In 1761 Lomonosov made a special addition to his report on the astronomical observations made earlier that year when Venus crossed the sun’s path (a moment of international scientific interest). In it he defended the study of astronomy, and of science itself, addressing one of the central issues in Enlightenment culture:

Reason [truth] and faith are sisters, daughters of one all-supreme parent, and they can never come into conflict unless someone out of vanity and the desire to flaunt his cleverness tries to latch enmity onto them. Good and sensible people, however, must strive to see what means may be found to explain and avert any seeming strife between them, as the most wise pastor of our Orthodox Church [Basil the Great] taught.1

While it is true that Lomonosov was in the midst of a conflict with members of the Synod over issues of censorship,2 his excursus on the concord of reason and faith, offered as appendix to a scientific paper, is a good starting point for describing the new cultural synthesis that emerged in the mid-eighteenth century, and to argue that a basic reconceptualization concerning Russian culture in the period is in order. This article, taking its cue from Victor Zhivov’s path-breaking Iazyk i kultura v Rossii XVIII veka (Language

1 M. V. Lomonosov, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, 11 vols. (Moscow, Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1950–83), 4: 373. Compare 5: 618–19.
2 See B. E. Raikov, Ocherki po istorii geliotsentricheskogo mirovozzreniia v Rossii: iz proshlogo russkogo estestvoznaniia, 2nd ed. (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1947), chap. 11. Raikov argues that Lomonosov insists on the separate and independent status of scientific truth and does not accept the “reactionary” position of “a hypocritical reconciliation of science and religion” (311); to him the speech thus represents “a pamphlet against the clerics” rather than a straightforward statement of belief.
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and Culture in Eighteenth Century Russia),\(^3\) suggests that there was a distinct rapprochement between ecclesiastical and secular culture during the fifty-year period from the mid 1740’s through the 1790’s, corresponding to the reigns of Elizabeth and Catherine II.

Before this argument can be made, there is a lot of historiographical debris that should probably be cleared away. Historians have generally denied the institutional and intellectual viability of the Russian Church in the eighteenth century, asserting that it was fully under the administrative thumb of the secular state (a view challenged most notably by Gregory Freeze\(^4\)), and have never seriously considered the existence of what we may refer to as a Russian brand of “Enlightenment Orthodoxy.”\(^5\) Slavophile-oriented

---

\(^3\) See the forthcoming translation, *Language and Culture in Eighteenth Century Russia*, trans. Marcus C. Levitt (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2009). *Iazyk i kultura* is a revision and expansion of Zhivov’s *Kulturnye konflikty v istorii russkogo literaturnogo iazyka XVIII — nachala XIX veka* (Moscow: Institut russkogo iazyka, AN SSSR, 1990). For a discussion of *Kulturnye konflikty*, see my review in the *Study Group on Eighteenth-Century Russia Newsletter*, 19 (1991): 53–57.

This article was first presented as a conference paper at the Tenth International Congress of the Enlightenment, Dublin, July 28, 1999.

\(^4\) Gregory Freeze, “Haidmaiden of the State? The Church in Imperial Russia Reconsidered,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36, no. 1 (January 1985): 82–102; see also his remarks, passim, in *The Russian Levites: Parish Clergy in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1977). For example: “the triumph of secular absolutism did not mean a sudden eclipse of Church authority and influence. To the contrary, precisely because secular absolutism was evolving, it still allowed for a dynamic change in Church-state relations” (15).

\(^5\) This is true of the standard histories of the Russian Church, for example Georgii Florovskii’s *Puti russkogo bogoslovia* (Paris: YMCA Press, 1937), chap. 4, and A. V. Kartsashev, *Ocherki po istorii russkoi tserkvi* (Paris: YMCA Press, 1959), vol. 2, which take what we may consider a basically “slavophile” approach. I have also raised this issue in “Sumarokov’s Drama ‘The Hermit,” chap. 6 in this volume.

In recent years there have also been a series of excellent monographs on leading “ Enlightened” clergymen in Russia: Stephen K. Batalden, *Catherine II’s Greek Prelate: Eugenios Voulgaris in Russia, 1771–1806* (Boulder: East European Monographs; New York: Distributed by Columbia UP, 1982); K. A. Papmehl, *Metropolitan Platon of Moscow* (Petr Levshin, 1737–1812): *The Enlightened Prelate, Scholar and Educator* (Newtonville, Mass.: Oriental Research Partners, 1983); Gregory L. Bruess, *Religion, Identity and Empire: A Greek Archbishop in the Russia of Catherine the Great* (Boulder: East European Monographs; New York: Distributed by Columbia UP, 1997).

On eighteenth-century Orthodox writers, see also the recent reprint of Evgenii (Bolkhovitinov), Metropolitan of Kiev, *Slovary istoricheskii o byvshikh v Rossi v pisateliakh dukhovnogo china greko-rossiskoi tserkvi* [first published in 1818], 3rd rev. ed. (Moscow: Russkii dvor; Sviato-troitskaia Sergieva lavra, 1995), a work which, as
historians who have chronicled the history of the church, as well as Soviet and Western scholars, have tended to write off official ecclesiastical culture of the period by referring to such generalizations as secularization, Westernization (that is, as a turning away from “genuine” orthodoxy), rationalism, and the state’s allegedly complete hegemony over the church.\(^6\)

A reevaluation of these ideas has important ramifications for the way we understand eighteenth-century Russian culture. It is central, for example, in evaluating the new type of “early modern” national consciousness that developed in Russia. Harvey Goldblatt has meditated on the problem in these terms:

…what remains unclear is whether the new type of state patriotism established by Peter I was actually in contradistinction to the older ideological patrimony of Orthodox Slavdom. A careful analysis of the literary works of important eighteenth-century authors such as Feofan Prokopovyc, Vasilij Tredjakovskij, and Mixail Lomonosov tends to suggest that the survival and resystematization of the Orthodox Slavic tradition played a central part in the ‘new secular nationalism’ of post-Petrine Russia.\(^7\)

---

\(^6\) For a discussion of the historiography see Freeze, “Handmaiden,” and David M. Griffiths, “In Search of Enlightenment: Recent Soviet Interpretation of Eighteenth-Century Russian Intellectual History,” *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 16, nos. 3–4 (Fall-Winter 1982): 317–56; see 354–56 for the issue of religious enlightenment.

\(^7\) Harvey Goldblatt, “Orthodox Slavic Heritage and National Consciousness: Aspects of the East Slavic and South Slavic National Revivals,” *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 10: 3–4 (December 1986): 347. Goldblatt draws special attention to the crucial role of the “language question,” and suggests that linguistic self-definition in the Slavic world offers a paradigm for the development of national consciousness. His argument dovetails in many ways with V. M. Zhivov’s views, discussed below.
Goldblatt goes as far as to assert “the existence of a premodern type of supranational spiritual solidarity...based on the common Orthodox Slavic heritage,” which he describes as Petrine Russia’s “Orthodox revival” (347 and 353). Goldblatt’s argument suggests that a purely “Westernizing” perspective on Russian nationalism that ignores Russia’s unique place in Slavic civilization may be seriously distorted. Furthermore, the status of religious culture also has direct significance for the issue of defining (and defending the very existence of) a Russian Enlightenment. Such redefinition may be seen as part of a broad attempt among scholars of modern European culture to pluralize the Enlightenment into a series of local Enlightenments.

---

8 For a brilliantly argued example of the first type of argument that sees Russia as one pole in an all-European spectrum, see Martin Malia, *Russia Under Western Eyes: From the Bronze Horseman to the Lenin Mausoleum* (Cambridge, MA: The Belnap Press of Harvard UP, 1999), chap. 1. A striking example of the importance of the Orthodox Slavic heritage for late eighteenth century Russian national identity and politics was Catherine’s “Greek project,” which Andrei Zorin argues played a key role in the development of subsequent Russian state ideology. See his *Kormia dvuglavogo orla...: Literatura i gosudarstvennaia ideologiiia v Rossii v poslednei treti XVIII — pervoi treti XIX veka* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2001), chap. 1.

