The Attitude to Religion in the New Russian Literature

MIKHAIL AGURSKY

Soviet social life is no longer uniform. There are several officially-tolerated trends within it. One can speak now of a limited cultural pluralism, within a certain framework. For example, one trend in Soviet literature which has attracted the attention of many observers for several years reflects the Russian national orientation, even Russian nationalism, though it is certainly limited in its authentic expression by ideological supervision.[1] Nevertheless it is very distinct and has several specific features. We shall call this trend the New Russian Literature. It can be regarded as Russian national opposition to contemporary industrial society, to urbanization, to mass culture, and to official ideology. Why such a trend is permitted in the USSR even in a curtailed form is an important question, which I have discussed elsewhere.[2] Here we need note only that at the present time part of the central Party apparatus (whose national composition is Russian) is making use of Russian nationalism in the political struggle against such political forces as republican Party organizations, the ideological sector of the Party, and the military-industrial complex. The aim of this political group is to demonstrate that the fast-proceeding national integration in the USSR, expansion and the arms race are undermining the Russian demographic base and harming the political stability of the USSR. Of course, at the base of this lies the Russian demographic catastrophe. In speaking of the support for Russian nationalism on the part of this or that group in the Soviet leadership, we should emphasize that there are genuine spiritual causes for this movement. Without these natural roots it could not have become a significant social current and attracted so many adherents.

Here we shall analyse only one aspect of the New Russian Literature, its attitude to religion, which is far removed from the usual treatment of religious problems in Soviet literature. However one must understand that this attitude is expressed obliquely and needs careful interpretation.

Religion as a pragmatic value

There is a growing belief in the New Russian Literature that the militant atheism of Soviet society has turned out to be extremely harmful for Russia.

It created a spiritual vacuum for which there was no adequate substitute, and that has led to frustration and moral degradation. Because of this belief there is no place for openly atheistic propaganda in literary magazines of this trend. (Newspapers have to side with the official line more than magazines.) Despite this, the main newspaper of this trend, *Sovetskaya Rossiya,* has managed to substitute, in place of the obligatory atheistic propaganda, attacks against religious groups like Jehovah's Witnesses, Baptists and Pentecostals, which it appears to regard as peripheral and not nationally oriented.[3] This is not atheistic propaganda but rather the selective treatment of different confessions and religious views according to national criteria.

There is now a growing and striking recognition of the pragmatic value of religious belief, if it is not regarded as anti-national. For example, a well-known writer, Viktor Astafiev, tells how three hunters who had to spend a hard northern winter in a small hut could not get along and narrowly escaped killing each other. Later one of them comments on this incident:

> Nowadays people cannot get on, they just suffer from tundra hysteria, from psychopathy.
> But how was it before? . . .
> Nerves were better. People usually believed in God. It helped. It was a restraint.[4]

Another example of the moral degradation caused by atheism in a novel by Astafiev is a poacher who because of his greediness was pulled away by a giant sturgeon into the river where he had to fight for his life all night entangled by weeds in cold water. "He didn't keep icons in his house", censures Astafiev, "he didn't believe in God, he laughed at his grandfather's advice, and he was wrong. He should have believed his grandfather and kept an icon for such emergencies, if only in the kitchen, and if something had happened* he could always have said that his late mother had bequeathed it to him".[5]

A literary critic and writer, Dmitri Zhukov, emphasizes the importance of religiosity in childhood even if a person loses his belief in adult life. In his essay on 19th century Russian literature he points to the poet Zhemchuzhnikov who had a deep religious belief which he subsequently lost. Nevertheless, according to Zhukov, he profited from it all his life. Zhukov claims that "an empty place after that (religious belief—M.A.) is dreadful".[6]

People tend to resort to religion in critical situations. Astafiev, for example, demonstrates this several times. The above-mentioned poacher, in his desperate situation, started praying. When he eventually came to faith he felt enormous relief in his sudden conversion. A very primitive woman, Kasianka, being already close to death after an illegal abortion, sees religious belief as a last resort. She mixed animist prayers (she is only half

*i.e. if an official censured him for keeping an icon.

