

Loyola University Student Historical Journal

**Volume 13
Spring-Fall, 1982
New Orleans, Louisiana**

The *Loyola University Student Historical Journal* is a yearly publication of the Loyola University Student Historical Association (L.U.S.H.A.). The Journal is the yearly culmination of the association's activities. It has served the purposes of encouraging scholarly research on the part of students in the fields of History and of making public these investigations since 1966. Printed papers are submitted to a selection committee, which includes Loyola History Faculty, Phi Alpha Theta and L.U.S.H.A. officers. Papers are judged by their scholarship and readability, with the best paper receiving the History Department "Best Essay Award." Papers are submitted by Loyola Faculty members, but students who wish to submit a paper for the next publication should contact the History Department at Loyola University, New Orleans, Louisiana.

PREFACE

The thirteenth volume of this Journal was made possible through funding of the Student Government Association (S.G.A.). The Journal Staff would like to thank the Student Government Association for their support.

The Journal Staff would also like to thank the History Faculty at Loyola for their cooperation and would like to extend special thanks to Dr. Bernard Cook and Dr. David Moore for their help in preparing the journal and in serving on the selection committee. Also the staff would like to thank Phi Alpha Theta's Pi-Chi chapter at Loyola for their assistance

It would be inappropriate to leave out Ms. Nancy Baker, Staff Advisor for the *Maroon*. It was Ms. Baker who really made this edition of the journal possible. For patiently teaching the journal staff how to use the typesetting computer and in assisting us in typing, we extend our grateful thanks. We would also like to thank Kenneth Beck for his assistance. A final thanks must be given to Mr. Manny Cunard, who has helped us more than he knows.

This volume of the Journal was typeset and edited entirely by students at Loyola University, with help from Ms. Nancy Baker. The editorial staff would like to extend our sincere thanks to Susan Bonin and Bruce Salmestrelli who spent a great deal of their time on this journal. Thanks should also be extended to Jane Macke and Tom Maher.

Table of Contents

Suffragists and Antisuffragists: Historical Roots of the Controversy

by Jane E. Herbert 1

The Heresy of the Judaizers

by Stephanie Dupont 7

The Changing Role of the Catholic Layman in the United States

by Susan Bonin 13

Affective Individualism: Is it an effect of the Modern Revolution?

by Jane Macke 20

Unclean, Unclean: A Brief History of Leprosy in Louisiana

by Patricia C. Wagner 25

The Old Believers

History Department "Best Essay Award 1982"

by Paul Deutsch 32

Suffragists and Antisuffragists: Historical Roots of the Controversy

by Jane E. Herbert

The woman's rights movement began more than a century ago. One might ask why it ever began at all. The question is not what motivated women to want to assert themselves, but what social and historical forces preceded and prompted the movement? Understanding the movement from its historical, social and economic aspects would make more intelligible the reasons for the resistance to the movement, reasons that, on the surface at least, often seem to lack reason altogether.

The woman's rights movement had its origins in an era that was also the beginning of many different revolutionary movements. It was a time of radical social, political and economic upheaval, and the woman's role in society was among those things most affected.

Few people would disagree with the claim that the earliest and most fundamental form of social organization was the family, and the place of the woman was established by her function in that family. For the most part, the family-organized society was patriarchal. Perhaps the most interesting point, especially for the purposes of this paper, is the fact that the structure of the family was radically altered and its interior ties loosened by changing social, economic and historical conditions. For example, the early agricultural family seems to have been a homogeneous unit. Its productive and familial functions were completely integrated; they reinforced each other.

With the emergence of the modern industrial society, however, this homogeneity was disrupted. The difference is obvious today. Unlike its earlier counterpart, the working class family today is subject to divisive forces. Its unity is fragmented by conditions that distract the interests and concerns of the members of the family. The fragmentation is due to the work and other activities that take place outside the family, the isolated occupations that pull the individual members of the family away from each other.

The woman's suffrage movement emerged between the early unified family and the modern fragmented family. The suffrage controversy was a consequence of the fact that the woman, too, was being taken outside the family, plus the additional fact that the family was still perceived as the foundation of society, and the woman the foundation of the family. She educated and disciplined her children for their later integration in and contribution to society's labor force. Any change in her place in society would have been seen as a threat to the

stability and welfare of the modern society's social modes of production.

To understand those who were opposed to the suffrage movement and the reasons for that opposition, it is important to understand these historical roots of the rights movement.

Prior to the Civil War, many women were involved in the abolitionist movement.

It was in the abolitionist movement that women first learned to organize, to hold public meetings, to conduct petition campaigns. As abolitionists they first won the right to speak in public, and began to evolve a philosophy of their place in society and of their basic rights. For a quarter of a century the two movements, to free the slave and liberate the woman, nourished and strengthened one another.¹

From the political experience gained by those who were involved in the abolition movement, a strong woman's movement arose in the 1830's and 1840's. The first Women's Rights Convention took place in Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848. The purpose of the women attending this convention was to end discrimination socially, economically and legally. Legal discrimination found its paradigm in the denial of voting privileges to women. Disagreement as to whether or not to demand voting rights arose because some felt it was too radical a demand. A suffrage resolution was passed but only by a small majority. According to William O'Neill, "The soundest reason for women suffrage was that in a free country to deny women the vote solely because of their sex was unjust, undemocratic, and ought properly to have been unconstitutional."²

The early suffrage movement was primarily concentrated in the North and the West. Only after the Civil War did Southern women begin to speak out for woman suffrage. By that time more women were enjoying an education, an education that incidentally but importantly prepared them for leaving the restricting security of family existence. The Civil War era was a turning point for the rights movement in that it enhanced the self-confidence of women. Because of their gains in practical experience and especially education, women were active participants in public work. However, there was as yet no active organized women's movement.