9 For a useful discussion of this question, see Griffiths, “In Search of Enlightenment.”

10 In the introduction to *Barbarism and Religion* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 1999), vol. 1, for example, J. G. A. Pocock makes the argument for a plurality of Enlightenments. He defines Enlightenment as characterized by two factors: “first, as the emergence of a system of states, founded in civil and commercial society and culture, which might enable Europe to escape from the wars of religion without falling under the hegemony of a single monarchy; second, as a series of programmes for reducing the power of either churches or congregations to disturb the peace of civil society by challenging its authority. Enlightenment in the latter sense was a programme in which ecclesiastics of many confessions might and did join...” (7). Russia, I would argue, fits this description.

Among the large number of works considering the religious roots of Enlightenment thought in various European religious traditions, see: Derek Beales, “Christian and philosophes: the case of the Austrian Enlightenment,” in *History, Society, and the Churches: Essays in Honour of Owen Chadwick* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 1985), 169–194; *The Margins of Orthodoxy: Heterodox Writing and Cultural Response, 1660–1750*, ed. Roger D. Lund (New York: Cambridge UP, 1995); Joseph P. Chinnici, *The English Catholic Enlightenment: John Lingard and the Cisalpine Movement, 1780–1850* (Shepherdstown, W. Va.: Patmos Press, 1980); S. J. Barnett, *Idol Temples and Crafty Priests: The Origins of Enlightenment Anticlericalism* (New York: St. Martin’s, 1999); Bernard Plongeron, *Théologie et politique au siècle des lumières* (1770–1820) (Geneva: Droz, 1973); Monique Cottret, *Jansénismes et Lumières: pour un autre XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1998); David Sorkin, *Moses Mendelssohn and the Religious Enlightenment* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1996) and The
While it is possible to describe the new Russian cultural synthesis in traditional period terms, linking it to specific cultural, political, social and institutional changes, it is perhaps less problematic to define it as a regnant discourse. To use Keith Baker’s formulation, discourses are “fields of social action symbolically constituted, social practices, ‘language games’[,] each subject to constant elaboration and development through the activities of the individual agents whose purposes they define.” Discourse thus occupies a mediating position between cultural mythology (the symbolic plane) and the embodiment of these conceptions (to whatever degree) in concrete institutions, actions, political or social formations. While the discourse in question may never have achieved full and successful embodiment in institutional terms, its existence and influence as a dominating mode of thought seems unquestionable. To describe the cultural rapprochement in terms of discourse seems particularly pertinent insofar as the discourse under consideration is more than simply one of many competing philosophical and other discourses that may be said to constitute culture or history as a whole. The discourse in question was embodied in — and in a basic sense equivalent to — the very vehicle of communication itself — the new and self-consciously developing literary language. In the Petrine period there had been a sudden sharp linguistic differentiation between the secular and religious literary tongues, as Peter demanded the rejection of Slavonic in favor of a (as yet non-existent) literary language in Russian, for which he created a new “civil” script. Slavonic was thus narrowly re-defined as ecclesiastical and outdated, as indicated by its subsequent classification as “Old” and “Church” Slavonic. Yet by the 1740’s–90’s the Slavonic linguistic heritage was re-
accepted as part of a new synthetic discourse which came to be known as “Slaveno-rossiiskii” (Slaveno-Russian). As the label suggests, the fundamental conception was of a literary language that subsumes both Church Slavonic and vernacular elements into a single, unified tongue.13

My argument here rests upon—and elaborates—Víctor Zhivov’s analysis, which brilliantly demonstrates how the debates over the creation of a new literary language, which seemed so arcane and pedantic to later generations, reflected the fundamental cultural self-consciousness of the era.14 Zhivov’s study, in essence, the history of the rise and fall of the Slaveno-rossiiskii discourse, provides a powerful framework from which to examine the changing cultural status of religion. The new “Slaveno-rossiiskii synthesis” was to be, in Zhivov’s formulation, “the single language for a single unified culture” (edinyi iazyk edinoi kulk’tury). As opposed to the sharp cultural and linguistic differentiation of the Petrine era (which reasserted itself again in the nineteenth century), Russian intellectuals of the period believed—following prevailing European linguistic theory—that a modern literary language had to be polyfunctional and to unite all sectors of society.15 Trediakovskii imagined the new linguistic situation in this way:

---

13 I do not mean to suggest that this term was universally accepted, or used consistently; terminology of the epoch was notoriously loose. Neither was “slaveno-rossiiskii” a new coinage, but had been used before in other contexts, sometimes, for example, to describe the Russian recension of Slavonic, at others to mean something like Common or Proto-Slavic. See the discussion of the term in Myriam Lefloch, “‘Sovereign of Many Tongues’: The Russian Academy Dictionary (1789–1794) As A Socio-Historical Document” (Diss. University of Southern California, 2002), chap. 4.

14 Zhivov’s provides a corrective to the work of Iuri Lotman and Boris Uspenskii, which focused primarily on the Karamzinian linguistic reform of the early nineteenth century. See esp. their “Spory o iazyke v nachale XIX veka kak fakt russkoi kul’tury,” Uchenye zapiski Tartusskogo gos. Universiteta, vyp. 358: Trudy po russkoi i slavianskoi filologii, XXXIV (Tartu, 1975): 168–322 and B. A. Uspenskii, Iz istorii russkogo literaturnogo iazyka XVIII — nachala XIX veka: iazykovala programma Karamzina i ee istoricheskie korni (Moscow: Moskovskii universitet, 1985).

15 See also V. M. Zhivov, “Svetskie i dukovnye literaturnyi iazyki v Rossii XVIII veka: vzaimodeistvie i vzaimootalkivanie,” Russica Romana, 2 (1995): 64–81.
…wherever anyone goes in a well-ordered city one may hear one’s native language. If a great bell calls someone to church, he may hear prayers flowing there as well as the word of God preached in his native tongue. If, on business or for curiosity, he goes down to the palace of the supreme Autocrat, there everyone…speaks the native language and congratulates each other in it, expresses their good wishes, greets one another, and so on, conversing in the native tongue, sincerely or hypocritically as the case may be. But it is this language which he hears and wants to speak for his own self-respect…If he enters the courtroom to appear before a Judge, he will likewise defend himself, present evidence…or be charged…in his native tongue. Does he wish to go out on the street? There too he can speak his native language and understand…the speech he hears spoken. Let him go see a comedy during a holiday; at the theater too they are putting the show on in the native tongue…What else? [He can]…hire a worker — in his native tongue; greet his friends — in his native tongue; scream at his servant — in his native tongue; give his children a lesson — in his native tongue; utter affectionate words to his better half or speak to her in anger — [all] in his native tongue.

A modern literary language could thus accommodate all spheres of activity, from the palace, to the street, to the law courts — and to the church. This was not merely a new literary language to replace the old but a fundamentally altered socio-linguistic model. The situation Trediakovskii envisages bridges the gap not only between traditionally separate arenas of social activity, secular, civil and religious, but also overcomes traditional diglossia and the very separation of written (literary) and spoken linguistic spheres. The spoken language — a new, informed, educated discourse — establishes the norm, as was accepted in mainstream French linguistic theory (to write as one speaks). However immediately impractical this may have been in Russia at the time of Trediakovskii’s writing (1745), his scenario pointed the way towards accepting a modern, polyfunctional literary discourse which would close the gap between secular and religious culture.

This discourse of synthesis both continued and to some extent reversed the Petrine position. On the one hand, the “concordist” discourse so

16 Slovo o bogatom, razlichnom, iskusnom i neskhotstvennom vitiistve (St. Petersburg, 1745), 57–59; quoted in Zhivov, Iazyk i kul’ture, 275.

