV (Moscow, 1934), 146
79. Pisma, IV, 10.
80. 'Free Theocracy' will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Three, below.
81. E. Sandoz, Political Apocalypse. A Study of Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor (Louisiana, 1971), 11-14.
82. E. L. Radlov, 'Solovyov i Dostoyevsky', F. M. Dostoyevsky. Stati i materialy, ed. A. S. Dolinin (Petersburg, 1922) (155-72).
83. J. Drouilly, La Pensée Politique et Religieuse de F. M. Dostoievski (Paris, 1971), 428-9.
84. R. Lord, Dostoevsky. Essays and Perspectives (London, 1970) (143-63).
85. V. S. Solovyov, Sobraniye sochineniy, ed. S. M. Solovyov & E. L. Radlov (10 volumes; St. Petersburg, 1901) (hereafter: Solovyov, SS), III, 197-8.

86. Anna Dostoevsky, Reminiscences, 345; PSS, XXI, 12.
87. Aimée Dostoyevsky, op. cit., 274.
88. Bishop Nestor was a prominent figure in the St. Petersburg diocese. Yanyshv was Rector of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy.
89. Dostoyevsky i yego vremya, ed. V. G. Bazanov & G. M. Fridlender (Leningrad, 1971) (305-7), 306. Letter from S. N. Tyutchev to P. V. Annenkov, 2 February 1881.
90. Aleksandra Bogdanovich, Tri poslednikh samoderzhavtsa. Dnevnik 1880-1912, ed. L. D. Frenkel (Moscow/Leningrad, 1924), 44. Entry for 1 February 1881.
91. Anna Engelgardt, 'Veliky russky psikholog', 1882. Cited in Literaturnoye nasledstvo LXXXVI. F. M. Dostoyevsky. Nove materialy i issledovaniya (Moscow, 1973), 541.

THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH IN DOSTOYEVSKY'S WRITINGS

Not all writers who are Christians write about Christian themes, and although one might reasonably expect Christian values to play some part in their works, the absence of explicitly Christian material does not necessarily imply anything about the writer's faith. So far as Dostoyevsky is concerned, it is an observable fact that religious themes featured increasingly in his works, reaching a climax in The Brothers Karamazov. In view of this, and on the basis of the previous chapter where we observed Dostoyevsky's 'return' to the Church during the last thirteen years of his life - a period which includes all but one of the major novels - we might expect to see a parallel increase in the amount of attention paid to the Russian Orthodox Church in the novels. It is the extent and the nature of Dostoyevsky's presentation of the Russian Orthodox Church in his novels which will concern us in the present chapter. We begin with a general survey of Dostoyevsky's treatment of religion up to and including The Humiliated and the Insulted (Unizhonnnye i oskorblyonnye, 1861). The presentation of the Russian Orthodox Church from Notes from the House of the Dead onwards will be discussed with reference to Dostoyevsky's treatment of three specific aspects of the Church: the Church as a place of worship; Russian Orthodox priests; and the desired relationship between Church and State, as revealed in the Church courts debate in The Brothers Karamazov.

Mochulsky characterizes Dostoyevsky's pre-exile writings as follows: 'Religious questions are never posed in any of his works

prior to his servitude in Siberia . . . In Dostoevsky's writings 55
of this period, God finds no mention'.¹ Hingley, writing of the
same period, remarks that we do not find 'any foretaste of
[Dostoyevsky's] later religious thinking as an apostle of
Orthodox Christianity'.² It is true that religious themes
were not central to Dostoyevsky's early writings. However, in
his description of life around him Dostoyevsky inevitably
touched upon religion to some extent, and general trends may
be discerned in his presentation of religion in the pre-exile
period.

First, one can see the influence of Utopian Socialist
thinking on religious matters. This is particularly, and not
surprisingly, true of Poor Folk which found such great favour
with the Natural School critics such as Belinsky.³ Russian
Orthodoxy plays a natural and unobtrusive part in the lives of
the characters of Poor Folk. Makar Devushkin is a traditional
Russian Orthodox believer, and it is his visits to Church
which enable him to see Varvara Dobrosyolova. His faith is an
intrinsic part of his world-view, intimately and inextricably
connected with his blind acceptance of the existing social
order and his own position in that order. Indeed, the two
are so completely interdependent that to make a mistake at
work is tantamount to complicity with the Evil One himself.⁴
On the one occasion when Makar indulges in a bout of
'free-thinking', he is overcome by a feeling of sinfulness, and
prays to God for forgiveness. Although he has not challenged
God directly, he has done so indirectly, by criticizing the
social order He ordained:

Every position has been determined for mankind by the Most
High. This person is destined to wear a General's

epaulettes, that one to serve as a petty official; this one to command, the other unquestioningly and fearfully to obey. Everything is calculated according to man's capabilities . . . and capabilities are determined by God Himself.⁵

In the world of the minor official, Providence is equated with the powers that be, and vice versa: His Excellency in the Department is not actually addressed as God, but this is clearly the role he plays for Makar Devushkin and those like him.

Such a presentation of religion is in keeping with the attitudes of the more radical thinkers of the time. Makar's religious faith is shown to be a contributing factor to the status quo, making him passive and unquestioning of society and of the rules according to which it operates. Religion does not feature in Poor Folk sufficiently to indicate Dostoyevsky's attitude towards the specific concept of institutionalized religion. The only character who is associated in a conspicuous manner with the Church is Varvara's relative, Anna Fyodorovna: a complete hypocrite, she appears to limit her participation in Church affairs to the arrangement of the funerals of those around. Even this dubious religious involvement is so shallow that a trifling argument suffices to stop her from attending the service itself. The person who makes a show of belonging to the Church is seen to be the least Christian in character.

Religion plays a conspicuous part in The Landlady⁶ (Khozyayka, 1847), which has been described as 'still one of Dostoevsky's most enigmatic works' and 'the richest of Dostoevsky's early works in important anticipations of the future'.⁷ So far as the present study is concerned, the basic problem of interpretation lies in ascertaining the significance of Murin's religious faith and of the way in which this faith

gives him an oppressive hold over Katerina, his wife/daughter. Mochulsky sees the tale primarily as a vehicle for examining mankind: for him, it deals with the trauma of the dreamer faced with reality; the relationship between man and freedom; love and passion as tyranny. He notes in passing that Murin has associations with Old Belief, but he attaches no intrinsic significance to them.⁸ Other critics have interpreted the tale with reference to Dostoyevsky's socio-political views at the time it was written. Frank draws attention to an article Dostoyevsky wrote for the St. Petersburg Gazette in the summer of 1847, in which he considers what it means to be a nationalist. Dostoyevsky denies that nationalism consists in revering the past at the expense of the present, and he implicitly criticizes the Slavophiles and others like them for whom, he says, nationalism lies in 'the dead letter, an outlived idea, a pile of stones, . . . a blind, wholehearted appeal to the dark national past'.⁹ The Landlady is seen by Frank as an artistic embodiment of this critical attitude towards Slavophilism. He also, however, sees in the tale a criticism of Orthodoxy 'so far as [Dostoyevsky], like Belinsky, then saw the latter as a religion of fear or terror'.¹⁰ Frank thus closely relates the depiction of religion in the story to the Utopian Socialist thinking which was an important part of Dostoyevsky's ideological world at the time. Neuhäuser's interpretation puts great emphasis upon this particular aspect. For him, Katerina represents the Russian people; Murin 'embodies all that is evil in Russia's national traditions, particularly as concentrated in religious ritual'; and Ordynov is a Utopian Socialist who wants to free Katerina (Russia) from what Murin represents.¹¹ Onasch, summarizing this and similar inter-

pretations, sees Katerina as the symbol for a 'deconfessionalized' ⁵⁸
('entkonfessionalisierte') Church: Ordynov thus becomes 'the
emancipator of the "sophianic" soul of Katerina, of the ideal
Church, from the "cold, jealous tyranny" of Murin/the Grand
Inquisitor'.¹²

Before moving to consider the evidence of the tale itself,
two things should be borne in mind. First, The Landlady is
primarily a creative, literary work, not a polemical weapon:
Dostoyevsky's socio-political views were inevitably reflected
in his writings to some extent, but his novels were not merely
vehicles for politics. Secondly, it should be remembered that
the criticisms of "the official, institutionalized Church which
were characteristic of Utopian Socialist thought represented
only one side of Dostoyevsky at the time in question, since
we have it on Yanovsky's evidence that Dostoyevsky was
concurrently a practising Russian Orthodox believer.¹³

Any interpretation of The Landlady must take into account
the fact that it belongs to the Romantic tradition. Passage
identifies such Romantic literary ancestors for Murin as
Hoffmann's hypnotist Alban in The Magnetizer and Coppelius in
The Sandman.¹⁴ He also points to the wizard in Gogol's
A Terrible Vengeance who, like Murin, has an incestuous love
for his daughter, also called Katerina. Yet Passage comments
that 'all of these "explanations" of Murin fail to account for
the character as a whole'.¹⁵ He draws particular attention to
Murin's attendance at vespers and his reading of religious
writings, for which he finds no source in the works from which
he considers The Landlady to be derived. Ultimately, however,
Passage decides that Murin's religion is sincere and of no
particular significance: 'Whatever may have been involved in

the past, he is genuinely pious, sincerely reads his religious books, and attends Vespers with true reverence. That he speaks Tartar is of no significance; that he may be an Old Believer is equally without significance'.¹⁶

This assessment of Murin as a sincere and harmless religious devotee is surprising. There would seem to be little doubt that he represents a dark and oppressive force, and that his religion plays a part in this. The question which must be asked, however, is whether the religious dimension of Murin's character is introduced with a specifically religious purpose. Religion plays no part in Murin's early relationship with Katerina, but comes only later. In fact, Murin's religious fanaticism is an effective way of sustaining him as an intense and threatening character at a stage when he is no longer capable of exercising power over Katerina on the basis of passion and sex. It could, therefore, be argued that the religious element is merely a vehicle to illustrate the psychological phenomenon of power over weak individuals. Yet Dostoyevsky had no need to introduce a specifically religious dimension to sustain Murin: if one looks at Murin's counterpart in Gogol's A Terrible Vengeance, one finds that, although also involved in mysticism, he is purely and simply a wizard.¹⁷ He is given no links with Orthodoxy at all, but is rather contrasted with all religious creeds. Such a character would have served Dostoyevsky's purpose had he merely wanted to portray in Murin an evil and oppressive force. But Murin is associated with the Russian Orthodox Church. It would seem, therefore, that the religious element is after all introduced with a specifically religious purpose.

First, the tale serves as a powerful condemnation of dark

and oppressive religion which plays on people's fears and weaknesses: Katerina's life is one of terror; Murin constantly rekindles her sense of guilt; their worship in Church is not joyful, but is characterized by Katerina's weeping on the cold stone slabs. Yet this darker side of Orthodoxy is held in an unwholesome awe by people, as is demonstrated by the extreme respect shown to Murin by his local priest.¹⁸ A similar respect for gloomy religion is shown by the German landlady with whom Ordynov lodges after leaving Murin's house: she is delighted when she sees her young lodger spending hours in gloomy prayer before the icons.¹⁹

Murin is not simply associated with Russian Orthodoxy in general, however. Dostoyevsky endows him with certain features which suggest that he is a schismatic, or has schismatic tendencies (since he still attends an Orthodox Church). He has many books, from which he reads to Katerina, and which are in manuscript, 'like old schismatic books'.²⁰ He reminds Ordynov of a merchant, a class closely associated with Old Belief: he has a beard and is dressed in a kaftan, in the old Russian style.²¹ Dostoyevsky's decision to depict the tyrannical Murin as a schismatic suggests that he did not, at this period, look kindly on Old Belief.

Before seeing The Landlady as a wholesale condemnation of Orthodoxy, however, some qualifications should be made. First, even for an Old Believer Murin is extreme. His religion borders on black magic, and there is no redeeming feature to it: if he is intended as a condemnation of Russian Orthodoxy and Old Belief, then the condemnation is weakened by the choice of an untypical representative. Secondly, and closely related to the first point,

one must ask whether the darker extremes of Murin as he is presented to us might not be a reflection of the impressionable mind of Ordynov, rather than a true representation of Murin himself. Ordynov is shown as welcoming a dark interpretation of life: when he enters church for the first time, for example, he deliberately chooses to stand in the darkest and most gloomy corner.²² Early in the story we read: 'Everywhere was deserted and empty; everything looked gloomy and unwelcoming: at least, it seemed that way to Ordynov'.²³ How many other features of the tale are portrayed as 'gloomy and unwelcoming' because they 'seemed that way to Ordynov'?

One extreme of the extent to which Ordynov may be seen as influencing the way people and events are presented is illustrated by Bem's interpretation, according to which all the events in the tale are merely a product of Ordynov's mind, and Katerina and Murin are merely extensions of Ordynov's (and Dostoyevsky's) emotions and ideas.²⁴ It must indeed be acknowledged that Ordynov is impressionable and highly emotional, prone to extremes of joy and despair. Since events are seen from his point of view, one may well be justified in concluding that Murin is less menacing and evil than he is presented. This reduces the condemnation of Orthodoxy to some extent.

Of perhaps more significance, however, is the fact that Murin is not the sole spokesman for religion in The Landlady: another side of Orthodoxy is visible in the lighter and healthier Russian piety which Katerina demonstrates when she is away from Murin. Most of the time her religion is frenzied and introspective. But once Ordynov has become a lodger in the house, Katerina's religion is turned outwards. When she is with Ordynov,

another human being for whom she can care, the terror which had characterized her spirituality is temporarily displaced, and it is out of concern and love that she makes the sign of the cross over Ordynov, not because of guilt, which is her usual motivation.²⁵ The childhood memories of Ordynov himself, in particular his memory of his mother blessing him, also evoke a happier, more normal version of Orthodoxy.²⁶ Murin is undoubtedly associated with Russian Orthodoxy, and Russian Orthodoxy suffers through the association. But it seems that he is intended only as a criticism of religious abuse, and that Orthodoxy is not rejected outright.

Further, and bearing in mind Frank's view that in The Landlady Dostoyevsky is speaking out against Slavophilism, it may be noted that neither Russian nationalism nor the Russian past are rejected wholesale. When Katerina symbolically clears Murin's possessions - objects which are Russian, but old, dark and gloomy - from the table, the things she replaces them with are themselves distinctive for being traditional and Russian: a richly embroidered tablecloth, an ancient silver drinking service.²⁷ The difference is in the atmosphere produced by the objects: Murin's give rise to gloom and fear, while Katerina's serve to remove the dark oppression. This is a healthier form of Russian nationalism, just as Katerina's religion was a healthier form of Orthodoxy. Katerina thus serves to reinstate both religion and Russia. Taken together, the two suggest that what is being offered in contrast to Murin's oppressive religion is not a vague universal idealism, not the 'denominationless' Church to which Onasch refers, but religion in a specifically Russian context.

The extent to which The Landlady might be a platform for

the religious thought associated with Utopian Socialism remains to be considered. At the beginning of the tale we learn that Ordynov has a passion for learning and philosophy²⁸ (nauka). At the end we are made aware that he had had plans to write a history of the Church, a project behind which lay his warmest convictions.²⁹ Neuhäuser equates the two, and suggests that Ordynov's project corresponds to Utopian Socialist philosophy and to the attitude to the Church characteristic of that philosophy. The basis of Ordynov's enigmatic 'system' ('sistema'), he considers, is 'a morality which has been purified of the superstitions contained in traditional morality and the doctrines of the established church'. Ordynov, he says, 'is either debunking church religion by a critique of the church on the pattern of Feuerbach, Strauss, or one of the utopian socialists, or he is building the new church as demanded by Saint-Simon and other French socialists'.³⁰

Neuhäuser's interpretation may be challenged on two counts. First, Ordynov's planned Church history is a different project from his 'system', as may be inferred from the text.³¹ Perhaps more significant, however, is that Ordynov is not presented as a person specially concerned with religion in any form: his Church history project is rather unexpected. It could be objected that a Utopian Socialist would not have an overtly religious nature and would not display traditional religiosity. Neuhäuser himself argues along these lines, and points instead to features of the specifically Utopian Socialist approach to religion which he alleges are present in Ordynov. He draws attention to 'the humanistic aspect which finds expression in Ordynov's deep sympathy for those around him who suffer'; he says that Ordynov is by nature 'good, pure,

angélique', as befitting a person in the Utopian Socialist world; he refers to Ordynov's 'lack of piety, his indifference to church doctrine and ritual throughout the novella'.³²

But do these character traits really apply to Ordynov? The only person for whom he shows concern is Katerina herself, with whom he is infatuated. There is little evidence of a 'humanistic aspect' to his nature: rather, he is shown to be alienated from people and not at home in the world, which oppresses him. Certainly Ordynov is not involved in what is going on in church at those times when he is present. But there is nothing in the text to suggest that he is opposed to what is going on: rather, he is simply unaware, caught up in his own internal dramas. It is true that Ordynov calls Murin a hypocrite, and resents the way he exploits religion to maintain his grip on the soul of Katerina, but this response results primarily from his rivalry with Murin for the love of Katerina. The Ordynov of the story is a dreamer, cut off from reality, a Romantic figure, and there is little to incline one to regard him as a Utopian Socialist thinker.

So far as Ordynov's Church history is concerned, it is true that, taken in context, it is contrasted with the unhealthy mysticism to which Ordynov falls prey after his experiences. Frank suggests that Ordynov was intending to preach a humanitarian religion of 'light and hope and faith in man', but that his experience of mankind, in the form of Katerina's unwillingness to free herself from Murin, that is, from the dark, mystical and ritualistic side of religion, had convinced him that his dream was unrealizable.³³ The text supplies some support for such an interpretation, since it is indeed after his experiences with Murin and Katerina that Ordynov abandons

his Church history. Nevertheless, to associate Ordynov with a religion of 'light and hope and faith in man' is to ignore those aspects of his character which were identified above. Even if this is done, however, it does not alter the fact that the Utopian Socialist approach is discredited: Ordynov himself succumbs to the very mysticism he would abolish.

Clearly The Landlady deserves its reputation as a rich and enigmatic work. It serves to reveal several aspects of Dostoyevsky's attitude to religious matters at the time it was written. The effect of his presentation of Murin is to condemn tyrannical religion which operates through fear and threats. Murin's schismatic tendencies suggest that Dostoyevsky associated Old Belief with this type of oppressive religious fanaticism. At the same time Dostoyevsky recognizes the attractiveness of this type of religion for mankind. Although Russian Orthodoxy suffers through its association with Murin, Dostoyevsky does not completely dismiss religion: the tale contains fleeting glimpses of a happier Russian Orthodoxy, which is light and joyful. Whether Ordynov represents another alternative still, the religion of the Utopian Socialists, is, as we have seen, open to debate: even if this is present, however, it is found to be wanting.

At the time of The Landlady Dostoyevsky was also working on Netochka Nezvanova, although this was not published until 1849.³⁴ In distinction from The Landlady, religion does not occupy a prominent place in Netochka Nezvanova. Nevertheless, the eponymous heroine encounters various people during the course of the novel who represent different aspects of religion. The old aunt of Prince X is superficially the most religious

character yet encountered in Dostoyevsky's writings: she is a frequent Church attender, with a prayer always on her lips as her fingers count her beads. That she is also a petty despot in the Prince's household invites the reader to draw his own conclusions about such people. The gentle Aleksandra Mikhaylovna is, on the contrary, very sincere in her religious devotions. Even she is not wholly free from suspicion, however, since her nun-like existence has rather been forced upon her by past circumstances and merely contributes further to her unnatural and oppressive life which brings only anguish. For Netochka herself Russian Orthodoxy holds morbid memories. It is associated in her mind with the sight of her mother's corpse and the demented entreaties of her crazed father that she pray before the family icon, before the two of them steal away into the night.³⁵ These memories are awakened when Netochka is taken into the icon room at the home of Prince X.³⁶ The room provides no comfort, but fills her with terror which is only increased by the faces of the saints peering darkly from the icons. The reader is reminded of the darker aspects of Orthodoxy as presented in The Landlady. Prince X himself is the embodiment of Christian virtues. While gentle and kind, he is yet a firm character, fully able to stand up to his strong-willed wife when necessary. He may be seen as an early version of the type which was later to assume such great significance for Dostoyevsky: the positively good man. The Prince is firmly situated in a Russian Orthodox context (it is he who takes Netochka to pray in the icon room), but his devotion to the Church is not at the expense of people. Netochka is presented as responding to the Christian kindness of the Prince. It would seem that the Left Hegelianism to which Dostoyevsky

was exposed during this period did not lead him to reject Christian moral-religious values, even though some aspects of religion are subjected to criticism by him.

Two works from 1859, Uncle's Dream (Dyadyushkin son) and The Village of Stepanchikovo and its Inhabitants (Selo Stepanchikogo i yego obitateli) may be considered together with the pre-exile works for the purposes of this survey, since in them the subject of religion receives a similar treatment: Dostoyevsky is, on the whole, looking at religion and the Church from the outside, and highlighting the more unacceptable facets. Religion does not feature prominently in Uncle's Dream, although Marya Aleksandrovna's attempts to persuade Zina to marry the old Prince by making a lofty appeal to Christian virtues expose the fickleness of hypocritical society: Christianity is invoked only when it is expedient so to do. A further example of such exploitation of Christianity for personal gain may be found in The Village of Stepanchikovo, in the character of Foma Opiskin. Foma himself is a stock literary type: the religious hypocrite. The tone of the narrative is comic, and over-serious analysis would run contrary to its nature. One particular feature of Foma's thinking, however, serves to express the essence of his religious faith: the distinction he makes between his Christianity and his life. This is immortalized in his words to Rostanov at the climax of the story: 'As a Christian I forgive you and will even love you, but as a man . . . I despise you'.³⁸ Foma's teaching, if considered separately from his character, contains thoughts which at the end of Dostoyevsky's literary career appear in rather more sympathetic a character: Zosima, in The Brothers

Karamazov. Thus Foma talks of the necessity for self-mastery, and of the beneficial effects of suffering.³⁹ However, the lack of credibility which he enjoys as a person deprives his moral admonitions of any power.

In The Humiliated and the Insulted a rather more sincere appeal is made to Christianity.⁴⁰ The appeal is to the spirit of forgiveness central to the Christian religion: Christ brought forgiveness to all men, and set an example for all. Two of the characters in the novel find it hard to forgive, however: neither Jeremiah Smith, Nelly's grandfather, nor Nikolay Sergeych, the father of Natasha, can bring himself to forgive his daughter for leaving the family home for an unworthy man. Although both are devout men, pride gets in the way. The central character in the novel, Nelly, pleads with Natasha's father to respond to the spirit of Easter, the spirit of mutual forgiveness and love.⁴¹ She makes the same appeal to her grandfather, as she later relates to Anna Andreyevna. The old man is faced with the compelling logic of a child, which sees things in black and white: 'And when we began to read the Scriptures once more, I asked [grandfather] again: why, if Jesus Christ said "Love one another and forgive insults", didn't he want to forgive Mummy?'⁴² But in between the exhortation and its fulfilment lies man with his complex psychology. It is this inner struggle between pride and Christ's teachings which is the focus of attention. The Humiliated and the Insulted thus illustrates an awareness in Dostoyevsky of the profound demands of Christ's teachings as applied to the human personality. This depth of penetration represents a significant progression from the earlier writings, where Dostoyevsky frequently seemed to be looking

Two further aspects of the presentation of religion in The Humiliated and the Insulted should also be mentioned. One is the fleeting evocation of a Russian Orthodox childhood by Anna Andreyevna, Natasha's mother. The old woman recalls how every night as the sun was setting she would make the sign of the cross over Natasha and read her a prayer, which her little daughter repeated after her.⁴³ Ordynov in The Landlady similarly had a childhood memory of his mother making the sign of the cross over him. The significance of such memories will be examined in more detail in the second section of this chapter.

The nature of Jeremiah Smith's religion also merits attention, since he is the first Protestant to appear in Dostoyevsky's novels. On one level, of course, it is immaterial to which particular confession Smith belongs: his predicament is that of any Christian who finds that pride prevents him from behaving as Christ taught. It is nevertheless significant that Dostoyevsky chooses to symbolize Smith's religious devotion with his well-worn and annotated New Testament.⁴⁴ Smith will be considered in more detail in Chapter Five, where we examine Dostoyevsky's presentation of Protestantism.

In our survey of Dostoyevsky's writings up to and including The Humiliated and the Insulted we have been concerned with one very specific area: the treatment of religious matters. One of the dangers inherent in such an approach is to create the impression that the works concerned deal with religion to the exclusion of every other theme, and

it should be repeated, therefore, that religion does not feature prominently in the early writings: that an important work like The Double (Dvoynik, 1846) does not even appear in our analysis serves to illustrate that fact. Certain trends may, however, be detected. Generally speaking, and in particular in the earliest works, Dostoyevsky writes about religion as an outsider and approaches the question from a socio-political rather than from a theological angle. His critique of religion shows the influence of Utopian Socialist thought: we have an exposé of the religious hypocrite and zealot, and of the abuse of religion in order to gain a hold over people. These are examples of ways in which religion functions at the expense of humanity. At the same time, however, Dostoyevsky gives an essentially critical portrayal of the would-be Utopian Socialist, Ordynov. Although dark and oppressive Orthodoxy is rejected in the early works, an alternative religion of light and happiness is briefly hinted at, still firmly rooted in the Russian Orthodox tradition. Little attention is paid specifically to the role of the Church with respect to the religious faith of the individual, although the emphasis in The Humiliated and the Insulted on the direct relationship between a man and Christ's teachings should be borne in mind. Finally, the early works contain themes which will later occupy Dostoyevsky the Christian writer: the problem of pride and Christianity; the attraction of an inquisitorial Church for the weak individual; and the positively good person.

The presentation of the Russian Orthodox Church in Dostoyevsky's works from Notes from the House of the Dead

onwards will be discussed with detailed reference to individual scenes from the novels which serve to highlight Dostoyevsky's attitude to specific aspects of the Church: the Church as a place of worship; the Russian Orthodox priest; and the relationship of Church to State.

It is a feature of Dostoyevsky's novels that they contain very few scenes which take place in church. Although regular church attendance might reasonably be regarded as a normal part of religious life, it is not given prominence by Dostoyevsky. Instead, the Russian Orthodox Church as a place of worship is most often encountered in the form of a childhood memory of a visit to church. Similar 'religious' memories have already been encountered in the early works: Ordynov in The Landlady dreams of his mother making the sign of the cross over him as a child; and Anna Andreyevna in The Humiliated and the Insulted recalls the Orthodox upbringing she gave her daughter Natasha. In the later works such memories become a major feature. The characters who recall their childhood religious experiences in this way are very varied: Raskolnikov in Crime and Punishment, Arkady Dolgoruky in A Raw Youth (Podrostok, 1875), and Zosima in The Brothers Karamazov. But the memories themselves are very similar: the same details recur, and the same atmosphere is evoked.

Raskolnikov's memory occurs in the middle of a disturbing dream in which he recalls seeing a horse beaten to death.⁴⁵ Despite the fact that his visits to church are to attend memorial services for deceased relatives, there is no sense of sadness about them, since Raskolnikov does not remember those involved. Indeed, the occasions are happy: he recalls the special rice cake which his mother would take, the church

with its ancient icons, and the old priest 'with his nodding head'. Arkady Dolgoruky's memory is recalled twice. The first time is near the beginning of the novel, when he tells Versilov about his childhood: he recalls his mother taking him to an old country church to receive the sacraments.⁴⁶ The second is at the height of his dealings with Lambert, when he has a fall and is knocked unconscious: the same memory is merged with another of his mother visiting him at school in Holy Week.⁴⁷ He recalls how she crosses herself in front of the old church opposite the school. Zosima's memory forms part of his teachings to his fellow monks shortly before his death. It is recalled in detail, and will serve as a basis for our examination of this phenomenon:

My mother took me to church on my own (I don't remember where my brother was at the time), to morning Mass on the Monday of Holy Week. It was a bright day, and I can remember now, just as though I saw it again, how the incense rose from the censer and floated slowly upwards, and how through a little window in the dome above God's rays of sunlight streamed into the church onto us, and how, rising in waves towards them, the incense seemed to dissolve in them. I looked up in tender emotion /smotrel ya umilenno/, and for the first time in my life I consciously received the first seed of the word of God into my soul. Then a young lad stepped out into the middle of the church carrying a big book, so big that it seemed to me at the time that he could hardly carry it. He laid it on the lectern, opened it, and began to read . . . and then the soft and sweet singing in the church: 'Hearken unto my prayer', and again the incense from the priest's censer and the kneeling in prayer.⁴⁸

The passage contains certain characteristic details: it is Easter time; it is usually the mother who is taking the child to church; rays of sunlight are streaming into the church; there is incense in the air. Sometimes we will be told that the church is old and poor, and that the icons do not have jewelled frames. Each detail is not merely informative

and descriptive, but also highly evocative and emotional: the passage is one to be enjoyed by the senses and the heart, rather than the mind. Particularly effective is the description of the incense slowly winding its way upwards to meet the grace-bearing rays of sunlight, the whole image suggestive of man reaching out to God and God coming down to meet him. Dostoyevsky inserts a small detail which reveals that this is a child's description: the sight of a huge book making its way to the centre of the church is precisely the sort of thing which would impress a child's mind. In Arkady Dolgoruky's memory the same role is played by the pigeon which flutters around in the dome of the church. There is a sense of directness and immediacy about the memories. Although in each case they are evoked by someone who is no longer a child, they retain their child-like quality: they have not been rationalized to allow for the fact that they stem from the impressionable mind of a child, but are presented as a valid and lasting statement. One could almost say that their value lies in their subjectivity, even depends upon it: they are not intended to be objective pieces of writing. Dostoyevsky re-creates for the reader the original experience, and it is in the act of experiencing it that understanding occurs.

The point at which Zosima talks of first receiving 'the first seed of the word of God' into his soul is significant. It is not after the Bible reading, although that has special significance for him, telling as it does of God's faithful servant, Job, but after the mingling of the incense and the sunlight. This suggests that Dostoyevsky's God speaks not only through the Bible, but also through the beauty and mystery of such an occasion. God works through the senses:

the aesthetic has a role to play in religion. There is little sense of purpose in the memories: even the act of worship is not stressed. The memories are essentially static: the person in church is there not to 'do', but to 'be'. The church is simply a place where God and holiness are to be encountered, and the sacred atmosphere is conducive to communion with this holiness. Little attention is paid to the clergy or to formal theology: Zosima's response to the story of Job is on the plane of the emotions, not of theological understanding. The emphasis is upon the 'experience' of church, rather than the church as a place for formal religious practices.

The characters who re-experience such religious memories are not necessarily believers, at least not when the memories occur. In the case of both Raskol'nikov and Arkady Dolgoruky it is notable that the memories come to them when they are involved in unworthy acts: Raskol'nikov is going to commit a murder; and Arkady is involved in society intrigue. Furthermore, their memories occur when they are not conscious: Raskol'nikov is asleep, and Arkady is literally unconscious. This may be considered symbolic, since for the characters concerned the memories really are part of their subconscious: they still exist, but have long been forgotten and play no part in the characters' lives. Even when those experiencing the memories are not old men, we are given the impression that we are dealing with a bygone age, and this is fitting, since for both Raskol'nikov and Arkady the memories are past history from an ideological point of view, the values they embody having been long since abandoned. The association of such memories with the distant past may also be seen in Notes from the House

of the Dead, when the narrator describes the convicts' routine during Holy Week. For one week they are allowed to prepare themselves spiritually for Easter by fasting and going to church each day. The act of going to church transports the narrator back in time:

It was a long time since I'd been to church. The Lenten service, so familiar from my distant childhood, in my family home; the solemn prayers; the bows down to the ground - it all stirred up in my soul a time long, long ago, and recalled impressions of my childhood.⁴⁹

A process of 'recognition' occurs when such memories are recalled: they present themselves as something familiar and precious. They have a beneficial effect upon those who experience them, which may best be expressed by the term umileniye - 'tender emotion'. Whatever is good in the character is brought to the surface, and changes that may have occurred in the meantime are forgotten. Raskol'nikov, for example, has long lived a life ruled by his head, not his heart, but the memory suggests that in him, too, there is still love. The act of re-living the memory symbolizes hope for Raskol'nikov's future: thus his eventual spiritual conversion need not be discussed solely with reference to what for many is an unconvincing epilogue. It may also be traced to the body of the novel itself, to something which was part of his life before the events of the novel took place.

The concept of good memories is considered elsewhere in Dostoyevsky's writings, too. In Diary of a Writer for 1877, Dostoyevsky declares that 'man cannot live without something sacred and precious carried away into life from the memories of childhood'.⁵⁰ Although he uses the adjective 'sacred' (svyatoy) to describe the memories, he is not, in this instance,

referring to specifically religious memories: he seems to suggest that any happy family memory will suffice and can influence a person for the good. Some years earlier, in articles written at the beginning of the eighteen-sixties, a similar role is attributed to the aesthetic impression produced by a work of art. In 'Mr -bov and the question of art' Dostoyevsky considers the lasting impression made upon a young boy by the Apollo Belvedere, and speculates upon how it could positively influence his future actions. ⁵¹

Elsewhere he declares that he has 'always believed in the power of humane, aesthetically expressed impressions' which 'penetrate the very centre of the heart itself and shape a man'. ⁵² The aesthetic dimension plays an important part in the religious memories too, as we have seen: indeed, it is given greater prominence than the formally religious.

Neither is the formally religious dimension prominent when the effect of such memories is considered. Experiencing religious memories does not prompt the character involved to begin attending church again. Indeed, such a thought is conspicuously absent. It is not a question of regularly fulfilling certain religious obligations: Dostoyevsky almost seems to be suggesting that once implanted in a person's heart/soul, such memories effectively replace, even perhaps invalidate, regular church attendance. What is important is the ability to re-experience these memories; the act of 'recognition'; and the fact of valuing them. The role of the Church is thus removed from the present into the past: it is fitting in this respect that the same experience is rarely given in the present. An exception is little Ilyusha's funeral in The Brothers Karamazov, but even

here the emphasis is not upon the present, but upon the memory which is being created for the boys.⁵³ In the future they too will re-experience the occasion and live through the same process of umileniye mentioned above. The role of the Church is to have provided this memory.

These memories are thus of considerable significance for the present study. On one level, they point to the importance of a Christian family upbringing for a child, and the lasting and beneficial impression it can have. This intimate link between Church and family was something Dostoyevsky himself had experienced and greatly valued. But they also reveal a tendency in Dostoyevsky to detract from the role traditionally accorded to the Church by minimizing the ritualistic and formal side of religion.

Apart from such memories, Dostoyevsky's novels contain few scenes which take place in church. In The Idiot (Idiot, 1868) Myshkin and Nastasya Filippovna are due to be married in church, but the wedding does not materialize, and we are told nothing about the church itself. That the wedding is intended for church greatly increases its skandal potential, however, since it is clear that a wedding between the couple in question is unlikely to be noted for the decorous and restrained behaviour usually associated with a church.

Decorum and restraint are, on the contrary, embarrassingly prominent in the church scene described in The Devils.⁵⁴ The occasion is the attendance of the local high-society ladies at morning Mass in the cathedral, and the scene is notable for being devoid of those features which characterize childhood memories of church visits: there is no sense of holiness and mystery; no shafts of grace-bearing sunlight; no suggestion

that those present are partaking of a profound and beautiful spiritual experience. The visit to the cathedral is part of the routine of society life and has become mere habit for those concerned, a fact emphasized by the abundance of such words as po-vsegdashnemu, bessmenno, obychnoye mesto and vsyo po-obyknovennomu ('as always', 'permanently', 'usual place', 'everything as usual') in the description. The decorum is, in fact, only superficial, since in church as anywhere else society's petty feuds continue: we are presented with the unedifying spectacle of Varvara Petrovna and the governor's wife racing each other to the priest in order to receive the honour of being blessed first. A very similar scene is recalled in Notes from the House of the Dead: it seems likely that Dostoyevsky himself may have witnessed such behaviour.⁵⁵ Christian humility is conspicuously absent. This is religion in comfort, comprising an expensive carriage in which to ride to church, a good seat on the front row, a plush velvet prayer cushion, and a gratifying opportunity to demonstrate one's philanthropic nature by conspicuously giving alms. It is ironic that the society ladies are so proud of their preacher (although he does sometimes go on too long ...): they prize that which does not feature centrally in the 'church as memory' episodes, while unaware that their spirituality is in any way deficient.

Dostoyevsky's description of this high-society Mass tells us little about religion, but a lot about religious hypocrisy. In the 'church as memory' scenes, the official Church was not central to what was going on, but the occasion was beautiful and holy. In the society Mass the official Church occupies a central position, fulfilling its traditional duties of officiating

at services, preaching and directing ritual. There is, however, little to show for its efforts: it is clearly not effective in bringing about spiritual renewal. The scene thus reinforces the impression that traditional church-going might not feature prominently in Dostoyevsky's religious ideal.

Just as there are few church scenes in Dostoyevsky's novels, so there are few memorable Russian Orthodox priests. Bishop Tikhon in The Devils is an exception and will be considered in due course, although it must be remembered that the chapter in which he appears was not reinstated by Dostoyevsky. Zosima of The Brothers Karamazov is, strictly speaking, a priest as well as an Elder, but it is in the latter capacity that he merits his central position in the novel, and it is as such that he will be considered in Chapter Ten of our study. Apart from Tikhon and Zosima, the priests who appear are minor characters, and are easily overlooked. The way in which they are depicted by Dostoyevsky is nevertheless worthy of attention, particularly when seen in the light of his presentation of scenes in church.

In Crime and Punishment we twice encounter a representative of institutionalized religion, both times in incidents concerning the Marmeladov family. Each of the adult members of the family - Mr. Marmeladov, Katerina Ivanovna and Sonya - stands in a particular relationship to the Russian Orthodox Church hierarchy, and the implications of their encounters with that hierarchy point to Dostoyevsky's own attitude towards it: we find a condemnation of many aspects of the role of priests, together with hints of a possible alternative.

The appearance of the priests is occasioned by two deaths

in the family: that of Marmeladov himself, and that of his wife.⁵⁶
Marmeladov's death is the result of being crushed under a
horse-drawn carriage. When it is clear that death is imminent,
a priest is called. When analyzing the part played by the
priest it is important to note the ideological forces at play
in the situation he is entering. The circumstances of Marmeladov's
accident, and of the life of his family as a whole, are narrated
in such a way as to encourage the reader to interpret the
incident with reference to the wider social structure. The
carriage by which Marmeladov is knocked down belongs to a rich
family, hence it is unlikely that they will be troubled by the
police. The fact that this rich and important family is being
kept waiting for its transport is of more concern than the plight
of Marmeladov, the 'little man'. The power of money is further
emphasized by Raskolnikov, who no less than six times within
a few minutes assures various people that he will meet the
costs incurred in getting help to the injured man: until
someone assumes responsibility for these costs, Marmeladov
will remain where he is. Finally, even when Marmeladov is at
home, and clearly near to death, the narrator digresses to
stress the difficult material circumstances of his family.
This emphasis upon the plight of the poor may be a reflection
of Dostoyevsky's original conception of the novel as a story
highlighting the problems of drunkenness; it may also be
related to the question of the motive behind Raskolnikov's
crime and the part humanitarian concern plays in it. Whatever
the origin, the effect is to encourage the reader to question
the workings of unjust society and to demand some answers.
Consequently, when the priest arrives as a representative
of the Church and Christianity, he is expected to cater not only

for the spiritual but also for the physical needs of man. His Christianity must have a social application if it is not to be rejected outright.

We know of the priest only that he ^{is} an old, grey-haired man: no other details are given to establish him as an individual character, and he is consequently judged solely on the basis of his performance in his official capacity. It is Marmeladov who has requested his presence. In view of Marmeladov's theology as made known in his public house conversation with Raskol'nikov, ⁵⁷ it is perhaps rather surprising that he still considers himself to be a member of the official Church. His very individual interpretation of Christianity seems to demand a minimum of effort. No matter if one is a drunkard, masochist, emotional black-mailer and destroyer of lives, so long as one is aware of the fact: God forgives those who do not consider themselves worthy of forgiveness. But Marmeladov still regards himself as an Orthodox believer and he asks that a priest be sent for: there are certain occasions which require a priest. It is not only Marmeladov who thinks in this way: the majority of those present seems to take comfort in the knowledge that a priest has been summoned. Thus Raskol'nikov assures Nikodim Fomich: 'The doctor's been, the priest's been, everything's in order'. ⁵⁸ And when Katerina Ivanovna falls ill the response is the same: 'They talked about fetching a doctor and a priest'. ⁵⁹ Whenever a priest comes near, people may be seen respectfully making way for him: their response is characterized by the repeated use of such verbs as otstupit', ustupit' and propustit'.

The role the priest performs for those present may be

interpreted on two levels. First, he is a part of the solid social structure which humans find so comforting, part of the established order of things. The priest is one of a trio which is completed by the doctor and the policeman: 'In the doorway appeared the priest with the sacraments, an old, grey-haired man. The policeman had been to fetch him, the one from the street. The doctor immediately moved aside for him, and exchanged a meaningful glance'.⁶⁰ (My emphasis.) The three together represent the pillars of society, a variation upon Uvarov's 'Orthodoxy, Autocracy and Nationality'. But the priest also provides comfort at a deeper level. To use the language of Dostoyevsky's Underground Man, he is part of the 'wall' in which the bricks are the immutable laws of human existence which provide order (poryadok).⁶¹ Such a role corresponds to a deep-seated need in man. Taken in this sense, the trio of the priest, the doctor and the policeman points forward prophetically to Ivan Karamazov's 'miracle, mystery and authority'.

The priest is clear in his own mind about his duties when he comes to attend Marmeladov: he is there to hear confession, to serve communion, and to offer the traditional words of comfort to the widow. He will then have fulfilled his task and will be on his way. Although one might expect his administration of the sacraments to occupy a prominent position in the narrative, the act is in fact passed over in very few words by Dostoyevsky. Much more prominence is given to the priest's answer to Katerina Ivanovna when she confronts him with the sight of her ragged and hungry children. The priest's response is completely unsatisfactory. He makes no attempt to relate to the specific situation and can only offer

spiritual clichés: 'God is merciful; trust in the help of
 the Almighty'.⁶² One is reminded of Makar Devushkin's words
 to the young beggar girl in Poor Folk: 'God will provide'.⁶³
 The difference is that Makar Devushkin realizes that words
 are not enough, and suffers because he cannot help: the
 priest seems to have no such awareness.

The priest is implicitly criticized for having a very
 inflexible idea of what is the domain of religion and what is
 not. His Christianity shuns involvement in the problems of
 life. Words like 'sin' have a very narrow area of application
 for him: the social sphere lies outside that area. The
 inadequacy of such thinking is made forcefully apparent by
 Dostoyevsky in a brief exchange between Katerina Ivanovna
 and the priest. Katerina Ivanovna questions the priest's
 declaration that God is merciful. The priest ruefully
 replies that to criticize God in this manner is a sin. Her
 reply, as she gestures to Marmeladov as a symbol of the
 grief and squalor of her life, is short but telling: 'And
 isn't this a sin?'⁶⁴ A similar point is made with respect
 to the priest's understanding of the word 'forgiveness'.
 He rebukes Katerina Ivanovna for her bitter words about her
 husband: she does not utter the precise formula of forgive-
 ness which the priest believes to be fitting on such an
 occasion. But the context clearly shows which of the two
 persons Dostoyevsky believes has the better understanding of
 what it means to forgive:

Katerina Ivanovna was busying around [her injured
 husband], giving him something to drink, wiping the
 sweat and blood from his head, straightening the
 pillows, and from time to time, while engaged in all
 this, she managed to turn to face the priest as she
 was talking to him.⁶⁵

Her bitterness does not stop her from doing all she can to alleviate her husband's suffering: such action speaks louder than pious words. She has forgiven Marmeladov more than the priest could ever conceive: her entire life with him has been one long process of forgiving. Dostoyevsky makes it abundantly clear who has won the moral victory: 'The priest lowered his head and said nothing'. Katerina Ivanovna may not appear a reliable spokesman: she is extreme, prone to flights of fancy, and never far from despair. Yet she like no one else understands the complex of emotions which made up Marmeladov, and she provides a striking contrast to the priest who seems devoid of all human emotion.

Katerina Ivanovna's attack on the Church reaches its climax as she herself lies at the point of death. She prevents those around from sending for a priest, and dies unconfessed, not having taken communion. This rejection of the priest is partly because of the expense: 'What? A priest? ... There's no need ... You've no money to spare...' ⁶⁶ Perhaps too the memory of her clash with the priest who attended her husband is still fresh in her mind. But the rejection also is a challenge to the very idea of a priest as mediator: 'There are no sins on me! ... God should forgive me without all that ... He knows how I've suffered! ... And if He won't forgive me, then so be it!' ⁶⁷ Katerina Ivanovna's relationship with God has nothing to do with the rules of the Church. It has been forged by a life of suffering and anguish: she is her own intermediary, her life is her witness. The priest has no part to play. Katerina Ivanovna does not stop believing in God, but she defies Him to turn her away. In so doing she makes a bold and dramatic decision to by-pass the Church.

An equally bold challenge to official religion is made by her daughter, Sonya, although this is not immediately obvious as part of Sonya's character. At no time does Sonya actually speak out against the Church. She thinks her mother is wrong to demand justice as she does. Thus she says to Raskolnikov: 'She doesn't realize that it's not possible that there should be justice among people, and she gets angry'.⁶⁸ But Sonya is an unconscious challenge to the Church, and she unwittingly removes further ground from under the feet of official religion.

First, Sonya is not a regular church attender: her dubious social standing sees to this. Yet she still is presented by Dostoyevsky as the most Christian figure in the novel, a fact which suggests that acceptance by the Church is not, in his eyes, necessary for one to be a Christian. Further, in the scene of her father's death Sonya provides a point of comparison and contrast with the official Russian Orthodox priest: she is presented as a sort of 'unofficial' priest, a priest of the 'unofficial' Church. Dostoyevsky invites us to make such a comparison by introducing parallel situations into the narrative. The priest and Sonya arrive shortly after one another, and the arrival of each is a source of interest to the people crowded around the entrance to the Marmeladovs' room. But whereas everyone moves aside to let the priest through, Sonya has to push her way to the front of the crowd. The priest enters the room unthinkingly: all doors are open to him. Sonya remains in the doorway, too ashamed to venture further. Up to this point the priest has had more success than Sonya. But when one considers the spiritual, rather than social, success of the two, the situation is reversed.

The priest's mission bears no visible fruit. He is seen to be unable to make an effective contribution to situations which demand love and compassion: he resorts to mechanical rituals and mechanical words. Sonya meanwhile is the only real point of contact with Marmeladov during the scene. Fittingly, it is in her arms, rather than the priest's, that Marmeladov dies. It is surely of significance that, when Katerina Ivanovna falls seriously ill and it is clear she will die, she is very near Sonya's apartment, to which she is taken: this reinforces the impression that Sonya is the right person in such circumstances. As the novel progresses, so Sonya's priest-like mission bears more fruit, instrumental as she is in the salvation of Raskolnikov. The nature of her priesthood differs from that of the official priest. The official priest arrived convinced that he was necessary to the situation as a mediator between man and God. Events are presented by Dostoyevsky so as to suggest that this is not the case. If the priest does have a role, then it is as a symbol of the order for which men crave. Sonya does not claim to be a mediator. But, in her capacity as a true Christian nature, she is a comfort and an inspiration. While discrediting the official Church hierarchy, therefore, Dostoyevsky seems to be pointing in the direction of the priesthood of all Christian believers.

We remarked earlier that there were two official Russian Orthodox priests in Crime and Punishment. The second makes his appearance to officiate at the requiem mass carried out for Katerina Ivanovna. ⁶⁹ The priest clearly wonders how he came to be involved with the bizarre Marmeladov family: 'While giving the blessing and taking his leave, the priest looked around him strangely'. But despite his unease, and despite

the way in which the Church hierarchy in general has been discredited by Dostoyevsky in its dealings with the Marmeladovs, the requiem mass is not at all devalued. A sense of dignity is conveyed to the scene from the beginning by the rhythm of the words used to describe it: 'Nachinalas' sluzhba, tikho, chinno, grustno' ('Quietly, sedately, sadly, the service was beginning'). It is true that there is an air of sadness, even something a little frightening, about it, but behind it all can be sensed glory and exaltation. A beautiful and holy atmosphere is evoked by the inclusion of just a few of the details of the 'church as memory' scenes: the sun illuminating the scene; the incense; a prayer. Raskolnikov is moved to remember things past: 'Yes, and it was a long time since he had heard the requiem mass'. The ritual is not questioned, and there is no hint of criticism: how different from every other aspect of religion with which the priest has been involved. The service in its glory and holiness does not depend upon those present: it is an independent phenomenon, which exists in its own right. Its value is in no way connected with the 'quality' of those around, even if the priest is little more than a state official, as Dostoyevsky has come close to suggesting on a previous occasion. No matter how much Dostoyevsky might question the value of the representatives of the official Church, the experience of worship is something he does not call into doubt.

A Russian Orthodox priest also makes a brief appearance in The Devils, at the deathbed of Stepan Trofimovich Verkhovensky.⁷⁰ We see the priest neither arrive nor depart, and are given no physical description of him. Yet seen in

relation to the novel as a whole, this minor and somewhat comic character plays quite a significant part. It is made clear from the beginning of the scene that if the decision had been left to Stepan Trofimovich, it is likely that no priest would have been summoned: in this respect he resembles Katerina Ivanovna in Crime and Punishment. The priest has been sent for by Varvara Petrovna, and this is significant: although her Church attendance has at least as much to do with maintaining her position as first lady in the town as with spiritual matters, she is presented as a basically sincere Russian Orthodox believer. As such, her response to the thought of Stepan Trofimovich's impending death is as expected: the occasion demands a priest. Stepan Trofimovich is 'bound' to carry out his 'duty', which consists in making his confession and taking communion. It would be unfair to suggest that Varvara Petrovna sees these actions as a guarantee of entrance to heaven, but she regards them as the things to be done by a believer at this stage in life: anyone who does not want a priest and sacraments can only be a non-believer. She thereby implies an intimate link between the actual state of being a Christian on the one hand, and participation in the more formal aspects of religion, including the acceptance of the authority of a priest, on the other. So far as Varvara Petrovna is concerned, the time has come for Stepan Trofimovich to stop 'fooling about', as she refers to his free-thinking, and to declare a commitment to the Christian faith. The means of doing so, and the proof of having done so, are available to him in the rites.

Throughout the scene Varvara Petrovna is very much on the defensive. Dostoyevsky exploits this to comic effect by having her interrupt Stepan Trofimovich whenever she fears he is about

to say something which would cancel out the good he has done in agreeing to take the sacraments. She wants to believe that he has repented of his former views, and she does not want to hear what she fears may actually be on his mind. Hence her request that the priest talk of devout topics so that it will literally be impossible for Stepan Trofimovich to get religion out of his thoughts. For Varvara Petrovna the priest is one of the central characters present, her principal weapon in what is likely to be an uphill struggle. Yet what is most striking for the reader is how little relevance the priest has for Stepan Trofimovich's spiritual state at this crucial stage in his life. As in Crime and Punishment, the primary purpose of the priest's visit - the administration of the sacraments - is passed over almost without mention. We read only that Stepan Trofimovich 'made his confession and communicated very willingly'. There are no details of the part played by the priest, and the reader is left to ponder the significance of the word 'willingly', rather an ambiguous word to use in this context. It reveals little of Stepan Trofimovich's real attitude towards the rites, and could suggest that he saw them as a way in which he could bring some comfort to Varvara Petrovna, rather than as a necessary religious experience.