After the Civil War, the leaders of the woman's rights movement believed they would soon be allowed to vote. As Aileen S. Kraditor writes, "To their dismay and disillusionment, the (Republican) party leaders informed them that 'this is the Negro's hour,' and that the women must wait for their rights."³

The constitutional legislation of the era reflected that fact. The passage of the Fourteenth Amendment guaranteed due process, but only to free males, and the Fifteenth Amendment, due to the exclusion of the word "sex", extended the right to vote to people without regard

to race, but without extending that right to women. The legislation caused a split to occur among suffragists in 1869. The split occurred because the women could not agree on how to view these amendments or on the most expedient way to work toward woman suffrage. Two separate groups arose: the National Woman Suffrage Association and the American Woman Suffrage Association. The two organizations remained split until 1890 when they merged as the Woman Suffrage Association. The American faction, a moderate group that included men as well as women, worked for suffrage in individual states. Lucy Stone, one of the early leaders of the rights movement, was the spokesperson for this group. The National faction, on the other hand, was a radical group formed by two other early leaders in the rights movement, Elizabeth Stanton and Susan Anthony. They campaigned for a federal suffrage amendment, the Anthony Amendment, that they introduced in 1868 and every year thereafter with few exceptions.

In 1913, a group known as the Congressional Union (it later became the Woman's Party) broke away from the National American Woman Suffrage Association. Led by Alice Paul, who was involved in the suffrage movement in England in the early 1900's, the Congressional Union's main purpose was to work for the immediate passage of a federal suffrage amendment. This group was militant in nature and, in the end, did little to sway public opinion to the suffragists' campaign.

While these organizations fought long and hard for suffrage, an opposing force was also hard at work — the antisuffragists, or antis. Their efforts were primarily defensive. When the suffrage campaign intensified, so did that of the antis; and during those times when the suffrage movement was less active, so was the anti-movement.

The first important antisuffragist group appeared in 1870 and was led by Mrs. Madeline V. Dahlgren, Mrs. Wm. T. Sherman, and Mrs. Almira Lincoln Phelps.⁴ These women saw the sanctity of the family, and with it the stability of society, jeopardized by women's rights. They did not consider the influence of society itself on the fragmentation of the family and the liberation of the woman, or that their own activities reflected the transformed role of women in society.

In the 1890's, other stronger organizations appeared in more than twenty states. By 1911, the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage was founded. Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, the first president of this organization, argued that women belong in the home and that "(w)omen cannot be treated exactly as men are, and motherhood, potential or actual, does determine woman's efficiency in industrial and social undertakings."⁵

Other arguments used by the women antis were expressed by Mary A.J. M'Intire.

Women voters would not reform politics because the bad women would be enfranchised along with the good, leaving political morality about where it had been. Temperance would not be furthered because the votes of dry women would be cancelled out by those of foreign women accustomed to the use of alcohol. Peace would not be assured because the Civil War had shown women to be no more pacific than men. Wages would not increase, because working women needed unions, not votes.⁹

Aside from the National Organization of Antis, there were also other groups opposed to suffrage. These groups constructed a variety of arguments that applied to a particular region of the country.

In the South, there was fear that blacks would be allowed to vote through enforcement of the Fourteenth Amendment, previously unenforced, if women got the right to vote. Southern white men felt that by opposing a federal amendment and staying with states' rights their control over the blacks would continue. Child labor was also an issue in this region because of the importance of textile manufacturing in the South. This major industry relied heavily on child labor as well as women workers. Textile manufacturers correctly assumed that women would oppose child labor because suffragists were active in support of child labor reforms. This was paradoxical because the employment of children and women already hastened the dissolution of the homogeneous family unit, liberated the women, and consequently, enhanced the likelihood of the women's rights movement.

With the rise of the temperance movement of the 1870's came prohibition and substantial suffrage support. This also proved to be the basis of opposition to suffrage in the Middle West. There, the liquor business spent huge amounts of money against suffrage because they feared women would vote for prohibition.

In the East, big business and big-city bosses spent vast amounts of money to oppose woman's suffrage bills. Big business had been opposed to numerous reform measures that were instituted in the early 1900's. They actually financed antisuffrage lobbyists. "A congressional investigation found that Swift and Company made secret antisuffrage contributions."¹⁰ There was concern that women with the right to vote and with such obvious ties to reform measures, would undermine high tariffs, railroad power, etc. Suffragists sided with Progressives regarding reform measures for tariffs, railroads and trusts.

In light of the Progressive era of reform, these antisuffrage businessmen and the opposing groups from the South probably had more to fear than the effects of an amendment granting suffrage to women. Social consciousness was growing in other groups, and there were those who already enjoyed the right to vote who felt hostility toward the power of big business and the men who amassed great

wealth. There was a need to do away with the inequities created by these powers. These reform-minded people were supportive of the women's suffrage movement. "The Progressive party in 1912 was the first major party to (endorse woman suffrage)."¹¹ The women's groups and the Progressives were closely linked through their mutual desire to reform.

The Antis continued to argue against the suffrage movement. In a sense, the most substantial argument against suffrage was that in the West where in some of those states, women did have the right to vote, "... the presence of women at the polls has only augmented the total votes; it has worked no radical changes."¹² The Antis pointed to Colorado as an example where "(e)qual suffrage has not raised the pay of women workers ... during its three years of trial ... nor in Wyoming where it has been in force for a quarter of a century."¹³

Very gradually, more states accepted woman suffrage, but the suffragists still had a hard struggle for passage of a federal amendment. Final ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment, guaranteeing women the right to vote, was adopted on August 18, 1920. One incidental reason woman suffrage finally became a reality was because of the Progressive support. It was expected that suffrage would increase their voting strength. That is, passage of the Nineteenth Amendment was an extension of these other social issues and forces. Suffrage was also supported by an increasing number of women in industry and government who found themselves in positions previously held only by men. This was due to the American involvement in World War I. More women became involved and interested in politics. "The Nineteenth Amendment did release fresh interest and energy into political life at the local, ward, and regional level. Women have exercised some of the healthy influence dreaded by the machines in favor of 'good government' ..."¹⁴ There was still discrimination in jobs, wages, and in other areas. After passage of the Nineteenth Amendment, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, an early suffrage leader, appealed to suffragists that they should not stop the fight. The Nineteenth Amendment was only a beginning.