Russian) with an appeal to the Archangel: "There is no blood, no wound on a fervent heart, on bones of a sickness . . . There is only one key—the key of the Archangel . . . Save me my God, save me and be merciful".[7]

An old woman recollecting the period of collectivization relates how a raft on which her family, including five children, were deported to the North, drifted into a blocked backwater where it remained for several days cut off from the main stream. There was no hope of help. Her husband, a non-Russian of Siberian animist stock, ordered the children to pray: "God save us or punish us for human sins!" Nothing happened. They decided that his prayer was not accepted by God since he was not a Christian. So the man resorted to his native animist prayer. He chopped a splinter, kindled it and ordered his children to throw chips into the river. The chip thrown by the youngest son was not extinguished by the water. Then the man ordered the whole family to stretch towards the chip, crossing their hands, and to pray: "Water, don't send us evil! Wind! Wind! Awake! Lean upon the midnight! Blow at the noon! Don't forget our souls!" Eventually the wind stirred and the raft returned to the river.[8]

Not only simple uneducated people resort to religious belief in an hour of despair. A cultivated Moscow girl, Elya, a student at the literary institute, lost her way in the taiga during a holiday in Siberia. Completely helpless, she tried to remember Christian prayers which she heard when, out of snobbery, she occasionally visited a Moscow church.[9]

But the pragmatic value of religion is more than help in an hour of crisis. Religious belief in the form of Russian Orthodoxy is also defended from the point of view of Russian historical and spiritual continuity, which is regarded as powerful barrier against demoralization. For some authors this centres on the issue of demolition of churches, which is treated from an atheistic point of view. The journalist Vasily Yelesin attributes the moral degradation of the peasants to the absence of churches in rural areas.[10] But for others it is more a problem of aesthetics. In some places churches were not demolished, but their crosses were removed. These crossless churches are a symbol of sorrow for the poet Valentin Sorokin, a symbol of a decapitated Russia.

> The lack of crosses on our cathedrals reminds me of the age
> When earth and grass were deeply choked by blood
> Cathedrals stand alone in fields . . .
> They are like warriors whose heads
> Were cut off by the Ghireans.*[11]

A surprising glorification of Russian Orthodoxy as the foundation of Russian national life can be found in a novel by Pyotr Proskurin. In 1928 at the height of the atheistic terror, a monk named Hieronim from a disbanded local monastery somehow made his way into the office of the provincial

*Ghireans were Tatars who invaded Russia in the 16th century.

Party secretary, Petrov, when he was alone. The monk blamed him for the dissolution of the monastery and showed the embarrassed Petrov the graves of ancient Russian warriors which had, fortunately, been preserved in the monastery cellar, untouched by vandals. He also showed him a marvellous wonder-working icon which he had saved from confiscation. Deeply impressed, Petrov understood suddenly "how it was possible to be a hermit, how it was possible to isolate oneself from other people for the sake of such beauty. It was," he thought, "the . . . spiritual foundation of the very nation to which Petrov himself belonged. . . ."[12]

For the writer Bakhvalov, Orthodoxy is no less important than the October Revolution. His character, an officer named Odintsov, says that only such things as "*the Byzantine creed,* the Battle of Kulikovo, the October Revolution can influence life".[13] (Our italics—M.A.)

The Battle of Kulikovo against the Tatars is regarded as a very important contribution of Russian Orthodoxy to Russian history, especially the role of St Sergius of Radonezh, who is becoming ever more widely recognized as a Russian historical hero. In a novel by Blinov, the painter Lobanov creates his masterpiece, "Russia on the march", which depicts Russians led by St Sergius marching to fight the Tatars. St Sergius saved Russia from disaster. Lobanov "thought deeply and imagined that dreadful time of discord, internecine war, Tatar forays, the slow degeneration which had to be stopped, to be interrupted by some unbelievable explosion. The Battle of Kulikovo was such an explosion".[14] What is very interesting is the almost explicit fact that for Blinov the situation which preceded the Battle of Kulikovo was archetypal and probably applicable also to the present critical situation of Russia. The reader should realize that Blinov had in mind the need for a new march under traditional banners that had already saved Russia.

The Battle of Kulikovo is a very important national symbol for Pyotr Proskurin also. He uses the same vision as Blinov—the march of Russians toward the field of Kulikovo, led by St Sergius.[15] St Sergius's spiritual leadership in this battle is also emphasized by the poet Valentin Sidorov. In his poem, Dmitri Donskoi comes to St Sergius to tell him that he has decided to fight the Tatars. St Sergius first of all asks whether all peaceful means are already exhausted, and only when Dmitri says that he has done all that was possible to avoid open confrontation does St Sergius bless him.[16]