The priest himself is not, it would seem, over-concerned to establish the state of Stepan Trofimovich's faith, if one may judge from the speed with which he begins to disrobe. He very affably agrees to stay when requested, but what he says, lyrical though it may be, is hardly likely to inspire anyone to faith. The effect is in any case rather spoilt when we learn that he utters his noble sentiments 'holding a cup of tea'. Stepan Trofimovich is very polite to the priest, but makes it

clear that he has no need of him. His ironical little smile as he interrupts the priest's homily reveals his gentle frustration with the situation: what the priest says has nothing to do with Stepan Trofimovich's faith. He does not want to know about a gloomy version of Christianity which can find only negative reasons for faith in God. He does not openly attack either the priest or the rites: they are all very well, but ... Like Voltaire's *Candide*, the 'but' remains on his lips, and we do not hear the continuation. At two crucial moments - when he is going to expand upon his thoughts on the rites; and when he is going to talk of the need for a priest or otherwise - Stepan Trofimovich is interrupted by Varvara Petrovna. It is, however, strongly suggested that rites and priests are not necessary in his religion. The convictions he declares belong to a more joyful and more lovely Christianity than that proposed by the priest, and they are the result of his personal experience, not of any Church creed. There is no dialogue between the priest and Stepan Trofimovich: their religious statements lie side by side and show two different approaches to the situation. If God is 'necessary' to Stepan Trofimovich, it is not because of anything the priest has said. The spiritual change in him began earlier in the novel, when he took to the road: if anyone was instrumental, then it was Sofya Matveyevna, whose role will be considered later.

It must, of course, be asked whether Stepan Trofimovich's conversion is strictly 'religious' at all. Throughout the novel his ultimate concern has been the aesthetic, rather than the ethical, and the narrator does not dismiss the possibility that aesthetic considerations may have played a part on this

occasion, too, although he admits that there has been a dramatic change in the character's views:

91

Whether [Stepan Trofimovich] was in fact converted, or whether the majestic ceremony of the administration of the sacrament shook him and awoke the artistic sensibility of his nature, but he firmly and, I am told, with great feeling, uttered a few words which completely contradicted many of his former convictions.

Even if Stepan Trofimovich's conversion remains on the aesthetic level, he is far from alone among Dostoyevsky's Christians in being affected by the beauty, rather than the 'religion', of the Orthodox rites: we have only to think back to the 'church as memory' scenes examined earlier in this chapter. ⁷¹ Whatever the true nature of Stepan Trofimovich's conversion, the fact remains that the part played by the priest is in effect a 'non-part' in its lack of relevance to the spiritual drama which is going on. We learn during the course of the scene that what amounts to a rejection of priest and rites does not necessarily signify a rejection of Christianity itself. Like Katerina Ivanovna in Crime and Punishment, Stepan Trofimovich wants to go directly to God without the mediation of the Church, and the evidence of the scene suggests that he may well have done so.

None of the minor priest characters so far considered has any redeeming features or is given a chance to speak in his own defence. They remain anonymous, and do not impress themselves upon the reader as individuals. In The Brothers Karamazov, however, we are given quite a vivid portrait of a Russian Orthodox priest, although once again he appears only briefly. The priest concerned is

Father Pavel of the village of Ilinskoye, usually referred to in the text as the 'Ilinsky Father' (Ilinskiy batyushka). The episode in which he appears is Dmitry Karamazov's futile visit to the merchant Lyagavy to try to raise three thousand roubles.⁷² Peace remarks that the 'Ilinsky' part of his name may well be an allusion to the alleged parricide called Ilinsky who is a prototype for Dmitry in the novel.⁷³ The connection goes no further than the name, however, since the priest is portrayed quite sympathetically, as a cautious, but basically kind, character.

Fyodor Karamazov refers to the priest as a learned — (uchonny) man,⁷⁴ but he is presented very much as a part of village life, and shares features typical of the common folk: a fatal weakness for underestimating distances, as Dmitry discovers to his frustration; and an unwillingness to disclose more than is necessary. Although portrayed in a gently comic manner, as when we see him racing alongside Dmitry, trying to keep up with the latter's furious pace, his reasonableness and basic common sense are made clear. There is no suggestion of the pomp or pretensions of the other priests we have encountered. The priest is far from naive, however, and he takes care to protect his own interests which, to the reader's surprise, lie in the direction of Fyodor Karamazov. The priest refers to the latter as his benefactor, and we learn that he is in some way dependent upon him: he expresses concern that Fyodor Karamazov's kindnesses should not come to a premature close. We are not told of any spiritual role he might play for Fyodor Karamazov, and do not know the origin of their acquaintance. But Fyodor Karamazov evidently holds the priest in some respect and even trusts him with his

money, the thing nearest to his heart, since it opens up so many possibilities to a vile old man. It seems most likely that the landowner makes generous financial donations to the priest's church: consequently, the priest is not averse to doing his benefactor a favour and letting him know of Dmitry's visit.

The whole episode tells us rather more about Fyodor Karamazov than it does about the Ilinsky Father, so far as spiritual matters are concerned: it points to the possible existence of a side to his character we might otherwise doubt. Perhaps there is a glimmer of Christian hope in that colourful character? As for the priest, his worth and interest as a character derive mostly from the features he shares with the common folk, not from his priestly status. Given previous experience of Dostoyevsky's presentation of Russian Orthodox priests, one is tempted to ask whether he would have been depicted in such a sympathetic way had he been acting in a spiritual capacity. Nevertheless, Father Pavel is a priest, and the portrait we are given of him is free from the sharp criticisms we have come to expect.

The priests considered so far have been relatively minor characters. Bishop Tikhon in The Devils would, on the contrary, have occupied an important position in the novel, had the chapter in which he appears not been censored by Katkov, the editor of Russkiy vestnik (The Russian Messenger) in which The Devils was being serialized. In the event, the novel was published without Tikhon and the chapter was never reinstated. Nevertheless, at the time of writing Dostoyevsky intended 'At Tikhon's' to be included, and it is on that basis that we

will now consider the chapter in detail.

The history of 'At Tikhon's' is extremely complex.⁷⁵ There are basically three versions of the chapter: the corrected proofs of the original, which Dostoyevsky sent to Russkiy vestnik, and which was rejected;⁷⁶ an amended version of these proofs, which Dostoyevsky hoped would be more acceptable to his editors;⁷⁷ and a second, unfinished, amended version, copied by hand by Anna Grigoryevna from an unknown source.⁷⁸ The main objections to the chapter in its original form had concerned the central section in which Stavrogin's confession is read out. The two amended versions reveal the nature of the changes Dostoyevsky made in his efforts to make the chapter acceptable. They will be referred to in so far as they throw light upon the way Dostoyevsky went about depicting a bishop of the official Russian Orthodox Church.

Reactions to Tikhon in his role as the representative of Christianity confronted with the awesome Stavrogin are reasonably consistent. Pascal sees him as 'a weak defender of the Christian faith'.⁷⁹ For Boyce Gibson, 'At Tikhon's' amounts to 'a conspicuous failure of the Christian witness'.⁸⁰ Jones is tempted to group Tikhon with Marya Lebyadkina, Shatov and Semyon Yakovlevich as a character whose views amount to a travesty of Christianity.⁸¹ Komarowitsch considers that Dostoyevsky would never have reinstated Tikhon because he did not live up to his expectations.⁸² Linnér too, after a detailed and very sympathetic analysis, concludes that Tikhon 'ultimately fails as a spiritual advisor'.⁸³

Tikhon is based upon the historical figure of Tikhon Zadonsky, whose writings and biography Dostoyevsky had read, and whom he considered to be of great importance for the future

of Russia. Dostoyevsky had originally planned to introduce Tikhon Zadonsky into The Life of a Great Sinner. He wrote to Maykov that in depicting Tikhon he hoped to create 'a majestic, ⁸⁴ positive, holy figure'. Out of The Life of a Great Sinner grew The Devils: now Tikhon was to be a representative of light in a novel in which there was much darkness. ⁸⁵ From the beginning Dostoyevsky wanted to portray the real Tikhon, not invent a character: he wrote to Maykov that his Tikhon would ⁸⁶ be a bishop as Tikhon Zadonsky had been.

What is striking about Dostoyevsky's Tikhon is that despite his official title and standing there is little about him which is the least suggestive of a bishop. From the outset he is quite clearly contrasted with the official Church, whose representatives deeply mistrust him. The Archimandrite of the monastery to which Tikhon has retired, a stern and strict man 'renowned for his learning', accuses him of negligent living and considers him a heretic; the monks themselves, embodied for us in the tubby, self-confident little figure who leads Stavrogin to Tikhon's cell, do not hold him in respect; a devout (bogomolny) gentleman from the local club claims that Tikhon is mad and ⁸⁷ that he drinks. It is characteristic of the biased treatment Tikhon receives from the narrator of The Devils that only the second half of this claim is denied by him.

Dostoyevsky's Bishop does not find favour with his fellow representatives of the Church because they have definite ideas of what is fitting for a man of Tikhon's rank, and Tikhon is at variance with those ideas. He is, for example, criticized for 'an unforgivable distractedness quite inappropriate to his ⁸⁸ rank'. Even Tikhon's cell is controversial. It is characterized by its very varied contents. Shabby old furniture stands next

to elegant and beautiful furniture; valuable carpets lie alongside rush matting; there are not only icons, but also mythological scenes and 'secular' pictures; books of the Church Fathers are on the same shelves as theatrical compositions 'and perhaps even worse'. The narrator, who shares the Church's doubts about Tikhon and colours the narrative accordingly, is unhappy about this mixture of sacred and secular objects. His cautious approach is epitomized in his assessment of Tikhon's library which, we are told, 'was composed in altogether too varied and contradictory a manner'.⁸⁹

The combination of sacred and secular objects in Tikhon's cell is significant, however. It seems to symbolize the blurring of the strict division between the sacred and the secular which characterizes the Bishop's entire ministry. This is true even of the quality of Tikhon's faith: despite his ecclesiastical rank, he is not depicted as a saintly man or perfect Christian. When asked by Stavrogin whether his faith would be sufficient to move mountains, the Bishop's answer is one of doubt: 'Perhaps I couldn't move one ...⁹⁰ My faith is not complete' (Ne sovershenno veruyu). The ambiguity of sovershenno, which can mean either 'completely' or 'perfectly', only heightens the tension. Stavrogin's response to Tikhon's admission reveals that he too, like those mentioned above, has a fixed conception of what a priest should be like. Fundamental to this conception is absolute faith: 'What? You don't believe completely?'⁹¹ Tikhon does not set himself up on a pedestal. He serves to challenge the idea that the Church is a place for holy men and the world a place for sinners. Being a bishop does not make him perfect.

The strict division between holy man and sinner, the

Church and the world, is dealt a further blow by Tikhon's teaching of mutual responsibility for sin: 'Every person who has sinned has sinned against all, and each person is in some way guilty of the sin of others'.⁹² If this teaching is true, then there can logically be no talk of 'sinful' and 'sinless'. Mutual responsibility for sin thus breaks down the barrier which people tend to erect between a holy Church and a wicked world. That very feature of Tikhon which the Church finds so suspect, his mixing of the sacred and the secular spheres, is positively advocated as a theological truth.

One aspect of Tikhon's theology which is perhaps rather more acceptable to the official Church is his acknowledgement that Christianity is not an easy matter. When the Bishop advises Stavrogin to submit himself to an Elder in order to attain self-mastery, he is aware that he is not offering an easy way out. He gives Stavrogin the impression that there is a long, hard struggle ahead of him, and reckons the time needed to attain self-mastery in years, even a lifetime. This is very different from the type of Christianity of, for example, Alyosha Karamazov, who seems to have been born a natural Christian, and who apparently has no inner struggles. In the light of this aspect of Tikhon's teaching, it is interesting to consider Archbishop Anthony of London's assessment of Dostoyevsky, as recorded by Linnér. Anthony considers that Dostoyevsky knew everything about the storms of the soul, but little about its struggle. 'Here Anthony contrasts two closely related words: borenie and bor'ba. The former denotes an aimless fencing about, the latter a struggle towards a goal.'⁹³ But surely Tikhon recognizes the need for precisely such a struggle? He is aware of the

difficulties which lie between a man and Christianity, and knows that the Christian way requires continued effort.

If this recognition of the need for a long struggle narrows the gap between Tikhon and the official Church to some extent, then his deep understanding of human nature is something which sets him apart from the other representatives of the Church we have so far encountered. Tikhon is under no illusions about human nature: indeed, Stavrogin ventures to call him a cynic, and to scorn his low opinion of men.⁹⁴ We are reminded of that other great cynic of human nature, Dostoyevsky's Grand Inquisitor. Tikhon differs from the Inquisitor in two important respects, however. First, he does not in fact scorn man, and he does not think of men en masse, as a group of weak creatures needing the support of that group. Rather, he sees the problems facing the individual. He is aware in particular of the barrier of pride and of how much easier it is to be hated than to be laughed at; he knows also that to accept sympathy and compassion implies to a certain extent acknowledging one's inferiority. Tikhon fully appreciates the problems involved in Christian humility. However, and herein lies the second difference, he also believes in a loving and merciful God who accepts even the slightest impulse towards Him. Tikhon's God is still transcendent, but it is precisely in His unknowability that there is hope for the greatest of sinners, for 'there is neither word nor thought in the human tongue to express all the ways and means of the Lamb'.⁹⁵ This enraptured statement is effectively a rejection of the intricacies of Christian dogma: if God's ways are limitless, how can the way to God be through acquiescence to a

precisely worded creed? The statement follows two others in which Tikhon already may be seen to be moving away from a dogmatic Christian attitude. First, he says that anyone who can forgive himself will be forgiven by God; then, that even if one only tries to do so, but fails, God will honour the intention. One is reminded of the all-encompassing theology of Marmeladov in Crime and Punishment: what it is easy to forget is that whereas Marmeladov is a drunken sado-masochist, Tikhon is a supposed bishop.

Despite such examples of unconventional theology, Linnér still considers Tikhon to be 'a teacher of the Orthodox Church'.⁹⁶ He refers by way of example to Tikhon's response to Stavrogin's visions of the Devil. Tikhon clearly is inclined to give a psychological explanation for the visions. His visitor chides him for this, remarking that a literal belief in the Devil would be 'more appropriate to [his] profession'.⁹⁷ The Bishop's words are not decisive, however, and Linnér considers that in leaving Tikhon's answer unfinished Dostoyevsky thereby also leaves the more Orthodox response to the question open to him.

If it is true that in this instance Dostoyevsky perhaps pays homage to the theology of the Church, in general his Bishop displays a characteristically Dostoyevskian lack of inhibition and does not trouble to modify his theology. For Tikhon himself is a Dostoyevskian character. The most conspicuous illustration of this again comes during the discussion of Stavrogin's hallucinations, when the merit of belief in the Devil is considered. Tikhon does not actually say that belief in the Devil is better than no belief at all. However, since the entire chapter operates on the level of

half-statements and innuendo, we are entitled to attach some credence to Stavrogin's mirthful allegation to that effect: 'And I'm sure that you consider such faith to be better than complete atheism ... What a priest!'

The hypothesis seems to be justified when Tikhon addresses the problem from a slightly different angle, and says that he would rather have complete atheists than the spiritual indifference so common in society. The Bishop's response to Saint Paul's letter to the Church at Laodicea also reveals his Dostoyevskian traits. He replies to Stavrogin's question whether he remembers the passage by saying: 'I do. Marvellous words'. Stavrogin retorts: 'Marvellous? Strange thing coming from a bishop ...' Clearly he is surprised that a bishop should identify so completely with the view that the 'lukewarm' should be spewed out: presumably this category would include most of the ladies attending Mass in the cathedral with Varvara Petrovna. This Dostoyevskian extremism, the urge for intensity rather than mediocrity identified by de Jonge, is probably not typical of a bishop of the Russian Orthodox Church.

At such points in their meeting Tikhon and Stavrogin seem to be of like mind. This does not lead Tikhon to condone Stavrogin's crime, however. He does not shirk the inevitable confrontation, but moves relentlessly nearer the critical moment when Stavrogin will either respond or will reject his message completely. Tikhon knows that Stavrogin's pride must be denied the boost it would get from the publication of a defiant confession. He first tries a ploy which both he and the reader know is not sincere: he tells Stavrogin to think of his 'career'. This having predictably

had no effect, he comes to the real point: Stavrogin must master himself if there is to be any hope for him. Tikhon thus moves deeper and deeper inside Stavrogin until the critical moment: he is forceful and persistent without being condemning. He is not afraid to become engaged in the struggle, even though in so doing he puts himself at the mercy of Stavrogin's taunts.

The way Tikhon^{chooses} to deal with Stavrogin gains in significance when compared to a parallel situation in The Brothers Karamazov, where the Abbot of the local monastery is confronted with Fyodor Karamazov. ¹⁰² Fyodor Karamazov delivers a stream of insulting comments about the monastery, but rather than rebuking him, the Abbot avoids confrontation. He humbly accepts the insults, even offering up thanks for them. Although he undoubtedly considers this to be the essence of Christian meekness, his response seems irrelevant. The archaic language in which his words are spoken seems merely to emphasize their unsuitability for the occasion. Not only does the Abbot's action reveal his insincerity, since ~~we well know that inside he despises Fyodor Karamazov:~~ it also has a detrimental effect upon Fyodor Karamazov himself, who leaves with an even greater scorn for the monastery hierarchy than before. Is Dostoyevsky not suggesting that the Church should be prepared to adopt a rather more energetic attitude towards sin, like the St. Nicholas of legend, rather than remain pure and ineffectual? ¹⁰³ It could, of course, be argued that Tikhon has no more success with Stavrogin than does the Abbot with Fyodor Karamazov: Stavrogin goes off and hangs himself. But there are moments when Tikhon comes close

to getting through to Stavrogin: he almost succeeds where conventional representatives of a conventional Church would surely fail. It must also be borne in mind that from the point of view of The Devils as a whole it is right for Stavrogin to commit suicide. Although in his original plans for Tikhon in The Life of a Great Sinner Dostoyevsky intended his Bishop to work a transformation in his opponent, by the time he came to write 'At Tikhon's' Dostoyevsky was involved in a different project, and the outcome of the encounter between Tikhon and Stavrogin had to take account of the complexities of The Devils as a whole.

What we have seen of Dostoyevsky's Bishop confirms our introductory remark to the effect that there is little about him which is suggestive of a bishop of the official Church. Tikhon goes out of his way to destroy the strict division between the Church and the world. He does not claim to be in any way superior because of his ecclesiastical status, and he does not use that status as a weapon in his encounter with Stavrogin. He does not appeal to precise Orthodox or Christian doctrine, but advances ideas which depart from what is strictly Orthodox and Christian. He displays a characteristically Dostoyevskian extremism.

When Dostoyevsky amended 'At Tikhon's', he introduced changes not only in Stavrogin's confession, but also in the way Tikhon is presented. For the purposes of the present study the changes made to Tikhon are significant, since they suggest that Dostoyevsky was aware of the rather idiosyncratic nature of his Bishop and felt that he should make him more like the conventional type he was supposed to represent. In the amended versions, Tikhon becomes more normal as a person

and more noticeably ecclesiastical. First, Tikhon has fewer nervous mannerisms: his twitch disappears, for example; and he flushes less often. The adjective smeshnoy (comic, funny) is applied to him far less frequently, both by the narrator and by Stavrogin; and the latter in particular no longer repeatedly refers to him as 'a crank'. Changes are also made to Tikhon's manner of speaking. In the original version many of his statements are delivered in an abrupt manner, which has the effect of making them seem even more unorthodox. In the amended versions Tikhon's replies are on the whole less abrupt, with the result that they seem more reasonable. For example, the reason Tikhon originally gives for doubting that his faith could move mountains is an abrupt: 'ne sovershenno veruyu'. This is amended to: 'po nesovershenstvu very moyey somevayus' ('the imperfect nature/ incompleteness of my faith causes me to doubt'). The second version possesses a balance and dignity which are missing from the first. A similar effect is achieved by providing additional details to describe how Tikhon responds to Stavrogin's jibes. In the original version, for example, we read that Tikhon makes his statement that atheism is better than indifference 'gaily and naively'. Amended, this reads: 'gaily and naively, but at the same time carefully and concernedly looking at his guest'. The effect of being shown Tikhon carefully weighing up his guest is to make his response seem less blatantly unconventional.

Some of Tikhon's most idiosyncratic remarks are omitted altogether from the amended versions. No longer, for example, does he refer to the letter to the Laodiceans as 'marvellous words', which in turn spares Stavrogin the trouble of declaring

110

that this is 'a strange thing coming from a bishop'. In the original version, after reading Stavrogin's confession Tikhon immediately asks if it might not be possible to introduce some changes into the text: 'perhaps a little in the style'. This altogether unexpected comment is missing from the amended versions, where Tikhon takes much longer to look up after reading the confession, and where Stavrogin speaks first. Missing from the second amended version is Tikhon's formal declaration concerning mutual responsibility for sin: perhaps Dostoyevsky decided that a bishop should not after all associate himself too closely with a child-molester?

111

112

On the other hand, some aspects of Tikhon are strengthened. This applies in particular to his response to Stavrogin's crime. Although, as mentioned above, Tikhon at no time condones the crime, his condemnation is much more extensive and explicit in the amended versions. He speaks with 'irritation' and 'indignation' in his voice, and his 'Christian feeling' is said to be deeply hurt. In both amended versions Tikhon refers to the Church: Stavrogin is said by him to have turned to the judgement of the Church. This contrasts with the original version, where the Church is not mentioned. In the second amended version, Tikhon makes a very specific appeal to Christianity, declaring that Christianity holds man responsible for his actions whatever situation he might find himself in: this appears in neither of the first two versions. The effect of this appeal is to associate Tikhon rather more closely with the faith he is supposed to represent. Finally, the amended version clearly suggests that Tikhon makes a mistake in his dealings with Stavrogin, and implies that he should have stopped when he saw that Stavrogin did not like his

insights into the comic nature of his crime. ¹¹⁶ A clear reason 105
is thus provided for the failure of the Bishop and, by
extension, of the Russian Orthodox Church, to convert Stavrogin.

Despite all these changes, however, even in the amended versions Tikhon does not come across as a typical representative of the Russian Orthodox Church hierarchy. At no time does he point Stavrogin to the official Church as the way out of his dilemma. Instead, he refers him to a starets ('Elder'), a figure on the edge of the official Church hierarchy. The place of Eldership (starchestvo) in Dostoyevsky's religious ideal will be considered in detail in the later stages of our study. It may, however, be noted that Tikhon himself possesses certain features of an Elder: Varvara Petrovna visits him regularly, which puts him in the mould of a spiritual adviser; and he is endowed by Dostoyevsky with the insight into human nature (prozorlivost') which is characteristic of an Elder.

Even when, in the amended versions, Tikhon refers to 'the Church', he does not seem to be referring to it in the sense of an institution: 'You have taken the great way, the way out of despair: which is to punish yourself before the whole world by bearing the shame you deserve. You have turned to the judgement of the whole Church.' ¹¹⁷ In these words, the phrases 'whole world' and 'whole Church' are presented as being equal to one another: when Tikhon talks of the Church, he thus seems to be referring to the world-wide body of Christian people, united by Christian attitudes. What he goes on to say reveals that he does not regard the Church as a static body: emphasis is placed upon the concept of transformation. Thus Tikhon knows that there are few

'pure souls' in society, and that most people will take a secret delight in Stavrogin's crime and confession. When he tells Stavrogin to turn to 'the Church' he does not, however, mean only the good people, but all people. He declares: 'You must not despise your judges, but sincerely believe in them as the great Church, then you will convince them, and they will follow your example, and you will blend together in love'.¹¹⁸ This is not a Church which already exists: it is the Church in the process of creation, the whole of mankind being transformed into what it should be. Tikhon suggests that the potential is there, but that it needs assistance to come to the surface: if Stavrogin treats society as the Church, it will respond as the Church. Mankind is the Church, if only it were aware of the fact. Tikhon is not a cynic, therefore, as Stavrogin would have us believe: he sees in the world not only its faults, but also its possibilities.

Dostoyevsky's conception of an ecclesiastical figure, as embodied in Bishop Tikhon, differs significantly from the other priests we have seen. They arrogated themselves and the institution they represented to the position of mediator between man and God. They attached importance to the formalities of religion, and had a fixed, sometimes harsh, idea of what was or was not acceptable to God. They appealed to the authority and teachings of the official Russian Orthodox Church. Tikhon adopts a position of humility. He does not claim to be the means to God himself, neither does he appear to assign this role to the Church he is supposed to represent. He suggests instead that the way to God is by overcoming the self. His role is to help and encourage in this task. The only 'Church' to which Dostoyevsky's Bishop appeals is the Church as the world-wide

In the episodes examined so far, Dostoyevsky's views on the Russian Orthodox Church have been deduced from the way he depicts the Church in specific circumstances. In The Brothers Karamazov, however, the question of the desired nature of the Church is broached directly, in the discussion about ecclesiastical courts which takes place in Zosima's cell.¹¹⁹ Ecclesiastical courts were a topical subject when the novel was being written, and it might initially appear that Dostoyevsky has temporarily abandoned his novel for the sake of contributing to the debate. Certainly one might expect rather different topics of conversation with such colourful characters as Fyodor Karamazov in the company. In the event, the chapter 'It will be, it will be!' illustrates Dostoyevsky's ability to transform a potentially dry academic debate into what is at times very entertaining repartee. Further, a close reading of the discussion reveals its relevance to the entire question of the author's attitude towards institutionalized religion.

The characters' views on the subject of ecclesiastical courts depend upon what they see as the desired relationship between Church and State, and this in turn is dependent upon their view of the Church. All of those who take part in the discussion refer to 'the Church', but what they understand by the term differs from person to person. Indeed, a fitting epigraph to the chapter would be a phrase spoken by Zosima at the beginning of the discussion: 'But in what sense?' There are, broadly speaking, two sides: one

represented by the ecclesiastic who wrote the article which initiated the debate; the other consisting of Iosif, Paisy, Ivan Karamazov and Zosima. It would, however, be wrong to assume that the latter four are all saying the same thing, even though it might seem so initially, and despite the fact that some members of the group themselves think as much. Rather, there is a progression in the chapter, beginning with the views of the ecclesiastic and culminating in the views of Zosima.

The basis for discussion is an article called 'The Foundations of Ecclesiastical Courts', written by an ecclesiastic who remains nameless. This article has been identified as one which existed, and which appeared in a book Dostoyevsky himself possessed: the paraphrased quotations from it are, in fact, almost verbatim. ¹²⁰ A detailed knowledge of the article is not necessary for our purposes: what is important is the stance taken by its author, and this is made clear from the few extracts offered. Characteristic of the ecclesiastic's attitude is that there is a very clear dividing line between the spiritual and the secular. He believes that the Church occupies a well-defined place within the State. His conception of the Church is very narrow and he has a clear idea of the limits of the Church's domain: most of life comes outside those limits. He certainly would deny that the Church should be in any way subject to the State. It should not, however, act in a manner alien to its nature: for the ecclesiastic, the Church exists as an institution whose task is to care for the spiritual needs of man, and it should not become involved in his civic life. Hence, ecclesiastical courts are unacceptable. In the context of Russian ecclesiastical

history this attitude is nearest to that of the Non-Possessors in the early sixteenth century, who believed that the Church should keep itself apart from secular society and thereby maintain its purity.

Of those present in the cell only Miusov would agree with such an opinion. However, his motive for doing so is subtly different from that of the ecclesiastic: whereas the latter wants to keep the Church free from the evils of society, Miusov wants to keep society free from the Church. Miusov's Christianity is at best nominal, hence his undisguised horror at much of what is said in the discussion. His comments can be both helpful and misleading, as will be seen below.

Father Iosif acquaints the company with the basic arguments of the ecclesiastic's article, and this is his main function in the discussion. He does not express his opposition to the ecclesiastic's views explicitly, but his low opinion of them is clearly conveyed: he informs Zosima that the author of the article is 'an ecclesiastic, mark you', as if Zosima might well be excused for thinking otherwise. Iosif is not only suspicious of the ecclesiastic, however. Ivan Karamazov has written an article which is intended to be a refutation of the ecclesiastic's views, and Iosif also has his doubts about this. Again, he does not say so directly, but the doubt in his mind is revealed by the terms in which he refers to Ivan's article. He describes it as lyubopytneyshiy ('most curious/interesting'); he comments that the ideas in it 'cut both ways'. Ivan 'seemingly' 'completely opposes' the separation of Church and State, says Iosif: but the monk is clearly uncertain. Despite his opposition to the ecclesiastic, Iosif essentially thinks in the same terms as him, and this is

the source of his suspicions of Ivan. For Iosif, too, Church and State are separate concepts: he does not say that the Church should be subject to the State, but it certainly should constitute a distinct and separate sphere. Therefore when Ivan talks about State becoming Church Iosif is on his guard: one can almost see the spectre of Rome arising in his mind as he considers what Ivan might mean.

The monastery's reply to the ecclesiastic is expressed by Father Paisy. Full of righteous indignation, he interrupts Iosif to declare that the ecclesiastic has misinterpreted the phrase 'the Church is a kingdom not of this world'. Paisy implies that the Church must indeed become involved in the world: 'If it is not of this world, then it cannot exist on earth at all'. Reference may again be made to the Possessor/Non-Possessor debate: Paisy is here speaking from the former position. Paisy's Christianity is not dry, theoretical theology: he speaks with feeling and conviction. He has a vision of world-wide Christianity. At the same time his conception of the Church remains within traditional attitudes: the Church is an institution and a mediator. He clearly distinguishes between Heaven and Earth: Heaven is somewhere else and belongs to a future date. The Church is the only way to Heaven: 'You enter [Heaven] only through the Church'. The Church is not a man-made institution: it was, Paisy makes clear, founded by Christ. But it exists as an institution nevertheless, as the terms he uses to refer to it suggest: it was osnovana ('founded') and ustanovlena ('instituted'). Paisy concludes by proclaiming that 'the Church is in truth a Kingdom and has been ordained to rule, and at the end will undoubtedly become a Kingdom on earth - this has been promised'.

These words are spoken in a prophetic manner and seem to apply 111
to a time far in the future. Meanwhile the institutionalized
Church continues in its role as mediator.

Throughout the discussion Paisy speaks in support of
Ivan Karamazov, and evidently does not consider that there is
any contradiction between their two positions. Ivan makes
his views known in three separate speeches. In the first, he
outlines the basic premises of his article: that the essential
principles underlying Church and State are different; that the
Church should 'contain the whole State'; and that this should
be 'the direct and chief aim of the entire future development
of Christian society'. Paisy's response is enthusiastic:
'Quite right!' But Miusov's is one of panic: 'The purest
Ultramontanism!' Each man sees something different in Ivan's
words. Only after Ivan's second speech does it become clear
which response is the most accurate, and what is actually
meant by 'the Church should contain the whole State'.

In the second speech, Ivan traces the history of the
relationship between Church and State. During the first three
centuries of Christianity, he says, 'Christianity existed on
earth only as a Church and was only a Church'. He contrasts
the concept of 'Christianity as only a Church' with the concept
'State'. The difference between Church and State, he reveals,
lies in 'the aims and fundamental principles' of each. The
way for a State to become a Church is by exchanging its own
aims for those of the Church. The aims of the Church, we learn,
are 'to turn the whole world and, therefore, the ancient pagan
state, into a Church'. Thus we turn full circle.

Paisy takes it upon himself to paraphrase Ivan's second
speech for the assembled company. He sums up by saying that

'the State ought to end by becoming worthy to become the Church and nothing else'. Miusov is comforted: it seems after all that what Ivan has been talking about is simply 'the realization of some ideal, infinitely remote'; 'a beautiful Utopian dream about the disappearance of wars, diplomats, banks and so on'. It may be noted that Miusov expresses these relieved thoughts not after Ivan's words, but after Paisy's paraphrase of Ivan's words. This is significant, since Paisy's paraphrase is, in fact, misleading. Paisy ignores certain details which reveal that Ivan's thoughts do not at all amount to a vague Utopian dream, but have a rather more concrete dimension to them. Neither banks nor diplomats nor any other feature of the State will disappear, because the form and organization of the State remain. Ivan makes this very clear: 'All this will in no way belittle [the State], or take away its honour and glory as a great State, or the glory of its leaders'. Only the aims of the State will change.

Lord has pointed to a close relationship between Ivan's thoughts on Church and State and the ideas of Vladimir Solovyov: 'There is no doubt whatever that Ivan's article on civil and ecclesiastical courts is an undisguised exposition of Free Theocracy'.¹²¹ An examination of Solovyov's writings reveals that striking similarities certainly exist. In 'Free Theocracy', 'the Church as such will not interfere in political or economic affairs, but will endow both the state and local government with a higher goal and a positive norm of activity. In other words, the government and zemstvo are completely free . . . provided that they allow for those higher needs by which a spiritual society is defined'.¹²² Although the submission of the State to the Church

must be free, Solovyov talks of the Church 'subjecting' the State to itself: 'Spiritual society - the Church - should subject society to itself, making the secular element its instrument and means'.¹²³ Much emphasis is placed by Solovyov upon the State as the 'instrument' of the Church: 'All the interests and activities of this life must be no more than means and instruments for eternal matters of moment'; 'if the Church really is the Kingdom of God on earth, then all other forces and powers . . . should be its instruments'.¹²⁴ Solovyov was critical of the Eastern Church because he wanted the Church to be 'actualized', and was not satisfied with it existing merely in the realm of the spirit:

It has preserved Christ's truth; but, preserving it in the soul of its peoples, the Eastern Church has not embodied it in external reality, has not given it real expression, has not created a Christian culture in the way that the West has created an anti-Christian culture.¹²⁵

Even this brief account of Free Theocracy suffices to demonstrate that Ivan Karamazov is indeed advocating essentially the same as Solovyov. Certainly, Ivan is not quite as explicit as Solovyov: he does not actually refer to the State as the 'instrument' of the Church. Neither does he suggest that the Church should 'subject' the State to itself. But his basic proposition would appear to be the same.

In Ivan's third speech, the topic of conversation is the nature of punishments in a society where 'everything has become the Church'. Ivan declares that the practice of physically removing a man from society would be replaced by excommunication from the Church. The realization that they had acted against Christ's Church would lead the criminals to

repent. Miusov judges this idea, too, to be 'a kind of dream', 114 'something shapeless'. In this instance he is essentially correct, since Ivan is indeed rejecting the mechanics of the state penal system. This does not, however, alter the overall nature of what Ivan is proposing: a Church which functions through the organs of the State.

This is the point at which Zosima enters the discussion. Much of what has been said in the course of the debate has been addressed to Zosima, as if those present feel that his will be the final word. Zosima does not explicitly declare anything which has already been said to be wrong (although the error of the ecclesiastic is, as we have seen, assumed throughout the discussion). He too refers to the transformation of society into a Church. But his comments reveal his own thinking to be significantly different both from that of Paisy and from that of Ivan. This may be inferred as much from what Zosima does not say as from what he says.

Missing from Zosima's words is Paisy's understanding of the Church as a mediating institution which is the only way to heaven. Although Zosima uses the word 'Church' many times, it tends to appear in conjunction with an epithet which suggests that he does not view it as an 'organization'. Thus we read: 'As a son of Christian society, that is, of the Church'; 'Towards society itself, that is, towards the Church'; 'Christian society, that is, the Church'. Characteristically, Zosima does not use the formal phrase 'ecclesiastical courts', but he prefers to paraphrase the concept: 'Now if judgement belonged to society as the Church'. Zosima's Church is a society composed of people united by

common Christian attitudes, living according to Christ's teachings. It is not to be found in external structures and hierarchical bodies, but exists on the moral plane: it should not surprise us, therefore, to hear Zosima say that in Europe 'in many cases there are no more Churches left at all, but only clergymen and magnificent church buildings'. This notion of the Church as a moral force is confirmed by Dostoyevsky's notebooks for the ecclesiastical courts debate:

Question: has the Church reached the end of its development as the society of Christ on earth, has it reached its ideal and its final form, or is it continuing to develop in accordance with its divine goal? This is not the dogmatic side of faith which is being considered, but only the moral state of man and society at a given moment.¹²⁶

At no time does Zosima speak of the Church as a static institution. Rather, he describes it in terms of emotional relationships: the Church is 'a tender and loving mother'; the criminal her 'dear and still precious son'. This tendency may also be noted when Zosima speaks of traditional features of institutionalized religion, such as the sacraments, services of worship and alms-giving. He looks at them not as duties which in some way justify man before God, but as an expression of a shared outlook on life: they constitute obshcheniye - 'intercourse' or 'contact'. We are not given the impression that these functions are necessary for a man to reach God: they are presented not as a means to achieving Christianity, but rather as evidence of Christianity.

So far as Ivan is concerned, 'Christ's Church' does not yet exist. It will not exist in its fulness until it has taken into itself the organs of the State. Ivan's comments about the moral judgement of the Church thus belong to the future. Zosima, on the contrary, says that Christ's Church exists now: the Elder's

entry into the discussion immediately brings it back to the present. It is true that for the time being the Church 'continues to exist only because of the seven righteous men', but while these seven symbolic figures exist, so does the Church, for the Church depends on people. One is reminded of the promise of Christ: 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them'.¹²⁷

Unlike Ivan, at no point does Zosima mention the State in conjunction with the Church: the two appear only in opposition to one another. He does not say explicitly that the State should be abolished, but it is certainly not clearly in focus: 'the disappearance of the State' seems to underlie his words. This hypothesis would seem to be confirmed by the notebooks for the discussion: 'Not a social organization in the State, but a social organization for the elimination of the State'.¹²⁸ This is how Zosima's Church differs from Ivan's. It does not seem to depend upon any attributes of State or, indeed, upon any other formal organizational principle: it is purely spiritual.

Miusov is in no doubt about the implications of Zosima's words. He seems suddenly to realize that what is being advocated amounts to anarchy, and that there will be no formal social structure at all: 'But what, for goodness' sake, is this? The State is to be abolished on earth?' So far as Miusov is concerned, anarchy will result if there is no State, no formal structure. Zosima's understanding of anarchy is significantly different. He considers that anarchy can exist in even the most highly organized state: legislation cannot make people good, as the failure of the formal penal system has shown. Like the Slavophiles, Zosima

has no confidence in institutions. The moral plane is the real centre of power: the sense of conscience which results from the moral imperative embodied in the Church as a group of Christian people is the most dependable form of social structure.

Zosima's thoughts on the nature of the Church thus represent a considerable shift from the narrow concept of formal ecclesiastical courts which initiated the discussion in the cell. Zosima's final recommendation for the Church has little which is concrete about it: his Church exists not as an institution complete with bureaucracy, but as a spiritual force. Like Ivan Karamazov's Church, it is world-wide, but unlike his it does not 'contain' the State: it renders the State unnecessary. It corresponds closely to the type of Church referred to by Bishop Tikhon in The Devils:¹²⁹ the Church as a moral idea. Zosima's failure to give prominence to the Church as an institutionalized body could, perhaps, be interpreted as a simple omission on his and, by extension, Dostoyevsky's part. In the context of our overall analysis of Dostoyevsky's presentation of the official Russian Orthodox Church, however, this seems unlikely. We have discovered during the course of this chapter that the role of the Church is consistently underplayed, and occasionally ignored or even rejected, by Dostoyevsky. Visits to church occur only rarely, and then they tend to be presented in a very specific manner, in the form of a beautiful childhood memory. The more formal aspects of church attendance are much less prominent than the aesthetic dimension. Russian Orthodox priests tend to be discredited both on the personal and on the professional level. They are presented as having little understanding of ordinary people; and their offers to perform ritual and to mediate are not valued.

as much as they might be. Occasionally, indeed, Dostoyevsky's characters seem to find their way to God without the help of the Church: some, like Sonya Marmeladova, because of circumstances; others, like Stepan Trofimovich Verkhovensky, because they choose to. Bishop Tikhon, who seems to correspond to Dostoyevsky's conception of what a priest should be, has very few 'ecclesiastical' features. He blurs the distinction between the Church and the world. Tikhon effectively ignores the formalities of religion and displays a disregard for the formal teachings of the Church. Zosima's failure to give prominence to the institutionalized Church is not, therefore, entirely unexpected: it is rather in keeping with what we have seen so far in our study. As yet, however, there has been nothing to account for the nature of Dostoyevsky's presentation of the Russian Orthodox Church, and no indication whether his apparent opposition to his own Church extends to all Churches, that is, to the very concept of institutionalized religion.

1. K. Mochulsky, Dostoevsky. His Life and Work, trans. M. A. Minihan (Princetown, 1967), 120-1.
2. R. Hingley, Dostoyevsky. His Life and Work (London, 1978), 69.
3. PSS, I, 13-108.
4. Ibid., 91.
5. Ibid., 61.
6. Ibid., 264-320.
7. R. Neuhäuser, 'The Landlady: A New Interpretation', Canadian Slavonic Papers, X, No. 1, 1968 (42-67), 42; Frank, op. cit., 337.
8. Mochulsky, op. cit., 73-82.
9. PSS, XVIII, 25.
10. Frank, op. cit., 341.
11. Neuhäuser, op. cit., 49-50.
12. Onasch, Der verschwiegene Christus, 72.
13. See Chapter One, 28, above.
14. C. E. Passage, Dostoevski the Adapter. A Study in Dostoevski's Use of the Tales of Hoffmann (North Carolina, 1954), 41-62.
15. Ibid., 55.
16. Ibid., 60.
17. A Terrible Vengeance (Strashnaya mest) may be found in Gogol, PSS, I, 244-82.
18. PSS, I, 268.
19. Ibid., 318.
20. Ibid., 293.
21. Ibid., 267-8.
22. Ibid., 267.
23. Ibid.

24. A. L. Bem, 'Dramatizatsiya breda. ("Khozyayka" Dostoyevskogo), Dostoyevsky (Prague, 1938) (77-141).
25. PSS, I, 277.
26. Ibid., 278.
27. Ibid., 305.
28. Ibid., 265.
29. Ibid., 318.
30. Neuhäuser, op. cit., 47-8.
31. Compare PSS, I, 266: 2-10 with ibid., 318: 34-8. It will be seen that the Church history project had occupied Ordynov for only a relatively short period, whereas his sistema had allegedly been evolving for years.
32. Neuhäuser, op. cit., 47; 48.
33. Frank, op. cit., 341.
34. The story appears in PSS, II, 142-267. Dostoyevsky originally intended Netochka Nezvanova to be a full-length novel, but these intentions were frustrated by his arrest and imprisonment in 1849, when only three Parts had been written. For details of the subsequent fate of the work, see PSS, II, 494-7.
35. Ibid., 185-6.
36. Ibid., 194.
37. Uncle's Dream may be found in PSS, II, 296-398. The Village of Stepanchikovo may be found in PSS, III, 5-168.
38. PSS, III, 86.
39. Ibid., 137; 153.
40. Ibid., 169-442.
41. Ibid., 383.
42. Ibid., 415-6.
43. Ibid., 194.
44. Ibid., 177.
45. PSS, VI, 46.
46. PSS, XIII, 92.
47. Ibid., 270; 272.
48. PSS, XIV, 264-5.

49. PSS, IV, 176.
50. F. M. Dostoyevsky, Dnevnik pisatelya za 1877 god (YMCA Press, Paris, n.d.) (hereafter: DP, 1877), 238 (1877 July/Aug. I, 1). DP, 1877 also contains those issues of Dnevnik pisatelya which appeared in 1880 and 1881. All references to the volume will be accompanied by a precise indication of the year, month and chapter from which the extract is taken.
51. PSS, XVIII, 78.
52. PSS, XIX, 109.
53. PSS, XV, 192. The funeral will be examined in more detail in Chapter Ten.
54. PSS, X, 121-6.
55. PSS, IV, 176. In a letter to his wife in 1875, Dostoyevsky describes the behaviour of high society ladies at the Russian Orthodox Church in Ems in terms reminiscent of the scene in The Devils: see Pisma, III, 172.
56. The events from the time of Marmeladov's accident to his death are described in PSS, VI, 136-45. Mrs Marmeladova's death is described in ibid., 332-4.
57. Ibid., 21.
58. Ibid., 145.
59. Ibid., 332.
60. Ibid., 142-3.
61. PSS, V, 103-4; 105.
62. PSS, VI, 144.
63. PSS, I, 88.
64. PSS, VI, 144.
65. Ibid.
66. Ibid., 333.
67. Ibid.
68. Ibid., 243.
69. See PSS, VI, 336-7. Further detailed reference will not be given.
70. The scene is described in PSS, X, 504-7. Further detailed reference will not be given.

71. For a more detailed discussion of the precise nature of Stepan Trofimovich's 'conversion', see: R. M. Davison, 'Dostoyevsky's "The Devils": The Role of Stepan Trofimovich Verkhovensky', Forum for Modern Language Studies, XVI, No. 2, April 1980 (109-19) (hereafter: Davison, 'Stepan Trofimovich Verkhovensky'), 114-16.
72. PSS, XIV, 338-40. The priest is first mentioned when Fyodor Karamazov tries to persuade Ivan to make the trip to Chermashnya: see PSS, XIV, 252-4.
73. R. A. Peace, Dostoyevsky. An Examination of the Major Novels (Cambridge, 1971), 218-9.
74. PSS, XIV, 253.
75. The history of the chapter is described in detail in PSS, XII, 237-47. See also *ibid.*, 157 (description of sources).
76. PSS, XI, 5-30.
77. PSS, XII, 119-33.
78. *Ibid.*, 108-19.
79. P. Pascal, Dostoïevski (Paris, 1969), 76.
80. Gibson, *op. cit.*, 146.
81. M. V. Jones, Dostoyevsky. The Novel of Discord (London, 1976) (hereafter: Jones, Dostoyevsky), 131.
82. W. Komarowitsch, F. M. Dostojewski. Die Urgestalt der Brüder Karamasoff. Dostojewskis Quellen, Entwürfe und Fragmente (Munich, 1928), 87-8.
83. S. Linnér, Starets Zosima in The Brothers Karamazov. A Study in the Mimesis of Virtue (Stockholm, 1975), 79.
84. Pisma, II, 264.
85. *Ibid.*, 289.
86. *Ibid.*, 264.
87. PSS, XI, 6.
88. *Ibid.*
89. *Ibid.*, 7.
90. *Ibid.*, 10.
91. *Ibid.*
92. *Ibid.*, 26.
93. Linnér, *op. cit.*, 101.

94. PSS, XI, 11; 27.
95. Ibid., 28.
96. Linnér, op. cit., 68.
97. PSS, XI, 9.
98. Ibid., 10.
99. Ibid., 11.
100. A. de Jonge, Dostoevsky and the Age of Intensity (London, 1975).
101. PSS, XI, 28.
102. PSS, XIV, 81-4.
103. The legend is related in V. S. Solov'ev, Russia and the Universal Church, translated from the French by H. Rees (London, 1948), 39.
104. Compare PSS, XI, 10: 31 with corresponding amendment, PSS, XII, 121.
105. Compare, e.g., PSS, XI, 24: 45 with corresponding amendment, PSS, XII, 120.
106. Compare PSS, XI, 7: 20 and 10: 4-5 with corresponding amendments, PSS, XII, 120.
107. Compare PSS, XI, 11: 3-4 and 11: 36 with corresponding amendments, PSS, XII, 121.
108. Compare PSS, XI, 10: 22 with corresponding amendment, PSS, XII, 120.
109. Compare PSS, XI, 10: 40 with corresponding amendment, PSS, XII, 121.
110. Compare PSS, XI, 11: 2 with corresponding amendment, PSS, XII, 121.
111. Compare PSS, XI, 23: 41-5 with corresponding amendments, PSS, XII, 114; 129.
112. Compare PSS, XI, 26: 12-15 with corresponding amendment, PSS, XII, 117.
113. See PSS, XII, 114 (amendment at 24: 4-5) and PSS, XII, 129 (amendment at 24: 25). Compare with PSS, XI, 24: 25-6.
114. See PSS, XII, 115 (amendment at 24: 34); 118 (amendment at 27: 10-17); 129 (amendment at 24: 31).
115. See PSS, XII, 116 (amendment at 25: 7).
116. See PSS, XII, 117 (amendments at 26: 32 and 26: 37-45).

117. PSS, XII, 115 (amendment at 24: 34).
118. PSS, XII, 118 (amendment at 27: 10-17).
119. PSS, XIV, 55-63. Further detailed reference will not be given.
120. PSS, XV, 534.
121. Lord, op. cit., 153.
122. Solovyov, SS, I, 287.
123. Ibid., III, 18.
124. Ibid., 17.
125. Ibid., 178.
126. PSS, XV, 209.
127. Matt. 18: 20.
128. PSS, XV, 209.
129. See 105-6, above.

THE CONTEMPORARY CHURCH'S ASSESSMENT OF DOSTOYEVSKY

'And yet many churchmen
were convinced that the
author was on their side.'¹

In the previous chapter we saw that Dostoyevsky's attitude to certain aspects of institutionalized religion was at best ambiguous and at worst highly critical. We noted that the Russian Orthodox Church was sometimes conspicuous by its absence in his novels. Yet, as we saw in Chapter One, that same Church played a prominent part at the funeral of Dostoyevsky, joining the State to shower praise upon the writer.² Admittedly, some ecclesiastical voices had been raised in protest against the attention paid to Dostoyevsky at this time, as is revealed in the diary of Aleksandra Bogdanovich, wife of an important official in St. Petersburg in the eighteen-eighties. When first approached, the Aleksandr Nevsky Monastery had apparently been less than enthusiastic about opening its doors to Dostoyevsky. Mrs Bogdanovich describes the response of Metropolitan Isidor when she approached him to try to arrange a free burial service for Dostoyevsky:

'The Metropolitan met our petition coldly and dissociated himself from it, saying that Dostoyevsky was a mere novelist, and that he hadn't written anything serious'.³ In the event, the personal intervention of Pobedonostsev secured a change of heart from the Metropolitan, and the funeral was enthusiastically supported by the Church. This prompts one to think that perhaps the Russian Orthodox hierarchy was unfamiliar with Dostoyevsky's writings. Yet a spate of articles about

Dostoyevsky appeared in religious journals around the years 1879 and 1880 when The Brothers Karamazov was being published. His writings were discussed in such publications as Pravoslavnoye obozreniye (The Orthodox Review), Donskiye yeparkhial'nye vedomosti (The Don Episcopal News), Vera i tserkov' (Faith and the Church) and Trudy Kievskoy Dukhovnoy Akademii (The Writings of Kiev Theological Academy). As will be seen below, some of these articles were written by prominent members of the Russian Orthodox hierarchy, including Bishop Antony Khrapovitsky. Clearly Dostoyevsky's novels were read by the religious establishment. Indeed, he soon became as much the property of religious as of secular commentators. The aim of the present chapter is to ascertain the contemporary Church's response to Dostoyevsky's portrayal specifically of religious matters. The chapter is based upon an analysis of articles which appeared in Russian journals and newspapers over a period of approximately thirty years from The Brothers Karamazov onwards. There will first be a brief examination of views expressed on the fundamental aspects of Dostoyevsky's religious faith. Our particular concern, however, will be to ascertain what the Russian Orthodox Church inferred from the novels about Dostoyevsky's attitude to institutionalized religion. Although we will be concerned primarily with the response of ecclesiastical commentators, reference will also be made to the secular press for purposes of comparison and contrast.

⁴
The Orthodox Encyclopedia refers to Dostoyevsky as 'a novelist and a religious thinker', and it was as both of these things that most critics approached him by the time of the

articles with which we are dealing. Religious characters and themes had, of course, appeared in the novels which preceded The Brothers Karamazov, but it was this final novel which most clearly invited a religious interpretation: set in a monastery; one of its main characters a monk; the question of God and immortality on the mind of almost every character. Dostoyevsky's Diary of a Writer and his celebrated Pushkin Speech added to his reputation as a spokesman for Russia and Russian Orthodoxy. The first thing which may be observed in the articles under consideration is that, whether the critics were secular or ecclesiastical, radical or reactionary, they tended to agree on the fact of Dostoyevsky's Christian faith and its centrality to his thinking. Admittedly, attitudes towards his faith varied according to the beliefs of the critics themselves. Some were rather sarcastic, like the critic of the radical journal Delo (The Cause), who referred to Dostoyevsky as 'Peter the Hermit'.⁶ Others were kindly condescending, such as Alekseyev, writing in Russkoye bogatstvo (Russian Wealth), who declared magnanimously that 'despite all his efforts to become a champion of gloom, [Dostoyevsky] is nevertheless a lantern'.⁷ Ecclesiastical commentators tended to be more expansive in their descriptions. In Pravoslavnoye obozreniye Dostoyevsky was called 'a defender of the truth'⁸ and 'a deeply believing Christian'. In Donskiye yeparkhial'nye vedomosti he was praised as 'a marvellous phenomenon by virtue of his Orthodox Christian views'.⁹ Khristianskoye chteniye (Christian Reading) dubbed him 'a fighter for faith and the Church'.¹⁰ Despite the differing levels of enthusiasm for Dostoyevsky's faith, there was thus general agreement over the fact of its existence.