17 This analysis is based on Zhivov. As he points out, despite the theoretical call to write as one speaks, the assimilation of the written Slavonic heritage was necessitated by the lack of a normative spoken tongue (177–83, 216–21). By the time of Karamzin’s reform at the end of the century, such an educated spoken Russian — the language of the salons — had already begun to form, and could potentially serve as a starting point for literary usage.
eloquently expressed by Lomonosov above that saw no clash between reason and faith (a position elaborated by a host of Enlightenment thinkers of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century — including Locke, Leibniz, and Wolff) informed Petrine ideology, as articulated, for example, by the works of Feofan Prokopovich. In the larger context of the Petrine reforms, however, the idea of concord could also play the somewhat paradoxical role of justifying a rationalist, anti-clerical position, which dictated Peter’s assault on medieval, Muscovite culture.\textsuperscript{18} Thus Peter rejected the type of linguistic synthesis Feofan had attempted — a “hybridization” of Church Slavonic, that is, an attempt to Russianize Slavonic\textsuperscript{19} — in favor of the creation of a completely new and distinct vernacular literary language. As opposed to Feofan’s attempt to incorporate vernacular elements into Slavonic, Slaveno-rossiiskii discourse reflected the attempt of the new, post-Petrine, generation to create a new literary discourse which could incorporate the Slavonic tradition into the fledgling vernacular. This discourse thus validated the Slavonic literary and religious heritage, bringing it into harmony with the secular. In the remainder of this article I will examine the Slaveno-rossiiskii synthesis by considering its literary production from the perspective of its two constituent elements, the secular and ecclesiastic, with some comments on their respective institutional contexts and orthographic differentiation; and in the last section consider the Dictionary of the Russian Academy (Slovar’ Akademii Rossiiskoi) as a crowning monument to this unique discursive synthesis.

The efforts of the first generation of modern literary professionals, led by the trio of Trediakovskii, Lomonosov and Sumarokov, to create a “new literature” are relatively well known and need not be repeated.

\textsuperscript{18} Feofan Prokopovich’s “tragi-comedy” Vladimir (1705) may be taken as an example of this basic tension. The Enlightened, concordist position that the Greek Philosopher propounds to Vladimir in the third act is juxtaposed to the ignorant, grotesque and superstitious of the pagan priests, who in the given context stand for the Muscovite-oriented Orthodox clergy. See Feofan Prokopovich, Sochinenia, ed. I. P. Eremin (Leningrad: AN SSSR, 1961), 181–87. Francis Butler disputes the generally-held assumption that Vladimir was meant as an allegory for the Petrine reforms, although he confirms that the parallel between the two rulers became a durable part of the Petrine mythology. See his Enlightener of Rus’: The Image of Vladimir Sviatoslavich Across the Centuries (Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 2002), chap. 6.

\textsuperscript{19} V. M. Zhivov, “Iazyk Feofana Prokopovicha i rol’ gibridnykh variantov tserkovno-slavianskogo v istorii slavianskikh literaturnykh iazykov,” Sovetskoe slavianovedenie, 3 (1985): 70–85.
yet it should be emphasized that although commonly referred to as “Russian,” the tradition they founded — and the discourse they developed and defended — was quite explicitly “Slaveno-rossiiskii,” as exemplified in essays, treatises, manuals and many other works (see note 12; the terms “russkii,” “ruskii,” “ross(iis)kii,” and “slaveno-rossiiskii” were often interchangeable). The fact that the second element of the formula was “rossiiskii” and not “russkii” is suggestive of the role that the literary language was to play as the language of an empire, as opposed to an ethnos.21

Assertions about the richness, abundance and ancient roots of the Slavonic literary tradition buttressed the hope of creating a fully functional, independent national literature, and even suggested the superiority of the Russian over the European position, insofar as Slavonic was said to be “of one nature” with Russian, as opposed to the greater distance between European vernacular languages and Latin. Lomonosov’s well-known “Foreword on the Use of Church Books in the Russian Language” (Predislovie o pol’ze knig tserkovnykh v rossiiskom iazyke), which Riccardo Picchio has characterized as “a manifesto of confessional [i.e., Orthodox] patriotism,”22 was just such an apologia for the Orthodox Slavonic element in Slaveno-rossiiskii. The entire literary production from Trediakovskii to Fonvizin, Derzhavin and Radishchev, and through the “archaists” of the early nineteenth century, that is, up until Karamzin’s reform took hold, reflects this linguistic self-consciousness.

Lomonosov’s essay on Venus — with which this article opened — indicates the direct connection in his mind between science and rhetoric, and also implies that the primary mission of literature was to glorify God’s rational goodness, as embodied among other things in the enlightened well-ordered state. Significantly, Lomonosov explicitly grounds his “concordist” philosophical position not only upon contemporary science and

---

20 See for example G. A. Gukovskii, Russkaia literatura XVIII veka (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1937), chap. 2–4; Istoriiia russkoi literatury, vol. 3, ed. G. A. Gukovskii and V. A. Desnitskii (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1941), part 3; Irina Reyfman, Vasilii Trediakovsky: The Fool of the “New” Russian Literature (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford UP, 1990); Viktor Zhivov, “Pervye russkie literaturnye biografii kak sotsial’noe iavlenie: Trediakovskii, Lomonosov, Sumarokov,” Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie 25 (1997): 24–83.

21 On the distinction between russkii and rossiiskii, see M. N. Tikhomirov, “O proiskhozhdenii nazvaniia ‘Rossiia,’” Voprosy istorii, 11 (1953): 93–96.

22 “Predislovie o pol’ze knig tserkovnykh’ M. V. Lomonosova kak manifest russkogo konfessional’nogo patriotisma,” in Sbornik stat’i k 70-letiiu prof. Iu. M. Lotmana (Tartu, 1992), 142–52.
those Western thinkers mentioned above by whom the Petrine reform had been justified, but also upon Orthodox patristic thought.\textsuperscript{23} The religious aspects of Russian Classicism have been almost completely ignored, and I am tempted to offer “Slaveno-rossiiskii literature” as a less problematic designation for this literary formation than “Russian Classicism,” insofar as it signals not only the inclusion of the Baroque poetic (Slavonic linguistic) heritage, but also much of its religious ideals, which both reflected and fed into the new discourse.\textsuperscript{24}

A tremendous amount of material could be cited here in support of this proposition. Here we may simply suggest several major areas of literary production that call for further investigation and reconceptualization. Russian dramaturgy, which developed out of school drama and the traditions established by Polotskii, in many cases exhibits Orthodox religious underpinnings.\textsuperscript{25} Furthermore, secular writers produced a massive amount of religious poetry, which is hardly considered, or even acknowledged, in literary histories, and yet which played a primary role in the development

\textsuperscript{23} On this issue see my “The Ode as Revelation: On the Orthodox Theological Context of Lomonosov’s Odes,” chap. 16 in this volume.

\textsuperscript{24} Much of later Soviet scholarship on eighteenth-century Russian literature was taken up with (mostly inconclusive) debates over “period style” classifications such as “Baroque,” “Classicism,” and “Sentimentalism.” See the debate in \textit{Russkaia literatura} in the mid 1970’s, for example, P. P. Okhrimenko, “Gde zhe konets ili nachalo (K voprosu o periodizatsii russkoi literatury),” \textit{Russkaia literatura} 1 (1974): 94–99. Zhivov discusses the crucial place of the ode in legitimizing aspects of the Baroque, Slavonic linguistic heritage in \textit{Iazyk i kul’tura}, chap. 2.

P. E. Bukharkin, in his recent monograph \textit{Pravoslavnaia tserkov’ i russkaia literatura v XVIII–XIX vekakh: Problemy kul’turnogo dialoga} (St. Peters burg: Izd. S.-Peterburgskogo universiteta, 1996), attempts to qualify traditional views (recently developed by V. A. Kotel’nikov) of the fundamental rift between Church and secular literature in the eighteenth century (50). Bukharkin concludes that there was no such basic break with the older Orthodox tradition, and that “Despite all perturbations, as before, at the basis of [eighteenth-century Russian] art lay Orthodox traditions” which “preserved the possibility of a fruitful dialogue between Church and literature” (80). Nevertheless, his analysis does not go very far beyond asserting the possibility of a fruitful dialogue and, it seems to me, remains hampered by an overall “slavophile” framework (discussed above). An earlier work which frames the dialogue as that between the modern secularized “Academy” and the traditional, monastic, manuscript culture of the “Church” is Hans Rothe, \textit{Religion und Kultur in den Regionen des russischen Reiches im 18. Jahrhundert: erster Versuch einer Grundlegung} (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1984).