The opposition to woman suffrage was not, then, a simple argument for the sanctity of the family and recognition of the natural limitations of women. The opposition came from concern for a social, economic and political structure which appeared to depend on the family and hence on the woman who unified the family and reared the children. But it was a social, economic and political structure that also gradually contributed to (even required) the subtle disintegration of the independent family by promoting more cosmopolitan life styles and modes of production. The opposition to woman suffrage, then, was as much a consequence of those forces behind the movement as was woman suffrage itself. Woman suffrage and antisuffrage seem to have been different dimensions of the same historical change rather

than, simply, different and opposing forces within history.

Notes

1 Eleanor Flexner, *Century of Struggles — The Woman's Rights Movement in the United States* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959), p. 41.

2 William O'Neill, *Everyone Was Brave* (New York: The New York Times Book Co., 1969, 1971), p. 49.

3 Aileen S. Kraditor, *The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920* (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1965), p. 3.

4 O'Neill, p. 57.

5 Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, "Woman Suffrage Opposed to Woman's Rights," *Annals*, LVI (November, 1914), p. 101. Quoted in O'Neill, p. 59. Such arguments were not without more scholarly origins. The philosopher, Hegel, maintained that "... man has his actual substantive life in the state, in learning, and so forth, as well as in labour and struggle with the external world. ... Woman on the other hand, had her substantive destiny in the family, and to be imbued with family piety is her ethical frame of mind." *Hegel's Philosophy of Right* (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 114. Hegel completed the scholarly assessment of woman's function with the observation, "When women hold the helm of government, the state is at once in jeopardy, because regulate their actions not by the demands of universality but by arbitrary inclinations and opinions." Hegel, pp. 263-4.

6 Mary A. J. McIntire, "Of What Benefit to Woman?: She Is A Far Greater Power Without Suffrage." (Boston, n.d.). Quoted in O'Neill, pp. 59-60.

7 David Morgan, *Suffragists and Democrats* (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1972), p. 175. Quoted in Barbara Sinclair Deckard, *The Women's Movement* (New York: Harper & Row, 1979), p. 299.

8 Kraditor, p. 64.

9 Frank Foxcraft, "The Check to Woman Suffrage in the United States," (Boston, n.d.), p. 4. Quoted in O'Neill, p. 61.

10 Pricella Leonard, "A Help or Hindrance," (New York, n.d.), p. 6. Quoted in O'Neill, p. 60.

11 Flexner, p. 325.

The Heresy of the Judaizers

by Stephanie Dupont

What exactly was the Judaizing movement in Russia? What caused it to grow? What contributed to its downfall? These questions have not all been easily answered by historians, for practically all contemporary sources available were written by the opponents of the Judaizers.¹

Careful research, however, has shown that the movement did not simply consist of the conversion of many Russians to Judaism, as Archbishop Gennadius and Joseph of Volokolamsk, the leading opponents of the movement, would have us believe. The movement, rather, was really a mixture of a number of Western influences coming into Russia by various means. The reasons for the growth of the heresy likewise are more numerous than Gennadius and Joseph would have us believe. The coming of a Jew named Skharia to Novgorod, and the movement of some of his converts to Moscow, do not alone account for the growth of the heresy.² Many internal conditions in Russia were favorable to the growth of the heresy, including political and religious factors. Once the heresy was active in Russia, there were many different reactions to it, again for a variety of reasons. The Judaizing movement, then, was much intertwined with other facets of Russian life during the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries. This paper will first attempt to explain the major components of the Judaizing movement. It will then consider the various factors contributing to the growth and ultimate decline of the movement.

The Judaizing heresy first appeared in Novgorod around 1470. It seems to have been inspired by three Jews who arrived in Novgorod at that time — Skharia, Moses, and Samuel.³ Among the many charges leveled against the Judaizers by their opponents were that they "denounced monasticism, rejected icons and prayers for the dead, denied the necessity of churches and church services, condemned the Church hierarchy as based on simony, and, to make things worse, proclaimed that 'reason is supreme and is hampered by faith'."⁴ Not all of those labeled "Judaizers" by their opponents, however, held the same set of beliefs.

Those called Judaizers by their opponents were not actually Jews, but people bringing new ideas into Russia, or people influenced by the new ideas. The Judaizers seem to comprise three factions, each one concerned with different new ideas and beliefs. George Vernadsky styles the first of these factions "the Judaizers proper." This group

did not adopt all of the ritual of Judaism, but adopted many of the dogmas of it. They did not practice circumcision and did not openly conduct Jewish services in the churches.¹ The sole concrete charge leveled against this group was iconoclasm, practiced in response to the Jewish injunction against the worship of carved images. Archbishop Gennadius also charged that they practiced the Jewish religion "in secret," but the evidence for this, says Wieczynski, "is so tenuous that the contention that this wing of the Judaizing movement existed only in Gennadius' imagination is difficult to refute."⁶

A second group styled "Judaizers" by their opponents were those who sympathized with the new scientific and philosophic teachings arriving in Russia, which contained some Jewish intellectual influences.⁷ These ideas basically stemmed from the hermetic and cabalistic philosophy and theology of the West. Hermetism could only be accepted by Christians who believed that the human mind could attain a religious knowledge higher and fuller than that revealed by Christ and the Scriptures. Hermetism and cabalism both included teachings in magic and the occult sciences, and astrology. Hermetism drew upon early Jewish dabbling in the occult as well as other occult beliefs. Western thinkers were applying such elements of hermetism to Christianity. Such teachings seemed very strange to Russian ecclesiastics and were considered to be heretical.⁸

Such ideas arrived in Novgorod as a result of the creation of the Ottoman Empire and the persecution of Jews in Spain, which moved the center of Jewish learning from the West to the Near East.⁹ Evidence of cabalism being part of the Judaizing heresy is also confirmed by the fact that Skharia the Jew, who came to Novgorod in 1470, is said to have been "profoundly versed in the cabalistic arts . . ."¹⁰ The group of Russians influenced by these teachings seems to have been made up of a small but well-educated group in Moscow, which included Fedor Kuritsyn, head of Ivan III's Foreign Office, who became the chief protector of the heresy in Moscow. Joseph of Volokolamsk, in his most influential work against the heretics, reports that Kuritsyn "studied various myths, astrology and magic and necromancy."¹¹

The third group that is called Judaizers by the opponents were rationalists who were critical of the established church. Some of these attacked corruption in church administration; others criticized rituals of church services or the use of icons, and some refuted various dogmas of the church.¹² The most characteristic factor concerning this group was that they introduced much of the substance of the anti-Trinitarian and reforming movements prominent in Europe into Russia. It is highly probable that there was contact between Russia and the western followers of Hus, Wycliff and other critics of Western Christianity.¹³ Dmitrij Tschizewskij argues convincingly that this was the case.