Combined with this was an acknowledgement that Dostoyevsky 128 had had a struggle for faith: 'The rich content of [Dostoyevsky's] soul did not come easily to him: he gained it through suffering; it emerged from the crucible of his heart with its tormenting experiences'.¹¹ But although this struggle for faith was acknowledged, Dostoyevsky's Christianity was valued only more highly as a result. At the same time, however, there was an awareness that to some people the strength of Dostoyevsky's faith might appear inadequate. This prompted commentators to make a point of confirming the writer's Christianity. Various arguments were advanced to this end. Bulgakov wrote that if Dostoyevsky had not been a Christian he would not have been able to depict positive spiritual experiences with such vigour.¹² Nikolayev, literary correspondent of Moskovskiye vedomosti (The Moscow News), assured his readers that if Dostoyevsky had not been successful in overcoming the torments of disbelief himself, he would have been unable to depict them in literature.¹³ Rozanov was a lone dissenting voice with his view that Dostoyevsky believed in the Devil more than in God: even he, however, acknowledged a desperate desire to believe on the part of Dostoyevsky.¹⁴

There was general agreement among commentators about where Dostoyevsky's particular gift as a writer lay: secular and ecclesiastical critics alike acknowledged his profound understanding of the workings of the human soul. Alekseyev, in an article which gives little credence to Dostoyevsky's religious ideals, talks approvingly of his 'deep "penetration" into suffering souls' and of the usefulness of this gift.¹⁵ Nikolayev refers to Dostoyevsky as 'a profound psychologist', and declares that his writings make possible the study of the

human soul. Among ecclesiastical writers who greatly valued this aspect of Dostoyevsky's writings was Taube, who calls him

'an expert of the soul'.¹⁷ This opinion was shared by Father Petropavlovsky in Pravoslavnoye obozreniye: '[Dostoyevsky] directed our attention to the self, to self-awareness and self-perfection. He plunged us into the very depths of the human soul, acquainted us with all its secret little crevices and curves, with all the movements and designs of the heart'.¹⁸

Most critics agreed that this profound knowledge of man went hand-in-hand with a deep love of man. Alekseyev, while dismissing Dostoyevsky's religious beliefs as 'incomprehensible nonsense', says that the reader does not notice this 'nonsense', since everything is engulfed by the author's 'passionate love for people'.¹⁹ Alekseyev is typical of many secular critics who took Dostoyevsky's love for mankind out of a Christian context and interpreted it from a humanist standpoint: this enabled them to praise Dostoyevsky without compromising their progressive convictions. In Russkaya rech' (Russian Speech), for example, Markov writes that despite its monastic setting The Brothers Karamazov evokes 'cheerfulness and freshness' and faith in 'the spiritual beauty' of man.²⁰ Religious critics, too, referred to Dostoyevsky's enthusiasm and optimism for man. They chose to interpret it in theological terms, using an image suggested by Zosima in The Brothers Karamazov: 'the spark of God in man'.²¹ Thus Petropavlovsky writes: '[Dostoyevsky] showed us the brilliant little spark in the soul of man by virtue of which we are akin to our Creator,

the Father of Light'.²² This particular concept seems to have endeared Dostoyevsky to many. A telegram sent to Anna Grigoryevna on the occasion of Dostoyevsky's death by students of Moscow Theological Academy reads: 'Even the tiniest trace of the image of God in man was dear to Dostoyevsky because he saw it as a pledge of a better future'.²³ Similarly, a graveside sermon by Archpriest Yanyshchev, Rector of the St. Petersburg Theological Academy, describes Dostoyevsky as 'one who believed in a treasure store of good impulses in the soul of the Russian man'.²⁴

Despite such enthusiasm, there was a slight degree of unease among critics regarding Dostoyevsky's apparent attraction to the darker sides of life. Mikhaylovsky's view that Dostoyevsky's delvings into tortured human souls revealed a twisted mind which enjoyed the sufferings of others is an extreme manifestation of such unease.²⁵ But even a well-disposed critic like Burenin, writing in Novoye vremya (New Time), expressed reservations in this area: in The Brothers Karamazov, he said, Dostoyevsky 'abused' the reader's nerves.²⁶ The Church in particular was clearly rather embarrassed by Dostoyevsky's familiarity with the less wholesome aspects of life, and felt obliged to justify it. S. Levitsky, writing in Pravoslavnoye obozreniye, attempts to explain Dostoyevsky's apparent preference for 'the negative, ugly aspects of human life' by suggesting that 'most likely the sad events of his own life and the many unsightly episodes which it was his lot to witness were responsible for such a development'.²⁷ Such an explanation might not convince everyone, but Levitsky himself clearly thought it sufficient

and did not trouble to look any more deeply into the matter. This was not the only aspect of Dostoyevsky's writings for which he felt obliged to supply an authoritative justification: he also tried to explain why Dostoyevsky's 'good' characters are never completely good, but inevitably have darker sides to them. 'If the positive, light characters which Dostoyevsky depicts are never invincible heroes or perfect models of morality', he writes, 'this does not give us the right to conclude that the author is full of pessimism': Dostoyevsky is merely being true to life.²⁸

The very fact that Levitsky draws attention to this demonstrates his fear that to the readers he was addressing, accustomed to dealing with clearly delineated representatives of 'good' and 'bad', Dostoyevsky's characters might appear rather too broad. The Church, one feels, would have sympathized with Dmitry Karamazov's opinion that 'man is broad, too broad. I would have him narrowed down'.²⁹

In the areas we have so far considered, there has been considerable common ground between secular and ecclesiastical critics: the fact of Dostoyevsky's religious faith; his skill as a psychologist; and his love and optimism for man. However, the relatively generous comments of the more radical secular critics were largely conditional upon them being able to detach Dostoyevsky from his religious context. When it came to an assessment of Dostoyevsky's religion per se, these conditions no longer existed, and there was a much greater divergence between the secular and the ecclesiastical response. So far as the radicals were concerned, the combination of a basically critical attitude towards Dostoyevsky and an instinctive hostility to anything religious

gave rise to spirited attacks.

First, Dostoyevsky's religion was associated by them with a reactionary world-view. Writing after the publication of the first part of The Brothers Karamazov, the critic of the 'progressive' journal Nedelya (The Week) said that it was already clear that religious issues were going to be the 'main nerve' of the novel, and he interpreted this as a confirmation of Dostoyevsky's 'retrograde' thinking.³⁰ Mikhaylovsky included respect for the existing order of things among the several reasons he proposed to explain Dostoyevsky's exaltation of suffering.³¹ Even the liberal Vestnik Yevropy (The European Herald) accused Dostoyevsky of obscurantism, and of preaching 'familiar doctrines of historical stagnation'.³²

The radicals felt that the essence of Dostoyevsky's religion was dark and gloomy mysticism. Representative of their response in this respect was an article by Antonovich, in which The Brothers Karamazov is called 'a mystical-ascetic novel', nothing but 'a religious tract', 'a chapter of the Cheti-Minei or a translation from the Acta Sanctorum'.³³ Antonovich compares Dostoyevsky with the Gogol of Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends, the book which had aroused such widespread indignation among progressives in the eighteen-forties. Burenin, who polemicized with Antonovich, referred to him rather scathingly as 'a critic of the Dobrolyubov school', but without Dobrolyubov's critical taste, and both of these traits are illustrated in the article under consideration.³⁴ We learn, for example, that of all the characters in The Brothers Karamazov, it is Rakin whom Antonovich considers to possess the most

humanitarian concern. Further, the critic is unable to distinguish between the various religious stances represented in the novel: Father Paisy, Zosima and the Grand Inquisitor are all tarred with the same brush of ascetic severity, obscurantism and selfish concern with individual salvation. Antonovich rebukes Dostoyevsky for what he regards as his rigid differentiation between the Church and the world, and for his alleged cruel division of mankind into 'sheep' and 'goats'. He sees Dostoyevsky as a spokesman for official Russian Orthodoxy, and associates him with the Grand Inquisitor's call for an authoritarian and inquisitorial Church. In this respect too he sees a parallel with Gogol, although he distinguishes between the two men by saying that whereas for Gogol the Church was central, Dostoyevsky accorded centrality to monasticism. So far as Antonovich is concerned, the basis of Dostoyevsky's religious thinking is nothing less than 'clericalism'. Zosima's call for free subjection to the Church has already been attained, he declares: by the Jesuits.

However extreme Antonovich's analysis might appear, it certainly was not isolated among radical critics. Chuyko, writing for the progressive journal Novosti (News), called The Brothers Karamazov 'a sort of sermon of mystical theories', and he attributed to Dostoyevsky 'a mystical-ascetic ideal', calling him an opponent of progress.³⁵ He interpreted the ideal of transforming the State into a Church, proposed during the Church courts debate, as 'nothing less than Jesuitism, understood in a peculiar way', and disguised as humanitarian concern. In Molva (Rumour), The Brothers Karamazov was labelled 'pure mysticism', 'a novel-sermon'.³⁶ In Svet (Light),

Dostoyevsky's religious ideal was dismissed as 'strange
and gloomy mysticism'.³⁷

A feature which both radical and liberal critics saw in Dostoyevsky's religion was a quality of 'other-worldliness'. Dostoyevsky, they said, was interested in spiritual things to the exclusion of the world. Markov, while admitting some sympathy for Dostoyevsky's ideal, expresses the view that in The Brothers Karamazov the writer invites accusations that he is advocating an abandonment of the world. In his opinion, Dostoyevsky seems to be saying that 'only by denying society, by shaking its dust from his feet and retiring into a monastery can a man become penetrated by the consciousness of his highest moral aims and overcome his instinctive greed and egotism'.³⁸

The critic Neplyuyev, who dismisses Alyosha Karamazov as 'a good-hearted nonentity', and accords Zosima the privilege of being 'the only Christian in Dostoyevsky', says that Zosima leads one to assume that the concepts 'Christianity' and 'asceticism' are synonymous. One can only infer, he writes, 'that clever people, like Zosima, should definitely retire from the world'.³⁹ A few years earlier, Makar Dolgoruky in A Raw Youth had similarly been criticized for being 'other-worldly'. The critic of Detskiy sad (The Nursery) expressed admiration for the ideal of blagoobraziye ('spiritual attractiveness') which Makar embodied, but regretted that it was 'not of this world': 'raw youths' needed to be shown an example of blagoobraziye which was 'of this world'.⁴⁰

The secular critics' accusations of other-worldliness increased in number and intensity after the Pushkin Speech with

its emphasis upon humility. When Gorshkov had written about The Brothers Karamazov in Russkaya pravda (Russian Truth) in 1879, he had been relatively gentle in his criticism, adopting the rather patronizing tone we noted earlier in Alekseyev. This may be illustrated by reference to his assessment of Dostoyevsky's portrayal of 'Eldership':

Those pages of the novel on which the monastery 'Elders' appear before the readers, surrounded by a glittering halo of other-worldly greatness and wisdom, can arouse nothing but pity for a writer who, even with such a genius, has been unable to free himself from the grip of mysticism.⁴¹

After the Pushkin Speech, however, Gorshkov's tone becomes sharper: Dostoyevsky is bluntly called a person 'not of this world', and his so-called 'new word' is dismissed as 'a muddle'.⁴² Kavelin, writing in Vestnik Yevropy, describes what Dostoyevsky proposes in the Pushkin Speech as 'oriental passivity', and says that it is time 'to stop talking about moral, spiritual and Christian truth, and to start acting and living it'.⁴³ (My emphasis.)

Essentially the same complaint of 'other-worldiness' lay behind the challenge made by many liberal critics to the effect that Dostoyevsky's ideals were too exalted for man and did not pay sufficient attention to the world in which people had to live. The critics pointed to the lack of a concrete dimension in Dostoyevsky's religious ideal: it would, they thought, remain an ideal unless certain practical measures were taken to bring about its realization. Gradovsky, writing in Golos (The Voice), typifies such a response. He does not subject Dostoyevsky's religious ideal itself to any criticism: indeed, he refers to the author's 'powerful homily of personal

morality'. However, he goes on to say that 'to a great extent 136
the social perfection [obshchestvennoye sovershenstvo] of people
depends upon the perfection of social institutions', and he
criticizes Dostoyevsky for ignoring this aspect of the problem.⁴⁴

'The Contemplator', writing in Russkoye bogatstvo, makes a
similar point:

It is difficult to imagine a more elevated ideal in theory
but it can have no practical influence on Russian
progress: . . . such remote ideals can only illuminate
the way for a few; the mass of people will always need
something nearer at hand, more concrete.⁴⁵

The liberal critics considered that this gap in Dostoyevsky's
religious ideal could be remedied by a series of reforming
measures initiated by an enlightened government, and they
treated it merely as a misguided omission on Dostoyevsky's
part. Certainly they attached no ideological significance
to Dostoyevsky's seeming disrespect for concrete details;
and did not interpret their observation in terms of Dostoy-
evsky and the Church.

The essence of the 'secular' response to Dostoyevsky's
religion may be summarized as follows. To the radicals
Dostoyevsky's religion appeared dark and gloomy. They consid-
ered that an authoritarian and inquisitorial Church came
closest to Dostoyevsky's ideal. They felt that Dostoyevsky
had abandoned the world to sin and the Devil, and was advising
other people to make a similar escape into self-centred purity.
The liberals, although not necessarily religiously inclined
themselves, were more sympathetic to Dostoyevsky's religious
ideals. They would, however, have welcomed rather more in the
way of concrete directives. But what of the ecclesiastical

commentators, to whom Christian ideals and the Church were of central importance; and what of those 'secular' critics who showed an understanding of religious matters? What was their assessment of the type of religion Dostoyevsky was advocating?

There was in this quarter widespread awareness that Dostoyevsky wanted to see 'inner', living Christianity. The Orthodox Encyclopedia drew particular attention to this feature of Dostoyevsky's religion: 'First of all and most important of all, Dostoyevsky teaches us, learn Christian ethics, put the Gospel teaching into practice in your own life, and only then will the rest have any meaning'.⁴⁶ Miller had drawn a similar conclusion from the episode involving the Swiss pastor in The Idiot: for Dostoyevsky, he wrote, 'living religion cannot be found in religious codes, but must enter right into the moral organism of a person'.⁴⁷ Obolensky, writing in Mysl' (Thought), contrasts Dostoyevsky's religious ideal favourably with 'purely ritualistic religiosity', 'where one's actions and life contradict the basic teachings of Christ'.⁴⁸ Bulgakov too suggests that Dostoyevsky wanted to get beneath the ritual to 'real' Christianity: he sees Dostoyevsky's great achievement in having removed 'the Church gilt and the Byzantine traditions' to reveal the living Christ.⁴⁹

There was an awareness among ecclesiastical commentators that Dostoyevsky did not accord central importance to theology or dogma. Bishop Antony characterizes his religion as 'intuitive': based not on formal creeds, logic and legalities, but on moral truths known to man instinctively. Dostoyevsky does not reject theology, says Antony, but he does not allow it to control religion: man is the starting point of his religious truths. Although Dostoyevsky may not use formal theological

terms, such as 'grace' or 'Redeemer', this does not mean that the concepts are missing from his faith: rather, they are 'constantly required by the very logic of things'.⁵⁰ Svetlov, writing in Bogoslovskiy vestnik, makes a similar point.

Commenting that Dostoyevsky's presentation of monasticism in The Brothers Karamazov had encouraged discussion in theological circles of the need for monastic reform, he remarks that the conclusions drawn from these discussions coincided with Dostoyevsky's views as reflected in the novel. This fact, he says, 'serves as a confirmation of the profound Christian intuition of our writer and psychologist, which in him replaces learned theological knowledge, which is not always enough by itself to provide truly Christian understanding'.⁵¹ As will be seen below, there were some religious commentators who would have preferred to see a little less 'intuition' and rather more theology. For the moment, however, it may be noted that both Antony, a bishop, and Svetlov, an archpriest, together with many others who held important positions in the Russian Orthodox Church, were entirely happy with the nature of Dostoyevsky's religion.

Coupled with this awareness of the 'living' nature of the type of Christianity Dostoyevsky wanted to see was an appreciation of what he understood by the concept 'Church' in its ideal sense. Terms such as 'brotherhood', 'free unity', 'love' and 'all-mankind' were repeatedly used by commentators in their attempts to define Dostoyevsky's ideal Church. Obolensky defines Dostoyevsky's ideal as not a 'constitutional agreement' or 'a state founded upon formal law', but 'a free union of mutually loving hearts'.⁵² Snegiryov, writing in Vera i razum

(Faith and Reason), says that for Dostoyevsky the true Church, must be 'a living, organizing, inner force' containing 'the idea of brotherly union'.⁵³ The critic frequently refers to this Church as an 'idea'. Shchukin, writing in Khristianin (The Christian), describes his own ideal of the Church as 'a universal free union of people', 'the spiritual union of mankind in Christ', and he attributes this ideal to Dostoyevsky.⁵⁴ Taube, who places Dostoyevsky between Khomyakov and Bishop Feofan the Recluse as one of the 'three pillars of the Russian Enlightenment of the last century', associates him with the ideal of the Church put forward by Samarin for the Slavophiles: 'The Church is a living organism (body), an organism (formation) of truth and love, or more accurately, truth and love as an organism'.⁵⁵ Solovyov spoke of Dostoyevsky's Church as a 'spiritual brotherhood', the embodiment of 'universal truth'.⁵⁶

But did the religious commentators consider that Dostoyevsky was sufficiently concerned about reality, something which the radical critics had forcefully denied? We know that Dostoyevsky himself wanted to effect a synthesis between the ideal and reality, and wanted to demonstrate that the perfect Christian could actually exist.⁵⁷ Tareyev's comment represents the general opinion, which was that Dostoyevsky had been successful in his quest: '[Dostoyevsky] alone took it upon himself to depict the living image of a holy man, and he succeeded brilliantly'.⁵⁸ There was, however, a wider range of opinion regarding this than on previous points, and a slight feeling of dissatisfaction with some aspects of Dostoyevsky's religion may be sensed. Particularly informative in this respect are the commentators' attitudes towards

Many of the secular critics who were sympathetic to religion were satisfied that Zosima was firmly rooted in reality. Obolensky wrote that both Zosima and Alyosha were not merely ideals, but 'proof that love can exist on earth and what its results can be'.⁵⁹ Burenin admits that there is an element of 'mysticism' about Zosima, but points out that his teachings deal with the most pressing current issues and should, therefore, find a response in the heart of anyone concerned with the state of society.⁶⁰ Miller, on the basis of what he sees as Zosima's deep concern for society, calls Dostoyevsky a Christian Socialist.⁶¹ Without using precisely these terms, many Church commentators made similar claims for Zosima. Thus Pobedinsky, writing in Vera i tserkov', says that Zosima is 'a model of almost ideal proportions, but at the same time is built upon such a real base that he is credible, conceivable and attractive even to a scientist or a rationalist'.⁶² S. Levitsky makes a general point about the 'rooted' quality of Dostoyevsky's religious ideal when he writes that 'it is not presented as an abstract, lifeless principle, but is a living, active force, able to renew mankind'.⁶³ V. Levitsky claims that all of Dostoyevsky's positive religious types are 'extremely vivid, true to life, and built on a very real basis', and he includes Zosima in their number.⁶⁴

It is rare for a Church commentator to see Zosima purely as an ideal, as does Bogoslovsky, writing in Voskresny den' (The Sabbath): Zosima, he says, 'is not so much a real personality as a "type", a model or ideal of the Russian monk'.⁶⁵

However, the language used by some commentators when referring to Zosima suggests that they perhaps did not consider him to be completely realistic, even if they claimed that he was.

V. Levitsky, for example, frequently uses the adjective idealny ('ideal') when describing Zosima, as when he talks of the 'ideal rays of love' which surround him. He refers to the type of love which makes up Zosima's being as 'at times almost reflective' (mechtatelny) as opposed to 'active' (deyatelny), an important distinction which Zosima himself makes in the novel: Zosima, however, criticizes 'reflective' love.⁶⁶ Shchukin similarly speaks of Zosima in terms of intangible concepts rather than concrete images: he describes Zosima's action in the novel by saying that 'warmth and cheerfulness flowed out from him'; and he refers to both Zosima and Alyosha as people 'who can create around themselves a moral unifying atmosphere'.⁶⁷ Further, several critics showed themselves to be aware of a 'contemplative' element in Zosima: Tareyev, for example, regards Makar Dolgoruky and Zosima as 'holy men with a tendency towards asceticism and contemplation'.⁶⁸

A desire for greater forcefulness may also be seen in the assessments of the type of love advocated by Zosima. Some commentators, like V. Levitsky, were not particularly discerning in this respect: after citing a critic who had said that Zosima's love did not include active resistance to evil or even a struggle with evil, Levitsky comments rather naively: 'We are not concerned to know the precise nuance given to Christian love as depicted by Dostoyevsky. So long as it was genuine Christian love'.⁶⁹ Others were rather more critical, however. Pavlov, writing in Rus' (Russia) was on the whole very

sympathetic towards Dostoyevsky's ideals, but he felt that something more forceful was needed in The Brothers Karamazov to combat the forces of darkness:

After Karamazovshchina we do not want the kind of holiness which bows down before the suffering of sin, always feels guilty to everyone for everything, and asks forgiveness 'even of the birds' - we want rather to see sin conquered.⁷⁰

Svetlov, writing in Bogoslovskiy vestnik, considers Zosima's love to be one-sided: it is not 'that full and perfect love which organically combines within itself total forgiveness and righteous anger at evil, peaceableness and goodwill with active resistance to evil or a battle against evil'.⁷¹

Attitudes to Alyosha were similarly varied. Some commentators regarded him as less, others as more, active than his teacher Zosima. Radical critics had given him a hostile reception, and this led the more sympathetic commentators to come to his defence. Much of what was written in Alyosha's defence was based upon the conviction that the future held great things for him. Zverev, writing in Rus', said that Alyosha was 'the new man entering into the Russian world, the hero of the future'.⁷² Miller parried the scornful attacks of Petersen, who had ridiculed what he saw as the trifling and petty activities in which Alyosha is engaged for most of the novel, with the assertion that only death had prevented Dostoyevsky from showing them the promised Alyosha. He points to the importance of what Alyosha actually does in the novel, even if it appears very mundane.⁷³ Shchukin adds his voice to the defence of Alyosha: in the future he will have 'an important, constructive social role'.⁷⁴ Tareyev's ambiguous feelings about Alyosha are illustrated by the fact that

at one stage he demonstrates that he is completely rooted in reality, while at another point he refers to him as a character 'with a real striving towards heaven, but a feeble feeling for the earth, and only an abstract understanding of evil'.⁷⁵ The former stance is the one he returns to finally,

and is the one taken up by V. Levitsky, who admits, however, that Alyosha's image does not come across very distinctly

or clearly.⁷⁶ The general opinion was that Alyosha illustrated Dostoyevsky's conviction that Christianity must be involved in life. But if religious commentators believed this, how, in their opinion, did Dostoyevsky mean it to come about?

Through the Church, the normal organ through which Christianity operates? This leads to a consideration of what ecclesiastical commentators, together with those secular critics sympathetic to religion, thought was the type of 'historical' Church Dostoyevsky wanted to see, and what importance they assigned to it in the writer's religious ideal.

Whereas radical critics had tended to associate Dostoyevsky with the type of Church represented, of course, by his Grand Inquisitor, such an interpretation was adamantly rejected by those sympathetic to the author. Thus Burenin, who had consistently taken it upon himself to defend Dostoyevsky from the progressive press, wrote that the meaning of the 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor' was 'a protest against precisely the type of inquisitorial religious ideal which our perspicacious critics are trying to attribute to Mr Dostoyevsky. It consists rather in a supreme apotheosis of Christian love and freedom'.⁷⁷ Most of the commentators considered the 'Legend' to be directed solely and specifically against the Roman Catholic

Church. Kirillov, for example, writes that 'in [the 'Legend']
 the late Mr Dostoyevsky gives a remarkable description of the
 whole of Roman Catholicism'. Throughout his analysis the
 critic refers to the Grand Inquisitor and his followers as
 'the representatives of Catholicism'.⁷⁸ S. Levitsky likens
 Dostoyevsky's portrayal of Catholicism to Khomyakov's. Both,
 he writes, consider that Catholicism wants to build the Church
 'not on spiritual principles, but on the external principles
 of power and force': Dostoyevsky's ideal is, by contrast, a
 Church built on 'freely-given love'.⁷⁹ Both Kirillov and
 Levitsky point to what they see as a new dimension in
 Dostoyevsky's analysis of Catholicism: the element of philanth-
 ropy he alleges to be present in the Catholic idea. They
 are anxious to point out, however, that he still thought that
 Catholicism was a distortion of Christ's teaching, and that
 its motivating force was a lust for power. They dismiss any
 possibility of genuine sympathy for the Catholic idea on the
 part of Dostoyevsky. Indeed, it is a feature of interpretations
 of the 'Legend' by Church critics that they see no ambiguities
 in it: Dostoyevsky is clearly on the side of Christ, whose
 kiss far outweighs the Inquisitor's dialectic. Levitsky
 summarizes Dostoyevsky's achievement in the 'Legend' by saying
 that 'the unsightly aspects of [Catholicism] stand out even
 more clearly than before, its delusions become even more
 obvious and enormous, the results of these delusions even more
 fatal for mankind'.⁸⁰

Many of the Church commentators were, like Kirillov and
 S. Levitsky, too embroiled in anti-Roman Catholic polemics to
 see any wider application for the 'Legend'. Others, however,

offered a freer interpretation. Thus Bishop Antony sees in the 'Legend', particularly in the account of the three temptations, a castigation of 'all forms of external pressure on the masses'. He gives examples of the type of thing he means by this: Catholicism, Socialism, party politics, 'state regimentation'⁸¹ in the West. Shchukin's interpretation in Khristianin draws particular attention to itself because he ventures to suggest that the lesson of the 'Legend' might usefully be applied to the Orthodox Church as well: 'Here too the Church has often taken the "sword of Caesar" into its hands to attain its spiritual aims, and has acted by means other than spiritual; there have been times in history when it has resembled rather too closely a department of state'⁸². However, Shchukin mitigates his accusation by saying that at least the Eastern Church has always been aware that such a situation is wrong, whereas the State-Church has become the guiding principle in the West. Significantly, Shchukin does not suggest that Dostoyevsky himself intended such an interpretation to be read into the 'Legend', but makes it clear that he is speaking for himself.

Rozanov was another who placed a wider interpretation upon the 'Legend'. His original analysis appeared in 1891, and an 'Afterword'⁸³ was published in 1906. Rozanov equated the Grand Inquisitor's solution with Dostoyevsky's own ideal: Dostoyevsky, he said, believed in the Devil more than in God, and he had lost the earlier confidence in man which was so evident in Notes from Underground. Rozanov considered that the 'Legend' was intended to be applied to the whole of history, and that it comprised three strands: a criticism of Christ's

lofty conception of human nature; Dostoyevsky's personal concern and pity for man, unable to cope with the burden of freedom and choice; and the Roman Catholic element - the attempt to organize man's destinies on earth. The whole was put forward as an illusion to make life bearable: 'There is no religion as the custodian of religious mysteries, there is only an illusion, by which it is necessary that man be deceived in order that he can in some way or other establish himself on earth'.⁸⁴

In the 'Afterword' Rozanov examines what is presented in the 'Legend' in the guise of Orthodoxy. He challenges Dostoyevsky's implication that Orthodoxy rejected miracle, mystery and authority, saying that there is as much of those three elements in Orthodoxy as in Roman Catholicism. Thus in the 'Legend', he writes, 'Dostoyevsky did not throw a big stone at Catholicism, but a handful of sand which scattered over all Churches'.⁸⁵ So far as the majority of commentators was concerned, however, the 'Legend' was aimed very definitely against Roman Catholicism alone.

There was much enthusiasm among Church commentators for the debate on ecclesiastical courts in The Brothers Karamazov. Dostoyevsky's idea that the State must be transformed into a Church was repeated with relish: it seemed to appeal to the Orthodox vision of the world. A speaker for the Society of Lovers of Spiritual Enlightenment referred to it as 'an original solution' of the desired relationship between Church and State, and paraphrased it as 'the replacement of the former elemental principles of life by genuinely Christian principles'.⁸⁶ The representatives of the Orthodox Church appreciated the way in which this Orthodox ideal was contrasted

favourably with the alleged Catholic ideal of the State-Church.

147

They clearly considered that they knew what was meant by 'the State becomes a Church', since there is no suggestion of doubt in their articles. Yet, for all their enthusiasm, their interpretations of the Church courts debate were deficient in analysis. While they provided quotations from the debate itself, and sometimes amplified them with Alyosha Karamazov's description of heaven on earth,⁸⁷ they yet made few attempts to probe more deeply into what was being said. It should be pointed out that the way in which Dostoyevsky's religious ideal is introduced is partly responsible for this. The alleged Roman Catholic ideal of 'Church becomes State' is easily understood, and one has a clear idea of the tangible effects of such a concept. When the concept 'the State becomes a Church' is introduced, and presented as the exact opposite of the first, the logic of the contrast persuades the reader that he knows the tangible effects of this second concept too. However, the articles by the religious commentators suggest that they did not have a precise understanding of what Dostoyevsky was saying. They seemed, for example, to lack a word which could accurately describe Dostoyevsky's religious ideal. Thus S. Levitsky explains that Dostoyevsky is not advocating Ultramontaniam, which he defines as 'the surrendering of state power to the Church hierarchy or to a priestly caste', and he instead introduces the word 'theocracy' to describe Dostoyevsky's ideal, without defining what he means by this term.⁸⁸ Yet if one consults the Orthodox Encyclopedia's definition of 'theocracy', which was presumably the definition Levitsky had in mind, since his article appears in Pravoslavnoye

obozreniye, one reads: 'A state structure in which supreme power is considered as belonging directly to God. God rules such a state through the clergy or high priests'.⁸⁹ This seems very similar to what Levitsky has just denied Dostoyevsky meant. But he is unusual in even attempting to find a formal definition.

Certain words recur as commentators attempt to capture the essence of the process Dostoyevsky is describing in the debate on ecclesiastical courts. Particular attention may be drawn to the verbs propitat'sya, proniknuta'sya and odukhotvorit'sya, the first two being synonyms meaning 'to become imbued, saturated', the third meaning 'to become spirit, spiritualized':

The foundations of society must be imbued with Christian principles.⁹⁰

The State must supplement and spiritualize [the principle of formal law] by the inner principle of religious faith.⁹¹

The life of society must be saturated by the principles of Christ's truth and be spiritualized by them so that the State will gradually be transformed into the Church.⁹²
(My emphasis.)

One is reminded of the way in which intangible images like 'atmosphere', 'warmth' and 'rays' were used to describe Zosima, as if precise, concrete images were inappropriate. The commentators seemed to understand the concept 'Church' as advocated in the debate as a spiritual and moral power which shapes attitudes, a force for transformation which provides the aims of society. They tended not, however, to attribute any particular form or structure to the concept, assuming that

the 'body' would be provided by the state. This view is expressed by Antony: '[Dostoyevsky] does not completely deny the state principle in life, . . . but requires of it merely that it assert and defend moral ideals with laws'.⁹³ The commentators thus assumed that in Dostoyevsky's socio-religious ideal the form of society would remain as it was, but the spirit in which things were done would alter:

'[Dostoyevsky] demands the penetration of Christian principles into all aspects of human life'.⁹⁴ The process they describe is very reminiscent of Solovyov's 'Free Theocracy'.

The majority of ecclesiastical commentators did not, therefore, attach particular significance to the absence of concrete details in the Church courts debate. As we have seen, they assimilated the content of the debate by combining their understanding of Dostoyevsky's ideal Church with the body which a state structure could provide. A small number of commentators did, it is true, draw attention to the lack of specific details both in the Church courts debate and in Zosima's teachings as a whole. Usually, however, a reason was advanced to justify the apparent omission. S. Levitsky, for example, remarks that Zosima does not stipulate exactly what means would be used to punish and correct criminals when the State had been transformed into a Church. The commentator points out, however, that even the present courts, which deal with only the 'outer man', cannot legislate for every possibility, and he concludes that 'it is even more difficult to fit into a definite framework the purely inner world of man', which is the domain of the new courts. 'In the given circumstances', he continues, 'one can only repeat the words of Father

Zosima: that the Church "will return the exiled, warn the scheming, and resurrect the fallen"⁹⁵. Snegiryov offers a different explanation for the lack of concrete details. He points out that Dostoyevsky was a 'thinker' and a 'poet', which meant that he was 'more able to think in images and ... to "feel thoughts" than to develop them logically and give them an abstract formula'. Consequently, his views presented themselves as 'a reflection of something poetic, not always amenable to analysis'⁹⁶. Kirillov addresses himself to the problem of the rather vague quality of much that is said in 'The Russian Monk'. 'In vain', he declares, 'would we look for . . . a definite religious/moral world-view from [Zosima], or rather from the esteemed author himself'. He justifies this omission by quoting the words of the narrator in The Brothers Karamazov to the effect that not everything that Zosima said has been written down, but only the spirit and the general character of his teachings.⁹⁷ The most important thing is clear, however, says Kirillov, and that is the principle behind what is said: self-perfection. He directs the reader who desires more concrete details to Dostoyevsky's Diary of a Writer. Taube similarly comments that Dostoyevsky did not provide details of the means by which life would become imbued with Christian principles. Since it would in any case be unthinkable for Taube that a mere novelist could do this, he is very happy to turn to a representative of the Russian Orthodox Church hierarchy, Bishop Feofan, to provide the missing information.⁹⁸

The temptation to fill in the gaps as Taube does is one to which many ecclesiastical commentators succumbed. If they

noticed that there were few references to the official Church in the Church courts debate, they tended not to attribute any theological significance to the fact. Rather they proceeded by assumption, and reinstated the institutionalized Russian Orthodox Church wherever they felt this was necessary.

Frequently, this was done apparently quite unconsciously. Thus S. Levitsky instinctively introduces the Church when pondering over who would be in charge in Dostoyevsky's Church-State.

He writes that secular figures would be able to hold power in Dostoyevsky's socio-religious ideal, but only if they were

'completely penetrated in the exercise of their duties by the spirit of Christ, and consequently completely subject to the institution directed by that spirit': the Russian Orthodox

Church.⁹⁹ Indeed, it is characteristic of Levitsky's treatment of Dostoyevsky's religious ideal that he uses the word 'Church' in the sense of 'institution' throughout. Svetlov similarly introduces the institutionalized Church into Dostoyevsky's religious ideal. Having said that for Dostoyevsky self-perfection is at the basis of any wider change, he continues:

'Since the improvement of morals, or "self-perfection in the spirit of Christian love", comes only from the Church, the great significance of [the Church] in the business of bringing about the social good becomes very clear'.¹⁰⁰

In both of the cases cited above, the central role attributed to the institutionalized Church comes from the mind of the commentator rather than from the writings of Dostoyevsky, as our own analysis of the Church courts debate has tried to show.

Further light is cast upon what the Russian Orthodox Church presumed Dostoyevsky's relationship to institutionalized

Orthodoxy to be if one compares the Church's treatment of Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy respectively. Svetlov directly contrasts the two writers: 'Dostoyevsky's critique of life from the standpoint of Christian morality does not affect the universal or national bases of life. It does not deny civilization, but only the West European social ideal'. Tolstoy's critique, by contrast, 'extends to a total negation of all [civilization's] bases, all its content, to the denial of civilization itself'. Dostoyevsky may have been rebuked for 'rationalizing' religion, Svetlov continues, but Tolstoy 'openly denies any dogmatic or mystical side to religion, and is a typical representative among us of Christianity without dogma'.¹⁰¹ It is quite clear which of the two writers is regarded as a threat to institutionalized Christianity.

Taube similarly distinguishes between Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy. Of all the articles so far considered, Taube's is perhaps the most obviously ecclesiastical in tone. He accords the Church unchallenged centrality, declaring, for example, that 'Church canons and statutes are imperative for all people, without exception'; and that 'Orthodoxy receives the truth from God via the Church'. One feels that he would certainly not have included Dostoyevsky among his 'pillars of the Russian Enlightenment' had there been any doubt at all in his mind about the novelist's adherence to the official Russian Orthodox Church. Tolstoy, on the contrary, declares Taube, 'destroys historical Christianity', 'destroys not only his own Orthodox faith, but rejects any Church whatsoever, mocks Church tradition and the most sacred feelings of Christian people, and even, in his wild fury,

mocks the sacraments'.

Pobedinsky considered that Dostoyevsky's relationship to the official Russian Orthodox Church was in no doubt whatsoever, and that he supported all those aspects of religion which were so unacceptable to Tolstoy:

It was precisely in the Orthodox Church, in its dogma and rites, in its monastic regulations and life, that [Dostoyevsky] saw the only school to nourish the God-bearing nation. He saw the salvation of the Russian intellectuals in the act of turning to the Orthodox Church, even to the lessons of the Cheti Minei. That is not all: it was from the Church and the Church alone that he expected the realization of the future world harmony, the kingdom of heaven on earth.¹⁰³

A further illuminating example of the way in which Dostoyevsky's support for the official Church was presumed is provided by the commentators' reaction to his depiction of the Russian Orthodox priesthood. In Chapter Two we saw that priests do not play a significant part in Dostoyevsky's novels, and that when they do appear, they are generally depicted in a negative manner. Precisely because they play such a minor role, however, the fact of that negative portrayal is not conspicuous. In the light of this, it is of note that Svetlov criticizes Gogol for 'one-sided' Christianity, citing in evidence the priest described in Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends, but does not mention Dostoyevsky's priests at all.¹⁰⁴ It does not occur to him that Gogol's 'one-sided' priest, unsatisfactory though he may be, might be less worthy of comment than the almost complete absence of priests in Dostoyevsky's works. Indeed, it was a common feature of the ecclesiastical commentators that they were seemingly unaware of Dostoyevsky's treatment,

or non-treatment, of the priesthood. The sympathetic secular critic, Obolensky, is unusual in commenting upon the Ilinsky priest in The Brothers Karamazov. He criticizes the character quite forcefully: 'Seeing a man in terrible agitation, [the priest] does not once think about his duties as a spiritual pastor and is not at all concerned about the soul of this man who could be about to commit a crime'.¹⁰⁵ Obolensky attributes this to the unsatisfactory training the priest will undoubtedly have received, however, and deduces from it only that Dostoyevsky himself was dissatisfied with seminary education.

Most Church commentators assumed priests to be an integral part of Dostoyevsky's religious ideal, as is illustrated by the title of an article by Bishop Antony, addressed to young priests of the Russian Orthodox Church: 'Pastoral study of people and life, based on the works of F.M. Dostoyevsky'.¹⁰⁶ Antony derives from Dostoyevsky's writings a guide for priests in the business of preaching to, and converting, their parishioners. Although clearly familiar with Dostoyevsky's novels, he does not comment upon the fact that of those characters he uses as models, only Zosima is associated with the Church, and then in a special capacity. Antony's article was criticized by the literary critic of Moskovskiye vedomosti: not, as one might perhaps expect, because the critic felt that to concentrate upon the role of priests was to misrepresent Dostoyevsky's religious ideal, but because he considered it wrong that the Church should be seen to be referring to a secular writer as an authority on spiritual matters. 'There is only one source of learning for pastors', declares

the critic: 'the Church'. And Dostoyevsky himself would have agreed, he continues: 'he knew that the light is in the Orthodox Church, and insisted that one could learn only from the Church'.¹⁰⁷

The critic 'M', writing in Vera i razum, also assumed Dostoyevsky to be an authority on matters relating to the clergy, and took for granted the writer's support for the priesthood. In 'The thoughts of F.M. Dostoyevsky on preaching the word of God to the narod, related to the present time', 'M' analyzes the section in 'The Russian Monk' where Zosima talks about priests and their role. In fact, such is the esteem in which Dostoyevsky's pronouncements on religious matters are held by the commentator that here, as in many of the other articles under consideration, it is not a question of critical analysis, but rather of quoting large extracts from the novel verbatim. 'M' then comments: 'That is how Dostoyevsky describes the pastor of the narod and his teaching role.¹⁰⁸ He does not mention that we do not actually see such a priest in action in The Brothers Karamazov (or in any other novel by Dostoyevsky), even though Dostoyevsky had the chance to portray one in the Ilinsky priest. Neither does 'M' appear to notice that the section on priests in Zosima's teachings is not central to the ideology of the novel. He does not suggest that Dostoyevsky is entirely happy with the state of the contemporary priesthood. Nevertheless, he sees him as a reformer of the priesthood, and certainly not as a potential destroyer. This is clearly demonstrated by the note on which he concludes his article: a fervent hope for 'an increase in the authority of pastors'.¹⁰⁹

Occasionally one encounters a Church commentator who has noticed that the Russian Orthodox clergy is not given a prominent role by Dostoyevsky. Such is the case in the speech to the Society of Lovers of Spiritual Enlightenment, to which we have had occasion to refer above. However, Dostoyevsky's omission is made good by the speaker almost unconsciously, thus demonstrating once again the assumptions made on Dostoyevsky's behalf. The speech is a commentary on Zosima's teachings about the Russian monk. Zosima, we are told, says that the faith of the narod must have a firm basis in monasticism. The speaker continues: 'If monasticism - along with our white clergy, we might add - ceases to serve as a flower of Christianity, . . . there will no longer be a saving force for Russia'.¹¹⁰ (My emphasis.) The addition of the white clergy has come from the speaker himself, not from Zosima. But it is done spontaneously, and when the white clergy are mentioned again later in the speech, it is as though they were a natural part of what Dostoyevsky intended. Thus, after recounting the ecclesiastical courts discussion, the speaker comments: 'Hence it is revealed that both monasticism and the white clergy have one and the same task, namely, to do as much as possible to enable the secular world to become a Church'.¹¹¹

Bogoslovsky, writing in Voskresny den', attaches rather more prominence to the absence of priests in Dostoyevsky's religious ideal. The bulk of his article is not unusual, consisting of extracts from Zosima's teachings, which are treated as authoritative. Near the end, however, Bogoslovsky reveals that he is not in complete agreement with Dostoyevsky.

It is not just monks who can help to bring about the kingdom of God on earth, he says. There is 'another small group of people which for the most part takes responsibility upon itself for establishing Christian love and brotherliness in society: the pastors of the Church'. Bogoslovsky does not, however, accuse Dostoyevsky of having abandoned the Church. He explains the absence of priests by what he sees as Dostoyevsky's disillusionment with the secular world: 'imbued with an extremely gloomy view of the world, [Dostoyevsky] sees little to rejoice about among the pastors of the Church who live in that world'.¹¹²

S. Levitsky is another who challenges the prominence of monasticism. He agrees with Zosima and Dostoyevsky that Russia has much to thank monasticism for: he acknowledges the special place monasteries hold in the hearts of the narod, and recognizes that national heroes have emerged from the monasteries in the past and could do so again in the future. But he says that 'this does not give us the right to think that only from the monasteries can we expect the salvation of Russia, which will lead to the renewal of the whole world'. He proceeds to remind Dostoyevsky of figures who were not monks and had yet played an edifying role in Russia's past:

Is our history really lacking in national heroes who emerged from the world and grew up among its troubles? . . . Do we not, on the contrary, find the intellectual and moral education of the narod in the hands of secular figures? . . . The world, then, is not without good people, and should not be looked at too pessimistically.¹¹³

The objections of Bogoslovsky and Levitsky were not the general rule, however. While the majority of ecclesiastical commentators could not fail to notice the centrality of

monasticism in The Brothers Karamazov, they were apparently unaware that this prominence was achieved at the expense of the white priesthood and the role of the Church in the world. One aspect of Dostoyevsky's presentation of monasticism did attract widespread attention, however: the writer's attraction specifically to Eldership. Many critics commented upon Dostoyevsky's choice. Bogoslovsky refers to Eldership as 'a special type of monasticism', and S. Levitsky describes it as 'one of the ancient features of monastic life which has almost died out'.¹¹⁴ Several commentators included in their articles the history of Eldership which Dostoyevsky himself provides in The Brothers Karamazov. There was general approval for the ancient tradition, which the commentators seem to have regarded as the ideal of monastic life. They clearly associated Eldership with strict obedience and discipline. Dostoyevsky's apparent support for this rigid, even harsh, tradition appealed to such as '-v', who called Zosima 'a strict zealot of ancient Eldership'; and to S. Levitsky, who pointed to the need for monks strictly to observe 'the vows of chastity, obedience and unworldliness which they had made to the Church'.¹¹⁶ Neither '-v' nor Levitsky seemed to notice that Zosima's version of Eldership does not quite fit the traditional pattern, as will be seen later in our study.

Dostoyevsky's choice of monasticism in general and Eldership in particular was considered to be very appropriate to the nature of his socio-religious ideal, which stressed the need for the self-perfection of individuals as the only way to bring social improvement. Svetlov makes this

It is not difficult to understand why monasticism is accorded such unique significance in the social outlook of Dostoyevsky. As we saw, Dostoyevsky felt that society could only improve with the improvement of its individual members - and monasticism devotes itself entirely to the moral perfection of the individual which is imperative for society.¹¹⁶

It was not assumed that Dostoyevsky was entirely content with the present state of monasticism. Various features of the presentation of the monastery in The Brothers Karamazov were attributed to a conviction on his part that monasteries in general should be reformed, and purified of their bad elements. Obolensky draws attention to Fyodor Karamazov's poor opinion of monks, an opinion which is confirmed when he encounters the monastery hierarchy in person: '[Fyodor Karamazov] sees himself in the monks, although on a lesser scale, but he actually considers himself to be better than they are because he, after all, is not claiming to be a monk'.¹¹⁷ The same critic attaches significance to Rakitin's inclusion in the novel: 'It is our profound conviction that [Rakitin] is introduced to show that salvation is definitely not to be found in the education provided by our spiritual seminaries and monasteries, even though, due to some misunderstanding, that education is termed "spiritual"'. Dostoyevsky's ideal of monasticism, Eldership, leads, on the contrary, to 'true monks'.

Church commentators expressed an awareness that Dostoyevsky's conception of monasticism was not of something isolated and rigidly self-contained. We read, for example, that 'the moral influence of [Dostoyevsky's] Elder Zosima

is not restricted to the monastery alone, but extends beyond its walls'.¹¹⁸ The student Yumonov, whose dissertation for Kiev Theological Academy in 1912 was devoted to a study of Dostoyevsky's depiction of Eldership, is another who points to its value for the secular world as well as for the monastery.¹¹⁹ But at the same time, and paradoxically, the stark contrast which appears to be established in The Brothers Karamazov between the monastery and the world was equally well received by Church commentators. Dostoyevsky was assumed to be implying that monks should keep themselves pure and separate from the dark elements which ruled in the world. The commentator whom we have seen introduce the white clergy into Dostoyevsky's religious ideal claims that Dostoyevsky intended a distinction between monks and priests in this respect:

Whereas monks must be model custodians and model organizers of the brotherly, selfless life in their sphere, so that their brotherly life is presented as a holy ideal and living example for people in the world, the white clergy is called to do battle with the world, to serve the Church in the world itself, openly to preach to people, and to guide them directly.¹²⁰

But what did Church commentators understand by Zosima's repeated command to Alyosha Karamazov that he should 'go and be like a monk in the world'? On the whole, little significance is attached to Alyosha in this respect. Although he is valued as someone who lives entirely according to Christ's teaching, and as an example of what can result from obedience to an Elder, the commentators do not accord him a central role: most of them would appear to have taken seriously the claim made by the narrator of The Brothers Karamazov that Alyosha's main role will be revealed in the sequel to the novel.

Consequently, their attention is focused upon Zosima. Some commentators noted that if Alyosha has a part to play, then it is in society: thus Kirillov identifies his role as being to introduce 'quiet and peace' into the world; and '-v' refers to Alyosha as 'a missionary in the world'.¹²¹ However, no implications for monasticism are drawn from either of these observations.

The Church's interpretation of Dostoyevsky's presentation of monasticism was thus relatively conservative, and discussion remained within traditional bounds. Dostoyevsky's aim was judged to be a reform of monastic life according to the principles embodied in Eldership. However, a more radical interpretation was advanced by critics sympathetic to Dostoyevsky who wrote in secular journals: Obolensky, writing in Mysl'; and Miller, in his article 'Karamazovshchina and monasticism'. Obolensky, for example, draws attention to the unofficial aspect of Eldership, noting that Elders 'might not even be officially recognized' by the Church, and pointing out that Zosima should not, therefore, be unthinkingly associated with official Russian Orthodoxy.¹²² This was something the Church commentators had ignored, preferring instead, as we saw above, to situate Eldership very firmly in the long established ascetic tradition of Orthodoxy. Obolensky also claims that, although Zosima is portrayed as an Elder, Dostoyevsky was not entirely in favour of Eldership: 'Even if Zosima as a man, as a character, even as a philosophy [sic], is Dostoyevsky's ideal, Eldership itself, as an institution, is not entirely to his liking'.¹²³ He suggests that Dostoyevsky was aware of the dangers inherent in any hierarchical religious

position, and advances in support of this claim his own interpretation of the chapter 'The Odour of Corruption', in which is described the scandalized response as Zosima's corpse begins to decay. Zosima's exalted position as an Elder had caused people to treat him as an extraordinary person, Obolensky suggests, and this had a harmful effect on their faith:

'Clearly, if [Zosima] had lived with people simply, and taught them as a person, not as an 'Elder', this would not have

happened'.¹²⁴ According to Obolensky, it is to avoid similar things happening with Alyosha that Zosima sends him out into the world.

Miller too considers that Dostoyevsky was critical of Eldership. In evidence he cites the fact that The Brothers Karamazov includes an account of the various criticisms of the institution which were current. Further, he points out disapprovingly that Zosima accords importance to the upper classes while keeping the narod waiting. 'But the ways and customs of "Eldership" and monasticism are one thing, and the generous heart and bright spirit of Zosima and others like him are another', he continues: in other words, he makes a similar point to that made by Obolensky, suggesting that it was not primarily the institution of Eldership which interested Dostoyevsky, but the spiritual ideal it embodied.¹²⁵

Miller also comments upon the far-reaching nature of Zosima's ministry, and upon the Elder's influence outside the monastery walls. This had been noted by several Church commentators, as we saw above. But Miller's interpretation of the desired link between the monastery and the world which Dostoyevsky would seem to be advocating is much more radical

than that of the Church commentators. The latter considered that Dostoyevsky was merely saying that monks should set an inspiring moral example which would emanate from the monastery precincts. Miller interprets the link in the light of Zosima's command to Alyosha to 'go and be like a monk in the world':

It would appear that the Elder understood by this worldly 'monasticism' merely the severing of truly 'superfluous and unnecessary desires'. . . . Such freely understood 'monasticism' should indeed extend beyond the limits of the monastery: it should become a universal and eternal element in life, without which genuine service to society is impossible.¹²⁶

Miller thus attaches rather more significance to the role of Alyosha in the context of the religious ideology of the novel, and demonstrates an awareness of aspects of Dostoyevsky's religious thinking which would appear to have escaped the attention of the majority of Church commentators.

The overwhelming majority of articles by religious commentators so far referred to have expressed almost wholehearted support for Dostoyevsky and for those aspects of religion portrayed in his novels. However, some representatives of Russian Orthodoxy were far from enthusiastic. They were less inclined to give Dostoyevsky the benefit of the doubt so far as support for institutionalized Orthodoxy was concerned, and they regarded his presentation of religious matters with great suspicion. Such was Konstantin Leontyev.

Leontyev made public his accusations against Dostoyevsky in an article entitled 'Our New Christians'.¹²⁷ It was written in response to Dostoyevsky's Pushkin Speech, although much of what is said refers also to the novels. Leontyev represents

strict, even harsh, Russian Orthodoxy. The contrast between him and Dostoyevsky is apparent in their respective attitudes to the question of evil. In The Brothers Karamazov we witness the agonies of Ivan Karamazov (and his creator) over the suffering in the world. For Leontyev, there is no question of man even beginning to ask why there should be evil and suffering:

'The Church answers this . . . with a prophecy for the whole of history: "There will be evil!", says the Church'.¹²⁸ A

further measure of Leontyev's Christianity is that he talks quite happily of 'coldly-Christian charity', charity in which the heart is not involved, whereas one cannot imagine such a concept even existing for Dostoyevsky.¹²⁹ In his article,

Leontyev brings three main charges against Dostoyevsky: that his vision of universal harmony is at variance with Christian teaching; that he makes no mention of the Church; and that his religion places too much emphasis upon love, and not enough upon the fear of God.