\textsuperscript{25} See my discussions in “Sumarokov’s Drama ‘The Hermit’: On the Generic and Intellectual Sources of Russian Classicism” and “Sumarokov’s Russianized ‘Hamlet’: Texts and Contexts,” chap. 5 and 6 in this volume.
of modern Russian poetry and poetics. This includes the rich tradition of psalm paraphrases and spiritual odes, genres practiced by virtually every poet of any stature from Polotskii and Trediakovskii to Kheraskov and Derzhavin. Furthermore, the spiritual ode and psalm paraphrase constitute a crucial link to the far better studied secular, panegyric ode. 26 There exists an extensive corpus of explicitly religious literature by “secular” writers, including many longer works in prose and verse, but practically none of this material has been published since its original appearance, and has completely fallen out of the purview of scholars and the canon of “Russian literature.” 27

Slaveno-rossiiskii discourse was also taken up and developed by a new generation of clergymen who were transforming the face of the Orthodox Church, and advocating a new trend which may be described as Enlightened or Enlightenment Orthodoxy. 28 In institutional and sociological terms,

26 Lomonosov’s famous “Evening” and “Morning Meditations on God’s Majesty…” and Derzhavin’s “God” are notable exceptions to this rule of neglect, although these works are virtually always treated in isolation from an Orthodox or religious context. On this see chaps. 15 and 16 in this volume. On the tradition of eighteenth-century religious poetry, see Alexander Levitsky, “The Sacred Ode in Eighteenth Century Russian Literary Culture” (Diss., University of Michigan, 1977); his publication of Trediakovskii’s Psalter 1753. Ed. Alexander Levitsky. Russische Psalmenübertragungen; Biblia Slavica, Ser. 3; Ostslavische Bibeln, Bd. 4b (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schoningh, 1989); and L. F. Lutsevich, Psaltyr’ v russkoi poezii (St. Petersburg: D. Bulanin, 2002).

27 Just to name a few of the longer works: Mikhail Kheraskov’s poems Pocherpnutye mysli iz Ekklesiasta (an adaption from Voltaire, three editions 1765–86), Utshenii greshkikh (1783 and 1800) and Christian verse epic Vseleennaia (1790); the novelist Fedor Emin’s Put’ k spaseniu, ili Raznyia nabozhnyia razmyshleniia (eight editions between 1780–1798); Andrei Bolotov’s Chuvstvovaniia khristianina, pri nachale i kontse kazhdogo dnia v nedele, otnosiashchiiasia k samomu sebe i k Bogu (1781), which was one of the works confiscated in Catherine’s raids of Moscow bookstores in 1787; the poet Vasilii Ruban’s translation of St. John Damascene, Kanon Paskhi prelozhennyi stikhami (four editions from 1769–1821, the last by the Synod typography); and Semen Bobrov’s monumental poem Drevniaia noch’ Vseleennoi, ili stranstvuiushchyi slepets (2 vols., 1807–1809).

28 As noted earlier and in my articles cited in note 24, as of the time of writing this piece (1999) there had been almost no work done on Enlightenment Orthodoxy as an intellectual or theological trend. (Various aspects of the larger phenomenon of Orthodoxy and Enlightenment — especially the politics of religion — were the subject of a dual panel at the AAASS National Convention in Denver, November, 2000.) In recent years, the historians Gregory Freeze and Olga Tsapina have been challenging regnant clichés about the institutionalized church as passive “handmaiden of the state” and about its alleged uniformity and intellectual stagnation. See the works by Freeze cited above and Olga Tsapina, “Iz istorii obschestvenno-politicheskoi mysli
just as a new generation was creating a modernized Russian literature, a new generation of leaders was changing the face of the Russian Orthodox Church. This new clerical cohort, whose representative figures I will take as Gedeon (Krinovskii), Gavriil (Petrov), Platon (Levshin) and Damaskin (D. E. Semenov-Rudnev), shared “a common ‘enlightened’ outlook” and were totally dedicated to the post-Petrine Orthodox Church; according to Freeze (ibid) they established the basic career profile for high churchmen in imperial Russia. These men had grown up within the new, post-Petrine reformed church, and for them the new cultural situation was already a given. As with Lomonosov’s cohort, they were moved by patriotic national and “confessional” goals, and strove to systematize and spread Enlightenment. This new generation of clergymen were almost all Russians and graduates of the Moscow Slaviano-Greko-Latino Academy, and Elizabeth and Catherine appointed them to replace the mostly ethnic Ukrainians who had come from the Kiev Mohyla Academy, and who had occupied the top positions since Peter’s time. In the words of Freeze, 

Rossii epokhi Prosveshchenia: Protoierei P. A. Alekseev (1727–1801)” (Diss. Moscow State University, 1998) and her articles “Secularization and Opposition in Times of Catherine the Great,” Religion and Politics in Enlightenment Europe, ed. James E. Bradley, Dale K. Van Kley (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001): 355–392; and “Pravoslavnoe Prosveshenie — oksiumoron ili istoricheskaiia real’nost’?” Evropeiskoe prosveshenie i tsivilizatsia Rossii, ed. S. Ia. Karp and S. A. Mezin (Moscow: Nauka, 2004), 301–13. Among other things, these and other scholars have begun to reconsider the political position of the Synod; the significance and effects of the nationalization of church property of 1764; the problem of the clergy’s legal and social status; ecclesiastical versus secular censorship; and attitudes toward such sensitive issues as religious toleration (e.g., the position of the Old Believers); relating these issues both to Elizabeth’s and Catherine’s policies and to conflicts within the Church. Useful surveys of the life and works of Gedeon Krinovskii, Gavriil Petrov, and Platon Levshin, including lists of their works and of basic secondary material, may be found in: Dictionary of Literary Biography, Volume 150: Early Modern Russian Writers, Late Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, ed. by Marcus C. Levitt. (Detroit, Washington, D.C., London: Bruccoli Clark Layman, Gale Research, Inc., 1995). See also Evgenii (Bolkhovitinov), Slovar’ istoricheskii, and Filaret, Obzor russkoi dukhovnoi literature. My argument here stresses the differences between these generations and cohorts, but we might also note the crucial role of the earlier generation of “Latinizing” churchmen both in laying the ideological groundwork for Enlightened Orthodoxy and in advancing poetry and rhetoric (two of the seven liberal arts) into the center of the new academic curriculum that became standard in Russia in the later seventeenth century. Both of these aspects unquestionably contributed in a major way to Slaveno-rossiiskii discourse and literary culture.
“a new episcopal elite took shape — Russian in nationality, clerical in social origin, elite in its advanced theological training.”31 (Notably, the Moscow Academy, which was the city’s only institution of higher learning before Moscow University was founded, graduated a stream of leading political, military, academic, and literary as well as ecclesiastic figures; illustrious graduates included the geographer Stepan Krasheninnikov, mathematician Leonid Magnitskii, professor of medicine Semen Zybelin, and the poets Kantemir, Trediakovskii, Lomonosov, Kostrov, Popovskii, and Vasilii Petrov. The cream of educated Russia, ecclesiastic and civil, thus shared a common educational background and literary culture.)

Gedeon (c. 1730–63), the Bishop of Pskov was the first to preach in Slaveno-rossiiskii; his sermons brought him great fame, especially after he was appointed court preacher by Elizabeth in 1753. Gedeon’s sermons were also marked by his use of use classical rather than biblical sources. (Lavished by presents from the empress, Gedeon acquired the reputation of a court grandee, and reputedly owned shoes with diamond buckles worth 10,000 rubles!) Gavriil (1730–1801) and Platon (1737–1812) were his disciples, and carried on his tradition in preaching. Gavriil, Metropolitan of St. Petersburg and Novgorod, though an ascetic in private life, played a visible role as court figure, scholar and theologian, and in his writing and public persona asserted the compatibility of Orthodox and Enlightenment thought. He was an accomplished linguist who knew French and German as well as the classical languages, and worked both on the Slavonic text of the bible and on the academy dictionary. Catherine dedicated her translation of Marmontel’s Belisaire to Gavriil, and he acted as the sole representative of the clergy to the Commission for New Law Code. Platon, who served as religious tutor to tsarevich Pavel Petrovich and who later became Metropolitan of Moscow, has been called the “leading representative” of “a spiritual or ecclesiastical branch of eighteenth-century Russian literature” which aimed “to bridge the gap between the ideas and fashions currently accepted by the educated segment of society, on the one hand, and strict adherence to the precepts of Russian Orthodox Christianity, on the other.”32 He was probably the most prolific and well-known cleric publishing and preaching in Slaveno-rossiiskii in the century. He produced a great number of sermons, catechisms, treatises, historical and other pedagogical works, and was a close associate of such figures as Potemkin, N. Panin, Sumarokov, Fonvizin, Novikov, Dashkova,

31 Freeze, “Handmaiden,” 96.
32 K. A. Papmehl, “Platon,” Dictionary of Literary Biography, 289.
and Derzhavin. (In The Brothers Karamazov Dostoevsky immortalized an anecdote about how during Diderot’s visit to Russia Platon had bested him in debate; when Diderot mocked the idea of God’s existence, Platon cut him short with the line from the psalms, “The fool hath said in his heart, ‘There is no God.’”33) Damaskin (1737–1795), Bishop of the Nizhegorod Region, was another outstanding “enlightened cleric.” He studied French, German, history, science and theology for six years in Göttingen before returning to become professor and prefect of the Moscow Slaviano-Greko-Latino Academy. He was a scholar and prolific translator and editor. Among his translations were Russian chronicles into German, Platon’s catechism into Latin, and classical works from Latin and Greek into Slaveno-rossiiskii. His extensive work as editor not only included editions of Prokopovich and Platon but also of Lomonosov, whose works he published in an exemplary three volume edition (1778), including much new material. This generation of clerics was involved in the cultural and literary life of their day to an extent perhaps never seen before or since.