Valentin Sorokin is more outspoken. He uses the same event, the Battle of Kulikovo, to emphasize the crucial role of the Russian Orthodox Church in the salvation of Russia in the past. What is striking about the poem is that it could have been printed in a pre-revolutionary religious magazine without readers suspecting that it was written seventy years later. The central hero of this poem *"Dmitri Donskoi"* is once again St Sergius. He blesses Dmitri, telling him that God is on his side. In the prologue to the poem he asks him, in the form of a prayer: "Keep the human kind, Thy Russian Christian kind from the impious mist".[17] Mamai, the Tatar Khan tramples down an icon,

and this act is depicted by Sorokin as blasphemy for which the Khan will be punished:

Go away from the icon
The heat is terrible
Go away from the icon
The light is terrible
And there is no limit to this light[18]

The writer Viktor Likhonosov passionately defends the Russian Orthodox clergy in an attack on a film about ancient Russia (obviously "Andrei Rublyov" directed by Andrei Tarkovsky). His hero says to its director: "What have you done with the clergy? . . . With clergy which didn't bend under the Tatars? And whom have you shown us?"[19] He demands a film about St Sergius. Likhonosov rejects the existence of pagan elements in the Russian religious world, and more precisely he condemns those (such as Tarkovsky in this film), who regard the Russian past as pagan.

The famous icon-painter Rublyov mentioned above is a favourite figure and the interpretation of his creative work has become more and more religious. The writer Tuirin refers to Rublyov in terms which are heavy with religious meaning. For example he speaks of Rublyov as a monk who took "upon himself the thorny ways of the *Philokalia*".*[20]

The new Russian literature defends Russian Orthodoxy in the past but also in more recent times. An outstanding attempt was made by Burmistrov to include in the list of permissible subjects for writers the pre-revolutionary Russian clergy and the Orthodox theological academies, which have always been regarded in the USSR as a stronghold of reaction. He uses a literary analysis of the famous writer Mikhail Bulgakov as an opportunity to show his theological environment in his childhood. (Bulgakov's father was a professor of the Kiev theological academy.)[21] The same opportunity is taken by Igor Belza, who traces Bulgakov's spiritual roots and refers positively to several Russian theologians, which had been unthinkable earlier.[22]

Pavel Florensky, an Orthodox priest who was an outstanding theologian and scientist before his death in a Stalinist labour camp, has become very popular; and not only as a scientist, as previously. The writer Vladimir Krupin refers to him openly as an outstanding spiritual contributor to Russian history.[23]

Searching for God

Religious belief is commended not only from a pragmatic point of view of national continuity. There is also evident seeking after God which, surpris-

*A collection of ascetic and mystical writings of the Fathers of Mount Athos, dating from the 4th to the 15th centuries, which was translated into Slavonic in 1793 and became very influential in Russian Orthodoxy—Ed.

ingly, has been expressed in literature openly published in the USSR. Certainly this search is shown obliquely in the majority of cases but the perceptive reader knows how to interpret it. Religious seeking, so far as it is expressed publicly, is usually quite abstract, syncretic and mixed with primitive paganism. Only in a few cases, for example that of Valentin Rasputin, can one speak of "biblical motives",[24] though even this is something of an exaggeration. The critic who said this seems to have rather vague ideas about the Bible. Moreover, religious seeking as a subject does not feature in Rasputin's writing, though his vision of the world is obviously religious.

Astafiev, on the contrary, gives a description of an inspiration which theologians might call "natural revelation". "Not by hearing," he says, "not in my body, but by the soul of nature which is also present in me, I sensed the peak of silence, the childlike heartbeat of the awakening day. A brief moment came when only the Spirit of God soared above the world, as people used to say in olden times".[25] Though Astafiev protected himself by "olden times", this protection is very ambiguous if one considers the whole of his writing in context. It might mean something else. It could be only a metaphor but in no case does it prohibit a religious reading of this text. Astafiev has an excellent command of Russian and is fully aware of all its implications.

Astafiev also contemplates the problem of death. He observed the burial custom of a small northern nation—the Yevenki. They usually equip their dead members with all they need for their future life after death. Once Astafiev saw even a mosquito repellent spray and a transistor radio in a grave. For him even this primitive view of death is more perfect and meaningful than the outlook of modern mass culture. Astafiev calls death "the eternal roaming". "Men in their vanity learned not to think about death, not to prepare themselves for the eternal roaming. There is no such thing—or so excessively clever people thought. Now everyone knows from their schooldays that death is darkness, dust, decay. To die means to vanish completely, to rot, to give oneself as food for worms".[26] The irony of these words is quite evident. Death for Astafiev is not the end. It is only a change.