"When one considers that the heresy was introduced to Novgorod by a Kievan prince and that in Moscow one of the most zealous adherents to the doctrine was F. Kuritsyn, a diplomat who had formerly served in Hungary, it seems quite probable that there was a connection between the Judaizers and the Hussites. At the time Kiev was a part of Poland-Lithuania, where for a time the Hussites threatened orthodox Catholicism; many adherents of radical Hussitism fled from Bohemia to Hungary; and Novgorod maintained close ties with the West, including the Slavic West . . ."¹⁴

Novgorod had strong commercial ties with Western Europe through the Hanseatic League. Merchants and commercial agents from Novgorod visited many other cities such as Lubeck, Bremen, and Hamburg. Often, German merchants resided in Novgorod and traded from there, attracting other western businessmen. It is reasonable to believe that sympathizers of Hus, Wycliff and other reformers influenced the commercial circles in which the men of Novgorod and other cities lived. Russian travelers, then, probably carried ideas of anti-Trinitarianism to Russia. This faction of the Judaizers shows no connections with Judaism, but was probably included in that category by the opponents because of their attempts to link all types of free-thinking to Judaism.¹⁵

We will now turn to a discussion of the internal situations in Russia which affected the growth and the decline of the Judaizing movement. Political and religious factors were much intertwined with the Judaizers and thus affected its growth or persecution. At the time of the Judaizing heresy, Ivan III was Grand Prince of Moscow and was attempting to incorporate Novgorod into his state. He replaced the old aristocracy and began his *pomestie* system, by which he rewarded military servants with land. His need for more land to continue this system led him to envision a general secularization of ecclesiastical property. He began by secularizing only the monastic lands of Novgorod. The clergy in Novgorod were violently opposed to this measure. Ivan went to Novgorod in 1479 in order to deal with rebellion among those who opposed the domination of Moscow, and to deal with protests against his large-scale secularization of Novgorod church property in 1478. In Novgorod, Ivan was impressed by the learning of two priests, Aleksey and Denis. These men had been converted by the first Judaizers, and as Judaizers they were against monasticism and thus favored the secularization of church lands. Ivan saw in them supporters of his secularization policy and perhaps even likely champions of his political cause. Thus, he brought them back to Moscow where he appointed Aleksey archpriest of the Uspensky Cathedral and Denis priest of the Arkhangel'sky Cathedral. Such use for the Judaizers led Ivan to be reluctant to take strong action against the heresy.¹⁶

The Judaizers were not the only group in favor of secularization of

church lands. The Trans-Volga Elders favored secularization of all church lands. They were opposed by Joseph of Volokolamsk, who strongly favored ecclesiastical land ownership. On this issue, then, the Judaizers and the Trans-Volga Elders were linked together as reformers. The Judaizers' position on monasticism at first helped strengthen the heresy, because of the lack of opposition from Moscow. However, the link of the Judaizers to the reformers would ultimately contribute to the destruction of the Judaizers. In 1503, an ecclesiastical sobor violently opposed the suggestion of Nil Sorsky, the leader of the Trans-Volga Elders, to deprive all monasteries in Russia to the right to own land. Ivan III tried to overrule the council three times, but was finally forced to give in. The immediate effect of this was an attack on the Judaizers as well. The Council of 1504 against the Judaizers led to the final downfall of the heresy.¹⁷

Another factor of Russian life which was intimately connected with the success and failure of the Judaizers was the struggle over the question of who would succeed Ivan III on the throne. In 1490, Ivan's eldest son, the husband of Elena Stepanova, died. Elena had a son, Dimitry, whom she wished to become the heir to the throne. Sophia Paleologa, however, the second wife of Ivan III, wanted her eldest son, Vasily, to be named as heir. For a time Ivan made no decision. In 1497, primarily for reasons of foreign policy, Ivan decided to name Dimitry his heir. Vasily and a group of boyars were caught plotting against Ivan in reaction to this, and were disgraced. This course of events had an effect on the Judaizers because Elena Stepanova was a Judaizer. When she and her boyar supporters were victorious in getting Dimitry named heir, the Judaizers were also strengthened, for Ivan's attitude toward the heretics became even more benevolent, and he was hardened against the opponents of the Judaizers. Elena's victory was short lived, however, in 1499, her party fell into disgrace when the Patrikeyevs and Ryapolovskys, the leading families of the boyar faction supporting Elena, were charged with "treason." Ivan soon forgave his son Vasily and made him grand prince of Novgorod and Pskov.¹⁸ The collapse of the boyar faction which supported Dimitry, however, "brought with it the end of the influence of the heretics and the beginning of their steady decline."¹⁹

Another factor important to the fate of the Judaizers was the presence of Fedor Kuritsyn in Moscow. Kuritsyn was early influenced by the Judaizers and was their leading protector in Moscow. Kuritsyn had much influence in Moscow, and was instrumental in getting Zosima, a sympathizer with the Judaizers, appointed as the metropolitan in Moscow. Thus, when Zosima was obliged to convene a council against the heretics in 1490 because of a formal complaint by Archbishop Gennadius, the results of the council were not satisfactory to Gennadius. Only a few Judaizers were punished, and these very mildly. As long as Kuritsyn held this kind of influence in Moscow, the

Judaizers were able to ward off the attacks of Gennadius and Joseph of Volokolamsk.²⁰ When Zosima was deposed due to "drunkenness" and Kuritsyn died, however, the Judaizers began to fall under the attacks of its opponents. A council was convened in 1504 to deal with the heretics. As a result of this council, the major offenders, including the brother of Fedor Kuritsyn, were burned and others were subjected to various punishments. This basically wiped out the Judaizers in Russia, but the final remnants of the heresy were not eliminated until 1520.²¹

Archbishop Gennadius and Joseph of Volokolamsk considered the Judaizers to be a very great threat to the Orthodox Church in Russia. Ever since Gennadius discovered the heresy in Novgorod in the 1480's, he attempted over and over again to get rid of them. For a long time, however, he met with little success.²² The importance of the various factors contributing to the support of the Judaizers is clearly evidenced by the fact that it was not until 1504 that Gennadius had any real success. It was not until *after* the death of Kuritsyn, *after* the death of Ivan III, *after* the disgrace of the "pro-heretic" boyar faction of Elena Stepanova, and *after* the defeat of Sorsky's proposal in the ecclesiastical sobor that Gennadius was able to suppress the heresy, in spite of his intense efforts since 1487.