Dostoyevsky's vision of harmony on earth is not only unrealistic, claims Leontyev, but it runs contrary to the teaching of Christ and the Bible: 'The prophecy of the universal reconciliation of people in Christ is not an Orthodox prophecy, but some sort of general humanitarian teaching. Such a world is not promised by the Church.'¹³⁰ And it is precisely the Church which Leontyev looks for in vain in the Pushkin Speech, he claims. To illustrate this point, he contrasts the Pushkin Speech with a speech delivered by Pobedonostsev on the same day:

In the speech of Mr Pobedonostsev, Christ may be known only through the Church: first love the Church. Whereas according to Mr Dostoyevsky's speech, Christ is apparently

accessible to each one of us with no assistance from the Church at all, with the result that we feel justified . . . in attributing to the Saviour promises he never made, about 'the universal brotherhood of nations'.¹³¹ 165

The references Leontyev includes to Dostoyevsky's novels suggest that this accusation is made with not only the Pushkin Speech in mind. For example, he draws attention to the fact that Sonya Marmeladova in Crime and Punishment does not read the teachings of the Church Fathers, and generally displays very few features of Orthodox religion. His comment is uncompromising: 'It is evident from this that Mr Dostoyevsky was thinking very little about genuine (that is, Church) Christianity when he wrote Crime and Punishment'.¹³² However, Leontyev sees some promise in The Brothers Karamazov: 'The Brothers Karamazov is rather closer to what is needed. Its author was clearly following a reasonably straight path, albeit slowly. He was coming closer and closer to the Church'.¹³³ Although Leontyev is pleased to see Russian Orthodox priests playing a central role, he still has reservations: 'Even here little is said about divine office or about monastic obedience. Not one Church service, not one public prayer.'¹³⁴ But the fact that the novel is set in a monastery appeases him to some extent.

The Pushkin Speech aroused the full force of Leontyev's hostility towards Dostoyevsky. He strongly criticizes Dostoyevsky's emphasis upon love, and questions his claim that the Russian nation possesses love for the whole of mankind. He is critical of the imprecise nature of the love Dostoyevsky appears to be advocating, asking rhetorically whether such a love is really possible 'without specific, definite articles of faith which are both, as it were, material and mystical,

and which stand outside and above mankind'.¹³⁵ Love could never
be 'the air people breathed without even noticing', claims
Leontyev: it could only ever be a palliative.¹³⁶ Admittedly,
he continues, Dostoyevsky had not always been under such an
illusion. In Notes from the House of the Dead and Crime and
Punishment he still saw love as it was: a corrective. His
heretical theory had come only later.

Leontyev criticizes Dostoyevsky's Christianity for allegedly having no definite form. Of the Christianity which is presented in The Devils as the salvation of Russia, he writes that it is 'something broadly evangelical', 'vaguely evangelical'.¹³⁷ In the Pushkin Speech, he claims, Dostoyevsky has done what so many others have done: turned his back on 'strict and unflinching Church Orthodoxy'.¹³⁸ The very language which Leontyev resorts to when talking of Dostoyevsky's Christianity accurately reflects his dissatisfaction with it. The claim that love will reign on earth is referred to as 'the over-rosy hue introduced into Christianity'; the conviction that love can become the essence of life is 'balm'; the religion of Stepan Trofimovich Verkhovensky in The Devils is 'beautiful, fragrant "milk"'.¹³⁹ What is actually needed, counters Leontyev,¹⁴⁰ is 'the solid, genuine food of Orthodox Christianity'.
Leontyev does not deny that Dostoyevsky may have been a faithful Orthodox Christian: he only regrets that he tried to teach others before he himself had been taught - by the Church. He ends on a relatively generous note, saying that the Pushkin Speech was 'a failure for the defender and admirer of the Church Dostoyevsky would have liked to have been'.¹⁴¹

Leontyev had effectively called Dostoyevsky a heretic,

and this prompted Vladimir Solovyov to come to the writer's defence, which he did in an 'Appendix' to his Three Speeches in Memory of Dostoyevsky.¹⁴² Dostoyevsky did not mean that there would be universal harmony in this life, said Solovyov, while at the same-time rebuking Leontyev for rigidly distinguishing between this world and the next: 'The universal harmony which Dostoyevsky preached is not a utilitarian well-being on this earth, but the beginning of that new earth where truth lives'.¹⁴³ Solovyov also defends Dostoyevsky for not speaking in strictly theological language: 'Dostoyevsky had to speak to people who had not read the Bible and who had forgotten the Catechism. Therefore, in order to be understood, he was forced to use such expressions as "universal harmony" when he meant the Church triumphant or glorified'.¹⁴⁴ Further, the philosopher firmly defends Dostoyevsky against the charge of wanting to by-pass the Church. He claims that Dostoyevsky would have agreed with Leontyev that 'Christ can only be known through the Church'. Indeed, he would have agreed with all those phrases pointing to the central role of the Church which had been cited in evidence against him: 'Dostoyevsky placed his finest hopes for man on genuine faith in Christ and the Church'.¹⁴⁵ Solovyov reminds Leontyev that Dostoyevsky spoke out in his Diary of a Writer against 'the narodniki who want to unite with the narod and be its benefactor without the Church'.¹⁴⁶

But to what extent is Solovyov referring to the institutionalized Russian Orthodox Church when he alleges Dostoyevsky's support for 'the Church'? He talks in more detail of Dostoyevsky's conception of the Church in the Three Speeches referred to above. In the first speech, Solovyov remarks that

'Dostoyevsky did not have any theological pretensions, and therefore we do not have the right to demand logical definitions of the Church in its essence from him'.¹⁴⁷ This does not prevent Solovyov himself from introducing various descriptive phrases in an attempt to define Dostoyevsky's socio-religious ideal. His Church is referred to as 'a spiritual brotherhood'; 'the Christian idea of universal unforced union'; 'universal brotherhood in the name of Christ'; 'the universal Orthodox task'; 'genuine all-humanity'.¹⁴⁸ It may be noted that these formulae do not necessarily imply any institutionalized aspect, or anything which could be termed a 'historical' Church. However, implicit in Solovyov's Three Speeches is the assumption that Dostoyevsky also meant the historical, institutionalized Church when he talked about the Church. We read, for example, that Dostoyevsky 'talked of the universal Orthodox Church not only in the sense of a divine institution, abiding, immutable, but also in the sense of the task of uniting the whole of mankind in the name and the spirit of Christ'.¹⁴⁹ (My emphasis.)

A further indication that Solovyov included the 'historical' Church when he spoke of Dostoyevsky's support for the Church is contained in his references to 'Church [khramovoye] Christianity', the components of which are Church attendance, Church ritual and Church prayers. Although such Christianity alone is insufficient, says Solovyov, it is nevertheless an essential part of 'true' Christianity, 'and must exist first of all, because on earth the external precedes the internal'.¹⁵⁰ He clearly implies that this 'Church' Christianity was fully accepted by Dostoyevsky, and that it was an integral part of his religious ideal. Despite such specific references to the

Church as an institution, however, Solovyov is most convincing when referring to Dostoyevsky's Church in an ideal, extra-historical sense. Once again, Dostoyevsky's alleged support for institutionalized religion would appear to be based on assumptions made on his behalf.

Leontyev, whose attacks on Dostoyevsky Solovyov was countering, was uncompromising in matters of religion, and one might be forgiven for suspecting his views to be extreme and unrepresentative. Indeed, most of the Church commentators we have referred so far would have agreed with S. Levitsky that Dostoyevsky's ideals 'correspond entirely to the hopes and aspirations of a true son of the Orthodox Church'.¹⁵¹ There were nevertheless some who, like Leontyev, found certain aspects of Dostoyevsky's religion unacceptable from a Christian and Orthodox point of view. This was true particularly of Dostoyevsky's faith in the coming world harmony. Bogoslovsky, for example, stresses that he is in overall agreement with Dostoyevsky. However, he expresses the following reservation: 'The longed-for kingdom which Mr Dostoyevsky promises as a result of the ideas of monasticism seems to us to be completely unrealizable. . . . It is conceivable not with Christ, but only in Christ, more precisely, in Christ's kingdom, which is not of this world'.¹⁵² (My emphasis.) He cites various Bible references in support of his statement. Pobedinsky similarly comments that 'various Russian religious figures rightly object that [Dostoyevsky's] rosy dreams about the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth do not fully correspond to the teachings of Christ'. He too refers to the Bible in evidence. Heaven on earth must be the Christian ideal, continues Pobedinsky,

but there is not an adequate dogmatic basis for one to take comfort in the thought of a complete victory over evil: 'the over-rosy hue which Dostoyevsky introduces into his hypotheses about the future of the Christian Church and the Russian narod is a dream and a fantasy'. Pobedinsky concludes by saying in Dostoyevsky's defence that the novelist himself at times regarded all this merely as an ideal.¹⁵³

The strong element of nationalism in Dostoyevsky's religion was another feature which gave rise to disapproval. Mikhaylovsky had commented upon Dostoyevsky's use of the concepts 'God' and 'atheism' in The Devils. He remarked that although these terms were sometimes used in the normal sense, on other occasions they acquired a distinctly un-Orthodox meaning, whereby a religious value was attributed to Russian nationality.¹⁵⁴ Tareyev also commented upon this issue, declaring that Dostoyevsky 'overrated the religious significance of nationality'. He continues: 'We cannot call these views on religion sufficiently profound or, more important, scriptural'.¹⁵⁵ The charge of adding to Scripture arose in connection with other aspects of Dostoyevsky's presentation of religious matters. Svetlov talked of Dostoyevsky's 'one-sided theory of individuality'.¹⁵⁶ Alekseyev charged Dostoyevsky with having invented the idea that the State must be transformed into a Church: 'How does Dostoyevsky know that the State will make way for the Church? It is true that he is a Christian - but neither in Holy Scripture nor in the Church Fathers would he find prophecies about such a thing'.¹⁵⁷

The critic Nikolayev was another who felt that Dostoyevsky's religious thinking did not entirely coincide with the teachings of the Orthodox Church. He first suggests this in a review

of the article by Bishop Antony referred to above. Nikolayev is essentially very sympathetic towards Dostoyevsky, and his observation is made almost in passing. Nevertheless, it is quite explicit: 'All his life Dostoyevsky strove to accept completely the Church's teaching, but he never stood on Church ground'. In each of his novels Dostoyevsky drew nearer to the Church's view of things, continues the critic, 'but he came to the end of his activity still not having accepted it

entirely'.¹⁵⁸ Nikolayev makes a related point in a later article, in which he challenges Rozanov's interpretation of the 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor'. Once again, the theme is introduced almost in passing, since Nikolayev's primary intention is to defend Dostoyevsky against Rozanov's charges of atheism. Nevertheless, the meaning is clear: 'Dostoyevsky emerged triumphant from the torments of his soul, and found the basis for reconciliation if not in the teaching of the Orthodox Church - for he never stood firmly on Church ground - then in the spirit of Orthodoxy'.¹⁵⁹ (Original emphasis.)

We might note the distinction Nikolayev makes between the 'spirit' of Orthodoxy and formal Church teaching, a distinction made by other commentators when analysing Dostoyevsky's religion, as we have already seen. The critic does not specify areas where he considers Dostoyevsky to be out of line with the Church, apparently taking it for granted that no illustration is required, although we have seen that the majority of commentators detected nothing amiss. But unlike the few who had identified un-Orthodox elements in Dostoyevsky's religion, he suggests a possible source: the Western ideas which had influenced the novelist in his youth. 'These ideas

left their imprint on all his subsequent activity, right to the end. This is why, although imbued with the elevated spirit and sentiments of Orthodoxy, he was unable to stand on strict Church ground'.¹⁶⁰ Nikolayev does not reveal whether he is referring to Dostoyevsky's contact with atheists, such as Belinsky became; or to Utopian Socialist thinking regarding the Church; or merely, perhaps, to familiarity, through reading, with Catholicism and Protestantism. The critic's comment is worthy of note, however, since he is alone in directly relating possible differences between Dostoyevsky and official Orthodoxy to the ideological influences the novelist was subjected to in the eighteen-forties.

One other body found it difficult to forget Dostoyevsky's activities in the eighteen-forties: the state censorship machinery. Indeed, Dostoyevsky's novelistic presentation of religious matters troubled suspicious censors throughout his life, and these dealings are a further valuable indication of how his religious ideal was interpreted by contemporaries. The writer's first notable clash with the censors occurred in 1864, when Notes from Underground was being published. The censors found much of Chapter Ten unacceptable, and the chapter as finally published was so disfigured that Dostoyevsky declared he wished it had not appeared at all. His frustrated comments to his brother Mikhail are often quoted:

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 contradicting itself. But what can be done now! Those swine of censors - where I mocked at everything and sometimes blasphemed for form's sake, that's let through, but where I deduced from all this the need of faith and Christ, that is suppressed. What's the matter - are the censors in league against the government or something?¹⁶¹ (Original emphasis.)

There is no record of the sections removed by the censors, but it has been suggested that their contents might correspond to an extract entitled 'Socialism and Christianity' in Dostoyevsky's 1864 notebook.¹⁶² This extract is in turn similar in content to the 'Meditation' Dostoyevsky wrote upon the death of his first wife, Masha.¹⁶³ In it, Dostoyevsky calls for the voluntary sacrifice of one's 'I', oneself, for others, in the manner of Christ.

If it is true that the key to the censored sections of Notes from Underground lies in 'Socialism and Christianity', then it is not clear why it should have offended the censors, and one might well ask, as did Dostoyevsky, whether they were 'in league against the government'. Further, Dostoyevsky voiced similar views in Epokha later in 1864,¹⁶⁴ and on that occasion the censors raised no objections.

This suggests that the censored passages were rather less innocent than Dostoyevsky would have one believe. Perhaps they bore the imprint of the writer's former Utopian Socialist ideas, in particular of the type of Christianity characteristic of that movement? One can only hypothesize.

Crime and Punishment also presented Dostoyevsky with problems on the religious front. Objections were raised not by the state censors, but by Katkov and Lyubimov, the editors of Russkiy vestnik in which the novel was being serialized. The problems were posed by the chapter where Sonya Marmeladova reads to Raskolnikov the Bible passage about the raising of Lazarus.¹⁶⁵ Again, the nature of the offending passages can only be inferred, on the basis of Dostoyevsky's correspondence. Referring to the chapter in question, Dostoyevsky wrote to Lyubimov: 'The good and

the bad have been completely separated, and it will be absolutely impossible to confuse them and to make improper use of them. Quite another colouring has been given to the Gospel reading'.¹⁶⁶ A letter to Milyukov casts further light:

'They fear that [the Gospel scene] might be immoral. I was right so far as that is concerned: there was nothing in it against morality - the absolute opposite, in fact. But they see something else, and what's more, they see traces of nihilism'.¹⁶⁷ Mochulsky implies that Katkov and Lyubimov

must have been imagining things, and comments incredulously: 'In the novel's most mystical scene, built upon the narration of the miracle in the Gospel, the well-meaning editors saw immorality and nihilism!'¹⁶⁸ But is an editorial mistake the only possible explanation?

When considering Dostoyevsky's problems with Notes from Underground, we noted the suggestion that the censored passages corresponded to 'Socialism and Christianity'. We asked why, if this was indeed the case, they were censored. It would seem reasonable to suggest that some change occurred between the notebook stage and the novel, in other words, that a less than Orthodox note was introduced during the creative process. Could not a similar thing have happened with the Gospel reading scene in Crime and Punishment? Might not the Gospel miracle somehow have been substantially transformed? Soviet scholars of Dostoyevsky have deduced from the writer's claim that 'the good and the bad have been completely separated' that 'in the first, uncorrected, draft Raskolnikov opposed his theory "all is permitted" much more sharply, more fully and more convincingly to the evangelical morality of Sonya'.¹⁶⁹ Does it not seem equally likely that,

rather than one side of the argument standing out too sharply, the thinking of Sonya and Raskolnikov was rather too similar for Katkov's taste, that there was nihilism in Christianity, and perhaps even Christianity in nihilism?

In both cases considered so far, it has been impossible to ascertain exactly what it was in Dostoyevsky's presentation of religion which proved to be unacceptable, and much must necessarily rest upon hypothesis. However, this is far from the case in the next example of censorial activity which we will examine. In 1886 an application was made to the St. Petersburg censor by the publishing firm 'Mediator' to publish as a separate pamphlet extracts from The Brothers Karamazov under the title The Story of the Elder Zosima. The pamphlet was to consist of the teachings of Zosima, and was intended for the narod as part of a popular education programme. It was only five years since Dostoyevsky's magnificent funeral, which had been attended by Church and State alike. Further, as recently as 1885 an edition of Dostoyevsky's collected works had been published, including The Brothers Karamazov complete with the teachings of Zosima. In view of both of these things, the censor's response to the request is worthy of note. Zosima's teachings, declares the censor, bear 'only a superficial resemblance to the teachings of Christ', and are 'in disagreement with the spirit of the teachings of the Orthodox faith and Church and with the existing structure of state and social life'.¹⁷⁰ The irony of such a judgement is even greater when it is recalled that many of the articles to which we have referred in this chapter were written by adherents, if not representatives, of the Russian Orthodox Church, and were

based precisely upon the teachings of Zosima, often containing long extracts from them. The aspects of Zosima's teachings which the censor, Kossovich, identified as suspicious were the alleged possibility of Heaven on earth; the need to assume the sins of others; and non-resistance to evil. Another censor who made a report on the matter, Panteleyev, specified the ways in which Zosima allegedly attacks the social structure: '[His teachings] explain that there can be no judges on the earth, suggest the abnormality of the master-servant relationship, the harm of a military education, the falseness of the concept of military honour, etc.'

171

The fact that the pamphlet was intended for the narod clearly made the censors especially vigilant for any suggestion of anarchy, which is what they imply is present in Zosima's teachings. One must also take into account the fact that the publishing firm 'Mediator' was run by Tolstoy, a connection which did not count in Dostoyevsky's favour. A memorandum written by the chairman of the St. Petersburg censorship committee makes the latter point abundantly clear. Having been requested to try to persuade the censors to pass the book, he writes to ask them exactly what they objected to, but adds:

However, although I still do not know [the committee's] reasons, I am ready in advance to acknowledge them as entirely correct, since there neither is, nor could be, anything more loathsome than 'Mediator'. We must pay special, vigilant attention to its activities, which are clearly of evil intent.¹⁷²

Even if the censors' initial suspicions arose mainly as a result of Tolstoy's connection with the whole affair, however,

we have seen that they found ample evidence to confirm their fears. Indeed, Kossovich went so far as to describe Zosima's teachings as 'almost identical with the latest opinions of Count Leo Tolstoy'.¹⁷³ Yet Tolstoy was to be anathematized, whereas Dostoyevsky was for the most part fêted by the Church and would continue to be so.

Just as Leontyev's accusations against Dostoyevsky were extreme, but nevertheless received confirmation from some other, less extreme, commentators, so the anarchic element which the St. Petersburg censors detected in Dostoyevsky's writings was identified by others, although they did not always label it as such. For example, we saw above that the most common interpretation of the Church courts debate was that the tools of state would remain the same, but that there would be a different, Christian, motivation behind them. Dostoyevsky was identified with the desire to reform and enliven, rather than to disrupt and abolish, which is what the censors suggest. Miller, however, effectively supports the censors. He interprets the Church courts debate in the light of 'Karamazovshchina':

[Ivan] is a representative of Karamazovshchina in its ideological sense. He requires unrestricted scope in action, and limitless depth of comprehension. No state gives the unrestricted scope he demands, so he asserts that [the state] must be swallowed up . . . by the Church'.¹⁷⁴

Miller thus sees in the Church courts debate not the Solovyov-style Free Theocracy, which was the interpretation generally given, and according to which the form of the State remains. Rather, he detects in the debate a call for the total dissolution of the State, and the reduction of

the Church to a moral force. The word 'anarchy' does not appear in the critic's analysis, but the concept may be read into what he says. Our own analysis of the Church courts debate suggested that such an interpretation might correspond more closely to what is advocated by Zosima. What is significant, however, is that Miller should detect this note of anarchy at all.

Alekseyev, writing in Russkoye bogatstvo, makes the charge of anarchy directly, interpreting the whole of the Church courts debate as a clear rejection of any formal institutionalized system whatsoever. He makes no attempt to hide his impatience:

Why is it that the State - that is, a contractual, mechanical union - cannot be a union in Christ? Why is it that in the name of Christ it is possible only to embrace, to comfort one another, to be mutually charitable, and not possible, for example, to decide problems of land-use, or to organize an education system, in short, impossible to draw up any social contract? Dostoyevsky's 'anarchy in Christ' is one big, inconceivable dream.¹⁷⁵

Both Miller and Alekseyev look more deeply into the significance of the Church courts debate, and detect in it elements which seemingly escaped the notice of the ecclesiastical commentators, but which were only too apparent to the state censors.

Let us, finally, consider the plight of a student of the Kiev Theological Academy, who in 1913 submitted a dissertation entitled 'The meaning of the Church in the life of the individual and society according to Dostoyevsky'. The dissertation was not published, but the examiners' comments appear in Trudy Kievskoy Dukhovnoy Akademii, and they acquire considerable significance in the light of our

findings so far.

Like the majority of the ecclesiastical commentators we have considered, the student was apparently convinced that Dostoyevsky saw an important place for the Church. The chapter headings themselves are revealing in this respect. Chapter Two, for example, is entitled 'The meaning of the Church in the religious and moral education of the individual'. Chapter Three deals with 'The significance of the Church in the transformation of the life of society and the creation of the Kingdom of God on earth'. For Dostoyevsky, we are told, the task of the Orthodox Church is to bring about the Universal Church. The 'primacy and priority' of the Church, declares the student, is confirmed in the Church courts debate. The positive qualities of the narod which Dostoyevsky identifies - humility, consciousness of sin, active love - are allegedly acknowledged by him to be the fruit of the upbringing provided by the Russian Orthodox Church. The student would appear to have satisfied not only himself but also his examiners that he had proved the importance of the Russian Orthodox Church in Dostoyevsky's religious thought, for he was awarded his diploma.

For the purposes of the present study, it is the criticisms of the two examiners, Popov and Rybinsky, which are of particular interest. Popov rebukes the student for taking insufficient care to make clear Dostoyevsky's adherence specifically to the Russian Orthodox Church: this 'confessionalist' aspect should, says the examiner, have been firmly established, particularly in the light of the 'universal Church'

of which Dostoyevsky speaks in the Pushkin Speech, a concept, which has negative implications for confessionalism. Popov also remarks that the dissertation contains no criticism of Dostoyevsky's religion. He thereby implies that criticisms could have been made, an impression confirmed by the comments of Rybinsky to the effect that the student pays no attention to the 'contradictions' in Dostoyevsky's writings. Of most significance for our purposes, however, is Rybinsky's criticism of the student for talking rather too much about intangible concepts such as the need for faith in God, Christ and immortality, instead of keeping to his theme of the institutionalized Church's significance according to Dostoyevsky. A similar criticism is made by Popov. Not finding a definition of the 'Church' in Dostoyevsky's writings, he remarks, the student takes his definition from other sources,

and then moves to the writings of Dostoyevsky for proof of the influence of the Church on the individual. . . . But the meaning of the Church as a definite institution completely disappears from the reader's view. Instead, there simply appears Christianity with its many-sidedness, and the rich and diverse Russian character.¹⁷⁷ (Original emphasis.)

Neither of the examiners explains the 'disappearance' of 'the Church as a definite institution' with reference to Dostoyevsky's writings. In pointing to the student's failure to establish satisfactorily the importance specifically of the institutionalized Church for Dostoyevsky, they lay the blame squarely upon the student himself, rather than attributing the 'failure' to the actual nature of Dostoyevsky's religious ideal. Despite the fact that both examiners would evidently have challenged some aspects of Dostoyevsky's religious

thinking, they appear not to have shared the views expressed by Leontyev or the state censors regarding the novelist's relationship to the official Russian Orthodox Church.

The examiners' assumption that it is the student who is at fault highlights a phenomenon noted more than once during the course of our analysis of the contemporary response to Dostoyevsky's presentation of religious matters. Although the spectre of Christianity without an institutionalized Church has raised its head on several occasions, it has almost invariably not been directly related to Dostoyevsky's religious ideal, but has been accounted for in other ways: here, by the alleged incompetence of the student. The majority of ecclesiastical critics, as we have seen, considered Dostoyevsky to be a firm supporter of the official Russian Orthodox Church. Indeed, he was repeatedly treated as an authority on religious matters, and his writings were even endorsed by a bishop. If the Church commentators had doubts about Dostoyevsky, they were for the most part concerned with the author's depiction of, and evident familiarity with, the darker sides of life. Ironically, this seems to have attracted their attention more than those other aspects of the novels which we noted in Chapter Two, and which arguably constituted the real challenge to the Church: the dearth of references to the Church as an institution; the negative portrayal of Russian Orthodox priests; and the lack of prominence given, for example, to Church attendance in the lives of Dostoyevsky's Christian characters. These omissions were noted by some commentators, as we have seen. But they were excused, or explained away: Dostoyevsky was a novelist, not a theologian;

he thought in images, not in specific details. There were a few grumbles from the Church that Dostoyevsky attached rather too much importance to monks, at the expense of the white clergy. Some ecclesiastical commentators tried to amend this by reinstating the clergy, in the firm belief that they were in no way acting contrary to Dostoyevsky's own desires in so doing. The majority of commentators did not, it would seem, even begin to suspect that Dostoyevsky might be launching a challenge to the role traditionally attributed to institutionalized religion. It was left to extremists like Leontyev and the censors, and to a few observant secular critics like Miller and Alekseyev, to draw attention to the potentially revolutionary and heretical streak in Dostoyevsky's religious thought. At the time such critics were in the minority: the remainder of our study will investigate whether, as our findings in Chapter Two lead us to suspect, the 'extremists' were actually nearer the truth than the majority who disagreed with them.

1. PSS, XIV, 16.
2. See Chapter One, 46, above.
3. Aleksandra Bogdanovich, op. cit., 44. Entry for 29 January 1881.
4. Valuable sources for the contemporary secular response to Dostoyevsky's writings are: I. I. Zamotin, F. M. Dostoyevsky v russkoy kritike. I. 1846-1881 (Warsaw, 1913); and V. Zelinsky, Istoriko-kriticheskiy kommentariy k sochineniyam F. M. Dostoyevskogo (Moscow, 1885-6). When articles referred to during the course of this chapter are also included, or referred to, in either of these anthologies, a page reference will be provided.
5. Polny pravoslavny bogoslovskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar' (orig. St. Petersburg, 1913, 2 volumes; Variorum reprint, London, 1971) (hereafter: Pravoslavny slovar'), 770.
6. G-n, 'Romanist, popavshi ne v svoi sani. "Dnevnik pisatelya" g. Dostoyevskogo', Delo, IX, 1880; Zamotin, op. cit., 305.
7. L. Alekseyev, 'O "Brat'yakh Karamazovykh"', Russkoye bogatstvo, XI, 1881; Zamotin, op. cit., 250.
8. I. D. Petropavlovsky, 'Zemnoy zhrebiy zhizni revniteley pravdy', Pravoslavnoye obozreniye, I, 1881 (339-43), 342.
9. A. Kirillov, 'Tserkovno-religioznye predmety, zatragivayemye v romane F. M. Dostoyevskogo "Bratya Karamazovy"', Donskiye yeparkhialnye vedomosti, 1881 (No. 4: 128-39; No. 13: 476-90; No. 18: 684-99), No. 18, 696.
10. A. I. Predtechensky, 'Ateizm i narodnoye razvitiye. (Pamyati F. M. Dostoyevskogo)', Khristianskoye chteniye, No. 3-4, 1881 (396-429), 399.
11. Petropavlovsky, op. cit., 343.
12. S. N. Bulgakov, 'Zhiznenny podvig Dostoyevskogo', Antony (Khrapovitsky) & V. S. Solovyov, F. M. Dostoyevsky, kak propovednik khristianskogo vozrozhdeniya i vselenskogo pravoslaviya (Moscow, 1908) (hereafter: Antony & Solovyov, F. M. Dostoyevsky) (3-8), 8.
13. Yu. Nikolayev, 'Vo shto veroval Dostoyevsky?', Moskovskiye vedomosti, 1894 (No. 246: 3; No. 253: 3-4), No. 253, 3.
14. V. Rozanov, Dostoevsky and the Legend of the Grand Inquisitor, trans. S. E. Roberts (London, 1972) (hereafter: Rozanov, Dostoevsky) 174-5.

15. Alekseyev, op. cit.; Zamotin, op. cit., 250.
16. Yu. Nikolayev, 'Dukhovny zhurnal o Dostoyevskom', Moskovskiye vedomosti, No. 311, 1893 (3-4), 3.
17. M. F. Taube, 'Tri stolpa russkogo samobytnogo prosveshcheniya proshlogo stoletiya: Khomyakov, Dostoyevsky i yepiskop Feofan, zatvornik Vyshensky', Mirny trud, No. 5-6, 1912 (254-93), 267.
18. Petropavlovsky, op. cit., 342-3.
19. Alekseyev, op. cit.; Zamotin, op. cit., 250
20. E. Markov, 'Kriticheskiye besedy', Russkaya rech, No. 12, 1879; Zelinsky, op. cit., 166.
21. Zosima in fact refers not to the 'spark' in man, but to the 'bright spot [svetlaya tochka]': see PSS, XIV, 266.
22. Petropavlovsky, op. cit., 342.
23. Miller & Strakhov, op. cit., 329.
24. Ibid., 'Prilozheniye', 91.
25. N. K. Mikhaylovsky, 'Zhestokiý talant', Otechestvennyye zapiski, No. 9-10, 1882. Mikhaylovsky's article appears in F. M. Dostoyevsky v russkoy kritike, ed. A. A. Belkin (Moscow, 1956) (306-85).
26. V. P. Burenin, 'Literaturnye ocherki', Novoye vremya, No. 1603, 1880; Zamotin, op. cit., 257-8.
27. S. Levitsky, 'Idealy budushchego s tochki zreniya pravoslavnoy i katolicheskoy, izobrazhonnye v romane "Bratya Karamazovy"', Pravoslaviye i narodnost' (Moscow, 1889) (1-72), 2-3. This article first appeared in Pravoslavnoye obozreniye, III, 1880 (29-67; 215-44).
28. Ibid., 4.
29. PSS, XIV, 100.
30. 'N', '"Bratya Karamazovy". Roman F. M. Dostoyevskogo. Chast' pervaya', Nedelya, No. 5, 1879 (158-63); Zamotin, op. cit., 241.
31. F. M. Dostoyevsky v russkoy kritike, 341.
32. Vestnik Yevropy, No. 3, 1881; cited in N. G. Pobedinsky, Religiozno-nravstvennyye idei i tipy v proizvedeniyakh F. M. Dostoyevskogo (Moscow, 1899), 53.
33. M. A. Antonovich, 'Mistiko-asketicheskiy roman', Novoye obozreniye, No. 3, 1881; see F. M. Dostoyevsky v russkoy kritike (255-305), 257; 285.

34. V. P. Burenin, 'Literaturnye ocherki. G. Antonovich, "raznosyashchy" roman Dostoyevskogo', Novoye vremya, No. 1843, 1881; Zamotin, op. cit., 258.
35. V. V. Chuyko, 'Literaturnaya khronika. Roman g. Dostoyevskogo "Brat'ya Karamazovy"', Novosti, No. 347, 1880; Zamotin, op. cit., 243-5.
36. V. Korsh, 'Zhurnalistika', Molva, No. 281, 1879; Zamotin, op. cit., 242.
37. 'N. N.', 'Literaturnye tipy. Kriticheskiye zametki. "Brat'ya Karamazovy" Dostoyevskogo', Svet, No. 9, 1879; Zamotin, op. cit., 226.
38. Markov, op. cit., Zelinsky, op. cit., 166.
39. Cited in P. Ya. Svetlov, 'Ideya tsarstva bozhiya v yeya znachenii dlya khristianskogo mirosozertsaniya. V. Tsarstvo bozhiye v vozzreniyakh Gogolya, Dostoyevskogo i Tolstogo', Bogoslovskiy vestnik, I, 1903 (463-98; 595-616), 497.
40. Detskiy sad, No. 9, 1876; Zelinsky, op. cit., 128-9.
41. 'M. A. Protopopov' (= A. Gorshkov), 'Russkaya zhurnalistika. Novy roman g. Dostoyevskogo "Brat'ya Karamazovy"', Russkaya pravda, No. 51, 1879; Zamotin, op. cit., 242.
42. 'M. A. Protopopov' (= A. Gorshkov), 'Propovednik "novogo slova"', Russkoye bogatstvo, No. 8, 1880 (1-28), 26.
43. K. D. Kavelin, Vestnik Yevropy, November, 1880, 433ff; Zamotin, op. cit., 311.
44. A. Gradovsky, 'Mechty i deystvitelnost'. (Po povodu rechi F. M. Dostoyevskogo)', Golos, No. 174, 1880; Zamotin, op. cit., 295. Dostoyevsky replied publicly to this particular aspect of Gradovsky's criticisms in Diary of a Writer: see DP, 1877, 545-59 (1880 Aug. III, 3).
45. 'Sozertsatel', 'Muza Dostoyevskogo i muza Turgeneva', Russkoye bogatstvo, No. 9, 1884; Zelinsky, op. cit., 54.
46. Pravoslavny slovar', 770-1.
47. O. Miller, 'Publichnye lektsii', delivered in St. Petersburg in 1874; Zelinsky, op. cit., 167. The episode to which Miller was referring appears in PSS, VIII, 57-65.
48. 'L.O.' (= L. Obolensky), 'Otsenka idey Dostoyevskogo', Mysl', No. 4, 1881; Zelinsky, op. cit., 69.
49. Bulgakov, op. cit., 6.
50. 'S.S.B.' (= Antony Khrapovitsky), 'Pastyrskoye izucheniye lyudey i zhizni po sochineniyam F. M. Dostoyevskogo', Bogoslovskiy vestnik, October, 1893 (41-79), 50. (Hereafter: Antony: 'Pastyrskoye izucheniye'.) A short-

ened version of this article, under the title 'F. M. Dostoyevsky, kak propovednik khristianskogo vozrozhdeniya', appears in Antony & Solovyov, F. M. Dostoyevsky (9-36). 186

51. Svetlov, op. cit., 486.
52. Obolensky, Mysl', No. 4, 1881; Zamotin, op. cit., 262.
53. A. Snegiryov, 'Filosofskoye mirosozertsaniye F. M. Dostoyevskogo', Vera i razum, 1885 (No. 21, 409-32; No. 23, 525-43), No. 23, 534.
54. P. Shchukin, 'Religioznye i obshchestvennyye idealy F. M. Dostoyevskogo', Khristianin, 1908 (September, 78-95; October, 279-92), October, 283.
55. Taube, op. cit., 258.
56. Solovyov, SS, III, 197; 198.
57. Pisma, IV, 59.
58. M. M. Tareyev, Osnovy khristianstva. Sistema religioznoy mysli. IV. Khristianskaya svoboda (Sergiyev posad, 1908), 245.
59. L. Obolensky, Mysl', No. 2, 1881; Zelinsky, op. cit., 170.
60. V. P. Burenin, 'Literaturnye ocherki. Shestaya kniga "Brat'yev Karamazovykh"', Novoye vremya, No. 1273, 1879; Zamotin, op. cit., 256.
61. O. Miller, 'Karamazovshchina i inochestvo', Russkiye pisateli posle Gogolya. Chteniya, rechi i staty Oresta Millera. I. I. S. Turgenev - F. M. Dostoyevsky (St. Petersburg/Moscow, 1913), 292.
62. Pobedinsky, op. cit., 17-18. Originally published in Vera i tserkov' (n.d.)
63. S. Levitsky, op. cit., 5.
64. V. Levitsky, 'Polozhitel'nye tipy khristian v sochineniyakh F. M. Dostoyevskogo i yego vzglyad na otnosheniye evangel'skikh zapovedey k zhizni', Vera i zhizn, No. 16, 1913 (61-73), 62.
65. I. Bogoslovsky, 'Russkiy inok i yego vazhnoye znacheneye, po romanu F. M. Dostoyevskogo "Brat'ya Karamazovy"', Voskresny den', 1888 (No. 22, 252-5; No. 23, 266-8; No. 29, 335-7; No. 31, 362-4; No. 32, 374-6), No. 22, 254.
66. V. Levitsky, op. cit., 63. See PSS, XIV, 54.
67. Shchukin, op. cit., September, 90; 91.
68. Tareyev, op. cit., 256.
69. V. Levitsky, op. cit., 65.

70. I. Pavlov, 'Kritika i bibliografiya. "Bratya Karamazovy". Roman F. M. Dostoyevskogo', Rus', No. 3, 1880 (17-19); Zamotin, op. cit., 266. 187
71. Svetlov, op. cit., 497.
72. N. Zverev, Rus', No. 1, 1884; cited in Pobedinsky, op. cit., 21.
73. Miller, 'Karamazovshchina i inochestvo', 281. Petersen's remarks appear in 'Oniks' (= V. K. Petersen), 'Vstupleniye k romanu "Angel"', Literaturny zhurnal, supplement to Novoye vremya, No. 6-7, 1881. See Zamotin, op. cit., 252-3; and Literaturnoye nasledstvo LXXXVI, 545.
74. Shchukin, op. cit., September, 93.
75. Tareyev, op. cit., 31-3; 274.
76. V. Levitsky, op. cit., 69.
77. V. P. Burenin, 'Literaturnye ocherki. Roman g. Dostoyevskogo. Obvineniye avtora v inkvizitorskom fanatizme i nenavisti', Novoye vremya, No. 1203, 1879; Zamotin, op. cit., 254.
78. Kirillov, op. cit., No. 4, 132.
79. S. Levitsky, op. cit., 43.
80. Ibid., 67.
81. Antony, 'Pastyrskoye izucheniye', 76.
82. Shchukin, op. cit., October, 282-3.
83. For details of Rozanov's initial analysis, see fn. 14, above. Rozanov's 'Afterword' appeared in Zolotoye runo, XI-XII, 1906 (97-101), under the heading 'Poslesloviye k kommentariyu "Legendy o velikom inkvizitore"'. (Hereafter: Rozanov, 'Poslesloviye'.)
84. Rozanov, Dostoevsky, 114.
85. Rozanov, 'Poslesloviye', 100.
86. '-v', 'Ob inoke russkom i o vozmozhnom znachenii yego', Chteniya v obshchestve lyubiteley dukhovnogo prosveshcheniya, No. 3, 1881 (344-63), 363.
87. PSS, XIV, 29.
88. S. Levitsky, op. cit., 12-13.
89. Pravoslavny slovar', 2152.
90. Kirillov, op. cit., No. 18, 697.

91. S. Levitsky, op. cit., 11.
92. Shchukin, op. cit., October, 279.
93. Antony, 'Pastyrskoye izucheniye', 76.
94. V. Levitsky, op. cit., 71.
95. S. Levitsky, op. cit., 19-20.
96. Snegiryov, op. cit., No. 21, 411-12.
97. Kirillov, op. cit., No. 18, 685; 689. See PSS, XIV, 260.
98. Taube, op. cit., 267.
99. S. Levitsky, op. cit., 13.
100. Svetlov, op. cit.; 481.
101. Ibid., 497; 498.
102. Taube, op. cit., 278; 279; 269; 270.
103. Pobedinsky, op. cit., 38.
104. Svetlov, op. cit., 470.
105. Obolensky, Mysl', No. 2, 1881; Zelinsky, op. cit., 147.
106. See fn. 50, above.
107. Nikolayev, 'Dukhovny zhurnal o Dostoyevskom', 3.
108. 'M', 'Mysli F. M. Dostoyevskogo o propovedanii narodu slova Bozhiya, v svyazi s sovremennostyu', Vera i razum, No. 20, 1906 (1013-20), 1016.
109. Ibid., 1020.
110. '-v', op. cit., 350.
111. Ibid., 363.
112. Bogoslovsky, op. cit., No. 32, 376.
113. S. Levitsky, op. cit., 32.
114. Bogoslovsky, op. cit., No. 22, 253. S. Levitsky, op. cit., 32.
115. '-v', op. cit., 344. S. Levitsky, op. cit., 33.
116. Svetlov, op. cit., 485.
117. This and the following quotation are taken from Obolensky, Mysl', No. 2, 1881; see Zelinsky, op. cit., 194; 232.
118. '-v', op. cit., 359.

119. T. Lyashchenko & V. Malinin, 'Otzyvy o sochinenii studenta N. Yumonova na temu: "Starchestvo v izobrazhenii F. M. Dostoyevskogo i otsenka yego (starchestva) s toчки zreniya idealov drevne-khristianskogo asketizma"', Trudy Kievskoy Dukhovnoy Akademii, III, 1912 (689-95), 692.
120. '-v', op. cit., 363.
121. Kirillov, op. cit., No. 18, 698. '-v', op. cit., 361.
122. Obolensky, Mysl', No. 4, 1881; Zelinsky, op. cit., 72.
123. Obolensky, Mysl', No. 2, 1881; Zelinsky, op. cit., 235.
124. Ibid.
125. Miller, 'Karamazovshchina i inochestvo', 283-4.
126. Ibid., 292; 297.
127. K. Leontyev, 'Nashi novye khristiane. F. M. Dostoyevsky i graf Lev Tolstoy', Varshavsky dnevnik, Nos. 162; 169; 173, 1880. The article appears in K. Leontyev, Sobraniye sochineniy (9 volumes; Moscow, 1912-13), VIII (175-213). It is followed by a 'Primechaniye', added in 1885 (ibid., 213-15). Reference will be made to the Sobraniye sochineniy (hereafter: Leontyev, SS).
128. Leontyev, SS, VIII, 186.
129. Ibid., 180.
130. Ibid., 183.
131. Ibid., 207.
132. Ibid., 196.
133. Ibid., 197.
134. Ibid., 198.
135. Ibid., 182.
136. Ibid., 192.
137. Ibid., 197.
138. Ibid., 199.
139. Ibid., 199; 192; 196.
140. Ibid., 196.
141. Ibid., 215.
142. V. S. Solovyov, 'Prilozheniye. Zametka v zashchitu Dostoy-

evskogo ot obvineniya v "novom" khristianstve', SS, III. (219-23). Solovyov's 'Tri rechi v pamyat Dostoyevskogo' appear in ibid. (185-218).

143. Solovyov, SS, III, 223.
144. Ibid., 222.
145. Ibid., 220.
146. Ibid., 222.
147. Ibid., 197.
148. Ibid., 197; 199; 201; 202.
149. Ibid., 201.
150. Ibid., 200.
151. S. Levitsky, op. cit., 41.
152. Bogoslovsky, op. cit., No. 32, 375.
153. Pobedinsky, op. cit., 36-7.
154. N. K. Mikhaylovsky, 'Literaturnye i zhurnalnye zametki', Otechestvennye zapiski, No. 2, 1873; Zelinsky, op. cit., 24-5.
155. Tareyev, op. cit., 293-4.
156. Svetlov, op. cit., 481.
157. Alekseyev, op. cit., Zamotin, op. cit., 251.
158. Nikolayev, 'Dukhovny zhurnal o Dostoyevskom', 3.
159. Nikolayev, 'Vo shto veroval Dostoyevsky?', 3.
160. Ibid.
161. Pisma, I, 353.
162. PSS, V, 381; PSS, XX, 191-4.
163. PSS, XX, 172-5.
164. PSS, V, 381.
165. PSS, VI, 241-53.
166. Pisma, I, 442.
167. Ibid., 444.
168. Mochulsky, op. cit., 277.
169. Pisma, I, 586.

170. V. K. Lebedev, 'Otryvok iz romana "Bratya Karamazovy" :
pered sudom tsenzury', Russkaya literatura, No. 2,
1970 (123-5), 124.
171. Ibid.
172. Ibid., 125.
173. Ibid., 124.
174. Miller, 'Karamazovshchina i inochestvo', 252.
175. Alekseyev, op. cit., Zamotin, op. cit., 251.
176. V. Popov & V. Rybinsky, 'Otzyvy o sochinenii studenta
O. Ellanskogo: "Znachenije tserkvi v zhizni lichnosti
i obshchestva po Dostoyevskomu"', Trudy Kievskoy
Dukhovnoy Akademii, VI, 1913 (680-3).
177. Ibid., 682.

SECTION TWO

DOSTOYEVSKY AND OTHER CHURCHES

DOSTOYEVSKY AND THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

Dostoyevsky's writings contain references not only to Russian Orthodoxy but also to the major confessions of Western Europe. Roman Catholicism in particular provoked some extreme comments from him. While interesting in themselves as a revelation of his interpretation of Catholicism, these comments are potentially of far greater significance. One need only recall Dostoyevsky's clashes with censors at different stages in his career to appreciate that he might have hesitated about being entirely open in his portrayal of the Russian Orthodox Church. However, the existence of a long-established anti-Catholic tradition in Russia arguably provided a solution to this problem: it effectively gave Dostoyevsky the opportunity to speak out against his own Church and, perhaps, all Churches, in the guise of an attack on the Roman Catholic Church, should he wish to do so. The extent to which people might be diverted by the anti-Catholic dimension if such a ploy were adopted has already been noted in Chapter Three, where we saw that the overwhelming majority of contemporary Church commentators interpreted the 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor' as an attack directed solely against the Roman Catholic Church and did not suspect that it might be intended to have a wider area of application. This does not, of course, mean that all of Dostoyevsky's criticisms of Roman Catholicism should be applied indiscriminately to the Russian Orthodox Church, but the restrictions imposed by censorship considerations should nevertheless be borne in mind.

In order best to appreciate Dostoyevsky's assessment of Roman Catholicism, let us first briefly consider the historical and ideological context in which it was made. Relations between Russia and Rome had for many centuries been characterized by a deep enmity which had its roots in the estrangement between Eastern and Western Christendom which led to the great schism in the Christian Church. The causes of the eleventh-century schism were many and complex, but prominent among them were two very specific ecclesiastical disputes. The first concerned the Papal claims to universal supremacy and infallibility. The Greeks rejected these claims: they accorded the Pope a primacy of honour, rather than universal primacy; and they maintained that the final decision in matters of faith rested not with the Pope alone but with a council representing all the bishops of the Church. The second cause for dispute was the filioque clause which the West had inserted into the Nicene Creed without the consent of the whole Church. The Greeks challenged the filioque on theological grounds, and they maintained that such credal changes could in any event be effected only with the consent of an Ecumenical Council. Attempts at reunion between East and West failed, and the Orthodox and Roman Churches remained separate. When Russia was converted to Christianity in the tenth century, she adopted the Greek rite and, together with it, the anti-Catholic sentiment characteristic of Eastern Orthodoxy. Russia's hostility to Rome was increased by Catholic Poland's interference in her succession problems during the Time of Troubles (1604-1613). The Jesuits in Poland championed the cause of Dmitry, the Pretender to the Russian throne, who

entered Moscow with their backing. Dmitry's challenge failed, 195
but the episode ensured that the anti-Catholic bias which
already existed in Russia became more firmly entrenched. This
enmity survived the policies of religious toleration pursued
in subsequent reigns.

Despite the traditional enmity between Russian Orthodoxy
and Roman Catholicism, the two Churches were nevertheless in
broad agreement about many points of theology and liturgy. A
number of Catholic positions were endorsed by the Eastern
Orthodox Church as a whole at the Synod of Bethlehem in 1672,
and this remained the case. Areas of agreement included
emphasis upon the hierarchical structure of the Church, the
apostolic succession, the episcopate and the priesthood; the
experience of the sacraments; devotion to the Mother of God
and the saints; and intercession for the departed. There was
also agreement about the visible unity of the Church although,
as seen above, Orthodoxy rejected Rome's view that the unifying
principle should be the Pope, and thought rather in terms of
the college of bishops and the Ecumenical Council.

At the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the
nineteenth centuries the fortunes of Roman Catholicism in
Russia improved. Paul I was very sympathetic to Catholicism:
he accorded the Catholic Church a privileged position, and
he welcomed the Jesuits. A Roman Catholic school founded
in St. Petersburg attracted pupils from the capital's most
illustrious families, and there were many conversions to
Catholicism as a direct result. Catholicism continued to
find favour at an official level during the early years of
Alexander I's reign: the Jesuits continued to flourish; and the

French Catholic de Maistre became the confidant of the Tsar.

The anti-foreign sentiment provoked by the Napoleonic Wars helped to force out both de Maistre and Catholicism, but the Roman Catholic Church continued to exercise an appeal for the Russian aristocracy in the reign of Nicholas I.

Prominent among nineteenth-century thinkers who expressed views on Roman Catholicism was Pyotr Chaadayev, whose first 'Philosophical Letter', published in Teleskop (The Telescope) in 1836, shocked Russian society and led to him being declared insane by the government of the day.¹ For Chaadayev, the only 'true' culture was to be found in the West: Catholicism was the crucial factor in that culture, providing the dynamic social principle upon which the whole of Western civilization was based. Russia's stagnation derived from the fact that her Christianity had been drawn from Byzantium: she had thus cut herself off from the source of spiritual life which issued from Rome.

This identification of Catholicism as the essence of Western civilization was taken up by the Slavophiles. Khomyakov wrote that 'Western Europe developed not under the influence of Christianity, but under the influence of Latinism, that is, of Christianity understood one-sidedly as the law of external unity'.² Rome had sacrificed freedom to necessity, and had imposed upon the West unity without freedom. Other Slavophiles endorsed and expanded Khomyakov's position: Ivan Kireyevsky reproached the West and the Roman Church for excessive rationalism and system building; and Ivan Aksakov said that the Roman Church was 'nothing but the West itself, but Rome itself, which elevates itself to universal

significance, claims universal dominion and insists on the subjection of the whole universe to itself'.³

Let us finally briefly recall the assessment of the Roman Catholic Church made by the French Utopian Socialist thinkers who influenced Dostoyevsky in the eighteen-forties. We have seen that the Utopian Socialists accused the established Churches of positively harming and distorting Christianity. This negative judgement of official Christianity was based for the most part upon their experiences of the Roman Catholic Church: thus when Fourier accused the Church of supporting 'Civilization' and oppressing the people, it was primarily the Roman Catholic Church he had in mind, although he also, for example, criticized the role of the Church of England in Ireland. In the novels of George Sand Catholicism was depicted as the embodiment of dark and oppressive religion, in direct contrast to the light and joy of 'true' Christianity. The Utopian Socialist assessment of Roman Catholicism was thus extremely critical, and would merely have added to the generally negative impression of Rome which Dostoyevsky inherited as a Russian and an Orthodox believer.

Roman Catholicism is not mentioned specifically in any of Dostoyevsky's pre-exile works where, as we have seen, religion is generally presented not in terms of separate confessions but symbolically, in terms of 'dark' and 'light' Christianity. We saw, for example, that The Landlady and Netochka Nezvanova contain both a criticism of dark and oppressive religion which functions at the expense of people, and hints of an alternative, more joyful, type of Christianity.

In the context of Dostoyevsky's familiarity with Utopian Socialist thought in the eighteen-forties it seems reasonable to suggest that he would have had Roman Catholicism as much as Russian Orthodoxy in mind when depicting dark and unhealthy religiosity at this stage. In the post-exile works, the references to Roman Catholicism are unambiguous: indeed, Dostoyevsky's negative attitude to Roman Catholicism is one of the aspects of his thought which many readers of his major novels remember particularly vividly. This is not because Roman Catholicism is mentioned with any great frequency: if one does not include the 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor', the references to Catholicism in the novels amount to only a few pages. However, they occur at some very memorable moments, as will be seen below.

Catholicism makes its first, brief, appearance in Dostoyevsky's novels at the beginning of the eighteen-sixties, in Notes from the House of the Dead and Winter Notes on Summer Impressions (Zimniye zametki o letnikh vpechatleniyakh, 1863). There is then a gap until The Idiot where in addition to Prince Myshkin's violent anti-Catholic outburst we also encounter what might best be described as an anti-Catholic 'smear campaign' led by Lebedev. Myshkin's attack on the Roman Catholic Church is echoed by Shatov in The Devils, and both will be examined in more detail below. Dostoyevsky devoted rather more pages to Roman Catholicism in his publicistic writings, particularly in the foreign affairs column he wrote for Grazhdanin in 1873-4 and in his Diary of a Writer from 1876 onwards. It will be apparent that both Myshkin's and Shatov's anti-Catholic comments precede

Dostoyevsky's journalistic treatment of the subject. The writer's interpretation of Roman Catholicism does not, however, change appreciably over the years: the message in The Idiot (1868) is based upon the same assumptions as that in the Diary at the end of the eighteen-seventies. Indeed, one can go back even further in time than The Idiot, and still find Dostoyevsky expressing the same views. Thus in his notebook for 1863/4 one reads: 'Out of Catholic Christianity has grown only socialism: brotherhood will grow from ours'; while in the Diary for November 1877 he is still talking of 'socialism as the heritage of Catholicism'.⁴ Since Dostoyevsky's analysis of Roman Catholicism does not alter radically over the years, comments dating from the end of his life may meaningfully be cited alongside comments made a decade or so before. The same fact justifies the chronology of the present chapter: there will first be an analysis of Catholicism as presented in the journals, followed by an examination of its treatment in the novels. This will be done so as to make clearly apparent any process of 'modification' which takes place when Dostoyevsky's views on Roman Catholicism are placed in a novelistic setting. The chapter will end with an examination of the 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor' and of its relationship to Roman Catholicism.