Platon and his cohort spread the faith using the new Slaveno-rossiiskii discourse. All wrote, preached and published in this language, and several owed their career advancement to their literary skill in it, no less than did Catherine’s court poet Vasilii Patrov or Derzhavin. For example, Lomonosov’s patron Ivan Shuvalov originally brought Gedeon to Elizabeth’s attention for his electric sermons delivered in what were described as “pure Russian speech” (that is, in Slaveno-rossiiskii, which, as noted, he was the first to use for this purpose, abandoning Prokopovich’s hybrid Slavonic). Gedeon, Petrov and Platon revived the Petrine tradition of the “live” sermon (that is, interpretive preaching instead of reading from scripture), a practice that had been introduced to Moscow and St. Petersburg from Kiev by Prokopovich and his cohort, but which had fallen into some decline in the intervening period. The 1740’s and 50’s witnessed a boom in the Slaveno-rossiiskii sermon, with its own themes and traditions. As in Peter’s day, the sermon could serve as a tribune for official policy matters, and — as in the case of the new secular poetry and dramaturgy — helped contribute to a rudimentary public sphere. An important theme of this literature — as in secular writing — was the cult

33 Part I, book 2, chap. 2. According to Fedor Karamazov, who expands upon the story for buffoonish effect, Diderot thereupon immediately declared his faith and requested baptism, and Princess Dashkova and Potemkin served as his godparents. For the historical source of the episode, see F. M. Dostoevsky, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. 30 vols. (Leningrad: Nauka, 1972–1990), 15: 529–30.
of Peter the Great, and of enlightened state rule. The official sanction no doubt helped make the sermon the most widely published genre of religious literature in the century (not including service and prayer books). Under Catherine the Great sermons in Slaveno-rossiiskii were collected, edited, published and sent out to all parish priests for obligatory use, thus further endorsing and spreading this language as the discourse of the Church. This, the Collection of Sermons for All Sundays and Holidays (Sobranie pouchenii na vse voskresnye i prazdnichnye dni) (3 volumes, Moscow: Synod, 1775), edited by Gavriil, established the “homiletic canon which continued to be in force through the first decades of the nineteenth century.” It included works of the leading Russian contemporary homilists (Gedeon, Gavriil, and Platon), translations of popular modern Greek Orthodox writers like Elias Miniates, as well as sermons by a variety of contemporary European writers, Catholic as well as Protestant, and not even exclusively clerics. Non-Orthodox contemporary writers included Bernard-Joseph Saurin (1706–61), Johann Lorenz von Mosheim (1693–1755) and Louis Bourdaloue (1632–1704), and some sermons were compiled from various sources, including Salomon Gessner (soon to be famous in Russia as the author of poetic idylls). Mosheim’s Heilege Reden of 1765 served as a model for the collection. It also included works by the Church Fathers, who were themselves also being actively translated into Slaveno-rossiiskii. The Priest Ioann Sidorovskii, who was a member of Dashkova’s Russian Academy, was known for his translations of John Chrysostom’s sermons (published in 2 volumes, 1787; second edition, 1791), which were later celebrated in his verse epitaph:

34 E. V. Anisimov, Rossiia v seredine XVIII veka: borba za nasledie Petra (Moscow: Mysl, 1986), 46. As Anisimov notes, they had much in common as far as both content and language—from our perspective we may say that they shared the common Slaveno-rossiiskii discourse. Both odes and sermons also came to feature extravagant praise of Peter; see V. V. Pochetnaia, “Petrovskaiia tema v oratorskoi proze nachala 1740-kh godov,” XVIII vek, 9 (1974): 331–337.

35 T. A. Afanas’eva, “Svetskaia kirillicheskaia kniga v Rossii v XVIII veke: Problemy izdaniia, repertuara, rasprostraneniiia, chteniiia” (Diss. Leningradskii Institut kul’tury im. N. K. Krupskoi, 1983), 119–23; Pochetnaia, “Petrovskaiia tema”; Zhivov, “Svetskie i dukhovnye literaturnyi izyuki,” 68.

36 V. M. Zhivov, “Gavriil Petrov,” Dictionary of Literary Biography, 276.

37 Zhivov, “Gavriil Petrov,” 277. On translations of non-Orthodox theology into Russian during this period, see Horst Rohling, “Observations on Religious Publishing in Eighteenth-Century Russia,” Russia and the World of the Eighteenth Century, ed. R. P. Bartlett, A. G. Cross, Karen Rasmussen (Columbus, OH: Slavica Publishers, 1986), 91–111.
Notably, during the period of the Slaveno-rossiiskii synthesis the sermon was accepted as part of the Classicist generic hierarchy, and sermons continued to be recognized and valued as part of “high” literature in Russia though approximately the 1830’s (by which point a new split had come to differentiate “Russian” and “Church Slavonic,” secular and religious, culture and language). Other important religious works in Slaveno-rossiiskii included theological textbooks, catechisms, translations and treatises, and saint’s lives. This period, which produced the modern standard Slavonic version of the Bible (the so called Elizabethan Bible, begun under Peter, whose second edition of 1756 is still the basic text in use), also saw the first impulse to translate the Bible into the vulgar tongue, an undertaking that was not completed for more than another century.

---

38 M. I. Sukhomlinov, Istoriia rossiiskoi Akademii, 8 vols. (St. Petersburg: Akademiia nauk, 1875), 1: 273; quoted in Zhivov, Iazyk i kul’tura, 401. Zhivov suggests that there was a confusion between Sidorovskii’s translations of Zlatoust and those of Priest Ivan Ivanov (401).

39 In the first draft of his “Epistle on the Russian Language,” Sumarokov included a section on Church oratory; for a discussion of why he did not include the passage in the published version, see my “Censorship and Provocation: The Publication History of Sumarokov’s ‘Two Epistles,’” chap. 3 in this volume.

At the time when the epistle was written, sermons were not yet being composed in Slaveno-rossiiskii (the passage in question refers to Prokopovich, whom Sumarokov ranks with Bourdaloue and Mosheim despite the “impurity” of his language, that is, his use of hybridized Slavonic). Sumarokov later wrote an approving literary analysis of Slaveno-rossiiskii sermons (“O Rossiiskom Dukhovnom Krasnorechii,” Polnoe sobranie vsekh sochinenii, 10 vols. [Moscow: N. Novikov, 1781–1782], 6: 293–302). In his Rhetoric (Kratkoe rukovodstvo k krasnorechiiu, 1748), Lomonosov also included numerous examples of not only classical but Christian orators (Orthodox and non-Orthodox, patristic and modern).