Thus we see that Astafiev's outlook, if one can so express it, includes many elements of primitive paganism mixed with Christianity, which he appears to regard as the natural religious belief of simple people. Indeed, the literary critic Starikova, commenting on his views, takes note of his religious search but claims that it is rather pagan. This is only partly justifiable. She generalizes her statement and claims that the spiritual search of the majority of contemporary Russian writers has the metaphysical character of "pagan religion".[27] On the other hand, the critic Yuri Seleznev tries to defend religious motifs in Russian literature as "fantastic" ones, claiming that such an approach challenges "the consumer trends of a business-like, rationalistic age cut off from the spirit".[28]

"Natural revelation" is also experienced by Georgi Semyonov. He related

how, looking at the sky, he realized with extreme pleasure "his helplessness before the infinite." "Who are we earthmen?" asks Semyonov, "where is our true home?"[29] He speaks in an ambivalent way about positive religion: "Not without reason did man invent a beautiful tale about the Ascension of the soul to heaven".[30] It is difficult to say whether the Ascension is really a fairytale for Semyonov or whether this is a way to escape from censorship. We have only his text to rely on.

A vague mysticism is professed by Yuri Bondarev. Asked directly for the reason of his "mystical" mood in his novel *Bereg (The Shore)* he answered: "Besides conscience there is also the sphere of subconscience".[31] This could well be an evasive way of defending his mysticism, since the notion of subconscience is not necessarily materialistic. This impression only increases when one reads Bondarev's justification of the religious outlook of Tolstoy. Asked for his attitude to Lenin's criticism of Tolstoy's religious views, Bondarev replied that the writer's religious search can be explained by his aspiration to get at the roots of everything.[32] However, Bondarev accuses Tolstoy ambiguously of not understanding that self-perfection is possible only after the victory of social revolution.

Bondarev strongly rejects Christianity. "Our hero," he writes, "has nothing to do with a Messiah who is full of love and an eccentric who redeems human sins through his death".[33] The Bible, according to Bondarev, is "a set of myths, statutes, advice and dogmatic instruction for actions which strike one very often by their cynicism, cruelty and off-handed, indisputable imperiousness".[34]

Even party officials are not free from a spiritual search if Pyotr Proskurin is to be believed. He makes his hero, a provincial Party secretary, Bruikhanov, who later became a minister, confess: "I know that all these thoughts proceed from the same fear of death and there is no God at all and he cannot exist, but I need him and it means that he exists for me. To live, every person needs something stable, eternal, something which must be deeply rooted in the very origin of everything, something which has no end, and this feeling, this wish to exist always, is God".[35] Proskurin seems to have fallen into the old Bolshevik heresy of God-building professed by Gorky and Lunacharsky and violently condemned by Lenin. Bruikhanov, however, is a God-builder only for himself. In fact he is encircled, in a religious trap. He is a hostage in his own family. An old Russian religious woman, Timofeyevna, his servant consciously performs the function of a messenger of the eternal truth in the heart of the Party. "She was the only firmament," writes Proskurin, "in this unequal struggle; though she was an illiterate old woman and everyone else was busy doing lofty things which they thought necessary. But the most necessary thing was here, with her, and she knew it".[35] Her task, according to Proskurin, is to spiritualize society as it is. As a result of her influence little Bruikhanov's daughter asks her: "Who is God?"[37]

Timofeyevna is not only the religious salt which flavours Russian society

in this novel. The manager of a big aviation factory, Chubarev, who is not a Party member, has an ambivalent attitude toward religion: he married in church.[38]

It is interesting that for Proskurin religion is intermingled with the non-believing part of society, and in a way most committed Party officials are something like the anonymous Christians of Karl Rahner. It is Petrov who acutely feels his spiritual continuity with ancient Christian Russia, it is Bruikhanov who is a God-builder.

Pantheism

Pantheism is a popular trend in the religious search expressed in the new Russian literature. It already has roots in post-revolutionary culture, and its most important protagonists are Mikhail Prishvin and Leonid Leonov. Prishvin started on his intellectual and literary path before the revolution, but is a favourite writer of the Soviet period. He devoted all his writing to nature, to which he had a deep attachment. He believed that nature is the sole bearer of universal truth. Though not anti-Christian, he did not believe in man. Man was for him a weak, fragile creature and only nature as a whole deserved adoration. But Prishvin was not an ecologist in a modern sense of the word. Ecology as a simple defence of nature would mean for him the lack of the absolute meaning of nature.