Fundamental to Dostoyevsky's analysis of Roman Catholicism in the journals is an accusation which he expresses in terms of Christ's temptations by the Devil in the wilderness.⁵ According to Dostoyevsky, Catholicism has decided that Christ

was wrong to refuse the Devil's offer of secular power. But she has not been content merely to disagree with Christ: she has effectively refashioned Him and has proclaimed 'a new Christ, not like the old one, but one who has been seduced by the third temptation of the Devil, the temptation of the kingdoms of the world: "All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me!"'⁶ Rome has done this, we are told, because she believes that Christianity per se is incapable of making an impression on earth: 'her Christ "cannot hold out without an earthly kingdom"'.⁷ In other words, she alleges that Christianity needs to consolidate its spiritual force, and she has therefore taken up secular power on Christianity's behalf. Dostoyevsky repeats this claim many times in the Diary, sometimes briefly, sometimes in more detail, as in the following extract from 1877:

The Roman papacy proclaimed that Christianity and its idea, without the universal possession - not spiritual, but political - of lands and peoples, cannot be achieved without the realization on earth of a new universal Roman Empire, at the head of which will be not the Roman Emperor, but the Pope.⁸

In taking this step, says Dostoyevsky, the Roman Catholic Church claims to be acting for the sake of Christianity, 'for the glory of God and of Christ on earth'.⁹

These accusations together form the very basis of Dostoyevsky's case against Roman Catholicism. They reveal as much about Dostoyevsky's own conception of Christianity as about his attitude to Roman Catholicism. Most obviously, they suggest that Dostoyevsky interpreted the episode of the three temptations in the wilderness not just in the broad sense of a power struggle between Christ and the

Devil, but as an occasion which had very specific implications¹ for the nature of ^{the} Christianity which Christ wanted to see. Dostoyevsky implies that Christ's refusal to give in to the third temptation amounted to an assertion that Christianity is primarily a spiritual force, and does not need the assistance of secular power in order to continue to exist in the world. The adoption of secular power is associated not with Christ, but with the Devil. Secondly, we may note the prominence attached by Dostoyevsky to the figure of Christ in determining the nature of Christianity: it follows from this that, so far as Dostoyevsky is concerned, a correct understanding of Christianity is dependent upon a correct conception of Christ.

Dostoyevsky presents very little evidence to suggest that he agrees that the Roman Catholic Church exists for the benefit of Christianity. Indeed, he denies that Roman Catholicism is at all interested in the spiritual kingdom of Christ: throughout his journalistic writings the Catholic Church is presented not as a spiritual body, but as a secular state, whose sole concern is to maintain and extend its power and dominion. 'From time immemorial', Dostoyevsky alleges, '[Roman Catholicism] has converted Christ's cause into nothing but a concern for her earthly possessions and her future political dominion over the whole world'.¹⁰ His conviction that secular power is of paramount importance for the Roman Catholic Church leads Dostoyevsky to interpret every aspect of Catholicism as a function of that overriding concern. Even things which are purely religious in appearance, and which might initially seem to exist for spiritual purposes, are presented so as to suggest that they

exist only to facilitate the attainment of Rome's secular ambitions. Her first victim in this quest for secular power, as we saw above, has been Christ Himself, whom she has misrepresented as the builder of a universal kingdom based on secular power. Dostoyevsky goes on to expose a whole series of spiritual abuses and distortions with which he confronts Roman Catholicism. The Pope, for example, is certainly not portrayed by Dostoyevsky as a shepherd who is concerned for the souls of his flock: he is depicted rather as someone who is completely void of Christian sentiment. Even his theological pronouncements are interpreted not as genuinely felt spiritual convictions, but as yet one more dimension of Rome's political strategy. According to this scheme of things, the decree of Papal Infallibility, issued in 1870, becomes a ploy by the Pope to lessen the impression of weakness created when he was deprived of his territories during the movement for Italian unification: 'At the critical moment, when they had taken from him Rome and the last parcel of land, and left him with only the Vatican, at that very moment he, as if on purpose, proclaimed his infallibility'.¹¹

Similarly, the Pope's claim to be the spiritual father of all who have ever been christened is seen not as evidence of sincere pastoral concern for believers outside the Roman Catholic Church, but simply as a new development in his secular machinations. The claim had been made by Pope Pius IX in a letter to Emperor Wilhelm in 1873, and it was commented upon by Dostoyevsky in Grazhdanin. Dostoyevsky remarks that until recently 'heretics' - by whom he means non-Catholic

Christians - were not only not considered to be Christians by Rome, but were regarded as even worse than heathen.¹² He is here making an oblique reference to the Pope's tendency to side with the Turks rather than with Russia in disputes between those two powers, something he interpreted as pure perversity on the Pope's part. This latest proclamation of the Pope, continues Dostoyevsky, 'gives notice of an unheard of broadening of Roman Catholicism's sights, hints at new horizons, new modes of action and new intentions for the future'.¹³ In other words, it suggests that the Pope is looking to expand his influence even more: we shall see below other methods Dostoyevsky thought the Pope was ready to adopt in order to achieve this.

Dostoyevsky declares repeatedly that the Roman Catholic Church's desire for power far outweighs its concern for human beings. '[Roman Catholicism] has long considered itself above mankind as a whole', he writes in 1876; and in the following year, referring to the likely clash between France and Germany over the Papal issue, he declares: 'So what if all Europe will flow in blood - the Pope will triumph, and for the Romish confessors of Christ this is everything'.¹⁴ Dostoyevsky associates such ruthlessness particularly with the Jesuits, whom he regards as the Pope's army and refers to as 'the black legions'. The writer gives full force to his hatred of the Jesuit order:

This is a status in statu, this is the Pope's army. It seeks but the triumph of its own idea - and then let everything standing in its path perish . . . let all other forces perish and wither away, let everything standing in discord with it die - civilization, society, learning!¹⁵

Dostoyevsky shows particular interest in the progress made by one division of this army: the clerical party in France in the eighteen-seventies. The clerics are similarly portrayed as self-seeking exploiters who will not hesitate to be ruthless: 'And if it is France who happens to be around, then why not suck her life-blood, even if it kills her? Why not risk her very existence? They must take from her everything she can give'.¹⁶ So far as Dostoyevsky is concerned, such ruthlessness naturally extends to the clerics' attitude to Christianity, which they see not as an end in itself, but as a means to their own ends. Dostoyevsky points by way of example to their response to the religious revival in France which occurred after the Franco-Prussian war and the Commune, and which was encouraged by the devout Catholic and conservative president of France, Marshal MacMahon. MacMahon's intention was the re-establishment of moral order: to this end he encouraged the expiatory religious cults and pilgrimages which had grown up after the war, and allocated money for the building of new churches. In the face of this religious revival, claims Dostoyevsky, 'the clergy immediately exploited the fact, but out of all proportion, with no understanding of social opinion, and with an impudence harmful to religion itself'.¹⁷

The Catholic Church's alleged single-mindedness and readiness to exploit the religious urges of the masses is something Dostoyevsky seems to have become convinced of as early as Winter Notes on Summer Impressions, written after his first trip to Europe in 1862. Not for one moment will he concede that the Catholics working among London's poor could be doing so out of genuine human concern: they too are serving the Catholic cause.

Consistent with such an interpretation is Dostoyevsky's portrayal of a Catholic woman who hands him a religious tract as he walks the streets of London. He does not give a full description of the woman, but chooses to isolate one particularly suggestive feature of her appearance: 'I could hardly make out [her face]: I remember only her intent look'.¹⁸

Dostoyevsky's impression of Roman Catholic priests is even worse: he sees the material aid they offer to poverty-stricken families as a cunning ploy to gain yet more converts.¹⁹

A further aspect of Catholicism to which Dostoyevsky pays critical attention is the great importance attached to the Pope. Frequently, Dostoyevsky's references to the Pope take on a specifically confessionalist character, and he reveals himself as an Orthodox Christian who objects to the way in which the Roman Catholic Church in the person of the Pope has tried to arrogate to itself a position of absolute supremacy with respect to the other Churches. For example, whenever Dostoyevsky refers to the Pope by the spiritual titles Rome claims for him, he invariably puts the titles in quotation marks, thereby indicating that he is not adding his own consent to what they imply. The Pope thus becomes "the most beatific Pope, the infallible vicar of God"; "the mediator"; "the head of Christianity".²⁰ At best, Dostoyevsky's references to the Pope are full of irony, as when he refers to 'the infallible, but homeless, Pope'.²¹

His assessment of the precise extent to which Catholics attach prominence to the Pope varies with circumstances. In his more generous moments he is relatively restrained, and declares only that the Roman Catholic Church equates the Pope

with God. More characteristic, however, is the claim that for Catholicism the Pope is more important than God. The progression from the former to the latter of these two claims may be observed in a speech Dostoyevsky puts into the mouth of the Jesuits when he imagines what they would say to the masses if the Pope decided to make an appeal to the people at large. They begin modestly: 'Know that the Pope has the keys of St. Peter, and that faith in God is but faith in the Pope, who has been placed on earth for you by God Himself, in His stead'. By the end of the speech, however, we read: 'You need only believe - not in God, but only in the Pope'.²² Rome is ready to do away with God completely, claims Dostoyevsky: 'the Catholic Church has raised the idea of Roman secular rule higher than truth and God . . . It would rather Christianity perish completely than that the secular kingdom of the Church should perish'.²³

Dostoyevsky's conviction that the essence of Catholicism is not spiritual concern but secular power is well illustrated by his treatment of France and Italy respectively as Catholic nations. It might initially come as a surprise to learn that for Dostoyevsky the Catholic nation par excellence was France rather than Italy. The functionaries of the Vatican are portrayed as being much more akin to the French than to their actual compatriots. The key to the mystery lies in the historical context in which Dostoyevsky was writing about Italy: the eighteen-seventies was the time when Italy rose up against the Pope in the name of its political liberation and unification. The Italians effectively wanted to separate Catholicism into its secular and spiritual elements: while

rejecting the Pope as their temporal leader, they wished to retain him as their spiritual leader. So far as Dostoyevsky was concerned, such an intention was misguided and impossible to achieve: since secular power was the most important thing to both the Pope and the Catholic Church as a whole, to deny it to them was to abandon the Catholic religion completely. Dostoyevsky consequently offers the following assessment of the Italians' actions: 'These honest citizens . . . have also, as it were, sacrificed a part of their religious feeling and faith by breaking with the Pope in order to strengthen their new little Italian kingdom'.²⁴ In the light of views he expresses about Catholicism elsewhere, we can see that Dostoyevsky is being generous indeed to say that the Italians have sacrificed only 'part' of their religion in denying the Pope secular power.

The same logic which enables Dostoyevsky to regard Italy as a non-Catholic nation enables him to refer to France as 'the representative, so to speak, of the entire Catholic organism, its banner'.²⁵ He admits that such a description might appear strange, since, as he has remarked on a previous occasion, France is a country 'which has now lost virtually all of her religion (the Jesuits and the atheists being one and the same thing); which several times has closed her churches; and which on one occasion even subjected God Himself to a ballot in the Assembly'.²⁶ Nevertheless, says Dostoyevsky, 'France is precisely the kind of country which, even if it didn't contain a single person believing in the Pope or even in God, would remain a predominantly Catholic country'.²⁷ This is because 'the religious idea and the Papal idea are essentially

There were two specific reasons why Dostoyevsky felt it possible to call atheistic France a Roman Catholic country. First, although France had, ever since the Revolution, declared herself uninterested in religion, successive French governments had continued to support the secular strivings of the Pope. Consequently, although they had rejected what - in Dostoyevsky's opinion - was peripheral to Catholicism (religion), they had remained true to what was essential (secular power for the Pope). France was thus more Catholic than she realized. The second reason is connected with Dostoyevsky's conviction that if the Roman Catholic Church was serving any higher 'idea' at all, then it was not Christianity, but the idea of the universal and enforced union of mankind which had been embodied in the old Roman Empire. He claims that with the Roman papacy 'began another attempt to set up a universal monarchy in full accord with the spirit of the ancient Roman world, only in a different form'.²⁹ Roman Catholicism is thus seen by Dostoyevsky as the temporary embodiment of a force which has preceded it and which will succeed it: the striving for the compulsory union of mankind. Dostoyevsky thinks that this same 'idea' is behind the French socialist movement:

Present-day French socialism itself - superficially an ardent and fatal protest against the Catholic idea on the part of all men and nations tortured and suffocated by it . . . is nothing but the truest and most undeviating continuation of the Catholic idea, its fullest and most final realization . . . For French socialism is nothing but the compulsory communion of mankind - an idea which dates back to ancient Rome, and which was subsequently preserved in Catholicism.³⁰

Dostoyevsky contrasts this unfavourably with 'the Eastern ideal

31

of a purely spiritual communion of men'. Thus he once more suggests that Christianity should be an inner and spiritual, rather than external and secular, force; and he associates adherence to such true Christianity with Eastern Christendom.

The link which Dostoyevsky establishes between Roman Catholicism and socialism is one of the most characteristic aspects of his treatment of the subject. He claimed that Roman Catholicism would exploit the socialist movement, just as it had allegedly exploited every other movement, in order to sustain its own existence. He felt sure that, should the monarchs of Europe withdraw their support from the Pope, the Roman Catholic Church would not hesitate to turn to atheistic socialism for assistance instead. This conviction is expressed in one of Dostoyevsky's notebooks as early as 1864/5: we read that the Roman Catholic Church 'will unite directly with the revolutionaries and socialists'.³² In an entry made shortly afterwards, we meet the formula pešh i bos ('on foot and bare-footed'), which later becomes the leitmotif for the Pope's appeal to the demos:

On foot and bare-footed, the Pope will go out to all the beggars, and he will say that everything [the socialists] teach and strive for is contained in the Gospel; that, before, the time had not come for them to find out about this; but that the time has now come, and that he, the Pope, surrenders Christ to them and believes in the ant-hill.³³

Since it is fundamental to Dostoyevsky's assessment of Roman Catholicism that it has nothing in common with true Christianity, the logic of the association which he makes between Catholicism and socialism is that socialism has nothing in common with true Christianity either. In an article written in 1873,

socialism and Christianity. Declaring that the Pope will tell the masses that 'communism is the same as Christianity, and that Christ was talking of nothing else', he continues: 'And even now there are clever and sharp-witted socialists who are convinced that [socialism and Christianity] are one and the same thing, and who seriously mistake the Antichrist for Christ'.³⁴ We may observe a distinct change from the views Dostoyevsky held in the eighteen-forties, when he himself had been inclined to see something in common between the two, as he admits elsewhere in his Diary.³⁵

To such an extent does Roman Catholicism become associated with socialism in Dostoyevsky's mind that the two seem to merge, and the Pope and his hierarchy are linked with those aspects of socialist teaching which Dostoyevsky himself found most hateful. We saw above that he has the Pope declare his belief in the 'ant-hill', the symbol for the complete organization of mankind which is rejected so vehemently in Notes from Underground. Catholicism is also associated by him with the socialist doctrine of the formulative influence of the environment: 'Know also that you are innocent of all your past and future sins, for all your sins have stemmed merely from your poverty'.³⁶ The relationship between Catholicism and socialism is not just one-way, however: Dostoyevsky considers that the socialists are just as likely to exploit the Pope as he to exploit them, and that the two can thus be mutually beneficial. He foresees such a thing happening in France:

According to the principles of the socialists, it's all the same whether there is a republic or a monarchy, and whether they will be French or German, and in truth, even if it somehow came to the point where the Pope would be of some service to them, then they would also acclaim the Pope.³⁷

The spectre of collaboration between Catholicism and socialism raises its head in The Devils, too, when Pyotr Verkhovensky expounds Shigalyov's system for the world, in which there will be 'complete obedience and a complete loss of individuality, but once every thirty years Shigalyov will bring about a convulsion . . . just so that it won't be too boring'.³⁸

Verkhovensky considers that the Pope is the person to lead such a society, and he foresees the International and Rome working together to bring it about:

[The Pope] will come out on foot and bare-footed and show himself to the masses. 'Look what you have driven me to!' he will say, and they will all rush to follow him, even the army. The Pope at the top, us next, and below us Shigalyov's system. Everything will be all right, provided that the International agrees. The old chap will agree straight away. There's no alternative for him anyway . . .³⁹

Despite these numerous criticisms, there are one or two aspects of Roman Catholicism for which Dostoyevsky shows a grudging admiration. One such feature is Catholicism's energy and desire to live: Dostoyevsky refers to this quality as zhivuchest'.⁴⁰ He often warns in his Diary against the dangers of underestimating the Pope, even though he may appear to be in a fragile position after the loss of Rome.⁴¹ Dostoyevsky considered such a wrong assessment of the Pope's strength to be typical of dreamy liberals, who did not understand the essence of the Catholic idea. It is perhaps

-appropriate that in The Devils precisely such a view is held by the members of Stepan Trofimovich's circle: 'We had long since predicted for the Pope the role of a simple metropolitan in a united Italy, and we were convinced that this entire thousand-year-old question was a laughable matter in our century of humanism, industry and the railroads'.⁴² Dostoyevsky himself treated the Pope with rather more respect in this particular instance.

There was one aspect of Catholicism to which Dostoyevsky attached particular worth: its value as a motive force, as the 'idea' of a nation. He felt that countries like Italy and France would effectively be cutting off their life-stream if they abandoned the Pope. This view is illustrated by Dostoyevsky's assessment of what Cavour had achieved for Italy:

Yes, he achieved his aim, he united Italy, but what happened? For two thousand years Italy had borne in herself a universal idea which could unite the world - not some abstract idea, not the speculation of some theoretical mind, but a real, organic idea, the fruit of the life of a nation, the fruit of a world-wide existence. This was the unification of the whole world: first the ancient Roman, and later the Papal unification.⁴³

'But what has come in its stead, asks Dostoyevsky? 'A united second-rate little kingdom, which has lost every kind of universal aspiration, . . . a mechanical, not spiritual, unity'. Similarly, should the Republican party in France forsake the Pope and Catholicism, they would, Dostoyevsky alleges, be depriving their country of 'the most independent of her political and historical ideas'.⁴⁴

Although all this has little to do with Christianity as

such, Dostoyevsky's use of the adjectives 'organic' and 'spiritual' to describe the Roman idea amounts to praise indeed. Certain reservations must be made, however. First, one must be aware of what may perhaps be most accurately described as the 'hierarchy of hatreds' which operates in Dostoyevsky's journals, as a consequence of which he occasionally praises things he might otherwise not praise, simply for the sake of polemic. Just as here Roman Catholicism perhaps benefits because it is being compared with the essentially bourgeois values Dostoyevsky associates with the new Italian kingdom, so must other positive references to Catholicism be seen in context. This is the case, for example, when Dostoyevsky considers the idea that the Polish Cardinal Ledohowski might become Pope. The suggestion is dismissed with the scorn it apparently deserves: the 'refined intellects' in the Vatican would not make such a blunder, we are told:

The news about Ledohowski's candidacy unquestionably comes from a Polish source, since only the empty head of a Polish propagandist abroad could seriously believe that the Roman Conclave, filled with such refined intellects, could commit the blunder of electing Ledohowski: the new Pope would do nothing but restore his fatherland, instead of restoring the Roman and universal power of the Pope.⁴⁵

Dostoyevsky's lack of respect for the Poles evidently outweighs his anti-Catholicism in this instance.

Whatever value Catholicism might have as a motive force is strictly limited to the non-Slavic nations of Western Europe, so far as Dostoyevsky is concerned. He expresses this opinion in a letter to Sankt-Peterburgskiye vedomosti to defend his own journal, Vremya, against accusations of supporting the Polish

uprising in 1863. European civilization, of which Roman Catholicism was the central feature, was suitable for Europe, he wrote, but in Poland it developed 'an anti-popular, anti-civic, anti-Christian spirit'.⁴⁶ The reason Dostoyevsky suggests for this is 'perhaps, precisely because the Poles are Slavs': Slavs should have Orthodoxy as their religion, and they are being false to themselves if they adopt Catholicism.⁴⁷ This reflects Dostoyevsky's theory of the essential link between religion, nationality and political structure, which he expounds in detail in Diary of a Writer in 1880:

At the beginning of every people, every nationality, the moral idea always preceded the conception of the nationality itself, since the former always created the latter. The moral idea always emanated from mystical ideas. . . . These convictions always and everywhere joined together to form a religion, the confession of a new idea. And always, just as soon as a new religion came into being, a new civic nationality came into existence . . . The civic forms of a people are conceived and formulated in keeping with the character of that people's religion.⁴⁸

Such a theory explains why for Dostoyevsky it is inconceivable that Slavic Poland could adopt Catholicism. At the same time, the theory implies acceptance of other religions in their correct national context: the logical implication of Dostoyevsky's claim that Roman Catholicism becomes anti-popular, anti-civic and anti-Christian in Poland is that in its right place it is popular, civic and Christian. We have, however, seen little evidence that Dostoyevsky really thought this. Although he points with some admiration to the value of Catholicism as a motivating force, his overall presentation of the Roman Catholic Church gives prominence to the rather less exalted features allegedly characteristic of Rome: its concern for secular power; its readiness to exploit any situation; and

its over-riding concern for self-survival.

As a direct consequence of the nature of Dostoyevsky's interpretation of the Roman Catholic Church, the present chapter has been concerned for much of the time with politics and power struggles. For the same reason, the spiritual dimension has been conspicuously absent. In connection with this, it may be noted that in Dostoyevsky's writings we encounter hardly any sincere Christian believers who are also members of the Roman Catholic Church. This is true not only of the journals, but also of the novels. The only Roman Catholics we encounter on a personal level in the whole of Dostoyevsky's career as a novelist until we come to the 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor' are two Polish Catholic prisoners in Notes from the House of the Dead. The two men concerned are Ostrozhsky and another identified only as Zh-ky, and they might not appear to merit particular attention, since they appear only briefly. Both men are portrayed sympathetically, and they faithfully observe their religious devotions: Ostrozhsky, we are told, 'was always reading the Catholic Bible'; and Zh-ky 'was continually praying to God'.⁴⁹ Their religion is seen to be a genuine source of comfort and strength to them: Roman Catholicism is thus seen to function as a genuine religion, and it is respected as such by the convicts, the narrator and, by implication, Dostoyevsky himself. This would not normally be an outrageous claim to make for any particular religious creed. It is only when one realizes how unusual - indeed, unique - this portrayal of Roman Catholicism is in Dostoyevsky's writings that its full

significance becomes clear. The sympathetic portrayal of Catholicism may perhaps be partly explained by the fact that Notes from the House of the Dead was written before Dostoyevsky's first trip to Europe, that is, prior to the negative impressions which resulted from his European travels and which are so prominent in Winter Notes on Summer Impressions. Notes from the House of the Dead is characterized by a tolerance and appreciation of men of different types and backgrounds, and it might reasonably be assumed that Roman Catholicism benefits from this. Further, it seems likely that Ostrozhsky and Zh-ky were based on real-life characters whom Dostoyevsky himself had known while in prison, and who had had the chance to impress themselves upon him as individuals, rather than being seen as a function of a particular interpretation of Roman Catholicism, whether that of traditional Russian anti-Catholicism; or of the Slavophiles; or of the European press, of which Dostoyevsky was an avid reader.⁵⁰ Whatever the reasons, the fact remains that in Notes from the House of the Dead, however briefly, Dostoyevsky allows Roman Catholicism to be seen to function as a Christian religion.

The scarcity of sincere Catholic Christians in Dostoyevsky's writings could, of course, be a direct reflection of his conviction that the Roman Catholic Church had left the Christian path. Where could people in the Catholic countries of Europe learn about genuine Christianity if their Church preached a distorted Christ? Yet we saw in Chapter Two that Sonya Marmeladova in Crime and Punishment

apparently manages to be a Christian without much assistance from the Russian Orthodox Church, so logically Roman Catholics should be able to be Christians despite their Church. In fact, Dostoyevsky does not deny that there can be Christians who are also Catholics. In Diary of a Writer for 1876 he anticipates his critics to this effect, predicting their reaction to his claim that Catholicism has 'sold' Christ:

Oh, I have heard burning objections to this thought: I have been told that faith and the image of Christ continue to this day to dwell in the hearts of many Catholics in all their former truth and purity. This is undoubtedly true, but the main source has become muddy and has been poisoned forever.⁵¹

One factor which contributed to Dostoyevsky's conviction that individual Christians still existed in the West was, we would suggest, his inherent sympathy for the narod of any land, whom he regarded as essentially good. Thus he writes of Catholicism's alleged plan to appeal to the masses:

'[Catholicism] has tens of thousands of tempters, wise and devious heart-readers and psychologists, dialecticians and preachers, while the people have always and everywhere been straightforward and kind'.⁵² Prince Myshkin in The Idiot

makes a similar point when he is talking about Catholicism:

he refers to the 'holy, truthful, open-hearted, ardent feelings of the narod'.⁵³ The quotation points to much more

than Dostoyevsky's attachment to the narod, however: it is an extremely valuable, if ambiguous, indication of the role he assigns to the Roman Catholic Church in the business of producing Christians. In the extract, Dostoyevsky agrees that 'faith and the image of Christ' still dwell 'in the hearts of many Catholics in all their former truth and purity'.

Yet at the beginning of this chapter we were told that Catholicism preaches a distorted Christ. This suggests that the true and pure image of Christ which is in the hearts of individual Catholics must either have come from somewhere other than the Roman Catholic Church, or is innate. If it has come from elsewhere, then there is no role for the Roman Catholic Church to play in the provision of the image of Christ. If it is innate, then there is no role for any Church to play: in other words, Christianity is not dependent upon an institutionalized Church. This would presumably explain why Sonya Marmeladova can be a Christian without the Church. The second half of the quotation introduces a note of ambiguity into this apparently straightforward state of affairs, however. It is true that the image of Christ is in the people's hearts, says Dostoyevsky, 'but the main source has become muddy and has been poisoned forever'. This qualification might be taken as an implication that there is after all some sort of necessary relationship between the individual Christian and the institutionalized Church, even though the logical implication of the first half of the quotation is that the state of the 'source' is irrelevant to the state of the individual believer. It thus becomes less certain that there is no role at all for the Roman Catholic Church to play.

A similar ambiguity characterizes remarks made by Dostoyevsky in 1873 regarding the path France must take if she is to win her struggle against atheism. France thinks that Catholicism will help her in this struggle, says Dostoyevsky, but she is wrong: 'France must be saved by

bringing her intellectuals back to God, by pouring the grace¹ of Christ into the hearts of millions of "unchristened" French workers, and for the first time acquainting them with His holy image'.⁵⁴ By thus denying that Roman Catholicism can save France, and by identifying 'God', 'grace' and 'Christ's holy image' as the things which can save France, Dostoyevsky implies that these three things are not to be found in Roman Catholicism. We may note the by now familiar distinction between Roman Catholicism and genuine Christianity. We might also note once again the centrality of the image of Christ to Dostoyevsky's conception of Christianity. In both these ways the extract confirms what we have seen already. In another way, however, Dostoyevsky's words complicate what has gone before, for they imply that 'grace' and 'the image of Christ' can be given to the French people by an external agency. This contradicts Dostoyevsky's earlier implication that knowledge of Christ is innate, and its existence independent of external agencies. But it also leads one to ask where, if the true image of Christ is to be given to men by France, that image may be obtained. We have been assured many times that the Roman Catholic Church does not possess it, but no other source is identified by Dostoyevsky, and the problem thus remains unsolved.

In 1880 Dostoyevsky again maintains that Christians may yet be found in the West: 'Yes, in the West there is in truth no longer Christianity, there is no Church, although there still are many Christians, who will never disappear'.⁵⁵ For Dostoyevsky to say that there is no 'Church' in the West might initially appear odd, since this chapter has been

concerned precisely with his thoughts on the major, Roman Catholic, Church in the West. As was the case in 'At Tikhon's', so here, apparently, Dostoyevsky does not use the word 'Church' to signify an institution.⁵⁶ Instead, 'Church' is associated with Christianity: and 'Christianity' is in turn associated with the existence of Christians. The term 'Church' is used in a similar manner by Myshkin in The Idiot, when he too admits that individual Christians still exist in the West, and comments: 'the Church could never disappear completely'.⁵⁷ But whereas Myshkin's words seem to suggest that the 'Church' exists so long as there are a few individual Christians, in the extract under consideration even the existence of 'many Christians' does not, apparently, constitute either a 'Church' or 'Christianity'. We can only infer that in this instance Dostoyevsky is using the terms 'Church' and 'Christianity' to refer to a situation where all men in a given society are Christians: or that in the West some extra element is required in order to constitute a Church.

What we have so far seen in this chapter would seem to justify our initial hypothesis that Dostoyevsky's presentation of Roman Catholicism might have important implications for his attitude to the role and nature of institutionalized religion in general. As we now turn from the journals to the novels, we will be concerned to see whether Dostoyevsky's presentation of Catholicism is modified in any way. In view of his oft-repeated conviction that Roman Catholicism has nothing to do with true Christianity, it should not come as a surprise to discover that of the characters in Dostoyevsky's

fiction who turn to, or are attracted by, Roman Catholicism - characters such as Ivan Petrovich and Aglaya Yepanchina in The Idiot, and Versilov in A Raw Youth - none does so for what could be called genuinely spiritual reasons. A common feature of these characters is that they are members of the aristocracy. As we saw in the introductory section to this chapter, it was historically true of nineteenth-century Russia that many members of the aristocracy turned to Catholicism, so in one sense Dostoyevsky's aristocratic Catholics are simply a reflection of reality. It is also appropriate to remember, however, that Dostoyevsky had a very low opinion of the spiritual state of the upper classes: in 1873, for example, he wrote: 'It is a remarkable thing that religious liberalism, indifference and, finally, atheism, have always, in every century and epoch, been the ailments of the higher, aristocratic levels of society'.⁵⁸ The fact that it is primarily members of the upper classes whom he depicts as would-be converts to Catholicism thus takes on extra significance, and is further evidence of his low opinion of the Roman Catholic Church. Dostoyevsky felt that the aristocracy had lost its roots in the narod, and with them its true religion. He associated this ailment particularly with those Russians who emigrated to - or even only travelled around - Europe. In Winter Notes on Summer Impressions he remarks that such people are inclined to be attracted to Catholicism, and that they 'begin to listen to Catholic Paters'.⁵⁹ Not all Russians who turned to Catholicism were 'rootless' and irreligious betrayers of their homeland; and undoubtedly in many cases Catholicism satisfied genuine spiritual longings. But Dostoyevsky's

presentation of Russian Catholics admits of no such possibility. 222

His Catholic converts are invariably associated with alienation from Russia: Ivan Petrovich and Versilov are abroad at the time of their Catholic involvement; and Aglaya Yepanchina marries a foreigner. Aglaya, in fact, becomes a Catholic in very scandalous circumstances, having run off with a Polish count, and subsequently fallen under the influence of a Jesuit confessor. All of this is entirely in keeping with her flamboyant character, but it discredits Catholicism no less for that.

Versilov's attraction to Catholicism is not scandalous in this way. Catholicism plays the same role for him that we saw it play for France and Italy: it gives him a central 'idea' at a time when he is wandering, both literally and metaphorically speaking. This is appropriate for a novel like A Raw Youth, which laments the lack of a unifying idea in society. A similar role is allotted to Catholicism in Dostoyevsky's plans for Atheism: Roman Catholicism was to be one of the ideologies the hero temporarily adopted as he searched for a satisfying 'idea' to replace his lost faith. It was not the final solution: that place was reserved for Russian Orthodoxy. Versilov in A Raw Youth does show signs of spirituality when he becomes a Catholic, but his religion is not characterized by joy or happiness: rather, he mortifies his flesh by wearing heavy chains, and he becomes intolerant and inhumane. This is the type of spirituality we have seen Dostoyevsky reject since the very beginning of his literary career.

Dostoyevsky's conviction that genuine spiritual concern

plays little part in the Russian aristocracy's attraction to Catholicism is admirably demonstrated by Ivan Petrovich in The Idiot, who takes it upon himself to provide an explanation of the phenomenon: 'It's all because of our . . . tiredness, I think . . . and the way they have of preaching . . . eloquent, individual . . . and they know how to frighten you'.⁶¹ His own imprecise mumbling illustrates the very point which he - and Dostoyevsky - is making. The upper classes are not healthy or sound, and neither are the reasons for which they turn to Catholicism: apathy, superstitious fear, aesthetic considerations. Ivan Petrovich's words are complimentary neither to the Russian aristocracy nor to Rome. In fact, the reputation of Roman Catholicism suffers greatly in The Idiot, not just at the hands of Ivan Petrovich. From the beginning of the novel what can only be described as a 'smear campaign' against Catholicism is carried out. Lebedev is the central character in this campaign, one of the aims of which, it would appear, is to posit a link between Roman Catholicism and eroticism. The campaign consists of a number of apparently trivial remarks and anecdotes, none of which is particularly convincing or significant in itself, but which together acquire some force. These remarks are frequently made apparently in passing, as when Lebedev, while relating the tale of Madame du Barry, decides that the best way to illustrate the esteem in which this lady was held is to reveal that 'a Cardinal, a papal nuncio, took it upon himself to put her silk stockings upon her bare legs, and even deemed it an honour'.⁶² The response of Lebedev's audience to this information is the same as usual:

they regard it as a fabrication. Nevertheless, the connection 224
between Catholicism and eroticism has been made, and the fact
that Lebedev is a renowned liar and buffoon does not prevent
this association from establishing itself in the reader's
mind.

A similar association is made in A Raw Youth, where we
learn that Lambert's mother is having an amorous affair with
the Roman Catholic Abbot Rigo.⁶³ At the same time, financial
gain is presented as something dear to the Catholic Church:
Rigo seems to be as interested in Lambert's mother's money
as he is in the lady herself. This alleged link between
Catholic priests, women and women's money is noted by Dostoy-
evsky as early as Winter Notes on Summer Impressions, where he
describes the devious means adopted by the Jesuits in order
to win over people - particularly women - and consequently
appropriate their inheritances.⁶⁴ Various remarks in Dostoy-
evsky's notebooks for 1864/5 would seem to indicate the
sort of thought process which went on in his mind when he
considered Catholic priests in this context. The contents
of the notebook in question suggest that Roman Catholicism
often occupied Dostoyevsky's thoughts at this period: there
are several entries devoted to the subject, including the
fragment 'Socialism and Christianity' and references to
articles in the press which relate to Catholicism. The
following remarks, which are grouped together in the notebook,
do not directly refer to any one of Dostoyevsky's works,
but they seem to bear at least a distant relationship to the
type of treatment Roman Catholicism receives at Lebedev's
hands in The Idiot:

Catholicism (the power of hell). Celibacy. Relationship to women at confession. Erotic illnesses. There is a certain subtlety here which could be understood only by the most underground, constant debauchery (Marquis de Sade). It's remarkable that all the debauched little books are attributed to debauched clerics, sitting in the Bastille, then entering the revolution, for tobacco and a bottle of wine. Influence through women. Michelet's book.⁶⁵

Brumfield relates this particular thought process to a French libertine novel called Thérèse the Philosopher (1749), a 'debauched little book' like the one mentioned in the extract, and which Dostoyevsky knew.⁶⁶ The 'philosophy' alluded to in the title is that of sexual licence based on rationalist principles: a priest character in the book teaches 'a satirical combination of religious and sexual ecstasy . . . in which the expression of spiritual devotion is conveyed in the language of physical love'.⁶⁷ Brumfield notes that Dostoyevsky himself adopts the motif of the erotically inclined French priest for use in The Brothers Karamazov, during Ivan's conversation with his devil. The devil relates how a young woman is rebuked by a priest for having 'fallen' again. She responds tearfully: 'But Father, it gives him so much pleasure, and it's so little trouble for me!', thus parodying the Enlightenment idea of rationalist ethics.⁶⁸ The devil's grand finale is to reveal that the priest proceeds to arrange a rendezvous with the girl concerned for himself for that very evening.

Not all the comments which contribute to the anti-Catholic campaign in The Idiot imply the existence of an erotic link. But even those which are on a slightly higher level than Lebedev's tale about the papal nuncio share with the latter

the dubious merit of inclusion solely on the grounds that they 226
bring the Roman Catholic Church into disrepute. Almost none
of the comments is strictly necessary to the plot of the novel.
Thus when Nastasya Filippovna wants to describe Rogozhin's
state of mind when she refuses to forgive him, she uses the
illustration of Henry at Canossa, who was humbled for three
days by a remorseless Pope Gregory VII before being granted
a pardon.⁶⁹ There must have been other illustrations open
to Dostoyevsky. The extent to which Dostoyevsky is prepared
to go in The Idiot in order to include a remark derogatory
to the Roman Catholic Church is well illustrated when the
narrator relates an anti-Catholic anecdote to illustrate
what is in any event no more than a completely unfounded
rumour about Myshkin. The reader thereby incidentally learns
about a fraudulent Catholic priest, who, having once taken
his priestly vows, immediately declares himself an atheist.⁷⁰
Perhaps the most ludicrous reference to Roman Catholicism
comes from Lebedev, who refers to the Pope using a feminine
adjective: rimskaya papa.⁷¹ No one knows why, least of all
Lebedev himself, but the grammatical 'error' adds to the
generally unworthy treatment Catholicism receives.

The abundance of anti-Catholic comments in The Idiot
may be connected with the fact that Dostoyevsky was abroad
when he wrote the novel. His wife's diary suggests that he
was not very happy in Europe, and this may have caused him
to take a jaundiced view of things, Roman Catholicism among
them. One does not receive the impression that Dostoyevsky
intended such slurs on the Roman Catholic Church to have any
wider application, either to other specific confessions, or to

institutionalized religion in general: their target is purely and simply Catholicism.

The 'smear campaign' in The Idiot is Dostoyevsky's anti-Catholic propaganda at its lowest level. It is nevertheless precisely such worthless criticism which provides the background for the rather more serious anti-Catholic accusations made by Prince Myshkin at the end of the novel. The crude anti-Catholic slurs will inevitably have penetrated the reader's mind to some extent by the time of the outburst, and they may well incline him to respond to what is said more sympathetically than would otherwise be the case. Myshkin's outburst which, as we have remarked earlier, precedes the charges made against the Roman Catholic Church in the journals, occurs during a dinner party at the home of the Yepanchin family.⁷² The tone of the conversation prior to Myshkin's interruption is light and good-humoured. It is true that Ivan Petrovich has intimated that death is a fate preferable to falling foul of the Jesuits; and there has been a certain amount of breast-beating over the aristocracy's own guilt in this area, as we saw above, but nothing so far has spoiled the dinner party. Myshkin, however, offends everyone's sense of propriety when he responds to the claim that his guardian, Pavlishchev, became a Catholic, by saying: 'Pavlishchev was a bright spirit and a Christian, a genuine Christian . . . how then could he submit to a . . . non-Christian faith? . . . Catholicism is just the same as a non-Christian faith'.⁷³ Myshkin's remarks amount to a much more serious accusation against Catholicism than anything intimated in the 'smear campaign',

and they express forcefully and economically the essence of what will subsequently be alleged by Dostoyevsky the publicist: Roman Catholicism has nothing to do with Christianity. In two short outbursts Myshkin brings against Catholicism all the charges with which we are familiar from our study of the journals: Catholicism preaches a distorted Christ, when it claims that Christianity cannot exist on earth without secular power; it is a continuation of the Roman Empire, and every aspect of it is subject to that overriding concern; it has deceived trusting people, although individual Catholic Christians still exist; it has given birth to socialism and atheism; and socialism is essentially the same as Catholicism, since 'it too is freedom through violence, it too is unity through the sword and blood'.⁷⁴

In one respect, however, there is a difference between the journals and Myshkin's outburst, and it is this difference which will occupy our attention. The context in which Myshkin's remarks are spoken seems at first sight to deprive them of some of their force, as if Dostoyevsky were trying to discredit them, or to distance himself from them to some extent. This distancing process is visible both before and after the outburst. First, Myshkin is in a highly excited state. Pavlishchev, the alleged convert to Catholicism, has been the most important person in his life to date, so the Prince is bound to react violently to what is said. Myshkin's comments throughout the novel have in any event tended to be extreme and to lack proportion: it is unlikely that his assessment of Catholicism will be different in this respect. Further, we have been prepared to expect that something terrible will happen

at the dinner party: everything is ripe for a skandal, a Dostoyevskian occasion not characterized by balanced reactions or well-reasoned responses. After the outburst everything is, by contrast, very reasonable. Myshkin asks forgiveness 'for everything, as well as the vase': 'everything' presumably includes his anti-Catholic accusations, and his words suggest that he retracts what he said.⁷⁵ By having his hero behave in such a manner, Dostoyevsky would appear to be acknowledging that Myshkin's harsh judgement of Catholicism is indeed unfair, and should be modified. At the same time, however, the characters at the dinner party who object to Myshkin's views are themselves completely discredited. They are shallow people, full of self-importance, and concerned only to maintain decorum. This is why what Myshkin says offends them so. They do not have any sincere religious feelings themselves, whereas Myshkin is shown to be consciously Christian, and arguably in a better position to pass judgement. Further, the period immediately before an epileptic fit, which is when Myshkin makes his speech, was highly valued by Dostoyevsky as a time of heightened awareness, a time when, more than at any other, the 'higher' truth was likely to be spoken.⁷⁶ Therefore, rather than distancing himself from what Myshkin says, as initially appears to be the case, Dostoyevsky might arguably be said to be endorsing his remarks. And by including them at such a dramatic point in the novel he has certainly ensured that they will be remembered.

There is some similarity here with the expression of Shatov's views on Roman Catholicism in The Devils, which are also pronounced upon a memorable occasion: Stavrogin's visit

to his former disciple, made at the dead of night.⁷⁷ Once again, the atmosphere is tense and heightened, and the character concerned is known to hold extreme views. The mode of presentation chosen by Dostoyevsky increases the impact of the words when they eventually come: Shatov takes us layer by layer into what Stavrogin taught him, and each successive layer further refines the character's peculiar and extreme religious world-view:

'Do you remember your expression: "An atheist can't be a Russian, an atheist immediately ceases to be a Russian", do you remember that? . . . I'll remind you of something else - at the same time you said: "Someone who's not Orthodox can't be a Russian" . . . But you went even further: you believed that Roman Catholicism was no longer Christianity'.⁷⁸

Again, as in Myshkin's outburst, Dostoyevsky begins with the essence of his attack: Roman Catholicism is not Christianity. The explanation for this accusation soon follows: 'Rome has proclaimed a Christ who gave in to the third temptation of the Devil and . . . having announced to the whole world that Christ cannot last without an earthly kingdom, Catholicism has thus proclaimed the Antichrist and thereby brought disaster to the whole Western world'.⁷⁹ The charge that Catholicism is nothing but a state comes a little later, when Shatov discusses the gods which various nations have taken unto themselves: 'Rome deified the narod in the form of a state and bequeathed to the peoples of the world the State'.⁸⁰

These views are the same as those expressed in The Idiot and the journals. Once again, however, there are signs of a process of distancing and discrediting which potentially deprives them of some of their force. First, Shatov himself

is to some extent distanced from the criticisms, since he presents them, analytically, as former beliefs of Stavrogin and does not claim them directly as his own - although as the conversation develops it becomes clear that they are now his own. The anti-Catholic remarks are arguably undermined most of all, however, by the fact that the entire conversation between Shatov and Stavrogin is problematical. It consists of an exposition of views which we know were dear to Dostoyevsky himself, and which played an important part in his religious world-view. Yet the very basis upon which these views rest, faith in God, is called into doubt when Stavrogin forces Shatov to say whether he believes in God, and Shatov effectively admits that he does not: 'I ... I will believe in God'.⁸¹ This admission would appear to cast doubt upon the value of Shatov's assessment not only of Catholicism, but of any religious matter. At this point in the conversation it seems that Dostoyevsky is disowning what might plausibly be supposed to be his own religious views, or at least acknowledging their very idiosyncratic nature. As in The Idiot, Dostoyevsky would appear to be retracting his character's uncompromising views on Catholicism. Yet from this crisis point Shatov recovers, and the conversation ends with him sending Stavrogin to visit Bishop Tikhon. His positive views would thus appear to be re-established, and with them his right to pass judgement on Roman Catholicism. Once again, the impression of 'distancing' proves to be something of a hoax.

Certain differences do, then, exist between the presentation of Roman Catholicism in Dostoyevsky's journals and novels respectively. In the journals, Dostoyevsky's views on

the Roman Catholic Church are expressed at some length, and the same point may be made several times. In the novels, on the contrary, his views are expressed with great economy and force. In the journals the accusations are made directly and unambiguously: in the novels, Dostoyevsky seems at first sight to be 'distancing' himself from the accusations. However, a closer look at the context for the remarks reveals that the distancing techniques are in fact rendered invalid or at least considerably weakened, and the accusations thereby effectively endorsed. There is thus no real 'modification' of Dostoyevsky's views, and the essential message remains the same: Roman Catholicism is not Christianity, because Christianity is above all a spiritual force, but Rome has distorted it and made it into a secular state.

By this stage in the present chapter there would appear to be little doubt but that Dostoyevsky experienced the same hostility towards the Roman Catholic Church as had so many other Russians throughout the centuries. Some of the things to which he objected were concerned specifically with Catholicism: the Pope's claim to be head of all the Christian Churches, for example; and the decree of Papal Infallibility. But Dostoyevsky's most fundamental objections to Roman Catholicism, as we have seen, had serious implications not just for Rome, but for the whole of Christendom. He seemed to dissociate Christ and Christianity from any type of secular power, and to be suggesting that Christ intended Christianity to be an inner, purely spiritual force, which had no need of a structure to be effective. The question which must be asked

is whether Dostoyevsky simply meant that Churches should not build empires; or whether he felt that there was no room for any form of organization or structure in Christianity. Was it a question of degree, with the Roman Catholic Church the most guilty culprit; or was Dostoyevsky dealing in absolutes, and merely making Rome the scapegoat for all Churches, the Russian Orthodox Church in their number? It is with these questions in mind that we now proceed to the 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor'.

We remarked earlier that the two Polish Catholic prisoners in Notes from the House of the Dead are unusual in the context of Dostoyevsky's writings, since they are effectively allowed to speak for themselves rather than being presented as a function of Dostoyevsky's anti-Catholic polemic. The reader has to wait until the 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor' to meet another Catholic who is allowed to state his own case - or at least someone who seems to be a Catholic. In connection with this qualification, and in view of the long-standing debate over the extent to which the 'Legend' refers specifically to Roman Catholicism, it might appear to be 'anticipating matters to include our discussion of the 'Legend' in the present chapter. Our initial justification for so doing is that superficially at least the 'Legend' is about Roman Catholicism: the context is a phenomenon in the history of Catholicism, the 'Inquisition' in sixteenth-century Spain; and the Grand Inquisitor is a Cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church. Using these criteria, the 'Legend' belongs to this chapter. For the purposes of the present study, the 'Legend'

may usefully be approached in two stages: first, an analysis of what it implies about the concept of institutionalized religion and the nature of true Christianity; and second, an assessment of the significance of its Roman Catholic setting.⁸²

The 'Legend' describes a meeting between the Grand Inquisitor and Christ, who has returned to earth for a brief visit fifteen hundred years after His death and His promise to come again. During the meeting, The Inquisitor recalls the occasion when Christ was tempted by the Devil in the wilderness, and he rebukes Christ for having refused to succumb. The Inquisitor claims that the temptations constituted a crucial point in history: Christ had the chance to determine and settle the whole destiny of mankind, but He refused. This is not, of course, the first reference to Christ's temptations in the present chapter: we have already seen how the accusation that the Roman Catholic Church has given in to the temptation of the kingdoms of the world is fundamental to Dostoyevsky's analysis of Roman Catholicism as presented in the journals and the novels prior to The Brothers Karamazov. In the 'Legend', the Inquisitor refers not just to the third temptation, but to all three, which he invests with symbolic value. The most important difference between the 'Legend' and previous references to the temptations, however, is that we are given a profound insight into the motives both of Christ and of those who decided to 'correct' His work. Christ's decision to reject the temptations is seen to have profound implications for Christianity in general; while the decision to accept the

'sword of Caesar' is seen to be prompted by something more than a mere grasping desire for secular power.

In discussions of the 'Legend', attention is usually focused upon the differences of opinion between the Inquisitor and Christ. The fundamental disagreement between them is about the nature of man; specifically, man's ability to respond to Christianity under the conditions apparently imposed by Christ when He withstood the temptations. The Inquisitor interprets Christ's action as a symbolic rejection of 'miracle, mystery and authority'. He admits that Christ acted nobly in the wilderness, but claims that He ignored the needs of man in so doing. Man does not want freedom, says the Inquisitor: he wants certainties and rules. Christ gave him the opposite:

Instead of firm foundations for appeasing man's conscience once and for all, you chose everything that was exceptional, enigmatic and vague . . . Instead of taking possession of man's freedom, you multiplied it . . . Instead of the strict ancient law, man had in future to decide for himself with a free heart what is good and what is evil, having only your image before him as a guide.⁶³

According to the Inquisitor, therefore, man craves precisely the 'miracle, mystery and authority' which Christ rejected. To ask him to manage without them is to ask him to act in a way contrary to his nature, and thus to place unreasonable demands upon him. The Inquisitor has a low opinion of man: he stresses his needs and inherent weaknesses, and has no confidence in his ability to overcome them. Christ, claims the Inquisitor, assesses man too highly when He asks him to rise above material concerns and to live without certainties

and a firm framework.

This fundamental disagreement between the Inquisitor and Christ informs the whole of the 'Legend'. For the purposes of the present study, however, it is important to look closely at the areas of agreement between the two. Indeed, perhaps the most surprising thing about the 'Legend' is the extent to which there is agreement. The Inquisitor does not try to hide the fact that Christ acted as He did in the wilderness. He quite openly admits that Christ rejected the three temptations and with them the material and psychological supports for mankind which the Devil was offering, and which the Inquisitor seems at first sight to be saying would have constituted an aid to Christianity, a 'bridge' to bring weak mankind to Christ. He thus acknowledges that Christ defined Christianity as something which must not depend upon 'miracle, mystery and authority'. At various points in their encounter, the Inquisitor tries to give the impression that Christ's action was prompted by pride and vanity: Christ, he says, wanted men to come to Him freely, 'fascinated and captivated' by Him.⁸⁴ But a closer look reveals that the Inquisitor himself knows that Christ had to act as He did. He knows that if Christ had given in to the temptations, He would have been looking for signs and wonders, rather than living by faith. As a result, His faith would have been destroyed. The Inquisitor is under no illusions about this, as is revealed by his comments about Christ's refusal to throw Himself down from the temple:

Oh, you knew very well that in taking just one step, in making just one move to cast yourself down, you would at once have tempted God and would have lost all your faith

in Him, and you would have been dashed to pieces against the earth you came to save, and the wise spirit who tempted you would have rejoiced.⁸⁵

The fact that these words are delivered in a sarcastic and scornful manner makes them no less significant: they amount to an acknowledgement from the Inquisitor that Christian faith is and must be as Christ defined it in the wilderness. They tell us that to seek material signs and certainties is not just to lessen or weaken Christian faith, but to destroy it completely: Christianity must rest on pure faith alone. There is therefore no such thing as Christianity which can be attained through tangible and visible aids: the Inquisitor rejects as much as Christ does the concept of Christianity dependent upon compulsion and secular power. There is no need to ask whose side Dostoyevsky is on so far as this message is concerned, since both the Inquisitor and Christ represent the same view. What they disagree about is whether man can cope with such Christianity. Like his creator, Ivan Karamazov, the Inquisitor accepts that things are as they are, but he rejects them as unfair to mankind, and decides to 'return his entrance ticket'.⁸⁶

The Inquisitor is faced with a dilemma. He acknowledges that Christianity does not and must not depend upon concrete manifestations and assurances: but he is equally convinced that man cannot manage without them. Of crucial importance for our purposes is that he makes no attempt to solve the dilemma as it stands. He does not try to reconcile the two truths, but immediately accepts that they are irreconcilable: the nature of Christianity has been decided once and for all; and the nature of man, as conceived by the Inquisitor, is

equally unchangeable. Instead, the Inquisitor deals with the consequences of the problem: men cannot be Christians. However, men want to be Christians, and are driven to desperation if they think that they are leading a Godless life. The Inquisitor knows this, indeed, it is central to his plan. He will create for men the illusion that they are Christians: he will provide them with a Church, institutionalized religion. He will create the illusion that organized religion is a means to Christianity, a necessary mediator between Man and God. He will focus men's attention upon the mediator, rather than upon the alleged ultimate aim, so that people will think that in fulfilling the demands of the Church they are serving God.