It is clear, then, that the heresy of the Judaizers was not a simple conversion of some Russians to Judaism, but, rather, was a movement concerning the interests of many different people for many different reasons. The Judaizing movement shows that Russia was influenced by Western ideas during the late fifteenth century, and that the adherents of these beliefs found their fate resting on the political and social situations prevailing in Russia at this time.

Notes

1 Michael T. Florinsky, *Russia: A History and an Interpretation* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959).

2 J. L. Wiczynski, "Hermetism and Cabalism in the Heresy of the Judaizers," *Renaissance Quarterly*, XXVIII (Spring 1975), 17-18. J. L. Fennell, "The Attitude of the Josephians and the Trans-Volga Elders to the Heresy of the Judaizers," *Slavic and East European Review*, XXIX (1951), 490.

3 Florinsky, p. 168.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 168.

5 George Vernadsky, "The Heresy of the Judaizers and Ivan III," *Speculum* (October, 1933), 442.

6 Wiczynski, p. 19.

7 Vernadsky, p. 442.

- 8 Wiczynski, p. 21.
- 9 Vernadsky, p. 442.
- 10 Albert F. Heard, *The Russian Church and Russian Dissent*, 1887; (rpt. New York: AMS Press, 1971.), 183.
- 11 Vernadsky, p. 442. Wiczynski, p. 24.
- 12 Vernadsky, pp. 442-3.
- 13 Wiczynski, p. 20.
- 14 Dmitriy Tschizewskij, *Russian Intellectual History*, Trans. John C. Osborne, Ed. Martin P. Rice (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis 1978), 67.
- 15 Wiczynski, pp. 20-1.
- 16 J.L. I. Fennell, *Ivan the Great of Moscow* (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1961), 327. Vernadsky, p. 444.
- 17 Vernadsky, pp. 445-6.
- 18 *Ibid.*, p. 453. Florinsky, p. 171.
- 19 Fennell, "The Attitude of the Josephians . . .," p. 507.
- 20 Vernadsky, p. 441.
- 21 Serge Bolshakoff, *Russian Nonconformity* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950), 34. Fennell, "The Attitude of the Josephians . . .," p. 494.
- 22 Fennell, "The Attitude of the Josephians . . .," pp. 498-9.

The Changing Role of the Catholic Layman in the United States

by Susan Bonin

This research paper will trace the role of the layman within the Catholic Church of the United States. The Second Vatican Council of 1965 will be the focal point of comparison reflecting the changing layman involvement. Although attempts have been made to include the best examples of the general circumstances of the laity, they will in no way draw the entire picture. Therefore within these limits, the colonial period will be the starting point for the pre-Vatican II analysis. Lay trusteeism and immigration will then be focused on with the laity as the main characters within this most erratic time in our Church history. The impacts of these factors will leave us with a general outlook by which to compare Vatican II changes in our Church. All the various national movements plus individual parish activity will be used as indicators to the layman's new role.

"It is indeed certain and clear that in the Church there are two orders very different from one another, the shepherds and the flock, that is in other words, the leaders and the people. The first order has the duty to teach, to govern, to guide men through life, and to fix rules for them; the duty of the other is to submit to the first, to obey, to carry out its orders and to pay it honor."

This letter of Pope Leo XIII on the Apostolate of the Laity in 1888 was the typical attitude toward the layman in the early Catholic Church in the United States. It was within this atmosphere that new colonial Catholics found themselves in a very weak position in regards to their involvement in the Catholic Church. Besides this internal limitation, the Catholic layman found himself having to resist the external secular environment of the colonies while withstanding the increasing influence of what would soon become his anti-Catholic neighbor. Unfortunately for many Catholics, this challenge was too much. As Callahan points out, the layman "could neither depend on the law to favor or sustain his beliefs nor could he depend on a consensus of opinion among his neighbors to provide a milieu in which his faith could weather the ordinary stresses of a genuinely Catholic life"² The response of the laity to these challenges was defection for many but increased loyalty for some. Basically, this loyal group was found among upper class Catholics who could continue to educate their children in Catholic schools abroad.³ Furthermore, these Catholic families i.e., the Carrolls of Maryland were able to become strong in their faith because of their close contact with the American clergy.

On the other hand, the lower class Catholics who survived the challenges did so only by a hard struggle against overwhelming odds. The fact that most of these Catholics were poor immigrants made them even more susceptible to the "shepherd-flock" mentality. Once they entered into the hostile anti-Catholic environment of the colonial period, they became timid and conforming, leaving all church matters to their pastor (if they had one). Thus, in the early church, one cannot speak of the "role of the layman;" the church was too new and too preoccupied with fitting into their Protestant surroundings and with just surviving another day.

This nonactive role of the laity, however, was soon to change to the other extreme with the use of lay trusteeism. It was not the lay ownership of the church property that in itself caused problems, but rather the subsequent assumption on the part of the laity that this also gave them the power to hire and fire their Pastors.⁴ Therefore, despite the good intentions which Bishop Carroll saw for the use of the system, it led to numerous abuses among the laity and eventual schism in the individual parishes.