40 According to the Czech scholar Josef Dobrovský who visited Russia in the 1790s, P. A. Alekseev told him that Trediakovskii had proposed translating the Bible “into vulgar Russian” (vulgaris russicae), but that this idea was rejected, as was the Petersburg publisher Veitbekht’s proposal to publish the Slavonic Bible in civil script. See Josef
Chapter 13. The Rapprochement between “Secular” and “Religious”

The rapprochement described here may also be traced orthographically, that is, by noting the instances when works of a religious nature appeared in civic script, and when works of non-religious content were published in kirillitsa (“church script”). Over the course of the century, the church’s presses published approximately 1.5% of the titles that appeared in civic type. Only seven of these came out between 1725 and 1755, and these were of a utilitarian character (descriptions of court ceremonies and publications of government regulations); the great majority of the rest appeared either in 1765, when a series of service books (sluzhby) were issued, or during the

---

Dobrovský, Korrespondej Josefa Dobrovského, ed. Adolf Patera, 2 vols. (Prague: Česke akademie Cisare Frantiska Josefa pro Vedy, slovesnost a umeni, 1895–1913), 1: 274, and G. N. Moiseeva and M. N. Krbets, Iozef Dobrovskii i Rossiiia: pamyatniki russkoi kultury XI–XVIII vekov v izuchenii cheshskogo slowista (Leningrad: Nauka, 1990), 222. It seems possible that the reference to Trediakovskii’s proposal had to do with his Psalter, which he proved unable to publish.

Pskov Archbishop Mefodii Smirnov’s 1794 translation and commentary of Paul’s Letter to the Romans formed the basis for the well-known project to translate the entire Bible taken up by the Bible Society in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, that was only completed in the 1860’s and 70’s (Polnyi pravoslavnyi bogoslovskii entsiklopedicheskii slovar. 2 vols. [1913; rpt. Moscow: Vozrozhdenie, 1992], 1: 328). The 1815 edition of Smirnov’s translation was published in both civic and church scripts (Evgenii, Slovar’ istoricheskii, 220). For a general history of Bible translations in Russia, see I. A. Chistovich, Istoriiia pervoda Biblii na russkii iazyk (St. Petersburg, 1899) and M. I. Rizhskii, Istoriiia perevodov biblii v Rossii (Novosibirsk: Nauka, 1978).

A calculation based on the Svodnyi katalog russkoi knigi grazhdanskoj pechati vosemnadtsatogo veka 1725–1800, 5 vols. (Moscow: Gos. biblioteki SSSR imeni V. I. Lenina, 1963–67). I did not include lists of publications (reestry) in this calculation.

Gary Marker, Publishing, Printing, and the Origins of Intellectual Life in Russia, 1700–1800 (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1985), 63. In 1764, the Synod opened a press in St. Petersburg. See A. V. Gavrilov, Ocherk istorii S. Peterburgskoi sinodal’noi tipografii, vyp. 1, 1711–1839 (St. Petersburg, 1911), 191–392.

It is hard to judge the significance of this peculiar and brief publishing episode, arguably the most dramatic instance of the secular alphabet’s inroads into the ecclesiastical domain. One possibility is the church’s desire to reach a more secular audience, although as Gary Marker notes, the Slavonic script continued to be used for virtually all primary education and so remained generally comprehensible (“Faith and Secularity in Eighteenth-Century Literacy, 1700–1775,” in Christianity and the Eastern Slavs, vol. 2: Russian Culture in Modern Times, ed. by Robert P. Hughes and Irina Paperno [Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1994], 3–24). Zhivov notes that the presumption of such a publication was “to reach those who could not read the old Cyrillic script. The intended addressee was thus a secularized section of society,” but he adds that this intended addressee may not have existed in 1765 and may thus simply have been “constructed in a discursive practice by the very act of this publication” (personal correspondence). That is, such an intended audience was a cultural fiction, a function of an ideally polyfunctional
decade of the 1790’s, when over half of the total number of Synod titles in civic type for the century were published. Of the works the Synod presses published in civil type, apart from a second edition of Catherine the Great’s Russian Primer (Rossiiskaia azbuka) in 1783 and several historical works (e.g., chronicles, the Russkaia pravda, or A. I. Zhuravlev’s historical polemic on the schism), almost all titles were on directly religious topics, though not necessarily by Orthodox writers, for example, translations of François Arnaud’s “Lamentations de Jérémie,” Hugh Blair’s guide to rhetoric, and various religious tracts including ones by Lorenzo Scupoli (c. 1530–1610), Roberto Bellarmino (1542–1621), and Philippe Julius Liberkühn (1756–88).

Since the Petrine orthographic reform of 1708–10 the use of church script had been reserved to church typographies, but when the Synod typography was backed up with work, it did sometimes farm out the printing of books to private presses.⁴⁴ There were other occasional but rare instances when secular presses used church type; notably, the formal pretext for the arrest of Novikov in 1792 was that he was selling an Old Believer book in church script, O stradaniakh otsev solovetskih, which he was also suspected of having published.⁴⁵ Orthographic overlap may be seen in terms of books’ content, although judgments in this area depend on how we define the bounds between “secular” and “religious.” The right to publish this or that work could spark controversy between secular and church publishers throughout the century,⁴⁶ and defining the lines may also remain a problem today. T. A. Afanas’eva’s 1983 study of “secular books in church type” in the eighteenth century, for example, essentially defines “secular” relative to the Slaveno-rossiiskii discourse. The publication of the Sluzhby might also have been prompted by the Synod Press’ desire to broaden its commercial appeal. Notably, in 1764 Grigorii Teplov had proposed that the Synodal Typography be transformed into a “commercial establishment” under direct jurisdiction of “Her Majesty’s Cabinet” that would print “useful books,” i.e. textbooks and manuals, and although this proposal was rejected, in 1765 there was criticism that the presses’ civic fonts were “lying purposelessly (lezhali bezplodno) in the Moscow Typography of the Holy Synod” (RGADA, fond 18, d. 174, l. 11). (My thanks to Olga Tsapina for this information.)

---

⁴⁴ Afanas’eva, “Svetskaia kirillicheskaia kni ga,” 97. Thus the Synod farmed out the publication of Prokopovich’s sermons to the Kadetskii korpus press (4 vols., 1760–1777; the last volume was published by Novikov), although this was published in civic type (153).

⁴⁵ It was in fact published in Suprasl’ by Old Believers; see A. V. Voznesenskii, Starobriadcheskie izdaniia XVIII — nachala XIX veka: vvedenie v izuchenie (St. Petersburg: S.-Peterburgskii universitet, 1996), 102.

⁴⁶ Marker, Publishing, Printing, chap. 2, passim.
traditions of medieval Russian literacy, including in this category not only works of history, grammars and primers (azbuki and bukvari) and other works of pedagogical and didactic literature, but also “books for reading,” which include saints lives, Prologues, Lives of the Fathers (pateriki), and other non-liturgical texts which, in more modern terms, we still might well consider “religious” (e.g., 138). By Afanas’eva’s count, 20% of eighteenth-century books published in church type may be considered secular (193). What is especially significant here, particularly as we move from the sphere of high culture to Russia’s broader experience of modernization, is that — as Gary Marker has shown — for most of the eighteenth century, despite sporadic efforts to the contrary (for example, Catherine’s civil primer), the teaching of initial literacy (that is, primary education) continued to follow the pre-Petrine pattern, and remained in a traditional, religious cultural context (i.e., in Slavonic using kirillitsa). It was based on memorization of “sklady” (syllables) and of the catechism, breviary (chasoslov) and Psalter, all of which continued to be published primarily in church type. This was one reason that despite the country’s overall changeover to civic type, more than one quarter of Russian books in the eighteenth century were printed in church type; somewhat less than a quarter of this figure represents books in church type published by Orthodox presses outside of Russia. The issue of orthographic changeover and of when and why which script was used is complex, and deserves further analysis. Pre-Petrine literary traditions continued to exist in parallel, in combination or in competition with the new.