As we have seen, the Inquisitor knows that what he is doing is a distortion of Christ. He knows that his Church does not bridge the gap which he claims exists between men and God. It is rather a symbol of that gap, a diversionary tactic devised for the sake of men, built upon all that was unacceptable to Christ. If organized religion were effective, then the Inquisitor would have no quarrel with Christ, for however weak men were, they would still be able to use the mediation of the Church to reach God. But it is not effective. Thus both Christ and the Grand Inquisitor reject the concept of organized religion as a mediator between men and God. Each of them thinks and acts in terms of Christianity or the Church, not Christianity through the Church. Christ demonstrated this conviction when He withstood the temptations: had He succumbed to them, He would effectively have authorized the establishment of a Church which operated on the material level. The Inquisitor demonstrates it when he admits that his Church is a

beautiful illusion, because the truth would be too terrible for men to bear.

The 'Legend' tells us that Christ did not authorize the existence of two levels of Christianity: one for the élite, who can manage without a tangible and authoritarian Church; and one for the masses, who need precisely such a Church. His actions in the wilderness proclaimed one type of Christianity for all: a Christianity which has nothing to do with institutionalized religion. Institutionalized religion is serving not Christ, but the Devil. This claim, bold as it may seem, is merely the logical consequence of giving in to the third temptation. Had Christ yielded, then He would have been agreeing to bow down to the Devil. The Inquisitor has actually taken this step. It is a stark choice between Christ and the Devil, and the Inquisitor knows that there is no middle way: 'And so we have taken the sword of Caesar and, having taken it, we of course rejected you and followed ⁸⁷ Him'.

The rejection of institutionalized religion in the 'Legend' is much more radical and far-reaching than the anti-Church attitude characteristic of the Utopian Socialist thinkers who influenced Dostoyevsky in the eighteen-forties, and to whom we referred in Chapter One. The Utopian Socialists claimed that 'Churchianity' had been substituted for Christianity, just as is claimed in the 'Legend'. However, they did not deny completely that there could be any such thing as institutionalized religion. Rather, they considered that Christianity had been devalued through the process of institutionalization. They felt that people were pleased that the established Church existed, because they could then

concentrate upon church attendance and ritual, and conveniently ignore any deeper claims Christianity might make upon their lives. How tragically different things are in the Grand Inquisitor's Church, where the people go to church because they truly believe that in so doing they are being Christians. Only the Inquisitor and his hierarchy know that institutionalized religion is a myth. The 'Legend' is not simply a call for a renewal of the official Church, for an injection of genuine spiritual concern: it is a call for the abolition of the official Church as something which is the embodiment of all that Christ rejected.

The 'Legend' is not merely negative, concerned only to say what does not constitute true Christianity: it also implies what Christianity should be, and points to how it can function despite having rejected secular and material means. Since Christ Himself does not speak in the 'Legend', many of the definitions of true Christianity come from the Inquisitor, and they are consequently delivered with a mixture of sarcasm and incredulity. This is how it must be, since the Inquisitor does not believe that such Christianity is at all appropriate for men. Perhaps for this very reason, he does not attempt to hide what Christ intended should replace 'miracle, mystery and authority'. First, the 'Legend' confirms our findings in the first part of this chapter to the effect that central to Dostoyevsky's conception of Christianity is the figure of Christ. All that the Inquisitor says is based upon the assumption that Christ's actions defined the nature of true Christianity. In fact, the focus of attention is even narrower than that: it is Christ in a very specific setting, the Christ

of the wilderness. Certain concepts are to the fore in the Christianity established by Christ. The leitmotif, provided by the Inquisitor himself, is freedom, a word which is continually on his lips as he assesses Christ's actions:

Was it not you who said so often in those days: 'I shall make you free?'⁸⁸

You wanted man's free love so that he should follow you freely.⁸⁹

Instead of taking control of people's freedom, you gave them greater freedom than ever.⁹⁰

Man had in future to decide for himself with a free heart...⁹¹

There must be no element of compulsion: Christianity must be based on the free movement of love from man to Christ. This is why the temptations had to be rejected: anything stemming from the tangible and visible proof provided by 'miracle, mystery and authority' would not be freely motivated.

Intrinsically linked to the emphasis in Christ's Christianity upon freedom is the prominence given to faith, which must be unconditional and not dependent upon external agencies and signs. The motif 'by faith alone' - which, it should be noted, is a Protestant motif - is introduced early in the 'Legend' by Ivan, as he gives Alyosha some background details. Ivan quotes some lines of verse to describe the plight of the people who have received no signs from heaven for so long: 'Trust what thy heart doth tell thee/There are no pledges from above'.⁹² He responds to this idea sarcastically: 'And only the faith in what your heart tells you remains!'⁹³ He personally seems to have little confidence that men can live by faith alone, and he does not seriously

entertain the notion. Yet the concept which is here presented with incredulity and sarcasm is seen to be fundamental to the type of Christianity represented by Christ in the 'Legend': men are indeed to have faith only in what their hearts tell them.

It is the heart, not the mind, which is prominent: at no point in the 'Legend' is it implied that Christianity is a theoretical matter which demands from man a grasp of abstract theological concepts. 'Heart' becomes as much a leitmotif of Christ's Christianity as freedom. We have already seen that men have to choose between good and bad 'with a free heart', and this is confirmed when the Inquisitor remarks incredulously that for the most critical spiritual decisions man is left with only 'the free decision of the heart'.⁹⁴ When Christ first appears in the 'Legend', attention is drawn to His heart, as it if were actually visible: thus we read that 'the Sun of Love shines in His heart'.⁹⁵ And it is the masses' hearts which are affected by Christ: they stir with responsive love. It is in the people's hearts, it seems, that may be found that which will enable them, despite the Inquisitor's doubts, to respond to Christ. They seem to have an innate knowledge of Christ, as may be illustrated with reference to Ivan's description of their response when Christ first appears:

He appeared quietly, inconspicuously, but everyone - for some strange reason - recognized Him. That might have been one of the finest passages in my poem - why they recognized Him, I mean. The people are drawn to Him by an irresistible force, they surround Him, they throng about Him, they follow Him.⁹⁶

Without Ivan knowing it - or, perhaps, without him wanting to admit it - this is indeed one of the finest passages in his poem. The recognition process which takes place between the people of Seville and Christ before Christ has said or done anything suggests that He knew what He was doing when He rejected the temptations: it suggests that no external agents are needed for faith to occur, but that man's knowledge and love of Christ are innate. For where otherwise could the people of Seville have acquired their knowledge of Christ? The Grand Inquisitor has done all he can to keep a true knowledge of Christ away from them: he rebukes Christ for coming to meddle, and intends to get rid of Him as quickly as possible. Yet clearly the Inquisitor has been unable to keep the people completely from a knowledge of Christ: the reason why they recognize Him can only be that they were born with such a knowledge. This would appear to confirm the hypothesis we made earlier in this chapter, when we were examining the implications of Dostoyevsky's statement that there were still Christians in the Roman Catholic Church despite Rome's alleged distortion of Christ. It also further isolates the comment which Dostoyevsky made in 1873, when he seemed to suggest that an external agent had a part to play in implanting the image of Christ in people's hearts.⁹⁷

Admittedly, the 'Legend' demonstrates that a distorted Church can affect the people's conception of Christ to a certain extent: it can persuade them that Christ said and did other than what was actually the case. But it equally suggests that the true image of Christ can never be completely erased from men's hearts, and that they will respond to the true Christ

when they see Him. Perhaps deep down the Inquisitor knows this: perhaps that is why he puts so much emphasis upon the need to keep Christ from the people, and makes it his constant concern to contain Christ and to reduce Him to an historical figure. Dostoyevsky suggests in the 'Legend' that Christ cannot be restricted to an historical role, but exists throughout time in the hearts of men.

Although the faith which Christ represents comes from the heart, not from the intellect, there is one very specific sense in which He is in fact associated with the mind. This stems from the emphasis which is placed in the 'Legend' upon freedom: Christ is associated not just with freedom in the broad sense, but also specifically with freedom of inquiry. This motif is first hinted at indirectly at the beginning of the 'Legend', when Ivan refers to the rise of the Lutheran Church and mentions in particular the questioning of miracles by Lutherans: 'Just then there appeared in the North, in Germany, a terrible new heresy . . . These heresies began blasphemously to deny the existence of miracles'.⁹⁸ The theme is picked up when Christ appears and we read that 'rays of Light, Enlightenment and Power stream from His eyes'.⁹⁹ (My emphasis.) The Inquisitor later associates Christ directly with free inquiry, implying that this is yet another curse which He has bequeathed to man: 'Freedom, a free mind and learning will lead them into such chaos . . . that some of them . . . will destroy themselves'.¹⁰⁰ As we have seen, it is still the heart which is most prominent in the 'Legend'. Nevertheless, the appearance of what is effectively a second Protestant motif (the first being sola fide) is worthy of note.

If one had to identify the leitmotif of the Inquisitor's concerns, then it would be happiness. He claims repeatedly to have acted so as to secure the happiness of mankind, and he attaches much more importance to happiness than to freedom. He considers that Christ passed on the task of making men happy to him and his followers:

You rejected the only way by which men might have been made happy, but fortunately, in departing, you handed on the work to us. You promised, and you confirmed it by your own word. You gave us the right to bind and to loose, and of course you can't possibly think of taking that right away from us now.¹⁰¹

The Inquisitor is here referring to Christ's words to the Apostle Peter, as recorded in the Gospels:

And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.¹⁰²

As may be seen, 'happiness' as such is not mentioned in the Bible verse in question. The overriding concern to make men happy seems to have come from the Inquisitor himself, who superimposes it on to Christ's words concerning the power to bind and to loose, and thereby establishes some sort of necessary relationship between the two. He and his followers now use the power to bind and to loose to bring about happiness. For example, they define what constitutes sin, rather than leaving man to decide for himself. Indeed, they even allow sin in certain circumstances: 'Oh, we shall allow them to sin too . . . We shall tell them that any sin can be atoned for, if it is done with our permission'.¹⁰³ It may be noted that the Inquisitor once again has a Biblical foundation for his words

and actions: permission specifically to forgive sins is given in St John's account of the Bible verse quoted above.¹⁰⁴ The Inquisitor's reference to these Bible verses inevitably raises the question of what Christ actually intended when He granted Peter the power to bind and to loose. Taken in isolation, the words might seem to imply that Christ did indeed authorize the establishment of a temporal body through which Christianity was to function and which could mediate between men and God, since it could say what was or was not permitted. Further, in Matthew's Gospel the words follow immediately after the verse which for Roman Catholics justifies the primacy of Rome: 'Thou art Peter and upon this rock will I build my Church'.¹⁰⁵

However, the Inquisitor himself does not attempt to interpret Christ's words in this way. He does not apparently see them as a contradiction of the rejection of institutionalized religion embodied in Christ's actions in the wilderness. Indeed, at no point in the 'Legend' does the Inquisitor attempt to suggest that Christ did in fact set up a Church. He as it were detaches the words concerning the power to bind and to loose from any wider context, and sees them merely as a means to make men happy. At no point does he suggest that Christ passed on the task of making men Christians. By including a reference to a Bible verse which could perhaps be used to undermine the fundamental message of the 'Legend' regarding institutionalized religion, and not interpreting it in terms of the establishment of a Church, Dostoyevsky effectively invalidates the power of the verse, and the basic message of the 'Legend' remains unchallenged.

The way in which the question of binding and loosing is

raised only to be ignored prompts the question of the extent to which what is presented in the 'Legend' is consistent with orthodox Christianity. Some critics have accused Dostoyevsky of misrepresenting Christ. Jones claims that 'the Christ of the Legend is not that of mainstream Christianity'.¹⁰⁶ Guardini writes that Dostoyevsky's Christ 'bears no relation to the domain of the average, which is the domain of the whole world and of everyday life'.¹⁰⁷ It might also be objected that Christ did in fact perform miracles and exert His authority. Quite a strong case may in fact be constructed in Dostoyevsky's defence. First, in the temptations in the wilderness as described in the Bible, Christ behaved exactly as Dostoyevsky relates, and refused to give in to the temptations.¹⁰⁸ To that extent, the Christ of the 'Legend' is consistent with the Christ of the Bible and Christianity. Further, Dostoyevsky clearly does not set out to deny that Christ performed miracles. Indeed, He is seen performing miracles during the course of the 'Legend' itself, and the miracles concerned are very memorable: the healing of the blind man; and the raising of the official's dead daughter. There is, however, a fundamental difference between these miracles and those which the Devil would have Christ perform: these are the result of faith in Christ, whereas the story of the temptations is about the use of miracles as the cornerstone of Christianity, as the very cause of faith. Guardini's accusation concerning the need to take into account the domain of the 'average' raises a slightly different question. One might respond by asking whether the Biblical Christ related to the domain of the average: was He not rather an offence and a stumbling block to everything

that was 'normal' and 'average'? One might add that a divine Christ is under no compunction to pay any heed to such concerns. In any event, as we have seen above, the 'ordinary' people of Seville as depicted in the 'Legend' certainly do not feel that they have been rejected by Christ: His behaviour in the wilderness does not seem to have initiated a rift between Him and the world.

The identity of the Christ of the 'Legend' is made more complex by the fact that it is not static: as Jones has pointed out, the way one responds to Dostoyevsky's Christ depends to a great extent upon the image of Christ which one already possesses.¹⁰⁹ Each reader comes to the 'Legend' with a different conception of Christ, and with a greater or lesser degree of sympathy for Him. To complicate matters further, there is also the question of whether Christ actually appears to the Inquisitor at all, a possibility advanced by Alyosha: 'Is this just an immense fantasy, or is it some sort of mistake by the old man, some incredible qui pro quo?'¹¹⁰ The response of Ivan is to ask whether it really matters, and his apparently careless response is in fact the most appropriate. For what is ultimately important is not whether the Christ of the 'Legend' answers in all respects to the Christ of the Bible - although we have tried to suggest that the difference might be far less than some would maintain - but that this is how Dostoyevsky has chosen to depict Christ in an episode which he himself referred to as a culminating point in The Brothers Karamazov, and which some would see as the culminating point of his entire career as a novelist.¹¹¹ This, we can say, is Dostoyevsky's conception of Christ: and

Problems surround not only the identity of Christ, but also that of the Grand Inquisitor. We saw in Chapter Three that contemporary commentators tended almost unanimously to identify the Grand Inquisitor and his hierarchy with the Roman Catholic Church. We ourselves justified the inclusion of the 'Legend' in the present chapter on the basis of certain contextual details which seemed to point unambiguously to the Roman Catholic Church. The Inquisitor refers to another date which seems to associate the 'Legend' with Roman Catholicism when he says that it is eight hundred years since the cause he represents first took up the 'sword of Caesar'. As Terras comments: 'In 756 King Pepin the Short of the Franks granted Ravenna to Pope Stephen III. Since [the 'Legend'] is set in the mid-sixteenth century, we may assume that Dostoevsky dates the Church's betrayal of Christ's legacy by that event. Also, after the second Nicaean Council (in 787), the last ecumenic council recognized by the Eastern Church, the Eastern and the Western Church drifted apart'.¹¹² Ivan himself makes a cross-reference to Roman Catholicism when he comments upon the Inquisitor's action in defying Christ to add anything to what He has said before: 'If you like', he remarks to Alyosha, 'this is the most fundamental feature of Roman Catholicism, in my opinion at any rate'.¹¹³

A further reason which might initially prompt one to associate the Church in the 'Legend' specifically with the Roman Catholic Church is that certain features with which it is endowed are reminiscent of Roman Catholicism as presented in Dostoyevsky's writings prior to the 'Legend'. The Inquisitor's

Church is, for example, associated with both socialism and 'the Roman idea'. The references to socialism are not direct, but implicit. Thus the Inquisitor agrees to finish building 'the tower' which men have been trying to construct, and which may be interpreted as the symbol for the socialists' efforts to build a just society without God.¹¹⁴ He also refers to the theory that sin is caused by an unjust society.¹¹⁵ There is nevertheless a difference between the journals and the 'Legend' in this respect. In the journals, the Roman Catholic Church was presented as wanting to exploit socialism if in so doing its own existence could be assured. In the 'Legend', the Inquisitor's relationship to socialism is not one of cynical exploitation for the sake of secular power: he is an observer of socialism, rather than a hanger-on. He sees socialism as an attempt by weak mankind to rebel. He will wait until socialism has failed, and will then step in to pick up the pieces, and to comfort mankind. Whereas previously we have been asked to believe that socialism is the direct result of Roman Catholicism, here the Inquisitor places the blame for the rise of socialism upon Christ.

The Inquisitor's relationship with the 'Roman idea' is similarly elevated to a higher plane than the relationship between Catholicism and the Roman Empire in the journals. In the latter case, the Roman Catholic Church's association with the Roman idea was connected solely with a desire for secular power: indeed, it was claimed that Catholicism had no existence outside the desire for secular power. There was not the slightest suggestion of humanitarian concern on the part of Catholicism, and people were merely a means to gaining yet more

influence. The Inquisitor, by contrast, claims to follow the Roman idea because it represents what man most desires: 'the need for universal unity is the third and last torment of man'.¹¹⁶ Dostoyevsky would seem to be suggesting that the Church which he has castigated so viciously elsewhere has a very exalted ideal behind it.

Alyosha Karamazov objects to this exalted treatment of Roman Catholicism. He offers another explanation of the Roman Catholic Church, one which corresponds to the interpretation of Rome given in the journals. He thereby effectively draws attention to the striking difference between the lofty motives given in the 'Legend' and what Dostoyevsky has alleged on previous occasions:

It's Rome, and not the whole of Rome either - it's an untruth. These are the worst of the Catholics - the inquisitors, the Jesuits! . . . We know the Jesuits, people speak badly of them, but are they the ones in your poem? They're not like that at all, not one bit... They are simply the Roman army for the establishment of a future universal earthly kingdom, with an emperor - the Roman Pontiff - at the head. That's their ideal - but there's no mystery or lofty sadness about it... It's nothing but a lust for power, for filthy earthly gains, enslavement.¹¹⁷

Although Alyosha's response corresponds to Dostoyevsky's own opinions as represented in the journals, it is made to look naive. Further, he reluctantly admits that Father Paisy has 'once said something of the same kind' as Ivan about Roman Catholicism, which adds force to the latter's claim that there is more to Catholicism than a mere lust for power.¹¹⁸ Ivan does not press his point, and contents himself with saying that there might be only one man in the Roman Catholic Church who has the humanitarian ideals of his Grand Inquisitor. But he

feels that at least one such has always existed, a conviction which necessitates a radical reappraisal of Roman Catholicism, as we have seen.

In the ways we have outlined above, the Church in the 'Legend' may be taken for the Roman Catholic Church, albeit a revised and more elevated version than the one we have previously met in Dostoyevsky's writings. In other ways, however, the Inquisitor does not necessarily represent one specific Church. The physical description we are given of him is reminiscent of the symbolic presentation of 'dark' religion in Dostoyevsky's early works. Like Murin in The Landlady, for example, the Inquisitor bears many features characteristic of the Romantic anti-hero:

He is an old man of nearly ninety, tall and upright, with a shrivelled face and sunken eyes, from which, however, yet shines a light like a fiery spark . . . He knits his thick grey brows and his eyes flash with sinister fire. He extends his finger and commands the guards to seize Him.¹¹⁹

This description contrasts markedly with that of Christ, who is characterized by light, sun and whiteness. The resemblance between the Inquisitor and Murin is not just physical: they have a common lack of faith in man's ability to cope with freedom, which they both see as a burden. ¹²⁰ The encounter between the Inquisitor and Christ thus recalls the encounter between 'dark' and 'light' religion in the early writings. According to such an interpretation, the Grand Inquisitor may be taken to represent not just Roman Catholicism, but any Church which functions through fear and oppression.

There are many respects in which the situation described

by Ivan in the 'Legend' could be seen to be suggestive of Russia rather than Europe. This applies particularly to his description of the people of Seville, who have been waiting for Christ for so long. We read, for example, that they long to suffer and die for Christ: 'The tears of mankind rise up to Him as before, [the people] love Him, they place their hope in Him, they yearn to suffer and die for Him as before'.¹²¹

The same people are depicted as living in iniquity, yet loving Christ like innocent children: 'And suddenly He wanted to appear to the people, if only for a moment - to the tormented, suffering people, sunk in filthy iniquity, but loving Him like little children'.¹²² These are features which Dostoyevsky felt to be particularly characteristic of the Russian narod, and to which he drew attention frequently on the pages of Diary of a Writer.¹²³ The impression that Russia may have been on Dostoyevsky's mind when he wrote the 'Legend' is further strengthened by the fact that Ivan quotes from a psalm in Church Slavonic. He also quotes a verse from Tyutchev, in which the poet writes of Christ walking around Russia. It might also be noted that the chronology of the 'Legend' ventures further than it strictly should. At times, the Inquisitor's account of the state of mankind is reminiscent of nineteenth-century revolutionary Europe rather than Spain at the time of the Inquisition: we have only to recall the implicit references to socialism to which we drew attention earlier.

The effect of such geographical and historical 'discrepancies' is to suggest that the area of applicability of the 'Legend' can be widened to take in all times and places. And

ultimately, of course, this must indeed be the case, for we have seen that Christ's rejection of the three temptations was categorical, not dependent upon cultural or historical circumstances. Since Christ's rejection of institutionalized religion was universally and eternally valid, so the Inquisitor becomes, as it were, universal and eternal. He is symbolic of anyone who has gone against Christ's wishes and has established institutionalized religion: he represents all Churches who attempt to put themselves forward as a necessary mediator between man and God. In view of this, it is appropriate that the actual conversation between the Inquisitor and Christ is divorced from any specific context. The two figures are cut off from the outside world, locked away in a prison cell. To this suspension of place is added a suspension of time, since the meeting takes place at the dead of night, when life stands still. Further, the Inquisitor is not wearing the sumptuous robes which would identify him as a Cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church, but is dressed in an ordinary monk's cassock, which cannot be associated with any specific confession. Dostoyevsky thereby goes some way to overcoming the restrictions of time and place, with the result that the level of the conversation is raised above the topical and the local to what is valid for all times and all places.

It remains to ask who is right in the 'Legend': the Inquisitor or Christ. Can man cope with Christianity as a purely spiritual concept which is not embodied in structure and hierarchy, but is, or so the Inquisitor would have us believe, 'exceptional, enigmatic and vague'? Can man cope, with just the image of Christ to guide him? The traditional

approach to this question is to weigh the words of the Inquisitor against the kiss of Christ. As with so much else in the 'Legend', this approach seems to depend as much upon the critic's own relationship to Christ and Christianity as upon the evidence of the 'Legend' itself. Christ's kiss is undoubtedly a powerful response, and it deeply affects the Inquisitor who lets Him go free rather than sending Him to the stake as he had originally planned. We are told that the kiss 'glows in [the Inquisitor's] heart', which suggests that even he cannot help responding to the true image of Christ when confronted with it, and that there may be a vestige of that image inside him still. ¹²⁴ But the question of whether Christ was right to act as He did is not just dependent upon the power of His kiss: as we have already seen, the people of Seville respond to Him in such a way as to suggest that He was right to withstand the Devil. They know Christ when they see Him because they have His image in their hearts. They could indeed manage without 'miracle, mystery and authority', if the Inquisitor would only remove his Church and allow them to.

Dostoyevsky's presentation of Roman Catholicism has proved to be of great significance for the present study. We have seen that he responds to Catholicism on several different levels, the least worthy of which, arguably, is represented by the anti-Catholic 'smear campaign' in The Idiot. At times, his comments reflect the enmity traditionally felt by Eastern Orthodoxy for Rome, as when he objects to the supreme authority claimed by the Pope. Most of his energy, however, is reserved for the accusation which underlies almost

everything he writes about Catholicism: the Roman Catholic Church does not preach true Christianity, since it proclaims a Christ who has taken up the 'sword of Caesar'. Dostoyevsky's objections to Rome's alleged distortion of Christ suggest that he himself saw Christianity as primarily a spiritual force, which can manage without secular power. He dissociates Christ from earthly kingdoms and from the compulsory union of mankind which he claims is represented by Rome: all this is rejected in favour of a 'purely spiritual communion of mankind'.

Although Dostoyevsky denies that Roman Catholicism is concerned about Christianity, he concedes that there are still Christians in the Catholic countries of the West. This suggests that in his opinion Christianity is not necessarily dependent upon the existence of institutionalized religion. Rather, it is dependent upon a knowledge of the true image of Christ, which seems to be innate, although some of Dostoyevsky's comments are ambiguous in this respect. Dostoyevsky's presentation of Roman Catholicism thus leads away from the concept of institutionalized religion. It is not entirely clear, however, whether he is objecting only to an excessive concern with secular power, or saying that Christianity should not allow itself to be embodied in any sort of formal structure at all.

The 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor' is unambiguous in this respect: Christianity must be purely spiritual, and must not be tempted into dependence upon the tangible and the visible. Institutionalized religion is not a bridge between mankind and God, but a myth devised by those who claim to be acting with man's best interests at heart. Man's only aid to Christianity is the image of Christ which is in his heart,

and which acts as his guide. The response of the people of Seville to Christ is a response of the heart, and suggests that Christ was right when he acted in the belief that man could do without miracle, mystery and authority. The 'Legend' tells us, therefore, that it is not just the Roman Catholic Church which distorts the message of Christ: all Churches do, by the very fact of their existence. Christ did not authorize the establishment of institutionalized religion. One notable feature of the 'Legend' is the Protestant themes it contains, particularly sola fide. Perhaps Protestantism, with its emphasis upon a direct relationship between the individual and God, will find favour with Dostoyevsky, since it seems to correspond closely to the type of Christianity advocated by the Christ of the 'Legend'. It is with this thought in mind that we now proceed to an examination of Dostoyevsky's presentation of Protestantism.

1. The letter appears in Sochineniya i pisma P. Ya. Chaadayeva, ed. M. Gershenzon (2 volumes; Moscow, 1913-14), II, 3-20.
For a more detailed discussion of the traditional enmity between Eastern and Western Christendom in general and Russia and the Roman Catholic Church in particular, see: D. A. Dirscherl, Dostoevsky and the Catholic Church: A Study in Religious Conflict (Doctoral dissertation, Georgetown University Graduate School, 1971), 5-84.
2. Khomyakov, PSS (4th edition), I, 148.
3. I. Aksakov, Sochineniya (7 volumes; Moscow, 1886-91), I, 559.
4. PSS, XX, 177; DP, 1877, 435 (1877 Nov. III, 3). A note in Dostoyevsky's 1860-2 notebook suggests that Roman Catholicism was a topic which interested him even then: among a list of titles for future articles we read 'What Rome means for the Pope' (PSS, XX, 152). The planned article was never formally written, but its likely contents may be surmised from the findings of the present chapter.
5. Christ's temptations are described in the Bible in Matt. 4: 1-11; Mark 1: 12-13; Luke 4: 1-13.
6. PSS, XXII, 88.
7. PSS, XXI, 243.
8. DP, 1877, 208 (1877 May/June III, 1).
9. DP, 1877, 217 (1877 May/June III, 3).
10. DP, 1877, 436 (1877 Nov. III, 3).
11. DP, 1877, 216-17 (1877 May/June III, 3).
12. PSS, XXI, 207.
13. Ibid.
14. PSS, XXII, 88; DP, 1877, 327 (1877 Sept. I, 3).
15. DP, 1877, 223 (1877 May/June III, 4).
16. Ibid., 222.
17. PSS, XXI, 181.
18. PSS, V, 72.
19. Ibid., 73.

20. DP, 1877, 169-70 (1877 May/June I, 1); PSS, XXI, 207.
21. PSS, XXI, 202.
22. PSS, XXII, 89; 90.
23. PSS, XXI, 243.
24. Ibid., 193.
25. DP, 1877, 199 (1877 May/June II, 2).
26. DP, 1877, 7 (1877 Jan. I, 1).
27. DP, 1877, 199 (1877 May/June II, 2).
28. DP, 1877, 218 (1877 May/June III, 3).
29. DP, 1877, 208 (1877 May/June III, 1).
30. DP, 1877, 8 (1877 Jan. I, 1).
31. DP, 1877, 208 (1877 May/June III, 1).
32. PSS, XX, 189.
33. Ibid., 191; DP, 1877, 220 (1877 May/June III, 3).
34. PSS, XXI, 203.
35. See, e.g., ibid., 130
36. PSS, XXII, 89-90.
37. DP, 1877, 219 (1877 May/June III, 3).
38. PSS, X, 323.
39. Ibid.
40. See, e.g., DP, 1877, 220 (1877 May/June III, 3); DP, 1877, 326 (1877 Sept. I, 3).
41. See, e.g., PSS, XXII, 88-9; DP, 1877, 217-18 (1877 May/June III, 3).
42. PSS, X, 30.
43. This and the following quotation appear in DP, 1877, 196 (1877 May/June II, 1).
44. DP, 1877, 434 (1877 Nov. III, 2).
45. DP, 1877, 387 (1877 Oct. III, 1).
46. PSS, XX, 99.
47. Ibid.

48. DP, 1877, 552 (1880 Aug. III, 3).
49. PSS, IV, 159; 210.
50. For a discussion of the prototypes of the Polish prisoners portrayed in Notes from the House of the Dead, see PSS, IV, 288.
51. PSS, XXII, 88.
52. Ibid., 89.
53. PSS, VIII, 451.
54. PSS, XXI, 204.
55. DP, 1877, 531 (1880 Aug. III, 1).
56. See Chapter Two, 105-6, above.
57. PSS, VIII, 451.
58. PSS, XXI, 229. As we have already seen, the narod were, by contrast, 'straightforward and kind': see fn. 52, above.
59. PSS, V, 63.
60. Pisma, II, 150.
61. PSS, VIII, 450.
62. Ibid., 164.
63. PSS, XIII, 27.
64. PSS, V, 88.
65. PSS, XX, 191.
66. Its title appears among notes made for The Life of a Great Sinner: see PSS, XX, 138.
67. W. C. Brumfield, '"Thérèse Philosophe" and Dostoevsky's Great Sinner', Comparative Literature, XXXII, No. 3, Summer 1980 (238-52), 243.
68. PSS, XV, 81.
69. PSS, VIII, 176; PSS, IX, 440-1.
70. PSS, VIII, 476.
71. Ibid., 440.
72. The scene is described in PSS, VIII, 446-60.
73. Ibid., 450.

74. Ibid., 451.
75. Ibid., 455.
76. See, e.g., DVS, I, 346-8; PSS, X, 450-1.
77. The scene is described in PSS, X, 196-203.
78. Ibid., 197.
79. Ibid.
80. Ibid., 199.
81. Ibid., 201.
82. The 'Legend' may be found in PSS, XIV, 224-41.
83. Ibid., 232.
84. Ibid.
85. Ibid., 233.
86. Ibid., 223.
87. Ibid., 235.
88. Ibid., 229.
89. Ibid., 232.
90. Ibid.
91. Ibid.
92. Ibid., 225.
93. Ibid.
94. Ibid., 233.
95. Ibid., 227.
96. Ibid., 226.
97. See 218-9, above.
98. PSS, XIV, 226.
99. Ibid., 227.
100. Ibid., 235.
101. Ibid., 229.
102. Matt. 16: 19.

103. PSS, XIV, 236.
104. 'Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained': John 20: 23.
105. Matt. 16: 18.
106. Jones, Dostoyevsky, 185.
107. R. Guardini, L'univers religieux de Dostoïevski, translated from the German by H. Engelman and R. Givord (Paris, 1947), 133.
108. See fn. 5, above.
109. Jones, Dostoyevsky, 184.
110. PSS, XIV, 228.
111. Pisma, IV, 53.
112. V. Terras, A Karamazov Companion. Commentary on the Genesis, Language and Style of Dostoevsky's Novel (Wisconsin, 1981), 234.
113. PSS, XIV, 228.
114. Ibid., 231.
115. Ibid., 230.
116. Ibid., 235.
117. Ibid., 237.
118. Ibid.
119. Ibid., 227. Compare with the description of Murin in PSS, I, 268.
120. For Murin's views on freedom, see PSS, I, 317.
121. PSS, XIV, 226.
122. Ibid.
123. See, e.g., DP, 1877, 532-3 (1880 Aug. III, 1).
124. PSS, XIV, 239.

DOSTOYEVSKY'S ATTITUDE TO PROTESTANTISM

There are few direct references to Protestantism in Dostoyevsky's novels. Nothing in the pre-exile writings could be said to represent Protestantism in the way that the 'dark' religion of The Landlady and Netochka Nezvanova arguably represents Roman Catholicism as seen through the writings of the French Utopian Socialists. It is not until The Humiliated and the Insulted in 1861 that a specifically Protestant character appears, in the person of Jeremiah Smith (Iyeremiya Smit), Nelly's grandfather, although he is not actually referred to as a Protestant. Anglicanism is strongly criticized in Winter Notes on Summer Impressions, but we must then wait until The Idiot before meeting Protestant characters again, in the form of the Swiss inhabitants of the village where Prince Myshkin undergoes a cure for his 'idiocy'. The final important reference to Protestantism may be found in The Brothers Karamazov, in Ivan Karamazov's account of the fate of Richard among the pious Protestants of Geneva. The subject receives a treatment consistent with Ivan's generally rebellious mood. In terms of volume it is in Diary of a Writer that Protestantism receives the most attention, and it is there that our analysis will begin. Let us first, however, briefly consider the history of Protestantism in Russia, in order to see the context for Dostoyevsky's own remarks.

Orthodoxy's first important contact with the Reformation had come in 1573, when Lutheran scholars travelled to

Constantinople to present the Patriarch with a copy of the Augsburg Confession. Although the Patriarch showed no inclination towards Protestantism, relations between Lutherans and Orthodox were cordial. The Reformation did not directly affect Orthodox doctrine at this period, but its influence was felt through other channels. In Russia the main channels were the generally increased contact with Western powers which was a feature of the reign of Ivan IV; and Russia's proximity to countries like Sweden which embraced Lutheranism as their official religion. At the same time there was some ideological opposition to Protestantism: in Western Russia, for example, early Protestant leaders were tried and executed.

These two trends continued into the seventeenth century. On the one hand the Protestant cause was, paradoxically, strengthened by the success of the Roman Catholic Church in Poland/Lithuania, since Russia was led into an informal alliance with Protestant Sweden who fought against the Catholic successes. Yet the Orthodox Church did not approve of the Reformation. De Madariaga notes that on re-baptism into Orthodoxy a Protestant 'had to damn Luther in so many words';¹ and on several occasions disputes between Orthodox and Protestants resulted in violence and the destruction of Protestant churches. The success of Protestantism in areas like the Baltic region caused the Orthodox Church to go on the defensive: in 1629, for example, the Metropolitan of Novgorod declared an end to relations with Lutherans for the whole of Northern Russia. In the sixteen-forties Protestants were banned from Moscow.

The late seventeenth century was marked by official toleration for Protestantism in Russia. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 led to the promulgation of an edict of tolerance of Protestants and an invitation for them to settle in Russia (1689). Peter the Great's manifesto to foreigners promising freedom of conscience secured the status of Protestantism as much as of any other confession. The Russian Empire in fact gained many more Protestants during Peter's reign, through immigration, the conquest of the Baltic provinces, and the large number of Swedish prisoners who decided to settle in Russia. Many of Peter's high officials were Protestants; and the Holy Synod, established in 1721, was modelled on the Protestant ecclesiastical synods in Germany. The number of Protestant communities in Russia greatly increased in the second half of the eighteenth century, as a result of German colonization. Catherine the Great, who had been born a Lutheran and educated by a French Huguenot, encouraged the immigration of German pietists who were skilled agriculturalists, and they settled in towns throughout Russia.

The latter half of the reign of Alexander I saw the rise of Protestant Pietism in Russia. Figures like Lopukhin and Golitsyn guided the Tsar in this direction: Golitsyn, for example, encouraged him to read the Bible for the first time. Alexander attended Protestant churches in Finland, and went to prayer and Bible meetings. In 1813, in keeping with the spirit of the age, the Russian Bible Society was formed. In the mid-eighteen-twenties, however, this wave of emotional pietism receded: once again the official Russian

Orthodox Church went on the defensive, fearing that a new syncretic Church was becoming the established Church of the Russian Empire. As a result of its efforts, Orthodoxy supplanted Protestant Pietism at Court.

In matters of theology, it was precisely those features of Orthodox doctrine and dogma which linked it with Roman Catholicism which served to separate it from Protestantism: emphasis upon the hierarchical structure of the Church; insistence upon the apostolic succession, the episcopate and the priesthood; and the veneration of the saints and the Virgin Mary. However, the Reformation played one notable part in the development of religion in Russia, in the form of its contribution to the rapid spread of sectarianism from the late seventeenth century onwards. This will be considered in more detail in Chapters Seven and Eight of our study.

It remains to consider attitudes to Protestantism in nineteenth-century Russian thought. Protestantism did not have particular significance for the Westernizers. The Slavophiles, however, took a considerable interest in Protestantism's place in the history of Christianity. Rather than seeing it as the opposite of Roman Catholicism and different from it in all respects, they tended to emphasize the organic connection between the two. This may be illustrated by reference to Khomyakov's analysis of the eleventh-century schism. In the schism the Roman Catholic Church had, said Khomyakov, arrogated to itself the right to change the universal Christian creed. This act of proclaiming a private opinion as a solution to a question in the universal Church

contained in itself the formulation and legitimation of

Protestantism, that is, of the freedom of investigation divorced from the living tradition of unity based on mutual love. Thus Romanism, at the very moment of its birth, proclaimed itself as Protestantism.²

Not only was Protestantism intrinsically linked with Catholicism, it was completely determined by it: 'Protestantism is a world which denies another world. Deprive it of this other world denied by it, and Protestantism will die: for its whole life is in negation'.³ The main difference between Catholicism and Protestantism, according to Khomyakov, was in their attitudes to unity: whereas the Roman Catholic Church had replaced Christendom's unity based on love with the authority of the Pope and of a rigid Church organization, Protestantism had abandoned unity altogether, emphasizing individual freedom. The other Slavophiles adopted Khomyakov's analysis of the West and the continuity of Western historical development. Despite their criticisms of the Protestant creed, however, they nevertheless had more sympathy for Protestantism than for Roman Catholicism, a point which may be borne in mind as we proceed to our examination of the presentation of Protestantism in Dostoyevsky's publicistic writings.

We discovered in the previous chapter that although it might initially appear that much of Diary of a Writer is devoted to a discussion of the Roman Catholic Church, purely spiritual matters take second place to questions of politics and power struggles. Frequently it is the 'Roman idea' to which Dostoyevsky is referring, rather than the Roman Catholic Church per se. We saw that this is because for Dostoyevsky the Roman

Catholic Church is merely a function of the wider 'Roman idea': the striving for the universal enforced union of mankind. A parallel situation exists with regard to Protestantism as interpreted by Dostoyevsky in the Diary: the Protestant Church is a function of the 'German idea'. The terminology which Dostoyevsky uses when referring to the 'idea' and the Church respectively illustrates the distinction he draws between the two concepts. When he means the 'German idea' in the broad sense, he uses the term protestantstvo ('protestantism'). When he means the Protestant religious movement, he refers to it as lyuteranstvo ('Lutheranism'). An awareness of this helps to clarify statements to the effect that Protestantism began a long time before Luther, which might initially confuse those accustomed to date Protestantism from the Reformation of the sixteen-hundreds. Dostoyevsky refers, for example, to 'the old Protestantism, which has been protesting against Rome and her idea for nineteen hundred years . . . protesting ever since the time of Arminius and the Teutoburger Wald'⁴. As was the case with Roman Catholicism, therefore, it seems likely that in Dostoyevsky's presentation of Protestantism, too, spiritual concerns could be eclipsed by politics and matters of state.

The article from which the extract quoted above is taken appears in the January 1877 issue of Diary of a Writer. In the article concerned, which is entitled 'Three Ideas', Dostoyevsky gives an analysis not only of nineteenth-century Europe, but of the whole of the history of mankind, in terms of the 'three ideas' of Catholicism, Protestantism and Orthodoxy.⁵ According to his theory, the German idea, like its

Roman counterpart, has been temporarily embodied in a series of movements which have acted as vehicles of protest against Rome. Lutheranism, which in the West would tend to be equated with the term 'Protestantism', does not occupy any more central a place than any of the other movements which have preceded it and will succeed it: it is merely 'that single formula of protestantism which was formulated in Luther's time'.⁶ Lutheranism is nevertheless a significant stage, since in Dostoyevsky's opinion it corresponds so completely to the essence of the German idea as he perceives it: protest. The word 'protest' recurs whenever Dostoyevsky is discussing Protestantism, and he denies that the German idea stands for anything but that: 'Germany's task is one. It existed before, and will always exist. It is her protestantism . . . her continuous protest'.⁷ Lutheranism embodies this perfectly: 'Finally, [the German nation] protested most strongly and powerfully, deriving a new formula of protest from the most spiritual, elemental foundations of the Germanic world: it proclaimed the freedom of inquiry, and raised the banner of Luther'.⁸

Although he accords a position of importance to Lutheranism, Dostoyevsky suggests that it really belongs to the past, and that Protestantism has already found another 'formula' appropriate to the latest 'formula' Rome has adopted for its 'idea'. Rome has moved from the religious arena (the Roman Catholic Church) to the political arena (socialism): it has decided to concentrate its energies upon the regeneration of society upon new social foundations and has, improbable though it may seem, become incarnated in the International. The

German idea has allegedly responded by similarly moving into the political arena: it has adopted the cause of German unification. Its key figure consequently is no longer Luther, but Bismarck.⁹ When Bismarck makes warlike threats to France he is thus merely acting in the Protestant tradition, since socialist France is the contemporary embodiment of Rome. So closely does Dostoyevsky adhere to this interpretation of history whereby 'ideas' move through a succession of temporary embodiments that, reading through his Diary, one might well be excused for thinking that Lutheranism no longer existed.

According to Dostoyevsky, Protestantism's 'formula' at any one time is completely determined by Rome, because Protestantism is nothing but a response to Rome. To such an extent does the German idea consist of protest against Rome, he claims, that if the object of her protest were to be taken away, she herself would most likely disappear too:

When Germany has the final victory and destroys that against which she has been protesting for nineteen hundred years, suddenly she herself will have to die spiritually, right after her enemy, because there will be nothing for her to live for, there will be nothing for her to protest against.¹⁰

Germany might claim to have a 'new word' with which to replace Rome, but this is not the case: 'During the whole nineteen centuries of her existence Germany, who has done nothing but protest, has never proclaimed her own new word, but all the time has lived by negation and protest against her enemy'.¹¹

This very negative appraisal of Protestantism in the

wider sense is naturally applied to Lutheranism, its religious embodiment: Dostoyevsky claims that Luther's Protestantism 'is a protesting and merely denying faith'.¹²

The object of its protest is, of course, the Roman Catholic Church. Dostoyevsky's act of associating the fate of Lutheranism so closely with that of Roman Catholicism is consistent with the Slavophile analysis of Western religion, as we saw in the introductory section to this chapter. Such an approach is very one-sided, however: it leaves no scope for a positive interpretation of Protestantism, and would be rejected by Protestants themselves as very biased. The name 'Protestant' does, in fact, have positive connotations, as Muckle observes in his study of Leskov's religion: 'the meaning of the name itself is derived from the sixteenth-century definition of to protest - to declare, affirm or speak as a witness'.¹³ The Orthodox theologian, Meyendorff, similarly draws attention to the creative dimension of Protestantism, pointing out that the principle 'Ecclesia reformata et semper reformanda' ('a Church reformed and ever being reformed') was always, and still is, one of the fundamentals of Protestantism.¹⁴ Dostoyevsky himself, however, chooses to ignore the concept of 'Re-formation', according to which an alternative Church, which corresponds more closely to Biblical Christianity, is put forward to replace an allegedly corrupt Roman Catholic Church. Significantly in this respect, there would appear to be only one reference to the Reformation as such in Dostoyevsky's writings, and even that has negative, rather than positive, connotations. The reference may be found in Dostoyevsky's 1864/5 notebook, among various notes about the major Churches. After claiming that

'the papacy has infiltrated the whole of the West much more;

272

deeply and to a much greater extent than people think', Dostoyevsky remarks by way of illustration that 'even the former reformation¹⁵ are a product of the papacy'. Yet although he persists in treating Protestantism as a negative phenomenon, and repeatedly discounts the possibility that the Protestant religion may have made a positive contribution to the history of Christianity, occasionally in the Diary there is evidence that he was indeed aware of what Protestantism stood for and not merely against. Despite his assertion that the Protestant religion is merely a function of the German 'political idea', he may be found responding - sometimes explicitly, sometimes covertly - to various aspects of specifically Protestant Christianity. His response has important implications for the present study, as we will now see.

The fundamental doctrine of Protestantism is expressed by the words sola fide: Christian faith is not a matter of guarantees and merit, but is to be attained 'by faith alone'. We saw in the previous chapter that the 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor' provides support for such a concept of Christianity, and suggests that men can indeed manage without visible and tangible guarantees. Instead, they are to live by faith, guided by the image of Christ. The Inquisitor's words to Christ, 'I swear, man has been created a weaker and baser creature than you thought he was', are challenged, since even the allegedly 'weak' masses of Seville respond to Christ before He has either said or done anything to prove His identity.¹⁶ But the 'Legend' goes further than this, as we

saw: it says that Christianity which rests on anything but faith alone is no longer Christianity; and that the official Churches, which try to act as mediators between men and God, are agents of the Devil. Sola fide would, therefore, seem to express exactly the type of Christianity Dostoyevsky wanted to see.

This faith in man's ability to live 'by faith alone' and to do without signposts and guarantees is not to be found in all of Dostoyevsky's works. It contrasts particularly markedly with the picture of mankind put forward in Notes from Underground. According to the Underground Man, the majority of men need to be told what is right and what is wrong: they need the assurance of rules and 'walls'. Notes from Underground was written in 1864, and it is possible that Dostoyevsky's faith in man, and in man's potential for good and God, had greatly increased by the time of the 'Legend'. Yet even in the 'Legend' itself the case against Christ is put with some force: clearly Dostoyevsky still appreciated the other side of the argument. If we now turn back to Diary of a Writer, we find further evidence to suggest that Dostoyevsky was inclined to doubt man's ability to live 'by faith alone', even though this is, on his own assertion, 'the only true sort of Christianity.

The claim that mankind longs for authority in the broad sense of the word is made when Dostoyevsky discusses the political situation in France in the eighteen-seventies. He considers what type of government would be best for the French people, who have experienced a series of different regimes in rapid succession. Only a few of them are bothered

about the principles of the Revolution, claims Dostoyevsky: 'the rest merely want peace and a strong government, to such an extent that they would agree to any authority - provided that it was undoubted authority'.¹⁷ The French, we read on a later occasion, 'long for a dictator, long for him to seize control over them, to assure their lives and property'.¹⁸ They would even welcome an outbreak of violence, 'if it would bring order at last'.¹⁹ In Dostoyevsky's mind the French are clearly not a nation which can exist without the assurance of strong authority: they correspond to a remarkable extent to mankind as depicted by the Underground Man and the Grand Inquisitor.

These comments might not merit particular attention were it not for the fact that at the same period Dostoyevsky expresses similar views with respect to people's religious faith and their ability to manage without a strong ecclesiastical authority on earth. The context for his remarks is an exchange of letters between Pope Pius IX and Emperor Wilhelm over the treatment of Roman Catholics in Germany.²⁰ The immediate pretext for Dostoyevsky's comments is the following sentence from the Emperor's letter, which Dostoyevsky singles out for attention: 'The evangelical faith which, as Your Holiness knows, I confess as did my ancestors, and as do the majority of my subjects, does not allow us to acknowledge any mediator in our relations with God other than our Lord Jesus Christ'.²¹ Dostoyevsky's response to the Emperor's words is certainly not consistent with what one would expect if he were on the side of Christ in the 'Legend'. He writes that the Pope has nothing to worry

about, since

he knows very well (and Rome has been expecting as much for a long time) that many of these proud people who rejected the 'mediation' of the Pope which Emperor Wilhelm talks about, and who acknowledged as their guide in matters of faith their conscience alone, have long since been weighed down by their freedom, which has become a burden to them.²²

Three centuries have been long enough, he continues, and many Protestants are 'far from opposed to returning to the "mediator"'. We observed in the previous chapter that Dostoyevsky occasionally ventures to read the Pope's thoughts, so that much is not new. The particular interest of the passage lies in the impression of agreement between Dostoyevsky and the Pope which one receives upon reading it. This impression is given most of all by the way in which Dostoyevsky manipulates the text: 'Nevertheless, the Pope, of course, must feel on firmer ground than the Emperor would suppose. The Pope knows very well' (My emphasis). Whereas on other occasions we have seen Dostoyevsky distance himself from the thoughts of the Pope and the Jesuits, on the basis of this particular extract one cannot but assume that he himself shares their doubts about man's ability to cope with 'pure' religion and to do without a mediating body and material aids. He does not on this occasion appeal to the image of Christ which, according to the 'Legend', is innate in people's hearts, and ensures that they can indeed manage without such aids. Perhaps the Emperor's subjects do not possess this image?

In his 1877 Diary, only a relatively short time before the 'Legend', Dostoyevsky again deals with the question of the need for a structure for Christianity. He is discussing the success of Protestant sects in Russia, but a reference to

'Martin Ivanovich Luther' in the course of his remarks suggests that he also has the main stream of Protestantism in mind. Dostoyevsky's comments take the form of an allegorical tale in which the 'trappings' of Christianity - ritual, hierarchy and so on - are represented by a container, and the essence of Christianity by a precious liquid carried inside that container. ²³ A group of people decides that men are worshipping the container instead of its contents, and they smash it in an attempt to remedy the situation. The contents spill out onto the ground, however, where they immediately begin to evaporate. In great haste attempts are made to construct a new container, but people disagree over the form this should take, and as a result many antagonistic groups arise, each with its own container. The assumption which underlies the allegory is very clear: Christianity needs its 'container', it needs a structure, with formal creeds and ritual, otherwise 'the life-giving liquid, the precious content, is spilled on the earth and, of course, disappears into the ground'. In other words, Christianity cannot exist in its essential form, but must be embodied in a structure. This is the opposite of what is implied in the 'Legend', where Dostoyevsky's Christ represents precisely such 'essential' Christianity, which is divorced from a concrete structure. It also, of course, runs contrary to the negative attitude to institutionalized religion displayed by most of Dostoyevsky's Christian characters prior to the 'Legend'. Now, by contrast, Dostoyevsky seems to be implying that those who think that they can manage without a defined structure for their faith are wrong.

It becomes clear from the allegory that it is not just a question of any structure: the implication is rather that there is one 'correct' container, which is the original one. Everything that is proposed as a replacement is alleged to be destined to fail. Dostoyevsky refers to the original container as 'the precious heritage, acquired through the ages', a definition which is reminiscent of the Orthodox concept of Tradition. Throughout the allegory, in fact, Dostoyevsky displays what is basically an Orthodox understanding of religious matters. A further example is his assessment of what happens when 'each group carries away for itself a few drops of the precious liquid' and tries to construct a new container around those few drops alone. Dostoyevsky refers to the consequences of such action as idolatry. Here he demonstrates the Orthodox conviction that the truth lies in the whole, rather than in the separate parts, and that to emphasize one part at the expense of the others leads to untruth, even though the parts together make up the truth. Rather than confirming the Protestant tendencies we have detected in Dostoyevsky's religious thought, the allegory thus reveals that there is still much that is recognizably Orthodox. Most significant for our purposes, however, is the extent to which what is said or implied in the allegory contradicts the bold message of the 'Legend': on the basis of the allegory one would be justified in assuming that Dostoyevsky had no confidence at all that 'pure' Christianity could exist, or that it corresponded in any way to the nature of mankind.