What perhaps made matters worse for the American hierarchy in dealing with the trustee system were the huge waves of immigrants from Europe beginning heavily in 1820 and lasting up until World War I. Along with various nationalities came often times reactionary, rebellious priests. Thus, the Bishops in the United States had to deal in very authoritarian ways to put down the schisms which soon resulted. As the abuses of lay trusteeism grew, priests often sided with the trustees or *Marguirres* as they were called in New Orleans to oppose the Bishops' authority. The reason for the laymen's attempt to gain too much of a role can be summarized by the fact that they were just too ignorant of the Catholic Church's "Standard Operating Procedures" and were furthermore not yet able to be truly American and Catholic at the same time.⁵

Unfortunately for the layman, the American Catholic hierarchy came crushing down hard and completely destroyed the use of an inherently logical system of lay trusteeism.⁶ With so few priests, what better way to allow them to concentrate on spiritual matters and leave the temporal duties to those most qualified to handle them — the layman. Nevertheless, the role of the layman hit its nadir around the middle of the 19th century. The reaction of the American hierarchy was in the end very extreme: "the layman was a person to be wary of, one who given his head too much, was prone to be carried away by his sense of power into thinking he had the rights within the Church which neither priests, bishop nor pope could annul." From now on, the layman had a new challenge from within; they would have to overcome the hierarchy's suspicion of them. Until then, they were

stripped of any voice in the church affairs, however worldly they might have been. Neither layman complaints, priests' reaction, nor Bishop England's earlier constitution as a means to solve the trustee dispute could hold back the inevitable tightening of the power strings by the Catholic hierarchy.⁸

Although one would expect some type of reaction on the part of the laity against their humbled position in the church, the more immediate problem of the "new immigration" between 1870-1915 drew their attention. These immigrants who came flooding in largely from Italy and Poland were usually poor, scared and Catholic; therefore, they fell right into the fold. No longer in their protective Catholic environment and faced with fervent anti-Catholicism, these immigrants became defensive and insular and thus the ghetto culture mentality was born. The layman became dependent on "Father" like never before and it is here that we understand well Pope Leo's letter.

In spite of the obvious discouragement on the part of the Catholic hierarchy, a small "lay renaissance" did occur toward the end of the 19th century. Its impact was heard in many articles which favored the organization and utilization of the laity by the Church. Perhaps the Lay Congress of Baltimore in 1889 is best indicator of this revival. Its initiator, Henry Brownson, saw it as a chance to unite the Catholics in order that they might better understand one another.⁹ Although lay support was not the problem, the lack of episcopal support doomed a completely successful movement. Only one American Bishop, John Ireland, was enthusiastic. Nevertheless, it was successful enough to plan a second congress in Columbia in 1893.¹⁰ Unfortunately, this movement lost its enthusiasm basically because it was just not yet the time to unite Catholicism and the American way of life. Thus the role of the laity was once again put on hold until a more favorable atmosphere would surface.

It was not until after World War II that the layman once again made himself heard. Lay-edited press cropped up everywhere as critical laymen spoke out. *Brownson's Quarterly* is one example of this spark of lay involvement.¹¹ Although there were several other examples, their impact soon again declined for the clergy took over much of the Catholic press. These lay journalists in fact "were rarely allowed to forget that they were expected not to 'undermine' official policies by criticism, exposure of abuses in the Church, the airing of scandals, or even by venturing their own opinion on the theological issues that rose from time to time"¹² In other words, what literature was written by laymen was always edited first by the clergy.

This editing, however, did cease when the *Commonweal* was founded in 1924 as an independent journal for interested faithful Catholics. Moreover it "was for years the primary means through which the liberal lay mentality, as opposed to the conservative outlook on life, made its presence felt within and beyond American

Catholicism^{11,13}

Before the "renewal" atmosphere of Vatican II took shape, the typical American Catholic layman was basically still very aware of his own ethnic background. "The Catholic parish provided a comfortable haven for immigrants who still felt ill at ease in their New World surroundings."¹⁴ For the layman, the Church was his way of life, the ghetto culture was his home. On Sundays it was not rare to see city Catholic churches filled to capacity with silent, pious worshipers. The Catholic service was something the layman could identify with; it gave him an "intense feeling of belonging to a community that was larger and more important than themselves, they did not have to do anything, they simply had to belong."¹⁵

"Lay people have a right and a duty to exercise the apostolate which stems from their union with Christ the Head . . . We desire that lay people in the parish work in cooperation with their priests, . . . we hope that they will lend their energetic assistance to every apostolic and missionary program of this, their ecclesial family."¹⁶

The above are excerpts from a Vatican II decree on the Apostolate of the Laity in 1965 and stands in marked contrast to Pope Leo XIII's decree of about 75 years earlier. Thus, what went on during the Second Vatican Council to warrant such encouragement for increased lay activity in the Catholic Church? Actually, the new lay vigor of today cannot be credited solely to the Vatican II Council. Rather, there had been Papal decrees for decades prior to 1960 which also called for increased lay participation. Pope Pius' decree of 1951, for example, proclaimed that "assistance rendered by the apostolate is an indispensable necessity."¹⁷

Furthermore, this renewal of the laity is explained clearly by Callahan in his book, *The Mind of the Catholic Layman* through several factors. First of all, the increase in the number and quality of educated Catholics has made a remarkable impact. The Catholic layman of the second half of the 20th Century, for example, no longer wants to simply obey fixed rules and rituals; he is ready for an active, participatory role in Church affairs.¹⁸ Secondly, the educated layman has become very critical and outspoken on controversial issues.¹⁹ Catholic lay newspapers such as *Commonweal* and *The National Catholic Reporter* are no longer edited, restricted or controlled by the American clergy. Another factor was the theological support brought on by well respected theologians. Books entitled *Lay People in the Church*, *The Role of the Laity in the Church*, and *The Emerging Laity*²⁰ had one thing in common; they were and still are trying to help the laity to respond to the new demands put on them by Vatican II.