Throughout the second half of the century, secular presses published a great number of religious works in civic type (especially sermons, but also school texts, treatises and other works of theology, saints lives, etc.), thus like the Synod’s publications in civic type, helping to spread the bounds of Slaveno-rossiisskii polyfunctional discourse. Clearly, publishing such

47 See Marker, “Faith and Secularity,” 9–18.
48 Afanas’eva, “Svetskaia kirillicheskaia kniga,” 192.
49 In general, the use and function of many works in church script (apart from explicitly liturgical ones) is more complex than it might seem at first. For example, due to the fact that primary education began with memorizing church texts, the high, artificial, ecclesiastical language could be perceived as being closer to the “simple folk” than the new literary language based on the vulgar tongue, which was felt to be Europeanized and elitist. Hence the government published newspapers and regulations in both scripts, and put out some of its most urgent communications (e.g., announcements regarding the Pugachev rebellion or Napoleon’s invasion) in church script, possibly also counting on local clergy to pass them on.
works in civil as well as church script were meant to help make them more accessible to the general reading public, even (or especially?) to those without formal training in the civil script.\(^{50}\) Most or all sermon writers who published their works did so in dual editions, one in each type face. The well known sermonizers of the Petrine epoch, Feofan Prokopovich and Gavriil Buzhinskii, who had, like Gedeon, made their careers in the church via oratory, continued to be published in the later part of the century in civic script.\(^{51}\) Over the course of the century, Afanas’eva counts approximately 550 sermon publications (slova and panegiricheskie rechi), of which 350 or almost 65% were in civic type (119). Often, individual works or entire collections of sermons could migrate between typefaces and between church and secular presses. Gedeon’s Sobranie raznykh pouchitel’nykh slov (4 vols., 1755–59), for example, was first published by the Academy of Sciences typography in civil script but was subsequently put out by the Synod press in church type (1760, 1828, and 1855). Platon’s twenty-volume collected sermons which came out over 43 years was published piecemeal by a variety of secular presses — the Moscow Senate Press, F. Gippius, Novikov, and Ridiger and Klavdia; only volumes 13–15 and 19–20 were published by the Moscow Synod press, and also in civil type. As noted, Platon was one of the best known and most published Russian homilists in the eighteenth century, and left over 600 published sermons in Slaveno-rossiiskii (his famous sermon on the Chesme victory of 1770 was translated into several modern European languages — Princess Dashkova rendered it into French — and it was praised by Voltaire in the foreword to his History of Russia Under Peter the Great\(^ {52}\)). There were also a number of clergymen who published poetry and theatrical works in Slaveno-rossiiskii (e.g., by Amvrosii [Serebrennikov],\(^ {53}\) Antonii [Znamenskii], and Apollos [A. D. Baibakov], who among many other works wrote commentaries on the New Testament, “holy tragedies” and “holy stories” [povesti]).

\(^{50}\) The issues raised in note 41 concerning the presumed audience for these works are also relevant here.

\(^{51}\) T. A. Afanas’eva, “Svetskaia kirllicheskaiia kniga,” 124–27 and 153. See also the appropriate entries in the Svodnyi katalog russkoi knigi.

\(^{52}\) Sermon prêché… sur la tombe de Pierre le Grand… (London, 1771); see also the letters from Voltaire to Catherine May 15, 1771 and Catherine to Voltaire, June 10/21, 1771 (Voltaire and Catherine the Great: Selected Correspondence, trans. and ed. A. Lentin [Cambridge, U.K.: Oriental Research Partners, 1974], 103 and 108).

\(^{53}\) For example, his “Poema na den’ vozhestviia na vserossiiskii prestol e. v. gosudaryni Ekateriny Alekseevny, samoderzhitsy vserossiiskii, razgovor Marsa, Neptuna i Rossa predstavliaiushchaia…” (!) of 1772.
The culmination and a purposeful attempt at canonizing Slaveno-rossiiskii discourse was the monumental *Dictionary of the Russian Academy* (Slovar’ Akademii Rossiskoi, henceforth: “SAR”), which came out in six volumes from 1789–94. The SAR was the product of the Russian Academy, an institution founded in 1783 under the presidency of Princess Dashkova, who simultaneously presided over the Academy of Sciences. Almost all of the major writers and literary figures of the later eighteenth century were members, save Nikolai Novikov; these included Mikhail Kheraskov, Gavriil Derzhavin, Denis Fonvizin, Aleksei Rzhhevskii, Vasilii Petrov, Nikolai L’vov, Ivan Shuvalov, Iakov Kniazhnin, Ivan Bogdanovich, Adam Olsuf’ev, Ivan Khemnitser, Vasilii Kapnist, Dmitrii Khvostov, Nikolai Nikolev, Ivan Elagin, Mikhail Shcherbatov and Vasilii Tatishchev. Forty-seven of the Academy’s sixty members took part in compiling the dictionary, and of these nineteen, or 41 percent, were churchmen (the French and German academies, in sharp contrast, excluded clergymen altogether, and the Académie française even forbade discussion of theological issues). Gavriil, already Metropolitan of Novgorod and St. Petersburg, and de facto leader of the church was, after Dashkova, the Russian Academy’s leading member. He occupied the president’s chair during her absences, and took a central part in organizing, compiling and editing the SAR.

Lefloch has identified six main groups of source material that was incorporated into the dictionary: 1) earlier dictionaries (including P. A. Alekseev’s *Tserkovniy slovar’* of 1773, which was an important starting point for the SAR); 2) the Elizabethan Bible and myriad church books — including liturgies, private and church prayer books, saints lives, as well as sermons, from John Chrysostom to Platon Levshin (i.e., Slavonic material from all periods as well as some in Slaveno-rossiiskii); 3) contemporary Russian poetry and prose (primarily the verse of Lomonosov but also works by

54 Lefloch, “Sovereign of Many Tongues,” chap. 1. Among other things Lefloch analyzes the illustrative quotes used in the SAR’s definitions which collectively illustrate and define the discourse it was promoting as normative.

55 Alekseev published additional material for the dictionary in 1776 and a “continuation” in 1779; a second edition was published by the Academy of Sciences in 1794; see Svodnyi katalog russkoi knigi grazhdanskoi pechatii, 1: 28. The *Tserkovniy slovar’* was published in civil type, and included special entries “translating” letters and symbols of the church script. It had been sponsored by the Free Russian Assembly, in which Alekseev was the only member from the clergy. (Tsapina, Iz istorii obschestvenno-politicheskoi myssi, 23; see also her “The Image of the Quaker and Critique of Enthusiasm in Early Modern Russia” Russian History, 24, no. 3 [Fall 1997], 263.)

56 Sukhomlinov, *Istoriia rossiiskoi Akademii*, 8: 28; see the discussion in Lefloch, “‘Sovereign of Many Tongues’,” chap. 3.
Sumarokov, Kheraskov, Dashkova, Derzhavin, Catherine II, and others); 4) historical texts (including chronicles); 5) proverbs and other material of oral provenance; and 6) legal texts, both historical and modern.\footnote{A possible seventh category is classical texts in translation. This list of material is from a lecture she delivered at USC on Feb. 12, 1999; see also Lefloch, “‘Sovereign of Many Tongues,’” which contains extensive appendices containing all of the SAR’s ascertainable sources. Notably, almost all of the religious texts had to be “translated” from the Slavonic to the civil script.\textsuperscript{57}} According to her preliminary calculations, the ratio of religious to secular material used in the SAR is between about three or four to one.\footnote{Ibid. This number may seem very high, but is perhaps less surprising if we keep in mind the approximately fifty-year existence of “secular” literature in comparison to the centuries-long Slavonic tradition.\textsuperscript{58}} The creation of the SAR thus dramatically asserted the unity of Orthodox and secular discourse, validating mainstream literary and linguistic practice, on the one hand, and on the other, demonstrating the institutional alliance of clerical and lay literary forces.\footnote{This institutionalized literary unity lived on to some extent in Beseda liubitelei russkogo slova (1811–16), the organization of the “arkhaisty,” which included bishops Evgenii and Amvrosii as “honored members” (Mark Altshuller, Predtechi slavianofilstva v russkoi literature: obshchestvo “Beseda liubitelei russkogo slova” [Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1984], 369), and in the Obshchestvoi liubitelei rossiskoi slovesnosti, (founded 1811), whose members included Moscow Metropolitan Filaret. The illustrious Filaret carried on Platon’s legacy; he was a well known homilist, and leading member of the Bible Society. The Obshchestvo liubitelei rossiskoi slovesnosti, which was later to organize the famous 1880 Pushkin Celebration, celebrated a memorial for Filaret upon his death in 1867 (Marcus C. Levitt, Russian Literary Politics and the Pushkin Celebration of 1880 [Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989], 55). Curiously, in 1880 the Ober-Prokurator of the Holy Synod, Konstantin Pobedonostsev, tried to promote Filaret as “national hero” in place of the overly-secular Pushkin! (Olga Maiorova, “Polemika vokrug Pushkinskogo prazdnika 1880 goda: Novye materialy,” lecture delivered at the conference, “Alexander Pushkin and Humanistic Study,” Stanford University, April 16, 1999). Thus at one end of the spectrum we have a religious-secular alliance represented by the SAR, and at the other the idea of two separate, opposing literary traditions.\textsuperscript{59}}