A further aspect of Protestantism to which Dostoyevsky

responds in Diary of a Writer is the commitment to 'free inquiry'. We have already seen that he considered freedom of inquiry to be the essence of Luther's message, and referred to it as 'the banner of Luther'. In the 'Legend', as noted in the previous chapter, the theme of 'free inquiry' is first introduced by Ivan, when he refers to the denial of the existence of miracles 'in the North, in Germany'. Later in the 'Legend' Christ Himself is associated with free inquiry by the Inquisitor, who sees it as just one dimension of the overall spirit of freedom which He represents. On the basis of the 'Legend' we concluded that the essentially Protestant spirit of free inquiry was consistent with the type of religion Dostoyevsky wanted to see.

Support for such a conclusion may be found throughout Dostoyevsky's writings, where Christianity is generally seen to exist happily alongside learning, and there is no visible tension between the two. In A Raw Youth, for example, Makar Dolgoruky symbolically accepts science and learning on behalf of Christianity when he praises the wonders of the telescope shown to him by his hermit friend.²⁴ The central religious character in The Brothers Karamazov, Zosima, is himself an educated man who converses freely with members of the educated upper classes. In the same novel superstitious expectations of miracles are firmly discredited when Zosima's corpse begins to decay and smell as would the corpse of any other person. Such features of Dostoyevsky's novels may be used to counter charges of obscurantism, and they suggest that he did not consider Christianity and reason to be incompatible. This does not mean that he elevated the intellect

to a position of prominence in Christianity. Most of his major 279 religious characters - Sonya Marmeladova, Myshkin, Shatov - have no claims to intellectual prowess, and their Christianity is rather the fruit of powerful, heart-felt convictions. Further, Dostoyevsky rejects outright the idea that Christianity must be amenable to reason. He is particularly opposed to attempts to 'water down' Christianity by explaining away miracles and removing everything that is a stumbling block and an offence to reason: commenting in the Diary upon Leskov's The Sealed Angel (Zapechatlenny angel, 1873), he criticizes the author for providing the tale with an ending which rationally accounts for the apparent miracle of the 'unsealing' of the icon.²⁵ In 'At Tikhon's' in The Devils, Stavrogin refers disapprovingly to priests who try to explain away miracles using natural explanations: he describes them as 'strongly inclined to Lutheranism'.²⁶ We may recall that miracles play an important ideological role in several of Dostoyevsky's major novels: the raising of Lazarus in Crime and Punishment; the theme of the Gadarene swine in The Devils; the miracle at Cana in Galilee in The Brothers Karamazov.

On the basis of this brief review it would appear that the spirit of free inquiry and belief in miracles are not mutually exclusive concepts for Dostoyevsky's Christian characters. They 'dare to believe', yet do not give the impression of being in any way restricted by pre-imposed systems of belief. This would appear to confirm our initial suggestion that Dostoyevsky was in general agreement with the principle of free inquiry in religious matters, and did not regard it as a dangerous or destructive tendency. Indeed, at

one point in his Diary he goes so far as to suggest that Protestantism's concern to establish free inquiry is out of date, and has been for some time. Thus, referring to the time of the French Revolution, he writes: 'Luther's Protestantism had long outlived its time, while the idea of free inquiry had long been accepted by universal science'.²⁷ This is an exaggeration on Dostoyevsky's part, as the generally negative response of the Christian Churches to Darwinism²⁸ in the nineteenth century illustrates. What is significant, however, is the spirit in which the remark is made: Dostoyevsky implies that free inquiry in religious matters is not something to be fought, but is a natural development. Elsewhere, however, he displays extreme caution when the subject arises, and it is this unexpected caution which will concern us.

It is particularly when Dostoyevsky is discussing Anglicanism that free inquiry becomes an issue. It is an observable fact that in Dostoyevsky's mind the various aspects of Protestantism appear to be apportioned among the different nations confessing that faith. Thus Germany is the embodiment of 'elemental' Protestantism, eternal opposition to Rome; Swiss Protestantism, as we shall see below, is associated with the type of morality which allegedly results from the doctrine of sola fide; and English Protestantism represents the ultimate consequences of the principle of free inquiry. Anglicanism is considered in some detail in the March issue of the 1876 Diary.²⁹ The article concerned is really in two parts, but they are linked through a common leitmotif: the French phrase entrée et sortie libres ('free entry and exit'). Dostoyevsky begins by describing the courteous welcome received

by Don Carlos, the pretender to the Spanish throne, when he made an unexpected visit to England. Thanks to the tolerance which England as a country practises - entrée et sortie libres - even such a 'blood-stained tyrant' as this, remarks Dostoyevsky, can be sure of a cordial welcome.³⁰ Having thus established entrée et sortie libres as the symbol for toleration to the point of indiscrimination, Dostoyevsky then moves on to discuss an article about Protestantism written by one Sidney Dobell. Dobell admits that Protestantism is undoubtedly 'narrow, ugly, impudent, unreasonable . . . the holiday of "all fools who rush in"', but he claims that it is also 'educational, and therefore it will live. More than that: it must be nourished and looked after'.³¹ Dostoyevsky perhaps understandably challenges the utilitarian criteria which Dobell uses to assess the value of Protestantism, and regrets that Dobell does not recognize faith itself as 'the matter to which everything must be subordinate'.³² Of most interest for our purposes, however, is that as Dostoyevsky proceeds, he incidentally reveals his fears as to what free inquiry in religious matters might lead to:

The whole utility, don't you see, consists in the fact that the gates are thrown wide open to every judgement and deduction; there is entrée et sortie libres to and from both the mind and the heart; nothing is locked up, protected or brought to an end; swim around in a boundless sea, and save yourself as you please.³³

Here we see the same call for definition and structure as we saw in the allegory about the container and its contents. Dostoyevsky seems to be saying that the truth of Christianity needs to be kept 'locked up', and protected from the ravages

of free inquiry. He implies that individuals will use for their own benefit the freedom they are given, to interpret Christianity in whatever way they please. There will be no certainties, but only vagueness, in which men will founder and sink. Yet no such fears are expressed by Dostoyevsky in the 'Legend', where men allegedly have the image of Christ to guide them and keep them in a knowledge of the truth.

Dostoyevsky's fears about the ultimate consequences of free inquiry are further illustrated by his conviction that Protestantism will eventually decline into atheism. He implies that once free inquiry has been adopted as a principle, more and more of Christianity will be eroded, until nothing remains. This point is made particularly clearly in the notebooks for The Devils, where the following words are attributed to Nechayev (Pyotr Verkhovensky): 'Luther rejected authority and founded a free Church. But of course he did not foresee that, as a result of developing organically, his religion would arrive at a negation of itself, i.e., at a negation of all religion'.³⁴ Behind this extract may be detected Dostoyevsky's fear that once men reject the accepted central authority in religious matters, they step on to a slippery slope away from Christianity.

The prospect of the demise of religion into humanism and then atheism seems to have occupied Dostoyevsky's mind particularly around the time of A Raw Youth. Versilov dreams of future mankind, when the concept of God will have vanished and men will direct the love they once felt for Him on to the earth, life and each other.³⁵ Versilov does not mention Protestantism, but it seems reasonable to suggest that

Dostoyevsky's vision of the future of Protestantism may have inspired his dream. Dostoyevsky himself links Versilov's dream with religion in England when he remarks in his Diary upon the similarity between the dream and what 'an observer' has told him about 'the character of certain altogether atheistic doctrines and sects in England', in particular 'the Church of atheists', whose members have rejected God, but worship humanity.³⁶ It seems, then, that Protestantism and atheism are intrinsically linked in Dostoyevsky's mind. But why should this be so? Why should the removal of a central authority in religion lead to atheism if, as Dostoyevsky suggests in the 'Legend', men possess in their hearts the image of Christ as a guide? Dostoyevsky's own religious characters do not have any obvious recourse to an external source of religious authority, yet they do not fall into atheism. Must we assume that this is simply because they are Russian?

Dostoyevsky's response to the various features of Protestantism which we have so far considered is not the response we would have expected on the basis of our analysis of the 'Legend'. We have restricted our investigation to the essentially Protestant motifs which seem positively to be advocated in the 'Legend' and which, on Dostoyevsky's own assertion, are the marks of true Christianity as represented by Christ and acknowledged by the Inquisitor: sola fide; free inquiry; the rejection of a hierarchical and institutionalized Church as a mediator between men and God. Yet we have seen Dostoyevsky apparently retract his bold claims in the 'Legend' concerning

'Churchless' Christianity. He has implied that attempts to achieve essential Christianity are misguided, since Christianity will 'evaporate' without a structure. He has lent his support to the idea that men find the religious freedom which Protestantism represents a burden, and long to be taken under the wing of the Roman Catholic Church once more. He has appealed to a central authority in matters of faith, and voiced fears that individual attempts to reach the truth of religion through the process of free inquiry will inevitably lead to atheism. The guiding image of Christ which plays such a crucial role in the 'Legend' has been strangely absent from Dostoyevsky's presentation of Protestantism: it does not seem to be present in the hearts of Protestants in the way that it is present in the hearts of the masses in the 'Legend', even though we suggested that the masses of Seville might be considered representative of people in all times and places. These inconsistencies will be borne in mind as we now proceed to the presentation of Protestantism in Dostoyevsky's novels.

The presentation of Protestant characters in Dostoyevsky's novels is progressively less sympathetic, culminating in the caricature of Genevan Protestantism given by Ivan Karamazov in The Brothers Karamazov. The first Protestant we meet is Jeremiah Smith in The Humiliated and the Insulted. He occupies with respect to Protestantism the position occupied by Volzhsky and Zh-ky in Notes from the House of the Dead with respect to Roman Catholicism: he is portrayed sympathetically, as a person whose religious convictions are genuine, rather than

being presented as a function of Dostoyevsky's conception of his religion, as tends to be the fate of Protestants in the later writings. This positive treatment of Western religion again occurs before Dostoyevsky's first trip to Europe, which tends to confirm our earlier suggestion that the trip had a decisive influence upon his conception of all things relating to the West.

We saw in Chapter Two that Jeremiah Smith is caught up in a personal struggle between what he knows to be the teaching of Christ concerning the need to forgive others, and his sense of pride, which prevents him from forgiving his daughter.³⁷ We noted that this in itself is not a specifically Protestant dilemma, but may befall Christians of all confessions. Nevertheless, Smith is presented as a Protestant, and he reveals something of Dostoyevsky's conception of Protestantism at this comparatively early stage in his writings. The very manner in which the fact of Smith's Protestantism is conveyed is significant in this respect. The adjective 'Protestant' is not used directly, but is implied. First, Smith is associated with Protestant countries: he is an Englishman and he lives in the German quarter of the city. He has an address appropriate to his religious nature, living as he does on Ascension Prospect (Voznesenskiy prospekt). Most important, however, is the object Dostoyevsky uses symbolically to represent Smith's religion: a New Testament.

The Bible has always occupied a position of central importance for Protestants, since it is their authority for Christian doctrine, so Dostoyevsky's choice of a New Testament to characterize a Protestant might not seem particularly worthy of attention.

Yet this is the only occasion in the whole of his writings that Dostoyevsky gives what might be regarded as a just picture of why Protestants read the Bible: because it enables them to go directly to Christ's teachings and to discover for themselves how He wants men to live. Elsewhere, Dostoyevsky tends to focus attention upon what could be regarded as a corruption of the prominence accorded to Bible reading: the emphasis upon education which he alleges to be characteristic of Protestantism, and seems to associate particularly with Anglicanism. Jeremiah Smith is himself given a concern for education³⁸ by Dostoyevsky. "One of the first things he asks Nelly is what she has been taught; and he soon begins to educate her himself, using a geography book and a New Testament. In keeping with the generally sympathetic portrayal of Protestantism in The Humiliated and the Insulted, Smith's educational concern is not presented in a critical light, but it is evidence that even at this relatively early stage Dostoyevsky had identified to his own satisfaction the type of mentality which went with Protestantism. Later, as we have already seen in connection with Sidney Dobell, Dostoyevsky reacts much more sharply to the alleged educational zeal of Protestants.

Although in this particular respect Smith's geography book is just as much a part of Protestantism for Dostoyevsky as is his New Testament, the latter book is still presented as being the more important of the two. Smith's New Testament has been used attentively and often, as may be inferred from 'the pencilled comments in the margins and the thumb-nail underlinings'.³⁸ The religion he teaches Nelly is taken straight

from the New Testament, according to his own understanding of it; and when Nelly challenges him about his unforgiving nature it is the New Testament which she in turn quotes in evidence against him. No criticism is implied of either Smith or Nelly for this, which would seem to suggest that Dostoyevsky himself agreed that Christ's teachings may indeed be derived directly from the Bible by individual believers. Yet Orthodoxy teaches that it is the Church which possesses the correct interpretation of the Bible, and that although individuals may read it, their interpretation must be aided and verified by the Church. During the reign of Nicholas I Russians were actually banned from reading the New Testament. Smith not only reads the New Testament, but his reading is apparently entirely unaided, since he is not seen attending any Church. By implicitly lending his support to Smith in this instance, Dostoyevsky could be accused of going against both Church and State. He does so explicitly in Crime and Punishment, where Sonya Marmeladova, who is apparently a Russian Orthodox Christian, keeps a copy of the New Testament in her room, reads it to herself, and reads it aloud to Raskolnikov. This deviation from Orthodoxy was noted by Leontyev in his forceful attack upon Dostoyevsky's presentation of religious matters to which we referred in Chapter Three: he likened Sonya to a young English girl, rather than an Orthodox believer, precisely on the grounds of her independent reading of the Bible without reference to the interpretation of the Church.³⁹ Not only Sonya, in fact, but several of Dostoyevsky's characters have a similarly 'direct' relationship to the Bible.⁴⁰ Dostoyevsky thus both lends his tacit support to a characteristically Protestant

practice and actively adapts it for use in his own religious characters. This suggests that he felt that the individual believer could indeed be 'trusted' with the Bible. Such a conviction would, of course, be true to the bold spirit of the 'Legend', where Dostoyevsky lends his complete support to freedom and the individual in religious matters. Yet we know from our reading of Diary of a Writer that elsewhere he displays extreme caution about the freedom of the individual to interpret the Bible, to the extent that he foresees an inevitable decline into atheism as a direct result. As we discovered repeatedly in the first half of this chapter, what appears to be an instinctive affinity for the spirit of Protestantism falls victim to a caution in religious matters which contradicts the boldness which is both expressed in the 'Legend' and embodied in Dostoyevsky's own religious characters.

The next work in which Protestantism appears, albeit briefly, is Winter Notes on Summer Impressions, which was written after Dostoyevsky's first trip to Europe and gives a correspondingly negative view of religion in the West. Protestantism - specifically Anglicanism - is treated in a manner consistent with the focus of the work, which may be defined as the influence of economics on the social morality of the countries visited by Dostoyevsky. All around him Dostoyevsky sees capitalist exploitation, the triumph of bourgeois values, and the transformation of society into a terrible ant-heap. Roman Catholicism is depicted busily exploiting the economic misery of the masses, as we saw in the previous chapter: the charity it gives to the poor is alleged

to be nothing but a cunning ploy to win more converts.

Anglicanism is portrayed no more positively: Dostoyevsky declares that 'it's the religion of the rich, and there's no attempt to disguise the fact'.⁴² The Anglicans are not really given the opportunity to speak for themselves, but are presented as a function of Dostoyevsky's general thesis about the West, according to which Baal reigns supreme. They are portrayed as worshippers of money, rather than God: their Church is a gentlemen's club for the rich and the comfortable. Dostoyevsky's description of them verges on caricature: 'Anglican priests and bishops are proud and rich, they live in rich parishes and grow fat with a completely free conscience'. Nevertheless, two particular features of his conception of Protestantism become apparent. First, he again displays the tendency we noted in The Humiliated and the Insulted to associate English Protestantism with a concern for education and academic matters. This time, however, the educational dimension is accorded more centrality, and the Anglicans are portrayed as having an academic approach to faith itself. Dostoyevsky claims, for example, that English priests are 'great pedants and very well-educated', and he refers to them as 'professors of theology'. Second, he seems to associate Protestants with a readiness to concentrate upon the spiritual state of men while ignoring their material needs: he claims that the Anglicans 'travel to the ends of the earth, and will go to darkest Africa in order to convert one savage, but forget millions of savages in London because the latter have nothing to pay them with'. This alleged ability of Protestants conveniently to ignore social problems and to fail to see the

need for any consistency between their professed religion and their life is a feature to which Dostoyevsky draws attention more than once in his novels. He seems to associate it particularly with Protestantism in Switzerland, as we shall now see as we consider the Swiss Protestants depicted in The Idiot.

The Idiot was written when Dostoyevsky was abroad, having been forced to leave Russia because of debts. During their four years of exile from 1867 to 1871, he and Anna Grigoryevna lived mainly in Dresden, Geneva and Florence. Dostoyevsky was not happy in Europe, as his letters to Maykov at this period amply demonstrate: they are full of despair, and the opinions expressed in them are anything but objective. Geneva suffers particularly at Dostoyevsky's pen: 'Geneva is boring and gloomy, a stupid Protestant town with an awful climate'; 'The worst thing of all is that Geneva is so absolutely awful: a gloomy place. Today is Sunday. Nothing could be gloomier or more terrible than their Sunday.'⁴³ In view of the obvious antipathy Dostoyevsky felt for Geneva and all things Protestant at this period, it should perhaps not surprise us that the Swiss Protestants in The Idiot do not appear in a good light.

The episode in which they feature belongs to the period before the action of the novel proper, when Myshkin is in Switzerland undergoing a cure for his 'idiocy'. Myshkin relates to the Yepanchin family the tale of his relationship with Marie, a young Swiss girl who had been rejected by the people in her village.⁴⁴ She had been seduced by a Frenchman and had run away with him, only to be abandoned and forced to

return in shame. The other villagers had shunned her; her own mother had treated her shamefully; and Marie had been reduced to taking refuge in the hills, where she looked after sheep. Myshkin had befriended Marie, and brought the initially hostile village children to love her, thus making the end of her life happy, although he had incurred the wrath of the self-righteous villagers in so doing.

Myshkin's tale is not at all profound: it appeals immediately to one's sense of indignation and compassion, speaking to the heart rather than the mind. But it reveals a great deal about Dostoyevsky's assessment of various aspects of Protestantism. First, considerable criticism is levelled at what is presented as the Protestant conception of morality. The religion of the villagers is remarkable for its lack of compassion and love, and for its rigid criteria for defining right and wrong. Marie, like Sonya Marmeladova in Crime and Punishment, is an immoral creature by the standards of conventional morality, and as such she is roundly condemned by all the good and upright Protestants of the village. At the same time her mother, a harsh and ungrateful woman, has their respect. The villagers do not even begin to consider forgiving Marie. They do not help her to regain her dignity as a human being, and they effectively cause her death. Yet all the time they are convinced that they are acting morally, since their conception of immorality is limited to sexual matters. As Myshkin laments: 'How hard they are towards this! What harsh attitudes they have towards it!' ⁴⁵ Myshkin's tale tells us that it is the villagers who are behaving immorally, not Marie.

A comment made by Dostoyevsky in a letter to Maykov at this

period is further evidence that he felt strongly about the false notion of morality which he attributes to the Swiss. Writing from Geneva, and as usual criticizing the town sharply, he says: 'The morals here are wild [nnavy dikiye]: if only you knew what they consider good and what bad'. He goes on to give an example of crimes which he alleges are condoned by Genevan society: 'What thieving, what swindling - which has become a legal part of trading'⁴⁶. This tendency to concentrate upon questions of morality when considering Swiss Protestantism could perhaps be evidence that Dostoyevsky shared the popular conception of the particular type of Protestantism which developed in Switzerland, specifically in Geneva: Calvinism. Calvinism has often been associated in the popular consciousness with a self-righteous morality which is ready to condone sins of lack of love and compassion, while judging very harshly the more obvious sins of violence and sexual immorality. The picture Dostoyevsky paints of the Swiss villagers is consistent with such an interpretation of Calvinism. It seems that Dostoyevsky nowhere mentions Calvin by name in his writings: Luther is the only one of the Reformers to be mentioned specifically. It is, however, very unlikely that Dostoyevsky was unaware of Calvin: he was reasonably widely read in religious matters, and may have read Ranke's History of the Reformation.⁴⁷ Certainly in The Idiot he captures what for some is the spirit of Calvinism.

The second main charge which Dostoyevsky brings against the Swiss Protestants is that their lives are at odds with their professed Christianity. For a confession traditionally associated with great familiarity with the Bible, the Swiss

villagers are surprisingly unaware of Biblical situations when they meet them in real life. The tale of Marie contains many parallels with the Gospel stories: she is variously presented as the fallen woman and the prodigal son; and, like Christ Himself when He washed the feet of his disciples, she washes the feet of her ungrateful mother. Yet the villagers are immune to the spirit of the Gospels. They choose to forget that Christ showed concern and forgiveness to sinners, rather than judging them harshly. On the rare occasions when they act in a slightly more charitable manner, they feel very self-righteous, like the shepherd who would sometimes give Marie the remains of his meal, and 'considered this a great act of kindness on his part'.⁴⁸ Dostoyevsky comments upon this particular alleged feature of the Protestant mentality in his Diary for 1876. Writing about the various charity appeals made in the spa town of Ems, he draws particular attention to a contribution of just five pfennigs recorded in the donation book. He espies a fair amount of business sense in the German who made the donation: he has, as it were, 'calculated the minimum cost of admission into Paradise', on the basis of Christ's words that even the smallest thing done for a child will count for much.⁴⁹ This 'spiritual accounting' is firmly rejected by Dostoyevsky.

The Christianity of the Pastor who appears in the tale of Marie is just as harsh and censorious as that of his parishioners. The Pastor himself, as one would expect in the light of the official Church figures who have featured in Dostoyevsky's writings prior to The Idiot, is depicted very critically. He is a careerist, whose sole ambition is to

become a well-known preacher. Like the priest in Crime and Punishment, he is identified as a member of the respected establishment, as is demonstrated by the collusion between himself and the schoolmaster as they lead the campaign against Myshkin after Marie's death. The religion he preaches is a marked contrast to the all-embracing Christianity of Dostoyevsky's Christian characters, and it contains recognizable features of the harsher aspects of Calvinist theology. For example, he indirectly refers to the division of mankind into those who are in a state of grace and those who are not. According to the Pastor, Marie is apparently not, having been 'marked out by the finger of God'.⁵⁰ That there is no attempt to bring her back into the fold seems consistent with such predeterminist teaching. Another feature of the Pastor's religion is his readiness to decide himself when grace has been either gained or lost, rather than leaving such momentous decisions to God, as Dostoyevsky's Christian spokesmen tend to do. This theme of gaining and losing grace is developed in more detail in the account of the Genevan Christians in The Brothers Karamazov, as will be seen below. Here it serves to introduce another alleged feature of Protestant theology: the conviction that there is a correlation between one's spiritual state and one's material prosperity. Thus the Pastor says of Marie: 'Here she is, bare-footed and in rags - a warning for all those who lose grace'.⁵¹ If it is true that a person's spiritual state can be calculated according to the material prosperity he enjoys, then one must conclude that most of Dostoyevsky's Christian characters are excluded from the group of the 'elect', since they tend to be notably lacking

in the blessings of this world.

Just as Sonya Marmeladova challenges the official priest in Crime and Punishment, albeit unconsciously, so Myshkin challenges the Pastor. He turns the children against him, and criticizes his actions in front of them. Significantly, we are told that Myshkin was only 'almost' reconciled with the Pastor after the death of Marie: it is difficult to think of any other occasion when Myshkin withholds his complete forgiveness.⁵² The tale of Marie clearly tells us a great deal about the type of religion Dostoyevsky rejects. It is not merely negative, however: it contains hints of an alternative to this allegedly harsh Swiss Protestantism. Thus, although Marie does not receive the forgiveness of the official Church, another source of forgiveness is apparently present, in the form of the children of her village: 'through [the children] she forgot her dark despair, as if she had received forgiveness from them'.⁵³ The children seem to have replaced the Pastor as the dispenser of God's forgiveness. (This does not prevent Dostoyevsky from portraying the less than angelic side of the children's natures, as when they initially display extreme hostility to Myshkin and Marie.) This concept is further developed when we recall that at the beginning of his tale, Myshkin refers to the children as 'little birds'.⁵⁴ There is another occasion in Dostoyevsky's writings when birds are alleged to be involved in the granting of God's forgiveness: in The Brothers Karamazov, where we hear Zosima's brother, Markel, ask forgiveness of 'God's little birds'.⁵⁵ Zosima himself tells the monks to ask forgiveness of the birds.⁵⁶ It is as if the birds as much as the children, in their

capacity as part of God's creation, function as His priests,
 His witnesses to all men. Dostoyevsky is here going much
 further than the doctrine of 'the priesthood of all believers'
 which we detected in Crime and Punishment⁵⁷: this is rather
 'the priesthood of all creation'. Such a concept is far
 removed from the formal dispensation which would have been
 the Pastor's to grant.

An alternative conception of grace is also implied,
 which again contrasts markedly with the rather arbitrary manner
 in which grace is lost and found according to the Pastor.
 Dostoyevsky's conception of grace does not correspond to a
 fixed theological formula, but is rather represented symbol-
 ically by the rays of the setting sun, the time of day which
 was so special to him.⁵⁸ In our analysis of Zosima's child-
 hood visit to Church we commented upon the grace-bearing
 shafts of sunlight;⁵⁹ and significantly it is at the setting
 of the sun that Myshkin sees Marie for the last time.⁶⁰ This
 suggests that, although the official Church denies her member-
 ship, Marie may indeed be regarded as a sanctified member of
 the Christian family. The alternative way of approaching
 and understanding specific theological concepts which is
 advocated in the tale of Marie contrasts with what is present-
 ed as the Protestant practice of separating religion from
 life and making Christianity a question of adhering to legal-
 istic theological formulations.⁶¹ Dostoyevsky points instead
 to the participation of the whole of creation in the business
 of Christian forgiveness and grace. This is consistent with
 Orthodox theology whereby not only man but all of creation is
 redeemed and forms part of one Godly whole. Once again,

therefore, we see that Dostoyevsky has not broken with the spirit of Orthodoxy.

Swiss Protestantism is subjected to equally harsh treatment in The Brothers Karamazov. The context is Ivan's conversation with Alyosha in the chapter 'Rebellion', in which he relates a series of examples of man's inhumanity to man, each more heart-rending than the last. What is striking about the tale of Richard in Geneva is that the inhumanity is carried out in the name of Christianity.⁶² The setting is similar to the story of Marie, in that Richard too offends against conventional morality, since he is illegitimate. Although this clearly is not his fault, the good-living Swiss feel entitled to treat him as an object: he is given away as a child, and subsequently used as a servant. Once again Dostoyevsky introduces a Bible parallel, for Richard goes off to watch swine, and is driven by hunger to steal their food. Ivan himself remarks that Richard is 'like the prodigal son in the Gospel'. Ill-treatment eventually causes Richard to run away from his owners: he turns to crime, murders an old man, and is sentenced to death. At this point his fate differs from that of Marie, since he is unfortunate enough to fall prey to the official Lutheran Church: in the light of his subsequent experiences we might feel that Marie was fortunate in being rejected by that same body. Richard is surrounded by the good Christians of Geneva, forcefully converted to Christianity, and goes to the scaffold crying that it is the best day of his life, for he is going to die 'in the Lord'.

Dostoyevsky uses the story of Richard to challenge several

features of Protestant theology as he understands - or perhaps chooses to understand - it. First, like the Anglicans in Winter Notes, the Genevan Christians are criticized for being concerned exclusively with man's spiritual state. If the 'Legend' is a rejection of concentration upon the earthly at the expense of the spiritual, then the tale of Richard represents the opposite extreme: spiritual bread without any concern for earthly bread. The first time the Genevans show concern for Richard is when he is safely locked away in prison and constitutes another potential spiritual scalp. They make no allowance for the physical needs of man: indeed, they do not understand them, since they themselves have never been in need. Their moral code allows them to live in luxury while others go hungry, but it condemns a starving boy driven to steal pig-swill, 'for it is forbidden to steal'. They thus demonstrate the same hypocritical double standards of morality as we saw in the tale of Marie, and are living proof of the dikiye nray to which Dostoyevsky refers in his letter to Maykov. Although slow to show compassion, the Genevan Christians are very quick to condemn, as the very language Ivan uses to describe their treatment of Richard suggests: yevo skhvatili, sudili, i prisudili k smerti ('he was caught, tried, and sentenced to death'). The quick succession of verbs conveys the short, sharp sequence of events; and the alliteration produced by the repetition of 's' emphasizes the harsh and unfeeling attitude the Genevans display. The reader is encouraged to respond with indignation, and to say with the Grand Inquisitor: 'Feed them, then ask them to be virtuous'.

It is implied that the 'immoral morality' of the Geneva Christians is the result of their adherence to the doctrine of sola fide. Throughout Ivan's narrative they are depicted as being uniquely concerned with concepts like grace and conversion: such matters are always on their lips. Dostoyevsky implies that sola fide is a very useful religious code for those who do not want Christianity to cost them too much in earthly terms. This is a perverse interpretation of the doctrine by Dostoyevsky, as would immediately be pointed out by Protestants themselves: the doctrine 'faith without works is dead' is as much a Protestant principle as sola fide; and the test of faith for a Protestant is the evidence of Christian love in his everyday life. Dostoyevsky himself was very familiar with the concept of a close relationship between faith and works, as will be seen when we come to consider the character of Zosima, with his teaching of 'active love'. Yet he still chooses to discredit the doctrine in this instance. This is despite the fact that a few pages later, in the 'Legend', the concept of sola fide is seen in an altogether more elevated way. Once again, a concept which is apparently advocated in the 'Legend' is discredited by Dostoyevsky when examined in a specifically Protestant context, and we are presented with a corruption of the original.

Richard's experiences also give Dostoyevsky the opportunity to criticize what he sees as the Protestant conception of 'conversion'. Richard, we read, 'turned to the Christian faith'. This formula is not used by Dostoyevsky of his own Christian characters, whose 'conversion' is of a very different nature. Stepan Trofimovich's 'conversion' at the end of The Devils is

a matter between him and his God: the priest, as we saw in Chapter Two, is completely irrelevant to the situation.⁶⁴ Alyosha Karamazov's mystical experience in The Brothers Karamazov can hardly be called a conversion, since he is already a Christian at the point when it occurs. It is nevertheless characteristic of Christianity as presented in Dostoyevsky's writings, in that it is something which happens between Alyosha and the universe, God's world: no 'pastors, members of various Christian brotherhoods, philanthropic ladies and so on' are present, as in the case of Richard. Richard's conversion, by contrast, involves much outside effort and pressure from 'charitable and devout Geneva'. Ivan describes the scene in a heavily ironic manner, and once again the very language he uses graphically conveys the mentality of the Genevan Christians. Ivan piles on the verbs, with their regularly accented endings, in direct proportion as the good citizens of Geneva pile on the pressure: usóveshchivali, ubezhdáli, napiráli, pilíli, davíli ('they exhorted him, tried their best to persuade him, wheedled, coaxed and pressed him'). Finally they achieve their aim, and Richard is converted, but one feels that the conversion process has been between Richard and Geneva, rather than between Richard and God.

It is the Protestant concept of grace, as apparently understood by Dostoyevsky, which is next subjected to criticism. In the story of Marie we saw that the village Pastor was very prompt to decide that grace had been lost. In Geneva it is the descent of grace upon a former sinner which becomes the focus of attention. The image of the descent of grace becomes

almost a comic leitmotif in the narrative, proclaimed every few lines: 'Grace has descended upon you! . . . Yes, grace has descended upon me!' Richard is repeatedly urged to meet his impending execution joyfully, and to regard it as a privilege, until finally he is convinced that this is indeed the case, and cries out: 'This is the happiest day of my life, for I am going to the Lord!' Like the chorus in a Gilbert and Sullivan opera, 'the pastors, the judges and the philanthropic ladies' take up the joyous refrain: 'Yes, this is the happiest day of your life, for you are going to the Lord!' So closely do the themes of grace and execution become entwined, thanks to Ivan's deliberately naive narrative tone, that the reader finds it hard to challenge the logic of his concluding sentence: 'And so, covered with the kisses of his brothers, brother Richard was dragged onto the scaffold, placed under the guillotine, and had his head chopped off in a most brotherly fashion, because grace had descended upon him too'. The reader is encouraged to ask whether grace is really adequate compensation for what has gone before, particularly when the two distinct stages of Richard's life are placed side by side in one sentence: 'Before in my childhood and youth I was glad to eat pig-swill but now grace has descended upon me too and I am dying in the Lord!' The very structure of the sentence, neatly divided into two halves, accurately conveys the mentality of the Genevan Christians: they divide life into two spheres, the religious and the secular, and do not feel the need for any common point of reference between the two.

The maliciously light-hearted manner in which the episode of the Genevan Christians is related does not detract from

the important position it occupies in the religious thinking of the novel. The frivolous style brings out even more effectively the grotesque quality of the spirituality of the Genevans. The episode looks both backwards and forwards in the novel. It looks backwards to the Church courts debate, and constitutes a strong challenge to the view that Christianity is one distinct area of life for which a small corner should be specifically reserved, since the Church is 'not of this world'. It looks forwards to the 'Legend', and the debate over whether Christianity should function on the material or the spiritual plane. Christ's Christianity as presented in the 'Legend' would appear to relegate earthly concerns to second place. The Genevan Christians could claim to be following precisely such teaching: they too concentrate upon the spiritual, as Richard and others like him discover to their cost. However, the change of tone in Ivan's narrative between the chapter 'Rebellion' and the 'Legend' suggests that there is a difference between Christ and the Genevan Christians. In 'Rebellion' it is flippant and heavily ironic: in the 'Legend', Christ is presented in a sympathetic and understanding manner. The way in which the Genevan Christians are presented does not in itself nullify what is said in the 'Legend' to the effect that there is only one kind of true Christianity: that which functions on the spiritual plane. What the Genevan episode demonstrates is that Dostoyevsky was well aware that the type of Christianity he advocates in the 'Legend' can easily become corrupted, and far removed from the spirit in which it was originally conceived.

As in the journals, therefore, the presentation of Protestantism in Dostoyevsky's novels is, almost without exception, extremely negative. Most of Dostoyevsky's publicistic references to Protestantism were, as we saw, related to the fundamental question of the need for a structure in Christianity, and man's ability to cope in the absence of such a structure. This concern is reflected in The Humiliated and the Insulted where, consistent with the trend we identified in the 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor', Dostoyevsky lends his support to freedom in Christianity, specifically, the freedom of the individual to go directly to Christ's teachings and to assess them without reference to a Church. In the later novels, the emphasis changes slightly, and the focus of Dostoyevsky's attention is the type of Christian Protestantism allegedly engenders. Dostoyevsky, we discover, does not consider Protestants to be very attractive people: as they appear in his novels they are generally devoid of compassion, and are quick to condemn human failings; they tend to ignore the material needs of man, and to show minimal social concern. Although he does not say so directly, Dostoyevsky implies that such an attitude is encouraged by the centrality they accord to the doctrine of sola fide. He chooses to ignore the fact that for Protestants the evidence of faith is its outworking in the form of love in one's everyday life. Dostoyevsky seems to associate Protestants with a legalistic approach to spiritual matters and a narrow understanding of what constitutes Christianity. The Protestants in his novels are immune to the spirit of Christianity: they strictly define

the domain of religion, and do not allow it to intrude into other areas of their life. Dostoyevsky implies that Christianity should, on the contrary, affect every area of life, and that the whole of creation is involved in such concepts as grace and forgiveness. We noted that this reflects the spirit of Orthodoxy.

The findings of this chapter have thus dealt a blow to the theory that Protestantism might find favour with Dostoyevsky. Rather than applauding the freedom and responsibility which Protestantism places upon the individual, Dostoyevsky casts doubt upon the wisdom of such an approach to Christianity. He does not seem to credit Protestants with possession of the image of Christ which plays such a central role in the 'Legend', and which is seen to enable men to cope with freedom in religion and to recognize the truth. He further discredits Protestantism by offering a biased interpretation of certain Protestant doctrines. Does this negative response constitute a retraction of the bold message of the 'Legend', where Dostoyevsky advances a Christianity which both is and must be completely divorced from institutionalized religion? This initially appears to be the case. Yet the fact remains that the representatives of what we might term 'Dostoyevskian' Christianity whom we have so far encountered nevertheless apparently manage without a Church. Perhaps it is the specifically Protestant context to which Dostoyevsky objects? It is with this in mind that we now proceed to an examination of Dostoyevsky's views on Judaism.

1. I. de Madariaga, Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great (London, 1981), 515.
2. Khomyakov, PSS (3rd edition), II, 51.
3. Ibid., 44.
4. DP, 1877, 8 (1877 Jan. I, 1).
5. DP, 1877, 5-11 (1877 Jan. I, 1).
6. DP, 1877, 207 (1877 May/June III, 1).
7. Ibid.
8. DP, 1877, 210 (1877 May/June III, 1).
9. DP, 1877, 210-12 (1877 May/June III, 1).
10. DP, 1877, 9 (1877 Jan. I, 1). Similar logic is applied by Dostoyevsky to the situation of the atheistic nihilists in nineteenth-century Russia. Thus Shatov in The Devils says of the movement: 'They would be the first to be unhappy if Russia somehow were rebuilt, even if it was as they wanted, and if she suddenly became rich and happy. There wouldn't be anyone for them to hate then, no one to spit at, no one for them to mock.' (PSS, X, 110-11.)
11. DP, 1877, 9 (1877 Jan. I, 1).
12. Ibid.
13. J. Muckle, Nikolai Leskov and the 'Spirit of Protestantism' (Birmingham, 1978), 11.
14. J. Meyendorff, Orthodoxy and Catholicity (New York, 1966), 119-20.
15. PSS, XX, 190.
16. PSS, XIV, 233.
17. PSS, XXI, 182.
18. Ibid., 215.
19. Ibid., 223.
20. Dostoyevsky's comments on the correspondence may be found in PSS, XXI, 205-8. We referred to this correspondence in connection with a separate point in the previous chapter: see Chapter Four, 202-3, above.
21. PSS, XXI, 207.

22. Ibid.
23. DP, 1877, 13-15 (1877 Jan. I, 2). Further detailed reference will not be given.
24. PSS, XIII, 289.
25. PSS, XXI, 55.
26. The comment appears in the first amended version of the chapter: see PSS, XII, 121 (amendment at 10: 27).
27. DP, 1877, 210 (1877 May/June III, 1).
28. In fact, Darwinism had a less hostile reception from the Russian Orthodox Church than from the Churches of Western Europe and the United States: Kline writes that 'the resistance to Darwinism on the part of the Russian Orthodox Church was of a comparatively dispassionate and "rational" kind, and . . . most, though not all, of the criticisms directed at Darwinian theory were scientifically justified, or at least intellectually respectable, in their historical setting'. See G. L. Kline, 'Darwinism and the Russian Orthodox Church', Continuity and Change in Russian and Soviet Thought, ed. E. J. Simmons (Harvard, 1955) (307-28), 327.
29. PSS, XXII, 91-8.
30. Ibid., 94.
31. Ibid., 95-6.
32. Ibid., 96.
33. Ibid.
34. PSS, XI, 270-1.
35. PSS, XIII, 378-9.
36. PSS, XXI, 96-8. It would appear that the 'observer' in question is Pobedonostsev: see corresponding note in PSS, XXII, 366.
37. See Chapter Two, 68-9, above.
38. PSS, III, 177.
39. Chapter Three, 163-6, above; Leontyev, SS, VIII, 195-6.
40. The precise role it plays for them will be examined in more detail in Chapter Eight, below.
41. "See Chapter Four, 205, above.
42. This and the following descriptions of the Anglicans appear in PSS, V, 73.

43. Pisma, II, 72; 79.
44. The story of Marie appears in PSS, VIII, 57-63.
45. Ibid., 59.
46. Pisma, II, 64.
47. L. von Ranke, Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation (1839-47). See Pisma, I, 138 where Dostoyevsky asks his brother Mikhail to send him the works of the 'new' historians: 'Vico, Guizot, Thierry, Thiers, Ranke etc. etc.'
48. PSS, VIII, 59.
49. PSS, XXIII, 72-3.
50. PSS, VIII, 60.
51. Ibid.
52. Ibid., 63.
53. Ibid., 62.
54. Ibid., 58.
55. PSS, XIV, 263.
56. Ibid., 290.
57. See Chapter Two, 85-6, above.
58. See Grossman, Seminariy, 68.
59. See Chapter Two, 73, above.
60. PSS, VIII, 63.
61. We noted a similar tendency to move away from a legalistic interpretation of theological concepts in the priest scene in Crime and Punishment, where the official Church's understanding of 'sin' and 'forgiveness' is challenged. (See Chapter Two, 83-4, above.) In Crime and Punishment, of course, it is the Russian Orthodox Church which is the culprit.
62. The tale of Richard appears in PSS, XIV, 218-9. Further detailed reference will not be given.
63. PSS, XIV, 230.
64. See Chapter Two, 87-91, above.

The treatment of Jews and Judaism in Dostoyevsky's works provoked an angry response during the writer's lifetime, and elicited comments like the following, taken from a letter from one of the Jewish readers of Diary of a Writer: 'No, unfortunately you understand neither the Jewish people, nor their life, nor their spirit, nor, finally, their forty-century history'.¹ Although for a brief period at the beginning of the eighties Dostoyevsky had sided with the progressive camp in advocating the extension of Jewish rights in Russia, these pro-Jewish sentiments were short-lived, and he subsequently incurred the wrath of the progressives and was accused by them of 'manic Judophobia'.² Eventually Dostoyevsky decided to speak out in his own defence, and he devoted an entire chapter of the March 1877 issue of Diary of a Writer to a systematic refutation of the charges of anti-Semitism which had been made against him. The chapter concerned, 'The Jewish Question', will be examined in more detail below: in the meantime it may be observed that some sixty years later extracts from it were cited approvingly in a virulently anti-Semitic article in a Munich-based pro-Nazi journal, which suggests that Dostoyevsky did not put up an altogether convincing defence.³ Dostoyevsky's anti-Semitism has continued to be a source of embarrassment for his readers, and various attempts have been made to conceal it: Soviet scholars, for example, have felt compelled to delete derogatory references to the Jews from his correspondence before publishing it.⁴

When examining the presentation of Jews and Jewish themes in Dostoyevsky's writings, it is indeed difficult not to become involved in a discussion of the extent of his anti-Semitic tendencies. The primary concern of the present chapter, however, is to determine what Dostoyevsky's treatment of Jews and Judaism reveals of his own religious thought and of his attitude to institutionalized religion: anti-Semitism per se will be referred to only in so far as it has a bearing upon that central theme. Attention will be focused upon two particular areas: the character of Isay Fomich Bumshteyn in Notes from the House of the Dead; and Dostoyevsky's response to the Jewish messianic consciousness. The full significance of Dostoyevsky's treatment of Jewish messianism for our purposes becomes apparent only when viewed in the context of 'Russian messianism', as expressed in the thoughts of Myshkin and Shatov. Consequently, part of this chapter will be devoted to an examination of the attraction of messianism for some of Dostoyevsky's own religious characters. In the course of the chapter we will be concerned to see whether Dostoyevsky's treatment of Judaism in any way supports the bold claims made in the 'Legend of the Grand Inquisitor'; or whether, on the contrary, there is a restatement of the caution which characterizes his response to Protestantism.⁵

It seems likely that Dostoyevsky was not very familiar with Jews or Judaism at the outset of his writing career. We may assume that he had gleaned something of the history of the Jewish nation and its great figures as a result of his religious upbringing, particularly his knowledge of the Old

One Hundred and Four Holy Stories from the Old and New Testaments;

and we know that the story of Job was one Bible episode which particularly affected him. But he had had few opportunities for personal contact with Jews, since the Jews had been expelled from St. Petersburg in 1826. In all probability, literature was the primary channel through which Dostoyevsky received his impressions of the Jews: it would appear that in any event books were almost more real to him than reality when he was a young man; and Russian literature had its stereo-typed Jewish figure in much the same way as the literatures of other nations.⁶

At first sight it appears that there are no significant references to Jews in Dostoyevsky's pre-exile writings. However, it is known that in the early eighteen-forties he wrote a play in which the main character was a Jew. He refers to the play in a letter to his brother in January 1844.⁷ It is likely that, for the reasons mentioned above, the play owed more to Dostoyevsky's familiarity with literature than to his familiarity with real-life Jews: significantly in this respect, the play was called The Jew Yankel, which suggests that it was inspired by Gogol's Jew of the same name in Taras Bulba. But nothing of the play remains, and all that can reasonably be concluded is that the Jews were a subject which, for a time at least, interested Dostoyevsky.

The paucity of references to Jews in the pre-exile writings extant suggests that this interest was not lasting: the only times when Jews are referred to are usually when Dostoyevsky's characters use the term zhid ('yid') and its

derivatives as an insult, in the sense of 'rogue' or 'scoundrel'. This is consistent with the traditional designation of Jews as objects of ridicule and scorn. In Netochka Nezvanova, however, a Jew is mentioned in a slightly different context. The Jew concerned is the famous violinist 'S', who is coming to St. Petersburg to give a concert. Yefimov, Nelly's father and himself once a talented violinist, is extremely jealous of 'S' and his success, and he bitterly condemns foreign musicians who come to Russia from abroad and are fêted by the Russian public. Not only do they take Russian money, but they also, we are invited to assume, prevent Russian talent from being recognized.⁸ The theme of Jewish exploitation in Russia and the suppression of the native population by Jewish settlers was to constitute the mainstay of Dostoyevsky's anti-Semitic attacks in the eighteen-seventies, but at this early stage in his career it appears only briefly.

In Notes from the House of the Dead we for the first time encounter a Jew who is portrayed in reasonable detail: the convict Isay Fomich Bumshteyn. It is possible that Dostoyevsky's knowledge of Judaism had increased by the time he wrote Notes from the House of the Dead, which was begun in 1855, and was published in Vremya in 1860-2. First, when in prison before being sent to Siberia Dostoyevsky had asked for, and was sent, a copy of both Testaments: thus he had had the opportunity to refresh his memories of the Bible stories he had been taught as a child.⁹ Second, and perhaps most important, the character of Isay Fomich Bumshteyn is based upon a real-life Jew, Isay Bumshtel, alongside whom Dostoyevsky was imprisoned: Dostoyevsky had thus had the chance to observe

a Jew at first hand. Finally, upon his release from the prison camp in 1854, Dostoyevsky asked his brother to send him, among other books, the writings of the ancient historians such as Herodotus, Tacitus, Pliny and Josephus Flavius.¹⁰ These would certainly have acquainted him with the history of the Jewish people, if he in fact received them and read them. Whatever Dostoyevsky's knowledge of Judaism at the beginning of the eighteen-sixties, Isay Fomich Bumshteyn is the most fully-drawn Jewish character in the whole body of his writings, and it is therefore important to establish the character's significance for the purposes of the present study.

Isay Fomich is unusual in the context of Russian literature in that, as Ingold remarks, he is portrayed as a practising Jew:

What distinguishes Dostoyevsky's Bumshteyn from both his literary prototypes and his literary offspring is the extremely significant fact that he . . . is portrayed not only as the allegedly typical Jewish opportunist and businessman, but also - and in exceptional detail - as an authentic representative of a specific type of religiosity.¹¹

Ingold is referring to Dostoyevsky's description of Isay Fomich performing his eve-of-Sabbath ritual, an episode which, together with the convicts' trip to the bath-house, is one of the most memorable scenes in the novel.¹² It is also Isay Fomich's first major appearance after his arrival at the prison camp. Both these facts have encouraged commentators to accord the prayer scene a position of prominence when assessing Dostoyevsky's attitude to Judaism at the time of Notes from the House of the Dead. Great attention has been paid

to the accuracy of Dostoyevsky's account of the ritual. Pascal claims that Isay Fomich's actions in the prayer scene 'do not correspond to any rite'; and he alleges that 'spitting during prayer is considered a sacrilege'.¹³ Ingold, by contrast, considers that Isay Fomich's behaviour accurately conveys the ecstatic worship characteristic of Hassidistic Judaism; and he informs us that there is indeed one particular Jewish ritual in which spitting plays a part.¹⁴ One is tempted to ask how likely it is that Isay Fomich practised that particular rite; or whether Dostoyevsky himself was aware of its existence; and whether it might not be more significant that Gogol's Jew Yankel spits when praying.¹⁵ Goldstein claims that Dostoyevsky's description of Isay Fomich at prayer is 'bristling with errors': 'not only is Isai Fomich wrapped in a tallith, which is almost never worn on Friday evenings, but he is shown wearing phylacteries, which are used only on weekday mornings, never on the Sabbath'.¹⁶ So far as Goldstein is concerned, Dostoyevsky has introduced the errors deliberately, and with malicious intent: in order to make Judaism appear a grotesque and ludicrous religion.

There is thus a tendency to take the description of Isay Fomich's specific type of religiosity as the starting point when assessing the presentation of Judaism in Notes from the House of the Dead, and to accord the ritual absolute significance. The conclusion reached using such an approach is that Dostoyevsky uses the prayer scene to discredit Judaism. Certainly, it must be admitted that the sight of Isay Fomich earnestly reproducing every twist and moan apparently required

by his faith is not an edifying spectacle, entertaining though it may be. Perhaps it is right to accord the prayer scene prominence. We would argue, however, that there are grounds for challenging this approach. First, by attaching such importance to Dostoyevsky's description of Isay Fomich's ritual, and by interpreting the distortions which may or may not be present as an attempt by Dostoyevsky to discredit Judaism, the critics effectively imply that Dostoyevsky himself would have been willing to judge a religion on the basis of its ritual. Our findings so far in this study suggest that this would be out of character for Dostoyevsky. Rather than attach importance and prominence to ritual, he and his characters have demonstrated a strong tendency to regard ritual as ultimately dispensable. The critics under consideration, on the contrary, effectively elevate ritual to a position of central importance for Dostoyevsky and thus, we would suggest, betray a fundamental misunderstanding of his conception of religion.

Secondly, we would suggest that precisely because it is unusual for a Russian author to supply a detailed description of a Jew practising his religion, there is a temptation for critics and readers generally to be diverted by the prayer scene, and to isolate it from the context of Isay Fomich's personality as a whole. It tends to be accorded prominence, and to be seen as the determining factor in the presentation of Isay Fomich, as if he did not exist outside his religion. As a result, every aspect of Isay Fomich's character is seen as a function of his faith. We would argue that a close examination of Isay Fomich reveals that the opposite is true:

that the prayer scene is not of absolute significance, but is rather itself a function of the character's very idiosyncratic personality. Consequently, in order to arrive at an accurate assessment of the significance of Isay Fomich for Dostoyevsky's attitude to Judaism in particular, and institutionalized religion in general, we must begin with the fact of his personality, and consider the prayer scene in the light of that personality.

Having thus set ourselves the task of examining Isay Fomich's character per se, problems immediately arise, since initially Dostoyevsky specifically uses Jewishness as a vehicle for characterization. In his description of Isay Fomich's arrival at the prison camp, the author avails himself of a ready-made character: the Jewish stereotype of Russian literature.¹⁷ Jews were traditionally depicted as publicans, pawnbrokers or tailors; they were subjected to ridicule; and they were invariably at some point accused of responsibility for the death of Christ. Within a remarkably short time of his arrival, Isay Fomich has been stamped with these trademarks.¹⁸ Thus when he fearfully makes his way across the hut and sits on his bunk, he tucks his legs up in a manner reminiscent of the tailor Petrov in Gogol's The Overcoat.¹⁹ Further, although he is at first timid and dares not speak, when one of the convicts approaches him with some old rags and asks to borrow money on the strength of them, he miraculously comes to life, and becomes bold: 'He suddenly roused himself and began busily running his fingers over the rags'. Finally, very soon afterwards a convict shouts out at him: 'He sold Christ!' These are all

features which belong to the general Jewish stereotype. It is, however, specifically in terms of Gogol's Jew Yankel that Isay Fomich is presented to us, particularly so far as his physical appearance is concerned. Thus the narrator remarks that Isay Fomich always reminded him of 'Gogol's Jew Yankel in Taras Bulba, who, having got undressed to go to bed . . . looked terribly like a chicken'.²⁰ Perhaps not unexpectedly, Isay Fomich himself is described as 'the spitting image of a plucked chicken'. Dostoyevsky's technique is quite transparent, and the reader's familiarity with the stereotype fills in any details the writer may omit.