A fourth and perhaps most important and graphic example of lay activity was the increase in the number of lay national movements. One of the best examples is the Christian Family Movement which

began as part of the Catholic Action program. CA, as it is abbreviated, is basically lay people working with priests and bishops for the betterment of the Church. It was begun as a response to the decline in the number of clergy and thus is an attempt at "multiplying the Priests' hands"²¹ Furthermore, Christian Family Movement has been a distinctively American movement since 1947.²² Its basic goal is to incorporate the entire family into the decision making process on Christian issues, social matters, educational problems, and of course religious and worshipping questions. In other words, the movement seems careful to avoid the formation of a hierarchical level within the Church. The movement has grown in numbers and promises to bring a "new heightened consciousness of belonging to the church."²³

Another just as exciting and hope-filled lay group is the Cana Movement.²⁴ This gets Catholic married couples to understand more fully how their married life fits into their Christian calling. Its leaders, of course, are not offering a cure for troubled marriages, but rather, a revitalization for already happy couples who want to be happier. Although this movement is not revolutionary, it does prove that Catholic men and women today are trying to actively participate in their religion without relying solely on some priest, nun, or brother. Although this may seem an obvious goal today, such involvement was practically unknown fifty years ago; pre-Vatican II Catholics were just too conditioned by legalistic observances i.e., Friday abstinence, Lenten fasts, etc.,²⁵ to be worried about marriage as a continuing sacrament.

The Grail Movement is just one more example of laywomen involvement in particular. Its aim is to unite the talents of young women to help turn society in a Godward direction.²⁶ Lastly, another branch of Catholic Action is the National Councils of Men and Women. In general these Councils invite all lay men and women to be apostles and thus gain a sense of being in the Church.²⁷ Moreover, they are concerned with all the issues which affect public life.

Before a conclusion can be made, one must move away from the national scene and focus on the impact which the changes had on the Church parish. After Vatican II, there was not only revival but also confusion within the Church. The layman did not know exactly how far his Parish duties would go. The one sure result of the Council, however, is that the typical parishoner of today is "no longer (the) passive pew-holder."²⁸ Rather, he has become involved in teaching, lecturing, counseling, liturgy planning and parish social workings. Furthermore, the Council tried to give the clergy norms by which to follow in distributing temporal duties for the Parish. My own Parish of St. Clement of Rome, for example, has followed these outlines by organizing a Parish Council along with a finance committee. This seems to be fairly consistent with other diocesan practices

around the country although some will be found to be more liberal and some more conservative. As a whole, however, the Catholic Church is still far from generous in its view on lay control of Parish property or on too much democracy in the Parish temporal decision making process. As Fogarty points out, many American Clergy still appeal to the lay trusteeism disputes as a reason for not allowing laymen a greater share in temporal duties.²⁹

In conclusion, one cannot deny that the Catholic layman has come a long way since Pope Leo XIII's 1888 decree. He has developed a sense of dignity and belonging, a more apostolic role, an increased share in decision making along with Priests and Bishops, and to some extent a voice in the governing of the Catholic Church. Although "some lay people are going to be discomfited by increasing appeals for them to accept a responsible role in the Church and to fulfill some minor chores,"³⁰ the lay atmosphere in general seems to be one of excitement and willingness. With national movements such as Catholic Action and individual parish councils, the contemporary layman is becoming an equally integral part of the Catholic Church. He is "no longer the ignorant immigrant whose faith must be preserved against a hostile, pluralistic environment,"³¹ but rather an educated, concerned and eager Church member.

Notes

1 Odile M. Liebard, *Clergy & Laity: Official Catholic Teachings* (North Carolina: McGrath Publishing Co., 1978), p. 1.

2 Daniel Callahan, *The Mind of the Catholic Layman* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), p. 5.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 12.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 17.

5 Gerald P. Fogarty, "Lay Trusteeism: Yesterday and Today," *America* (November 19, 1966), p. 659.

6 Callahan, p. 24.

7 *Ibid.*

8 *Ibid.*, p. 25.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 65.

10 *Ibid.*, p. 70.

11 *Ibid.*, p. 42.

12 *Ibid.*, p. 40.

13 *Ibid.*

14 Don Brophy and Edythe Westenhaver, eds., *The Story of Catholics in America* (New York: Paulist Press, 1978), p. 134.

15 *Ibid.*, p. 135.

16 Liebard, pp. 220-29.

17 *Ibid.*, p. 91.

18 Callahan, p. 106.

19 *Ibid.*, p. 107.

20 *Ibid.*

21 Leo R. Ward, *Catholic Life, U.S.A. Contemporary Lay Movements* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1959), p. 32.

22 *Ibid.*, p. 35.

23 *Ibid.*, p. 52.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 53.

25 John Cogley, *Catholic America* (New York: Image Book of Doubleday Co., 1974), p. 109.

26 Ward, p. 107.

27 *Ibid.*, p. 121.

28 Brophy and Westenhaver, p. 140.

29 Fogarty, p. 656.

30 Donald J. Thorman, *The Emerging Layman: The Role of the Catholic Layman in America* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1957), p. 167.

31 Fogarty, p. 659.

Affective Individualism: Is it an effect of the Modern Revolution?

by Jane Mucke

Many historians agree that in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, there was a decrease in the number of the gentry who were putting out their children to schools and as apprentices. These upper class families were beginning to keep their children at home. Lawrence Stone seems to suggest that this is the beginning of a more affectionate feeling towards the children by the parents. He deals with this theme in his book, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England 1500—1800*.

This paper will examine Stone's themes on affective individualism, and compare and contrast other historians' beliefs on affective individualism. Stone stresses the process of how individuals thought about and treated each other, and how they regarded themselves in relation to God, and to the various social levels in *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England 1500—1800*.¹ He states that he believes that "affective individualism" is an effect of the Modern Revolution for he states that a critical change took place during the eighteenth century. This critical change was in the family structure. The distant, deferential patriarchy was replaced by a more caring, democratic family.