Thus, as Zhivov has described the linguistic and cultural rapprochement under Catherine,

The Petrine anti-clerical policy was replaced by the creation of a united state enlightenment culture, in which both religious and secular authors responded to \textit{[poluchaiut] the identical social demand…The empresses’ confessor, the heir to the throne’s tutor in religion, and the court preacher were just as much literary agents of the court as those who composed panegyric odes or
academic greetings...the juxtaposition of religious and secular, as in language, was no longer an issue. In Catherine's reign literary activity gained the status of an activity that had state importance, and in which the empress was herself involved. Having achieved that status, literature—like language—began to embody (not only as an intention, but in a real, functional way) the unified power of the regnant culture (edinovlastie gospodstvuiushei kul'tury), which dominated all spheres of social life. Accordingly, it was perceived as a single whole, creating a system of genres in which sermons and theological tracts took their place beside odes, elegies and comic operas.60

Yet by the time the SAR was completed it had already begun to outlive itself, and the cultural discourse it canonized was fast becoming obsolete by the time the companion seven-volume alphabetical version appeared in 1806–1822 (the earlier version was organized by roots).61 The last serious debate over the viability of Slaveno-rossiiskii discourse as vehicle for secular literature was arguably that between the “archaists and innovators,” terms made famous among later scholars by Iurii Tynianov’s 1929 essay.62 There

60 The passages, separated by ellipses, are from Zhivov, *Iazyk i kul'tura*, 77, 370 and 403. We should note here, however, that this system of genres was still strictly hierarchical, and that low, “purely entertainment” genres (such as comic operas, novels, or popular farces [igrishchi]) could be rejected as falling below ethical or aesthetic standards.

61 See Pushkin's heavily ironic comments in canto one of *Eugene Onegin* in 1825 (*Eugene Onegin: A Novel in Verse*, translated from the Russian, with a commentary, by Vladimir Nabokov, 2 vols. [Princeton, N.J.: Princeton UP, 1975], 2: 107–8), in which he describes the SAR as “an everlasting monument to the solicitude of Catherine and to the enlightened labors of Lomonosov’s successors, strict and trustworthy guardians of our native tongue” — a not so hidden parody of pompous slavenorossiiskii discourse! Pushkin continues by quoting an equally ornate speech by Karamzin about the SAR, delivered to the Academy in 1818. The SAR was replaced by a new academy dictionary, significantly entitled *Slovar tserkovno-slavianskogo i russkago iazyka* in 1847 (2nd ed., 4 vols. [St. Petersburg: Akademiia nauk, 1867–68]); this dictionary was published by the “Second Section” (Vtoroe otdelenie) of the Academy of Sciences which had replaced the Russian Academy. The standard Russian dictionary (analogous to Webster's in America) was to become V. I. Dal’s *Tolkovyi slovar zhivago velikorusskago iazyka*. 4 vols. (1863–66), whose title is also indicative; the standard scholarly dictionary of Church Slavonic was I. I. Sreznevsky’s *Materialy dlia slovaria drevne-russkago iazyka po pis’mennym pamiatnikam*. 3 vols. (St. Petersburg: Otd-niie russkago iazyka i slovesnosti Imp. Akademii nauk, 1893–1912).

62 In the collection *Arkhaisty i novatory* ([Berlin]: Priboi, 1929); on this epideis, see Altshuller, *Predtechi slavianofilstva*; and Iu. M. Lotman and B. A. Uspenskii, “Spory o iazyke.” These scholars emphasize the utopian and Romantic aspects of the arcahists’ program, represented primarily the works of Admiral A. S. Shishkov, which
is no need here to review the epochal political and cultural circumstances that put an end to the tradition this discourse represented, and that set the stage for the new synthesis of the literary language accomplished by Pushkin, canonized anew in the later nineteenth century.\footnote{Boris Gasparov, \textit{Poeticheskiy iazyk Pushkina kak fakt istorii russkogo literaturnogo iazyka}. (Wien: Gesellschaft zur F"{o}derung slawistischer Studien, 1992).} Zhivov himself, somewhat paradoxically, has described the cultural synthesis he so meticulously defined and the very existence of a Russian Enlightenment as a “mirage,” as “illusory,” a “myth” manufactured by the state (primarily Catherine) as a camouflage for hidden, “real” political purposes (with distinctly totalitarian overtones).\footnote{V. M. Zhivov, “Gosudarstvenniy mif v epokhu Prosveshcheniia i ego razrusheniie v Rossii kontsa XVIII veka,” \textit{Vek Prosveshcheniia: Rossiia i frantsiya. Le siecle des lumieres. Russia. France. Materiały nauchnoi konferentsii. Vipperovskie chteniia} — 1987, vyp. 20 (Moscow, 1989), 141–65 and \textit{Iazyk i kul'tura}, 419–25.} For many critics of Russian culture, both the secular as well as the religious traditions of the eighteenth century were subsequently seen as empty and bankrupt due to the interference or control of the state. In the aftermath of the French Revolution the hypocritical self-interest of old regime culture became strikingly evident as an inevitable structural problem, and destroyed the very basis of the cultural synthesis, which after all had taken place within the ideological and institutional context of imperial state culture. Slaveno-rossiiskii discourse and its normative texts were (with minor exceptions) relegated to the trash-bin of history, as relics of an archaic or pseudo-culture.

Since the early nineteenth century, practically all of Russian culture has, at one time or another, been seen as an illusion, from Chaadaev’s rejection of the entire national heritage going back to Byzantium, to the leftist political and cultural avant-gardes who were ready to throw Pushkin & Co. from the ship of modernity, to those who in our day dismiss Socialist Realism as nothing more than a state-imposed sham. On the other hand, Zhivov’s reservations about the status of Enlightenment in Russia do suggest substantive questions about the case I have tried to make here on the basis of the framework his own work provides. Does the material offered here allow us to speak of a true synthesis during this period? I have tried to indicate an initial positive response to this question, suggesting that especially if seen as a regnant elite discourse, and not only an institutional and literary formation, the evidence...
of a Slaveno-rossiiskii episode in Russian culture is hard to gainsay. At the same time, there is a great deal left to be said about many of the historical developments and cultural trends of the day that surely influenced the shape of the proposed synthesis. These include such things as: the practical differences between Elizabeth’s and Catherine’s cultural policies; the conflicts between secular writers and Synodal censors; the effects of the nationalization of church property; the monastic revival; Freemasonry; and other tensions within and between secular and religious realms that could not help but affect the character of the overall synthesis. Another objection might come from the very assertion of an “Enlightened,” non-“traditional” Orthodoxy. Were the Slaveno-rossiiskii sermons, for example, by presuming a greater degree of human moral perfectibility by rational means contrary to “traditional” Orthodox discourse about original sin?65 We are confronted with the problem of how to define Orthodoxy, a particularly difficult question given the rather inclusive nature of the Russian Orthodox theological tradition.66

More generally, this challenge to the nature of eighteenth century Russian religious doctrine raises the larger issue posed by Enlightenment culture for all traditional religious cultures of the older type (Protestant and Jewish as well as Orthodox and Catholic): does the rapprochement between faith and reason demanded by adapting to life in a modern society spell the inevitable demise of a faith-based life-style? An affirmative answer to this question would seem to come only from those on the extreme ends of the spectrum, either radical traditionalists (e.g., Slavophiles) or radical secularists (e.g., atheist revolutionaries), and would not do justice to those for whom concord or compromise, as articulated in a discourse of cultural synthesis, indicated a possible alternative path.

65 See Zhivov’s comments, for example, in Dictionary of Literary Biography, 276–77. Some have also seen the Petrine tradition in Russian Orthodoxy as essentially alien for its “Protestant” innovations.

66 Certainly, defining and documenting Orthodox doctrine is problematic throughout the history of the church. In the 1750’s and 60’s, some of the main opponents of “Enlightened Orthodoxy” were those associated with the Kievan scholastic tradition, the faction which during the Petrine period had been opposed to the Moscow “Grecophiles” as “Latinizers.” Does it follow that we are to define the scholastic tradition as traditional Russian Orthodoxy?