Despite this initial recourse to stereotypes by Dostoyevsky, Isay Fomich is nevertheless given a character which exists apart from his Jewishness, as may be seen if one widens one's view to take in all of his appearances in the novel, particularly the two major episodes apart from the prayer scene: the visit to the bath-house; and the convict theatre. First, he is an enthusiast, to the point of extremism. In the bath-house, for example, he is not satisfied with steaming as the other convicts do, but has an apparently insatiable desire to get hotter and hotter. This extremism is mirrored in the language used to describe him, which is full of superlatives: 'And, to crown it all, Isay Fomich cackles at the top of his voice, seated on the very highest tier. He steams himself into a state of unconsciousness, but no degree of heat seems to satisfy him'.²¹ (My emphasis.) He commits himself completely to whatever he is doing: just as in the bath-house he seems to turn into steam and heat, so at the theatre, we read, 'he was completely transformed into hearing

Second, Isay Fomich enjoys life greatly: he is ever cheerful, makes the most of things, and is very attached to the things of this earth. He spares no expense at the theatre or the baths, determined to enjoy himself to the full. In his enthusiasm for the steam bath in particular, he is reminiscent of another of Dostoyevsky's characters who can think of no more comfortingly earthly pleasure: Ivan Karamazov's devil in The Brothers Karamazov.²³ Ever optimistic, Isay Fomich is the only one of the convicts to have concrete plans for the future, symbolized by his desire to marry, and by his secret recipe for removing the brand marks from his face when he is eventually released. Third, Isay Fomich possesses features which are characteristic of Dostoyevsky's long line of buffoons: he enjoys being the centre of attention, and will gladly make himself the figure of fun in order to remain centre-stage for a little longer. The fact that all eyes are upon him in the bath-house merely encourages him to more ridiculous extremes.

These are the main features of Isay Fomich's character, and it will be noted that they have all been illustrated with reference to a scene other than the prayer scene. In the prayer scene, Isay Fomich is merely true to his own character; and behaves as he would in any similar situation. He is the enthusiast and the extremist, falling to the depths of despair then rising to the heights of ecstasy. He believes absolutely in the religious ritual, seeing great significance in every word, just as he commits himself completely to what is said and done in the theatre production. He plays the buffoon,

pretending not to notice the arrival of the camp commandant. One looks in vain for something unique to the prayer scene, something to suggest that Isay Fomich's attitude to religion differs even slightly from his attitude to any other situation. One thinks it has been found upon reading how carefully he looks after his prayer shawl, only to recall that just as much care was taken to fold up the tattered rags he had accepted as a pledge.²⁴

The prayer scene is in no way distinctive, therefore, but is determined by the unchanging character which Dostoyevsky has created for Isay Fomich. The existence of this fundamental character explains why Dostoyevsky 'seems to have woven into the bathhouse scene features borrowed from the two earlier scenes'.²⁵ All of the major scenes in which Isay Fomich appears are similar: each is essentially a ritual, demanding participation and response. Isay Fomich's response is constant in each case because his character is constant, not because of the overriding influence of his religion. As a result, the prayer scene is valid not as a comment upon Dostoyevsky's conception of Judaism, but as an illustration of Isay Fomich in action. Isay Fomich is no more typical of a Jew practising his religion than he is typical of the average convict in the bath-house or at the theatre: not all convicts steam themselves to the point of unconsciousness; not all convicts become oblivious to all around at the theatre; and not all Jews, we are encouraged to assume, perform their ritual in such a ridiculous, even grotesque, manner. Thus, although the prayer scene initially appears to be of great

significance for an assessment of Dostoyevsky's relationship to Judaism, it loses much of its force.

An awareness of the above affects one's attitude to particular aspects of Dostoyevsky's portrayal of Isay Fomich which might initially appear to have a specifically religious significance. There is, for example, the question of the use Dostoyevsky made of the real-life prototype for his Jew, the convict Isay Bumshtel. There are real-life prototypes for many of the characters in Notes from the House of the Dead.²⁶ The characters in the novel may usually be traced back to their prototypes quite easily with the help of state records, although Dostoyevsky generally made some changes so far as physical appearance, crimes and sentences were concerned. In the case of Isay Fomich, Dostoyevsky stays very close to the facts: Isay Bumshtel had been convicted of murder, flogged and branded just as Isay Fomich is said to have been. In addition, Dostoyevsky made only a slight alteration to the original name. There is, however, one notable difference: according to the records, Isay Bumshtel was of Greek Orthodox faith, and would, therefore, have had no reason to perform the Jewish ritual which Isay Fomich performs in the novel.²⁷ The fact that Isay Fomich is portrayed as a practising Jew, and that no mention is made of baptism into Orthodoxy, would suggest a deliberate choice by Dostoyevsky. Soviet scholars have assumed that this is the case, and they observe that depicting Isay Fomich as a practising Jew 'gave [Dostoyevsky] the opportunity to create the lively and extremely humorous scene where Isay Fomich carries out his praying ritual'.²⁸ It is thus gently implied that Dostoyevsky was motivated by

anti-Jewish feelings. An alternative reason why Dostoyevsky chose to depict Isay Fomich as a practising Jew might have been that he was already unable, as he was later in his life, and as will be seen below, to conceive of someone who was a Jew by race no longer worshipping the Jewish God, and choosing instead the 'Russian' God. There is one further possibility, however. Goldstein reveals that a 'mistake' may have been made in connection with the records, and that Bumshtel may not have been of the Orthodox faith after all.²⁹ Clearly one can only hypothesize. However, since, as we have seen, the Jewish religion is less the focus of attention in the portrayal of Isay Fomich than initially appears to be the case, it is arguably less likely that Dostoyevsky would deliberately have made Isay Fomich a practising Jew in order to make a point about Judaism as a religion, and more likely that a mistake was, in fact, made in the records.

Isay Fomich's name poses a similar problem of interpretation. His patronymic, Fomich, is an impossibility for a Jew.³⁰ Ingold's suggested explanation for Dostoyevsky's choice of patronymic is consistent with the critic's interpretation of Isay Fomich as an actor playing a role. By making Isay Fomich 'the son of Thomas' (=Foma), Dostoyevsky 'closely associates him with a stereotype of Russian folklore: the "fool", who in oral folklore was frequently called "Foma" or "Fomka".³¹ Jackson has suggested that Isay Fomich's patronymic may be traced to a rather closer literary ancestor: Foma Fomich in Dostoyevsky's own The Village of Stepanchikovo and its Inhabitants.³² It might also be asked whether Isay

Fomich was not so named in order to recall the 'Foma' of the Bible. It was Thomas who doubted Christ's resurrection: perhaps Isay Fomich's patronymic is intended to make the point that the Jews as a nation did not accept Jesus as the promised Messiah and did not believe He had any divine properties. Such a suggestion is not unreasonable. On the other hand, since, as we have seen, it is consistently Isay Fomich the person rather than Isay Fomich the function of Judaism who is the centre of Dostoyevsky's attention, one is less inclined to attribute his patronymic to a desire by Dostoyevsky to make a pointed remark about Judaism as a religion, and more inclined towards one of the other suggested explanations.

Of all the incidents in the novel featuring Isay Fomich there is one, however, which clearly invites an interpretation in terms of his religious faith: the episode in which is described the reaction of the non-Orthodox convicts to the Orthodox convicts' celebration of Christmas, with its accompanying coarse revelry and drunkenness.³³ The other faiths represented in the camp are Old Belief, represented by an Old Believer who is not given a name; Islam, represented by 'a small group of Caucasian hill-dwellers', among whom Dostoyevsky pays particular attention to the Lezgian Nurra and the Tatar Aley; and Judaism, represented by Isay Fomich. Each of these faiths is effectively on trial at this point in the narrative. The general response to what happens is critical: the Old Believer, for example, goes off to his bunk to read the Bible, saddened to see a holy day abused; and Nurra, 'with righteous indignation', declares that 'Allah will be angry'. In both instances the sadness and anger are motivated by sincere

religious concern, and there is no suggestion of narrow sectarian hostility. This is not the case with Isay Fomich, however, who responds in a classic sectarian manner. His objection to the Orthodox Christians' festival stems not from sadness at their disrespect for God, but from his rejection of their particular rite. He makes it quite clear that he does not recognize the Russian Orthodox feast; that it therefore does not exist; and he makes a point of going about his work as usual. He behaves 'stubbornly and arrogantly'. Placing his response in the context of the novel as a whole 'only serves to confirm one's initial impression that the Jew is being intolerant, since Isay Fomich's own religious practices are respected by the prison authorities: he is allowed to leave the prison to attend services, for example; and although his religious ritual is laughed at, this is, as we have suggested, because of his own ridiculous character.

The fact that Dostoyevsky does not avail himself of the Jewish ritual scene in order to make a comment on Judaism as a religion, but instead chooses the Christmas day episode is entirely in keeping with what we have so far seen of his attitude to religion, and vindicates our rejection of the approach which takes the ritual as its starting point. Just as what Dostoyevsky rejects as a comment on religion is significant, so is what he chooses instead. In the Christmas day episode the Old Believer, the Muslims and the Jew are judged not on their ritual, but on their attitude to ritual, expressed in terms of generosity of spirit and a readiness to look beneath credal differences to what is good in each religion. Although of different creeds from the Orthodox convicts to a

greater or lesser extent, the old Believer and the Muslims feel a sense of religious brotherhood with them. They look beneath doctrinal differences to the essence of religion, love and worship of one's God, and they are saddened. Their attitude seems to have Dostoyevsky's approval. We have seen in previous chapters that Dostoyevsky himself displays a very tolerant attitude to Catholics and Protestants in his writings of this period: it would seem reasonable to suggest, therefore, that at the beginning of the eighteen-sixties he was inclined to regard ritual and credal differences merely as local manifestations of a shared religious consciousness which had no absolute significance in themselves.³⁴

In contrast to the generous response of the Old Believer and Nurra, Isay Fomich reacts like a true ritualist, for he exalts ritual and the specifics of religion to a decisive position in the evaluation of spirituality. It is for this that he is condemned by Dostoyevsky. Since it is Isay Fomich and no one else who is accredited with such a response, it would appear that this was a feature which Dostoyevsky associated specifically with Judaism, rather than with any other form of religious faith. Dostoyevsky's portrayal of Isay Fomich is, therefore, an indication of his attitude to Judaism, and it tells us that he had a negative opinion of it. We have seen, however, that the vehicle he uses for comment is not the prayer scene, but one which is much more appropriate to his general attitude to spiritual matters as revealed so far in the present study.

Apart from Isay Fomich, there are only two more Jewish characters of any note in Dostoyevsky's novels: Achilles the Jewish fireman in Crime and Punishment, who becomes an unwilling witness of Svidrigaylov's suicide; and Lyamshin in The Devils. Fleeting though it is, the appearance of Achilles has aroused considerable debate.³⁵ There has, for example, been a lively exchange of views about whether he is actually a fireman at all.³⁶ Differences of opinion also exist regarding the symbolic significance of this encounter between Svidrigaylov and a Jew. Some would say that the incident is an illustration of Dostoyevsky's humour: Svidrigaylov may appear to be the ideal Orthodox Slav,

but in him there is only a repulsive emptiness and boredom. He is the accursed and wandering Jew . . . Meanwhile the real Jew in his imperial Russian uniform makes the proper pronouncement of nationalistic orthodoxy: 'You can't do that there here'.³⁷

Others offer a rather more sombre explanation: Svidrigaylov's witness is, for example, seen as 'another parody and debasement (in his "Achilles helmet") of the heroic or godlike element in humanity. His "eternal sorrow" mirrors and reinforces the ultimate despair of Svidrigailov'.³⁸ Steinberg sees Svidrigaylov's suicide in front of the Jew as a challenge to the Jewish nation's 'existence merely for the sake of existence': better self-annihilation than 'the curse of self-preservation'.³⁹ Goldstein relates Achilles' appearance to Dostoyevsky's religious thought, declaring that even though the Jew appears a mere feeble shadow, 'his brow remains marked by the stamp of the eternal and his ghostlike presence represents an eerie challenge to the messianic role

of the Russian people that Dostoyevsky would like to preempt
for them'.⁴⁰

One would be forgiven for considering some of these interpretations rather extravagant. Not only is Achilles' appearance arguably rather too fleeting to merit such a heavy symbolic load, but the Jew himself is endowed with various comic and distinctly human features which render it difficult to think of him as 'godlike' or 'ghostlike'. Thus he automatically assumes that Svidrigaylov is drunk, and when he realizes that he is not, his only concern is that he should go to kill himself somewhere else. Further, the 'eternal sorrow' on his brow is qualified by Dostoyevsky with the adjective bryuzglivy ('peevish', 'grumpy'), which is rather inappropriate for the purposes of lofty symbolism. Goldstein's reference to Dostoyevsky's interest in Jewish and Russian messianism is, however, of considerable relevance to the presentation of Judaism in the later writings, particularly The Devils, to which we will now turn.

There are two dimensions to the presentation of Judaism in The Devils: the Jewish character Lyamshin, who is identified as a Jew early in the novel;⁴¹ and Shatov's references to the messianic consciousness of the Jews as he outlines his messianic conception of history to Stavrogin.⁴² In the latter instance, the Jews themselves are mentioned only in passing, and the emphasis is upon Russian messianism, but since the concept of messianism features increasingly in Dostoyevsky's religious thought from the end of the eighteen-sixties onwards and is of some relevance to the present study, it will be

examined in some detail. We will begin, however, with a brief examination of the portrayal of Lyamshin.

At first sight, Lyamshin is as Russian as any of the other characters in The Devils: his name is Russian; he does not have a stereotypical Jewish accent; and he works for the Russian civil service. He even, in order presumably to demonstrate his complete dissociation from all things Jewish, performs amusing imitations of Jews in his role as resident entertainer of the von Lembke circle.⁴³ So far as religion is concerned, Lyamshin is far from a practising Jew: rather, he gives the impression of being an atheist and an iconoclast, as befits a member of Pyotr Verkhovensky's revolutionary circle. Indeed, he is associated with two acts of sacrilege: not only has he slipped pornographic pictures into the Bibles of the travelling Bible-seller Sofya Matveyevna; but he is also strongly suspected of responsibility for the appearance of a mouse inside the town's icon.⁴⁴ However, despite Lyamshin's efforts, Dostoyevsky does not, as it were, allow him to escape the fact of his Jewish heritage, and on one or two important occasions he is characterized according to the traditional Jewish stereotype. Thus when Shatov goes to him to borrow money to hire a midwife for his pregnant wife, Lyamshin is promptly made to display several character traits traditionally associated with Jews: he is cowardly; suspicious; anxious to part with as little money as possible; and extremely concerned about his health.⁴⁵ Further, it is Lyamshin who is cast in the role of Judas in Pyotr Verkhovensky's circle: there is arguably some room to challenge Dostoyevsky's assertion that Russians have no 'a priori blind

religious hatred of the Jews along the lines of "Judas sold out Christ".⁴⁶

There is no obvious link between the caricature of Jewishness embodied in Lyamshin and the apparently serious assessment of the Jews as nation-messiah which comes from Shatov in the same novel. It appears initially that whereas Lyamshin represents nothing more than a crude attempt by Dostoyevsky to discredit and ridicule the Jewish nation, Shatov is allowed to adopt a reasoned and tolerant approach to the Jews' place in the history of mankind. Shatov's views in fact constitute an equally great distortion of Judaism, since, as will be seen below, he attempts to consign the Jewish messianic consciousness to history, and to appropriate their role for Russia. Before examining Shatov's treatment of Jewish messianism in more detail, however, and in order to provide a basis for comparison when we come to examine Jewish messianism as presented in Diary of a Writer, we will first try to establish the main features of 'Russian messianism' as it appears in Dostoyevsky's novels.

The claim that Russia has an exclusive role to play in the future of mankind is first made by Prince Myshkin in The Idiot at the Yepanchins' dinner party.⁴⁷ His comments follow his anti-Catholic tirade, and they constitute a response to what he sees as the spiritual bankruptcy of the West. Initially, Myshkin does not appear to be talking in terms of any specific confession or nationality: he speaks generally of Christ and Antichrist, and of the need for a restoration of true Christianity according to Christ's teaching. But he gradually narrows his terms of reference

until it becomes clear that he has a specific source of salvation in mind. The first stage in this process is what appears to be an assertion of the supremacy of specifically Eastern Christendom: 'The West must be rebuffed with our Christ, whom we have preserved and whom they have not known!' (My emphasis.) These words recall Eastern Orthodoxy's belief that it alone has kept the image of Christ pure and undefiled, while in the West that image has become distorted. Myshkin does not mean the East in the broad sense, however, but is referring specifically to Russia, as becomes clear when he goes on to declare that the advance of the Jesuits must be met with 'Russian civilization'. He does not define this concept, and his comment might easily be taken as an expression of nationalistic, rather than religious, zeal: Ivan Petrovich's observation that Myshkin's words are 'full of patriotism' seems very appropriate.

Myshkin then shifts the topic of conversation slightly to discuss the importance of a leading 'idea'. He laments the absence of an 'idea' among the Russian aristocracy, for to have an 'idea', he says, satisfies man's spiritual craving. Different terms are used by Myshkin to express the concept figuratively: bereg, otechestvo, zemlya, rodina. At first, Myshkin appears to be acknowledging the value of any 'idea', but he then offers two formulae which reveal that this is not so. The first comes from Myshkin himself: 'He who does not have the soil [pochva] beneath him does not have God'. It is offered as a paraphrase of the second, which is attributed to an Old Believer: 'He who has turned

away from his native land has turned from his God'. The two do not, however, express exactly the same thing. Whereas the Old Believer's remark posits a link between nationalism and God, the emphasis in Myshkin's words is upon pochva: for him, God seems to be 'in the soil'. Perhaps his use of such words as zemlya was not, after all, purely figurative. This suspicion is confirmed when he goes on to express a deep conviction that 'the Russian light' is 'hidden in the earth [v zemlye]'. Although Myshkin's starting point was Christianity, what he says at this stage is suggestive rather of Dostoyevsky's own doctrine of pochvennichestvo.⁴⁸ A few lines later, Myshkin apparently begins to talk in terms of Christianity once more, albeit of a Russian variety: 'Show Russian man the future renewal of the whole of mankind and, perhaps, its resurrection, through the Russian idea, the Russian God and the Russian Christ'. But he has again introduced a concept not normally associated with Christianity: 'the Russian idea'. He does not reveal what there is in 'the Russian idea' which is not covered by the concepts 'God' and 'Christ', and one can only assume that it is in some way related to 'Russian civilization', of which he spoke earlier.

Although Myshkin does not use the term 'messianism', the basic features of a messianic awareness are present in his conviction that Russia alone can renew and resurrect mankind, with the help of 'the Russian God' and 'the Russian Christ'. But what he says has little to do with Russian Orthodox Christianity or the Russian Orthodox Church. He at no point uses the term 'Orthodoxy', either in the sense of

Eastern Orthodoxy in general, or specifically Russian Orthodoxy. He instead, as we have seen, refers to concepts like 'Russian civilization' and 'the Russian idea', which remain undefined. There is no suggestion that Russia will be directed in her mission by the Russian Orthodox Church; and neither is the Church allocated the role of providing knowledge of the Russian God or Christ: the only source which is indicated is 'the soil'. Myshkin is not very helpful in revealing exactly how 'the Russian idea' will be conveyed: we are told only that Russia must 'bear it' to the people of the West, and that the Russian Christ must 'shine out'. While apparently rejecting the Russian Orthodox Church as the medium through which Russia will take salvation to the world, Myshkin offers very little that is concrete to replace it. The Russian messianic consciousness apparently has no need of a formal structure through which to operate.

Like Myshkin, Shatov too claims a unique position for Russia: she is 'the only "God-bearing" narod', to whom alone are given the keys of life and 'a new word'.⁴⁹ She will save the world with 'a new God'. According to Shatov, Russianness and God are intimately connected: the Russian soul is intended for faith in God, to the extent that 'an atheist cannot be a Russian'. This faith must be Orthodox, for 'a non-Orthodox believer cannot be a Russian'. What we have seen so far seems to be rather closer to mainstream religion in Russia than Myshkin's thoughts. However, once Shatov begins to explain his messianic theory of history, mainstream Christianity is once again left far behind.

Shatov declares that every nation is powered by a motive force (sila) which is generated by the search for its own 'god', and by belief in that 'god' once it has been found. He is not referring to God in the Christian sense, but seems to imply that 'god' can mean many different things: we later learn that nature, philosophy and the state can all serve as the 'god' of a nation. In order to be great, a nation must believe that its god is the only true god, and must drive all other gods from the face of the earth:

'Each narod is only a narod so long as it has its own god and expels all other gods in the world with no thought of reconciliation.'

'If a great narod does not believe that it alone has the truth . . . then it immediately ceases to be a great narod and is immediately transformed into ethnographical material.'

Shatov's chief concern seems to be the nations, who appear to pursue a messianic role for the sake of their own existence, rather than for the sake of their 'god'. In fact, Shatov effectively equates 'nation' with 'god' when he declares that 'god is the synthetic personality of the whole narod'. When challenged by Stavrogin, he denies that he has 'reduced god to an attribute of nationality', and rephrases his idea as follows: 'the narod is the body of god'. 'God' and 'narod' are still, however, intimately linked.

Up to this point Shatov has been talking in general terms. From here onwards, however, he refers to specific nations, among them the Jews. There have been several great nations in history, we are told, each of which has bequeathed its 'god' to the world. The Jews are one such nation, and

their part in history is assessed thus: 'The Hebrews lived only to await the true God, and they bequeathed to the world the true God'. Since then various nations have taken up the role of nation-messiah, but only one nation has the true God, and that is Russia: 'the only "God-bearing" narod is the Russian narod'.

Shatov's thoughts on messianism are significant on several levels. So far as Dostoyevsky's presentation specifically of the Jews is concerned, they are an interesting example of a more subtle type of anti-Semitism. Although Shatov's account of the Jews might appear to be reasoned and reasonable, his words are based upon a distortion of the Jewish messianic consciousness. In Shatov's scheme of things, the Jews' messianic role belongs firmly to the past. We are left to conclude that the Jews have ceased to believe in their messianic status, and have consequently been reduced to 'ethnographical material'. In fact, the only person who has ceased to believe in the messianic role of the Jews is Shatov himself. He looks at them from the perspective of the New Testament, and effectively converts them to Christianity by implying that they recognized Christ as 'the true God' and graciously bowed out of history at that stage. He omits to mention that for the Jews Christ was not the Messiah they had been awaiting, and that 'the true God' was Jehovah. He ignores the fact that the Jews continued to believe in their status as the nation chosen of God, even after Christ. His apparently balanced and magnanimous reference to the Jews is thus based upon a misrepresentation of Judaism: he avoids their challenge for the role of nation-messiah by consigning

them to history.

Although Shatov appropriates the messianic role for Russia, the nature of Russian messianism differs from its Jewish model. In particular, the external and omnipotent God central to Jewish messianism is missing from Shatov's words. His God, as we have seen, does not seem to exist independently, but is intimately linked with the narod. When asked by Stavrogin to declare his faith in God as an external being, Shatov is unable, and can only declare his desire to believe: 'I ... I will believe in God'. Rather than the nation being an instrument of God, Shatov seems inclined to see God as an instrument of the nation, a function of its nationality.

Finally, Shatov's messianic thoughts are, like Myshkin's, consistent with the overall trend in Dostoyevsky's religious thought away from institutionalized religion. Shatov twice implies that Orthodoxy has an important place in what he is saying: when he endorses the remark that 'a non-Orthodox believer cannot be a Russian'; and when, going through his 'creed' upon Stavrogin's insistence, he lists Orthodoxy as one of the things he can believe in. But he does not reveal what he means by Orthodoxy or how it is related to what he says: certainly he does not appear to be referring to the Russian Orthodox Church. First, the Church as an organization is not, apparently, needed in order that the Russian messianic consciousness fulfil its appointed role: Russian messianism requires no structure as such, but will be 'carried' by the narod. Neither is the official Church allocated any role in the provision of faith: so far as Shatov

is concerned, as we have seen, God is in the narod, not the Church. One might reasonably ask where the narod itself acquires its knowledge of God. Shatov does not say: he seems to take it for granted. A possible clue is provided by an extract from Diary of a Writer for 1877. Criticizing those educated Russians who deny that the narod either has or can have any understanding of complex theological beliefs, Dostoyevsky declares:

[The educated Russian] will never understand that the muzhik's teacher 'in the matter of his faith' is the soil itself, the entire Russian land [eto sama pochva, eto vsya zemlya russkaya], and that these beliefs are, as it were, born with him and are fortified in his heart as he lives.⁵⁰

Thus we return to Myshkin's assertion that God is to be found 'in the soil': it is there that the narod obtains its faith. Little effort seems to be involved in 'extracting' God from the soil: Dostoyevsky's words suggest that faith and knowledge of God are a birthright - for the muzhik, at least. There is no reference to any role for the Church to fulfil, but that is only logical, for if faith is through nationality, as the extract suggests, all that is required to attain it is to be born a Russian. We are once again invited to believe that the Russian narod is the 'God-bearing' narod.

The nature of 'Russian messianism' as expressed in the thoughts of Myshkin and Shatov is consistent with the type of religion to which we have seen Dostoyevsky repeatedly attracted. There is a directness and all-embracing quality about it which is entirely in keeping with the 'Churchless'

'Christianity of the 'Legend' and with Zosima's visions of a world-wide 'society of Christ' in the chapter 'It will be, it will be!' Although in Russian messianism faith seems to be a birthright, it does not come directly from God: as we have seen, 'the soil' has a part to play. But there is no formal process involving the Church through which faith is acquired; and neither is there, apparently, any need to develop or to participate in a formal religious institution in order to sustain that faith. Indeed, there does not seem to be a formal religious category at all: the whole of the Russian narod's being is presented as if it were an expression of its relationship with God. Russian messianism functions through the Russian people, and thus has no need of any structure.

In The Devils, the concept of messianism is of necessity portrayed in a positive light, since the proposed new nation-messiah is Russia. The challenge of Jewish messianism is, as we have seen, by-passed. In 'The Jewish Question' (1877), Dostoyevsky's major statement on the Jews, the Jewish challenge is faced, and Dostoyevsky does not try to consign it to history.⁵¹ He even implicitly acknowledges that the Jewish nation has a special relationship with God, declaring that 'a Jew without God is somehow inconceivable: you can't imagine a Jew without God'; and 'it's quite impossible even to conceive of a Jew without God, in fact, I simply don't believe in educated atheistic Jews'.⁵² This is the same type of relationship to God as that implied in Shatov's words to the effect that 'an atheist cannot be a Russian': the Jews too,

it seems, are meant for faith in God. However, in order to feel completely free to talk of the Jews and messianism, Dostoyevsky seems to find it necessary to discredit the concept of messianism itself, which he does by including for the benefit of his readers an account of the 'messianic command' allegedly given to the Jews.

In content, the messianic ideology which Dostoyevsky associates with the Jews corresponds closely to messianism as described by Shatov. We read again of a nation sustained by the thought of its uniqueness before its God, and being encouraged to act decisively, even ruthlessly, in order to drive all other gods away. Dostoyevsky's account of the Jews' messianic awareness is written in such a savage and threatening tone, however, that one's impression of messianism and of the nations who indulge in it alters radically. What follows is the Diary's version of the messianic command, worded so as to suggest that the Jews are being addressed by God:

'Go thou forth from among the peoples and form thine own entity, and know that henceforth thou art one before God, exterminate the others or reduce them to slavery, or exploit them. Believe in thy victory o'er the whole world, believe that all will be humbled before thee. Hold all things in abomination and have no commerce with anyone in thy daily life. And even when thou shalt be bereft of thy land, of thy political personality, even when thou shalt be scattered o'er the face of the whole world, amongst all the peoples - take no heed - believe in all that has been promised thee, now and forever more, believe that all this will come to pass and, meanwhile, live, loathe, unite and exploit and - be patient, be patient.' 53

This messianic commission, presented by Dostoyevsky as a quotation so as to give the appearance of authenticity, bears

a close resemblance to a passage from an anti-Semitic work' by Yakov Brafman called The Book of the Kahal (Kniga kagala).⁵⁴

This book enjoyed popularity in the eighteen-seventies in Russia, and Dostoyevsky himself is known to have possessed three editions of it.⁵⁵ In the passage concerned, Brafman had cunningly combined various Old Testament verses in a distorting manner, in order to discredit the Jews. Although not everything in Dostoyevsky's version can be traced back to Brafman, the striking similarities which exist suggest that it was indeed Brafman who acted as Dostoyevsky's inspiration. The fact that the passage may be largely borrowed does not, however, absolve Dostoyevsky of responsibility for what is contained within it; and neither does it alter the fact that Dostoyevsky effectively disowns his own religious heritage as a Christian and comes close to heresy. This applies particularly to the impression which is given of the Jews' God, presumably the God of the Old Testament. The God of the Old Testament is admittedly regarded by some Christians as an awesome figure, but the God depicted here seems almost perverse, as He encourages His chosen people to 'loathe' and 'exterminate'. Has Dostoyevsky forgotten that the God of the Old Testament is still supposed to be his God, albeit modified by the 'God of love' of the New Testament? At other points in the chapter Dostoyevsky's portrayal of the God of the Jews is less hostile, but it is again implied that the God whom the Jews worship is their own special God, who is interested only in the Jewish nations and has no wider application for Christianity at large. In a manner similar to that which he adopted when referring to the Pope, so here

Dostoyevsky distances himself from the Jews' God by choosing to refer to Him using epithets: 'their Providence, under the name of the former, original Jehovah'; 'their forty-century Jehovah'.⁵⁶

Not only does Dostoyevsky abuse the nature of God for his anti-Semitic purposes, but he also offers a travesty of Jewish theocratic hopes. He refers to a certain 'legend' about the Jews which he allegedly heard as a child, and according to which all Jews are still awaiting their Messiah who will take them back to Jerusalem and will, by his sword, bring all nations to their feet. The 'legend' associates the Jews with a love of gold: the reason why Jews are so keen to trade in gold and to possess gold objects, we are told, is that this is a convenient form in which to keep their wealth, for such objects will be easily transportable when the Messiah finally comes.

Just as the messianic command is based upon Biblical writings, so may the core of the 'legend' be traced back to the Old Testament and other Jewish writings. The expectation of the Messiah, the hope of the gathering together of the Jews, and the longed-for return to Jerusalem amount to an accurate account of the fundamental features of the theocratic hope as expressed by various Jewish apocalyptic writers.⁵⁷ Yet, while bearing some relation to the truth, the 'legend' is a distortion of it. Dostoyevsky does not mention such features of the Jewish theocratic hope as the triumph of righteousness and peace, and the coming of God's kingdom on earth. He presents the theocratic hope as if it consisted in nothing but a temporal victory and material prosperity for

the Jews. When, elsewhere in the chapter, Dostoyevsky envisages the future of the Jews, he chooses to be imprecise and mysterious: he hints darkly at something terrible which lies ahead for the world, and endows the whole with an apocalyptic colouring by referring to 'the times and seasons' yet to come.⁵⁸ In fact, so far as Dostoyevsky is concerned, there is no secret about the ambitions of the Jews at all: they aim to control the world through the power their money gives them. The Jews as a group are associated by him with the rise of capitalism and materialism in the West, and with the desire to destroy all Christian values.⁵⁹

The 'legend' shows Dostoyevsky once again manipulating Old Testament theology in order to make an anti-Semitic point: but has he forgotten that the apocalyptic writings of the Old Testament, which he here appears to ridicule, are read not only by Jews, but are also referred to by Christians in their musings over the world to come? To such an extent does Dostoyevsky try to dissociate himself from the Old Testament and the Old Testament God in 'The Jewish Question' that it is easy to forget that in his novels his religious characters are very attached to the Old Testament: in The Brothers Karamazov, for example, Zosima recommends the monks to tell the Orthodox peasants of such great Old Testament figures as Abraham and Sarah, Jacob and Joseph.⁶⁰ Dostoyevsky is apparently oblivious to the Jews' contribution to his own professed Christian faith, and regards them as a force for evil, rather than for good.

Of particular interest for the present study are Dostoyevsky's allegations regarding the existence of a Jewish

status in statu (state within a state) in Russia. He declares that the Jewish nation could not possibly have lasted for so long, or have resurrected itself so many times, 'without a status in statu, which it has preserved always and everywhere during its most terrible, thousand-year-long dispersions and persecutions'.⁶¹ Similarly, for the (distorted) theocratic hopes to be maintained, 'it is imperative that the strictest status in statu be preserved'.⁶² The Jews had been accused of building a status in statu in Russia by Brafman: Brafman's evidence to support this accusation was the existence of the statutes of the Minsk kahal (Hebrew: community), all 285 of which were cited in his book.⁶³ (He omits to mention that the Minsk kahal had been abolished in 1844.) Goldstein interprets Dostoyevsky's use of the phrase status in statu as evidence that in this area too he was influenced by Brafman, and he remarks that the expression was 'practically unknown in Russia prior to the appearance of Kniga kagala in 1869'.⁶⁴ In fact, Dostoyevsky himself had used the term in Vremya as early as 1862, when referring to the position of the aristocracy in Russia after the Petrine reforms.⁶⁵ It is not so much the source of the phrase which is significant, however, as what status in statu represents in the context of 'The Jewish Question': the need for a structure to house one's messianic consciousness.

When examining the Russian messianic awareness, as expressed in the thoughts of Myshkin and Shatov, we noted the lack of reference to anything resembling a Church through which messianism might function. Shatov implies that all a nation requires is a messianic belief in itself, and that while

it possesses this it will continue to thrive. We remarked that this is in keeping with the general trend of Dostoyevsky's thought away from institutionalized religion. On one level, Dostoyevsky's use of the term status in statu in 'The Jewish Question' does not contradict this, for he uses the phrase as a convenient short-hand form for the twisted version of the messianic awareness which he associates with the Jews, and which is described so vividly in the 'messianic commission' quoted above. Yet there is an additional, structural, connotation to status in statu which is not present in Shatov's concept of messianism. Thus, after quoting the Jews' messianic commission, Dostoyevsky remarks: 'This is the essence of the idea of the status in statu, and of course there are certain inner and perhaps secret laws guarding this idea'.⁶⁶ He later refers to 'the Jews' peculiar, inner, rigid organization [stroy] which unites them into something integrated and particular'.⁶⁷ Further, we read of the Jews 'in the full armour of their organization and segregation, their racial and religious detachment, in the full armour of their rules and principles'.⁶⁸ Dostoyevsky automatically assumes that such a structure exists and must exist: when he attributes the Jews' long survival as a nation to their status in statu, and says that without the latter it would not have been possible, he is referring to the structure as well as the idea. He seems to doubt the sufficiency of their messianic belief in its purely conceptual form, and to acknowledge the necessity of a process of institutionalization. The organized structure which the Jews have allegedly created is depicted in a predictably negative manner. But what is

significant is that he implies the necessity of such a structure at all. Although we are not dealing with Christianity in this instance, we can see a parallel with our findings in the previous chapter. There Dostoyevsky was seen to doubt that men could manage without a Church and cope with purely spiritual Christianity, despite what is implied in the 'Legend'. Here, Dostoyevsky is sceptical that the Jews' messianic awareness could have survived without recourse to an organized structure, even though Russian messianism apparently has no such need.

The Jews, of course, are an essentially foreign group so far as Dostoyevsky is concerned. In the chapter immediately preceding 'The Jewish Question'; Dostoyevsky again refers to a situation where a nation has been left with its faith, but with no political power or land. This time, however, he is referring to Orthodox Slavs, and it is to them that we will now turn for purposes of comparison. Will the Slavs, too, be seen to have need of an institution to safeguard their religious faith?

In the chapter concerned, Dostoyevsky discusses the reasons why Constantinople should belong to the Russians, and talks of the leading role Russia will play in the consolidation of Slavdom.⁶⁹ In the course of the discussion, he considers the effect of Turkish rule on the Orthodox nations of the East. The plight of the Orthodox under Turkish rule is, for our purposes, similar to that of the Jews in Russia, since they too have effectively lost their land and their political independence, and are left only with their religious faith. Dostoyevsky decides that in some ways

the Turkish oppression has had a positive effect, since it has helped to strengthen the unity and faith of the Orthodox nations. The suggestion that oppression acts to strengthen faith is not in itself original. Of more significance is the way Dostoyevsky expresses the idea: 'The four centuries of Turkish oppression in the East were, in one sense, even useful to Christianity and Orthodoxy there'.⁷⁰ (My emphasis.) Dostoyevsky seems to be making a distinction between 'Christianity' and 'Orthodoxy', as if they were two distinct phenomena, rather than one being an expression of the other. He has, in fact, done this since the opening paragraph of the chapter, where he refers to the way the Russian narod 'has gone off 'of its own free will to serve Christ and Orthodoxy against the infidels, for the Slavs, our brothers through faith and blood'.⁷¹ (My emphasis.) A similar type of distinction is made in the following passage, where Dostoyevsky explains in more detail why exactly the presence of the Turks should have been beneficial. Here, however, the distinction is between 'Christ' and 'Church', and we discover why it is that Dostoyevsky has been offering 'pairs' of concepts in this way:

The oppressed and exhausted Christian population of the East saw in Christ and in faith in Him its sole consolation, and in the Church - the only and last remnant of its national identity and particularity. [The Church] was its last and sole hope, the last plank of a wrecked ship; for the Church, in spite of everything, could preserve these peoples as a nationality, while faith in Christ prevented them, or at least some of them, from merging with their conquerors and forgetting their race [rod] and their past history.⁷²

It is clear from the passage that not only ^{are} 'faith in Christ' and 'Church' two distinct concepts in Dostoyevsky's mind, but each has a distinct function. 'Christ and faith in Him' are

'the consolation of the people'; while the 'Church' is a symbol of the people's 'national identity and particularity'. 'Church' is thus not a term which embraces 'Christianity', 'Christ' and 'faith', but is only one half of what Dostoyevsky is trying to say. It apparently has nothing to do with sustaining the faith of the oppressed Orthodox Christians, whose spiritual comfort comes from Christ, not the Church: indeed, it seems not to be associated with their spiritual lives at all. The Church's raison d'être is ultimately unconnected with Christianity: rather, the Church is a source of national identity.

If we now think back to the 'pair' of concepts which caught our attention initially, 'Christ and Orthodoxy', we discover where 'Orthodoxy' fits into this scheme of things. Dostoyevsky distinguishes 'Orthodoxy' from 'Christ', just as he distinguishes 'Church' from 'Christ': in other words, 'Orthodoxy' belongs with 'Church' rather than with 'Christ', and is associated by Dostoyevsky on this occasion at least with national identity, rather than with Christianity. When he writes that the Russians have gone to serve 'Christ and Orthodoxy', therefore, Dostoyevsky means that they are fighting for their faith, which is Christianity as opposed to Islam; and for their nationality, which is Slavic as opposed to Turkish.

Dostoyevsky thus admits that the Eastern Christians need a Church. However, they need it not for matters of faith, but only for the sake of nationality. Dostoyevsky seems to assume that the faith of the Eastern Christians will be preserved without recourse to a structure at all. He implies

that their spirituality can exist on the purely conceptual level, as in the 'Legend'. The Church of the Orthodox Slavs is not organized religion, but organized nationalism. If we now recall Dostoyevsky's allegations regarding the existence of a Jewish status in statu in Russia, then it may be seen that he appears to be making a distinction between the Jews and the Eastern Christians regarding the need for a structure to safeguard faith, just as he makes a distinction between Jewish messianism and Russian messianism in this respect. We have seen him ridicule the idea that the Jews' religious beliefs could have existed on the purely conceptual level, and imply that without a status in statu they would have evaporated, like the precious liquid referred to in the previous chapter. Yet the faith of the Eastern Christians apparently does not evaporate without a structure: Dostoyevsky allows himself to be rather bolder where Slavs are concerned.

Dostoyevsky's treatment of Jews and Jewish themes thus highlights many different aspects of his religious thought and of his attitude specifically to the question of institutionalized religion. We have focused our attention upon two main areas: the character of Isay Fomich Bumshteyn in Notes from the House of the Dead; and the theme of messianism, both in its Russian and its Jewish form. The portrayal of Isay Fomich is consistent with Dostoyevsky's overall attitude to different religious creeds at the beginning of the eighties, when he showed a tendency to look beneath differences in creed and ritual to what was shared between all religious faiths. Dostoyevsky criticizes Isay Fomich for adopting a

ritualistic approach to religion. This criticism is not made on the basis of the character's behaviour in the prayer scene, even though this may initially appear to be the case. The prayer scene, as we saw, has no absolute significance, but is simply a reflection of Isay Fomich's enthusiastic and extremist temperament. To condemn a religion on the basis of ritual would in any event have been contrary to the spirit of Dostoyevsky's religious thought. Isay Fomich is criticized not for his own ritual, but for his attitude to ritual, which he exalts to a decisive position in the evaluation of spirituality. Dostoyevsky rejects such an approach.

Dostoyevsky's presentation of messianism illustrates both the more radical and the more conservative tendencies in his attitude to institutionalized religion. Russian messianism corresponds in many ways to the type of spirituality with which we have come to associate Dostoyevsky by this stage in our study: a spirituality which has little to do with formal theology; which has a directness about it; and which neither is, nor apparently needs to be, embodied in an institutionalized religious body. The Russian messianic consciousness has no need of a structure. It is an expression of the life of the Russian narod, and seems to have little in common either with Russian Orthodoxy, or with Biblical Christianity generally. Dostoyevsky's analysis of Jewish messianism, meanwhile, involves a distortion and manipulation of the Bible, specifically of the Old Testament. He shows a disregard for his own religious heritage as a Christian,

and a tendency to dissociate himself from pre-Christian Bible history. Most significantly, however, he seems unable to accept that the Jewish messianic awareness could have existed for so long without a status in statu, a formal organization involving laws and a rigid internal structure. Despite the fact that Russian messianism can apparently flourish with the aid of nothing more institutionalized than the body of the Russian narod, the Jews allegedly need an institution, and their continued existence can be explained only with reference to such a structure. The Russians, we must assume, are more capable of coping with spirituality on a conceptual level. Dostoyevsky seems to feel similarly about the Orthodox Slavs under Turkish rule, whose faith has apparently been preserved without recourse to a Church, but with the direct help of Christ, in a manner reminiscent of the 'Legend'. They do need a Church, we learn, but only in order to maintain their identity as a nationality, not for the sake of their Christianity.

Dostoyevsky thus demonstrates a mixture of the boldness shown in the 'Legend' and the caution we noted in our study of his response to Protestantism. But a pattern seems to be establishing itself. Whereas the boldness seems to be reserved for Slavs, like the Eastern nations under Turkish rule, and the Russians themselves, the caution is most evident when Dostoyevsky is responding to 'foreign' faiths and groups. Perhaps, then, it is a question of nationality? Perhaps the 'Churchless' Christianity of the 'Legend' can for some reason apply only to Slavic nations? In order to test this hypothesis,

let us now examine Dostoyevsky's response to those religious groups in Russia itself which, while remaining Russian, have to a greater or lesser extent dissociated themselves from the institutionalized Russian Church: the Old Believers and the extreme sectarians.

1. DP, 1877, 100 (1877 March II, 1).
2. 'S.S.', 'Bezdelki Dostoyevskogo', Odessky vestnik, No. 208, 23 September 1876, 2; Zamotin, *op. cit.*, 216.
3. F. Jantsch, 'Dostojewski und die Juden', Weltkampf, XVI, 1939 (Munich) (272-5).
4. D. I. Goldstein, 'Rewriting Dostoevsky's Letters', The American Slavic and East European Review, XX, Pt. 2, 1961 (279-88).
5. Two detailed studies of Dostoyevsky's attitude to the Jews have recently appeared: D. I. Goldstein, Dostoyevsky and the Jews (London, 1981) (hereafter: Goldstein, Dostoyevsky); and F. P. Ingold, Dostojewskij und das Judentum (Frankfurt am Main, 1981). Although the emphasis in these studies is different from our own, the research they contain has been particularly useful in the present chapter.
6. The young Dostoyevsky's enthusiasm for literature is well illustrated by his passionate defence of Racine and Corneille in a letter to his brother Mikhail at the end of the eighteen-thirties: see Pisma, I, 58-9.

For an account of the history of the presentation of Jewish characters in Russian literature, and of the treatment of the Jews themselves in Russia, see Ingold, *op. cit.*, 9-14 and 43-57.
7. Pisma, I, 69.
8. PSS, II, 176. The warm reception given to foreign artists in Russia is also mentioned in 'Peterburgskaya letopis', 13 April 1847: see PSS, XVIII, 113. There is, however, some controversy over the attribution of the feuilleton to Dostoyevsky: see Goldstein, Dostoyevsky, 168 fn. 20; and PSS, XVIII, 302-4.
9. Pisma, I, 125; 127.
10. *Ibid.*, 145. There is no indication in any of the subsequent letters that Dostoyevsky actually received the books, but this may simply be because correspondence between the two brothers was rather erratic at this period.
11. Ingold, *op. cit.*, 57.
12. The prayer scene is described in PSS, IV, 95-6.
13. F. M. Dostoievski, Récits de la Maison des Morts, trans. P. Pascal (Paris, 1961), 184.
14. Ingold, *op. cit.*, 59; 216 fn. 11.

15. Gogol, PSS, II, 150.
16. Goldstein, Dostoyevsky, 24.
17. See fn. 6, above.
18. Isay Fomich's arrival is described in PSS, IV, 93-4. Further detailed reference will not be given.
19. Gogol, PSS, III, 148-9.
20. This and the following quotation may be found in PSS, IV, 55. In fact, it is not Yankel himself who is said to look like a chicken, but another of the Jews who appears in Taras Bulba: see Gogol, PSS, II, 153.
21. PSS, IV, 99.
22. Ibid., 123.
23. PSS, XV, 284.
24. Compare PSS, IV, 95: 16-17 with ibid., 94: 17-18.
25. Goldstein, Dostoyevsky, 28.
26. See PSS, IV, 279-88. 283-4 relates specifically to Isay Bumshtel.
27. PSS, IV, 283-4.
28. Ibid., 284.
29. Goldstein, Dostoyevsky, 169 fn. 4. This would explain certain things: Ingold, for example, claims that had Isay Bumshtel been a convert to Orthodoxy, he would have taken a 'russified' version of his forename, thus becoming 'Yesaya', but there is no mention of this in the records. See Ingold, op. cit., 204 fn. 50.
30. Goldstein, Dostoyevsky, 19.
31. Ingold, op. cit., 67.
32. R. L. Jackson, 'A Footnote to "Selo Stepančikovo"', Ricerche Slavistiche, XVII-XIX, 1970-2 (247-57).
33. PSS, IV, 109. Further detailed reference will not be given.
34. This hypothesis would seem to be confirmed by the positive portrayal of the Tatar Aley in Notes from the House of the Dead. Though strictly speaking a Muslim, Aley is associated with what might be considered the essence of Christianity, devoid of any confessionalist colouring: Christ's teaching in the Sermon on the Mount. The young boy's response when he hears the Sermon is one of joy:

'Oh, yes, yes, Isa [Jesus] is a holy prophet, Isa spoke the word of God! How good it is!'
 'What did you like most of all?'
 'The place where he says: forgive, love, do not offend, love your enemies. Oh, what good things He says!'
 (PSS, IV, 54.)

Aley is described as one of those people who are 'beautiful by nature . . . endowed by God' (PSS, IV, 52). He belongs to Dostoyevsky's line of 'positively good men', and is particularly reminiscent of Alyosha Karamazov in The Brothers Karamazov.

For an examination of Dostoyevsky's interest in Islam, see: M. Futrell, 'Dostoyevsky and Islam (and Chokan Valikhanov)', Slavonic and East European Review, LVII, No. 1, 1979 (16-31).

35. Achilles appears in PSS, VI, 394-5. Further detailed reference will not be given.
36. The debate took place in the 'Letters' section of The Times Literary Supplement (hereafter: TLS) over a number of weeks. See, for example:

<u>TLS</u> 17.7. 1981	{ Letter from J. Bayley)
<u>TLS</u> 28.8. 1981	{ Letter from D. Goldstein)
<u>TLS</u> 27.11.1981	{ Letter from J. L. Rice)
<u>TLS</u> 15.1. 1982	{ Letter from J. L. Whelan)
<u>TLS</u> 5. 2. 1982	{ Letter from R. Alter).
37. J. Bayley, TLS 'Letters', 17.7.1981.
38. J. L. Rice, *ibid.*, 27.11.1981.
39. A. Z. Steinberg, 'Dostoyevsky i yevreystvo', Vyorsty, III, 1928 (Paris) (94-108), 104-5.
40. Goldstein, Dostoyevsky, 54.
41. PSS, X, 30.
42. Shatov's conversation with Stavrogin may be found in PSS, X, 196-203.
43. PSS, X, 252.
44. *Ibid.*, 251.
45. *Ibid.*, 446-7; see Goldstein, Dostoyevsky, 80.
46. DP, 1877, 106 (1877 March II, 2). Goldstein (Dostoyevsky, 189 fn. 18) considers that 'it is entirely conceivable that Dostoyevsky deliberately cast Lyamshin in the role of informer because he was a Jew'. He argues that other characters could have been used just as easily.
47. The following comments are based upon an analysis of PSS, VIII, 450-3, without further detailed reference.
48. Pochvennichestvo: see Chapter One, 31-2, above.

49. See fn. 42, above. Further detailed reference will not be given.
50. DP, 1877, 231 (1877 May/June IV, 1).
51. 'The Jewish Question' appears in DP, 1877, 97-117 (1877 March II, 1-4).
52. DP, 1877, 98 (1877 March II, 1); 109 (1877 March II, 3).
53. DP, 1877, 108 (1877 March II, 3). As translated in Goldstein, Dostoyevsky, 123.
54. First published in Vilno, 1869. For further details of Brafman's book and of the use Dostoyevsky made of it, see Goldstein, Dostoyevsky, 96-8; 122-5; 193-4 fn. 27.
55. L. P. Grossman, Biblioteka Dostoyevskogo (Odessa, 1919; University Microfilms Ltd. Authorized Facsimile, High Wycombe, n.d.), 158; V. S. Nechayeva, Opisaniye rukopisey F. M. Dostoyevskogo (Moscow, 1957), 524.
56. DP, 1877, 109 (1877 March II, 3); 98 (1877 March II, 1). Cf. Chapter Four, 205, above.
57. The Jewish theocratic hope is summarized by D. S. Russell as follows: 'A renewed Jerusalem will be its centre; there the dispersed will flock from the ends of the earth; there, too, God's people will dwell in peace around the holy Temple, and men will bring to it their gifts from far-off lands; over this kingdom a royal prince will rule in righteousness'. (D. S. Russell, The Jews from Alexander to Herod (Oxford, 1967), 143.) For further details of Jewish theocratic and messianic hopes, see Russell, op. cit., 140-4; and J. Bright, A History of Israel (London, 1972), 455-7.
58. DP, 1877, 108 (1877 March II, 3).
59. DP, 1877, 113 (1877 March II, 3). See also Versilov's reference to the coming 'zhidovskoye tsarstvo' ('yiddish kingdom') in A Raw Youth (PSS, XIII, 172); and references to the 'tsar iudeysky' ('king of the Jews') in the notebooks for The Idiot (PSS, IX, 180; 183).
60. PSS, XIV, 266-7.
61. DP, 1877, 108 (1877 March II, 3).
62. DP, 1877, 110 (1877 March II, 3).
63. Goldstein, Dostoyevsky, 123; 193-4 fn. 27.
64. *Ibid.*, 123.
65. PSS, XX, 7.
66. DP, 1877, 108 (1877 March II, 3).

67. DP, 1877, 110 (1877 March II, 3).
68. Ibid.
69. DP, 1877, 84-97 (1877 March I, 1-3).
70. DP, 1877, 87-8 (1877 March I, 2).
71. DP, 1877, 84 (1877 March I, 1).
72. DP, 1877, 88 (1877 March I, 2).