Leonov, who came to literature later, in the 1920s, also regarded nature as the primeval force and deeply regretted every assault on it. But he is much more of an ecologist than Prishvin and his pantheism is weaker.

The influence of Prishvin and Leonov on contemporary Russian literature is very strong. The literary critic Vadim Klozhinov wrote recently that "the age of Prishvin" has come.[39] Another critic, Yershov, claims that the philosophical ideas of Leonov are an important milestone in Russian cultural development.[40] One can see their influence in the works of many Russian writers, some of whom go farther than their teachers. For example Romanovsky says in a short story: "It is possible that besides nature there is nothing in this world".[41]

It is interesting that Leonov's pantheism was criticized recently by a literary critic, Mikhail Lobanov, who more or less openly sympathized with Russian Orthodoxy. Lobanov emphasized the internal contradictions of Leonov's novel *Russky les (Russian Forest)* published in 1954, and later awarded a Lenin prize. "On one hand," says Lobanov, "Vikhrov (the protagonist) is committed to the traditions of his fathers and grandfathers but on the other hand he professes pantheistic philosophy as the ultimate spiritual wisdom".[42] (As we saw above, Likhonosov made a similar criticism of the recognition of non-Christian elements in the Russian historical past.) It is not Vikharov but Leonov himself who professes this philosophy. An experi-

enced reader would see immediately what Lobanov had in mind in speaking about the traditions of the fathers—Orthodoxy. But Leonov relies on a different tradition which co-existed with Orthodoxy for a long time—the primitive pantheism which survived in Russia for centuries.

For others pantheism has a positive value. The critic Tolchenova, for example, praises an old man named Bugorkov, a character from a novel by Georgi Semyonov, by saying that he has "a happy pantheistic nature".[43]

Religious materialism

Another religious trend popular in the new Russian literature is religious materialism. It has its roots mainly in the thought of the Russian religious philosopher Nikolai Fyodorov, who died in 1903. Fyodorov regarded human history as a theurgical process whose eventual objective must be a general resurrection, to be achieved by humanity with the aid of technology. Every technological achievement must be used to resurrect everybody as a distinct living personality. Fyodorov's philosophy attracted many writers in the twenties and thirties, including Maxim Gorky, Olga Forsh, Andrei Platonov, Nikolai Zabolotsky and others. Recently it has had a new wave of influence, and Fyodorov is now a favourite in this trend. His philosophy is not necessarily regarded as an alternative to Russian Orthodoxy, and might contribute to religious syncretism, though in the majority of cases it is an independent search.

Konstantin Tsiolkovsky, who died in 1935, a forerunner of Soviet space flights, was strongly inspired by Fyodorov. He believed that human activity in outer space had an important theurgical value. He has always been famous in the USSR but only now has the secret of his inspiration been revealed publicly.

Another Russian philosophical influence is Vladimir Vernadsky, who died in 1945, a famous scientist officially recognized in the USSR. He argued that the eventual objective of the human evolution is the so-called Noösphere, the collective memory and intelligence of the human race. In this he anticipated Teilhard de Chardin. According to Vernadsky, concentrated human efforts, and especially scientific efforts, will eventually create the new human cosmos, the kingdom of the human spirit.

The popularity of these religious materialists extends beyond the Russian nationalist school of thought. It is possible that people who hold nationalist views accept this religious materialism only because it is of Russian origin, since it contradicts their negative attitude to scientific and technical progress and to industrial society.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we may refer once again to the reasons for the support for this trend, particularly its religious aspect. Of course, pragmatic considerations

lie at the root of it. Religion, and Orthodoxy in particular, are viewed, firstly as a means of stabilizing the Russian family, which has degenerated under the influence of urbanization and atheist propaganda, and secondly as a barrier against national integration, which opposes Russian interests by creating a de-nationalized mass, and moreover, and perhaps most importantly, strengthens the claims of the Party élite in non-Slavic republics to power in Moscow.

It is not impossible that some Party leaders see religion as a means for stabilizing society by distracting people from political and economic problems, which was something Stalin well understood. But one way or another, the support for religion testifies that the Party is currently experiencing the same crisis that the Bolsheviks underwent after the 1905 revolution, and which was expressed in the "God-building" of Gorky, Lunacharsky and Bogdanov. There is a growing awareness in Party circles that Marxism has been unable to fill the dangerous vacuum which has arisen as a result of the cruel atheist terror of the twenties and thirties and, later, of the sixties. No-one knows where this is leading. In any case, we should evidently not view this process as wholly negative, even though it contains dangerous tendencies.

[1]See for example: J. Dunlop, "The many faces of contemporary Russian nationalism", *Survey*, Vol. 24, No. 3, 1979; G. Kline, "Religion, national character and the discovery of Russian roots", *Slavic Review*, Vol. 32, No. 1, 1973; T. Bird, "New interest in old Russian things", *ibid.*

[2]M. Agursky, "The New Russian Literature", Research paper No. 40, The Soviet and East European Research Centre, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1980.

[3]See for example A. Petrov, "Pautina", *Sovetskaya Rossiya*, 27 April 1979.

[4]V. Astafiev, *"Tsar-ryba"*, *Roman-gazeta*, No. 5, 1977, p. 105.

[5]*Op. cit.*, p. 47.

[6] D. Zhukov, *Kozma Prutkov i yego druzya*, Moscow, 1976, p. 174.

[7]V. Astafiev, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

[8]*Op. cit.*, p. 61.

[9]*Op. cit.*, p. 106.

[10]V. Yelesin, *"Derevnya"*, *Nash sovremennik*, No. 10, 1978, p. 172.

[11]Quoted from Ye. Safonov, *"Otsvet togo bolshogo dnya"*, *Nash sovremennik*, No. 6, 1977, p. 214.

[12]P. Proskurin, *"Imya tvoe"*, *Roman-gazeta*, No. 14, 1978, p. 34.

[13]A. Bakhvalov, *"Nezhnost' k revushchemu zveryu"*, *Molodaya gvardiya*, No. 1, 1978, p. 158.

[14]A. Blinov, *"Udar molnii"*, *Molodaya gvardiya*, No. 11, 1978, p. 117.

[15]P. Proskurin, *op. cit.*

[16]V. Sidorov, *"Vospominaniya o pole Kulikovom"*, *Molodaya gvardiya*, No. 2, p. 123.

[17]V. Sorokin, *"Dmitri Donskoi"*, *Nash sovremennik*, No. 12, 1977, p. 119.

[18]*Op. cit.*, p. 125.

[19]V. Likhonosov, *"Gde ty? Chto s toboi?"*, *Volga*, No. 2, 1979, p. 67.

[20]Y. Turin, *"Zvenigorod"*, *Moskva*, No. 3, 1977, p. 172.

[21]A. Burmistrov, *K biografii M. Bulgakova*, Kontekst, 1978.

[22]I. Belza, *Genealogiya "Master i Margarity"*, *ibid.*

[23]V. Krupin, *"Nabolevsheye"*, *Literaturnaya gazeta*, 22 October 1979.

[24]A. Dyrdin, *"Zhivaya zaviyaz"*, *Don*, No. 3, 1979, p. 164.
[25]V. Astafiev, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
[26]*Op. cit.*, p. 115.
[27]I. Starikova, *"Pamyat'"*, *Novy mir*, No. 1, 1979, p. 269.
[28]Yu. Seleznev, *"Fantiasticheskoye v sovremennoi proze"*, *Moskva*, No. 2, 1977, p. 206.
[29]Quoted from N. Tolchenova, *"Kakiye my zemlyane?"* *Moskva*, No. 4, 1977, p. 201.
[30]*Ibid.*
[31]Yu. Bondarev, *"Mgnoveniya"*, *Nash sovremennik*, No. 8, 1978, p. 174.
[32]Yu. Bondarev, *"Zhiznenniye uroki L'va Tostogo"*, *Sovetskaya Rossiya*, 19 June 1978.
[33]Yu. Bondarev, *"Mgnoveniya"*, *Roman-gazeta*, No. 20, 1978, p. 80.
[34]*Ibid.*
[35]P. Proskurin, *op. cit.*, No. 14, p. 9.
[36]*Op. cit.*, p. 29.
[37]*Op. cit.*, p. 27.
[38]*Op. cit.*, No. 13.
[39]V. Kozhinov.
[40]L. Yershov, *"Dvizheniye literatury"*, *Nash sovremennik*, No. 7, 1978, p. 177.
[41]S. Romanovsky, *"Yel'"*, *Nash sovremennik*, No. 2, 1977, p. 120.
[42]M. Lobanov, *"Sekret mastera"*, *Molodaya gvardiya*, No. 5, 1979, p. 276.
[43]N. Tolchenova, *op. cit.*, p. 200.