This caring, democratic family, of which "affective individualism" is a characteristic, is often said to be the beginning of the modern family. Professor Stone gives four key features of the modern family which seem to support his theory: 1) an intensified affective bonding of the nuclear family at the expense of neighbors and kin, 2) a strong sense of individual autonomy and the right to personal freedom in the pursuit of happiness, 3) a weakening of the association of sexual pleasure with sin and guilt, and 4) a growing desire for physical privacy. These features were supposedly all established by 1750 in the gentry and upper classes.²

Before one can continue the discussion on affective individualism, a standard definition must be offered. Stone defines individualism as

a growing introspection and interest in the individual personality; a demand for personal autonomy and a corresponding respect for the individual's right to privacy, to self-expression, and to the free exercise of his will within limits set by the need for social cohesion.³

The driving influence that Stone sees behind this development of personal introspection is the hallmark of the Puritan personality:

an over-powering sense of sin and preoccupation with individual salvation stimulated by literacy, private reading, and meditation.⁴

This interest in one's self came from the belief in self-discipline, and the idea of toleration of other religions arose from simple willingness to tolerate diversity for the sake of peace. One could say that these were reactions to the civil wars of the 1600's. This new interest in the self was also influenced by the Renaissance ideal of the individual hero, and religious introspection which arose from Calvinist views of sin and guilt.⁵ Stone seems to suggest that we can find examples of this interest in the self in the new genres of writing developing in the eighteenth century. One example is the idea that the central theme of most novels dwelt on the struggles of love and personal autonomy against family interest and parental control.⁶

A rising demand for autonomy is the second characteristic of individualism. Stone states that this demand for autonomy

found practical application in growing resistance to attempts to put extreme pressure on the individual's body and soul.⁷

Ideas of the Levellers on the individual's natural property rights, and the idea of contractual states also influenced this desire for autonomy.

Also aiding the development of individualism was the idea that man could begin to control, and benefit from his environment. Also, the growing indifference towards the authority of the clergy aided in this growth. These aspects aided in the development of possessive individualism within the sphere of economics. Stone states that selfish pursuit of pleasure was placed at the center of human motivations.⁸ Adam Smith had stated that

individual lust for gain, if left to itself, produced a self-regulating market economy that would maximize collective economic benefit.⁹

Individualism was reaching the affective stage in society as a whole during the eighteenth century through the movement against cruelty, and the emergence of the "Man of Sentiment," or "Man of Feeling." The Romantic movement aided in the encouraging of emotional involvement within the family. Indeed, affective individualism was emerging within the family. Stone states that the effect of affective individualism on the family can be seen through the attack on and decline of the patriarchy, the decline of family prayers, and an increasing stress on personal privacy.

The new ideas of contractual obligations decreased the authority of the husband and father, and produced a new type of familial relationship. Each member of the family now had his or her own duties and obligations as well as rewards. As Bishop Fleetwood, a moral theologian of the 1700's, stated

There is no relation in the world, either natural or civil and agreed upon, but there is a reciprocal duty obliging each party.¹⁰

The husband and father role was also diminished by the decline of

religious enthusiasm, and the growth of religious radicalism which appealed to one's individual conscience. Also, the paternal control the employer once held over their apprentices was decreased as more apprentices did not live in the same house as the master, and as the traditional non-monetary rewards were translated into wages in money.

Stone believes that all the aspects of life in eighteenth century Britain caused a change within familial relationships. He seems to suggest that the standard world view had changed, or rather, evolved. He states that by the early 1700's most people saw all human beings as unique, and that it was

right and proper for each to pursue his own happiness, provided that he also respects the right of other to pursue theirs.¹¹

This change in the world view had been caused, according to Stone, by a "shift of a whole system of values which dominated the thinking of the English elite."¹² The English elite — the wealthy bourgeoisie and the squirarchy — were indeed the backbone of this change in the world view, and the development of both affective and possessive individualism. It was their reaction to the growing market economy, and their Puritan religion combined with the growth of literacy and interest in government that helped to bring about these changes.

Yet Stone states that affection is only partly found in the product of individualism; its roots can be found in a basic personality change. This personality change, combined with the two following ideas helped to stimulate affection in eighteenth century Britain:

The new confidence that the pursuit of happiness best achieved by domestic affection was the prime legitimate goal in life (and) the new ideal of the 'Man of Sentiment' who was easily moved to outbursts of indignation by cruelty and to tears of sympathy by benevolence.¹³

Lawrence Stone is joined by Lloyd de Mause in his belief in affective individualism. De Mause states in *The History of Childhood* that the central force of change is found in the personality. The change occurs because of the "evolution of parent-child relations" are independent from historical, social, and technological change.¹⁴ He categorizes the relationship between parents and children in eighteenth century Britain in the "Intrusive Mode," one of the six modes he uses to categorize parental-child relations throughout history. In the Intrusive Mode, the child is nursed by the mother, and is not swaddled.¹⁵ These practices allow one to believe that there is a growth of affection for the child. It is important to discuss the practices of child-rearing during the eighteenth century, since as de Mause concluded, child-rearing practices are often the basis for the adult personality.¹⁶ De Mause states that John Locke saw tenderness as an upper class tendency, and encouraged these parents to change their ways and imitate the hard-working farmers who did not spoil their children with tenderness. Locke stated

Esteem and disgrace are, of all other, the most powerful incentives to the mind, when once it is brought to relish them. If you can get into children a love of credit, and an apprehension of shame and disgrace you have put into 'em the true principle.¹⁷

However, one must realize that if the farmer had the time to play with his children, and show them much love and tenderness, then he would most likely do so. Both de Mause and Stone point out that it was only the upper class who were able to treat their children with tenderness, and spoil them as they wished.

One of Stone's opponents of affective individualism is Alan MacFarlane. In his critiques of Stone's *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England 1500-1800*, MacFarlane states that his *The Family Life of Ralph Josselin* contradicts Stone's theory that affection within the family was a result of the Modern Revolution. MacFarlane shows through an analysis of Josselin's diary that there was indeed affection between parents and children before the eighteenth century.¹⁸

MacFarlane states in *The Family Life of Ralph Josselin* that domestic life centered around birth, marriage, and death. MacFarlane, at once, points out that the first line in Josselin's diary refutes Stone's theory.

I was borne to the great joy of Father and mother being much desired as being their third child and as it pleased God, their only sonne.

Josselin wrote this in his diary after the birth of his first son, Thomas. This statement shows that there was some affection for the children. Even marriage and courtship were affective vehicles as shown by Josselin's entry on the first day he met his wife.

The first Lordsday being Oct:6 my eye fixed with love upon a Mayd, and hers upon mee, who afterwards proved my wife.¹⁹

MacFarlane does state that some element of parental control over courtship and marriage occurred when parental consent was sought. However, parental consent was not always sought. Josselin's second son, John, married without the knowledge or consent of his father. MacFarlane gives as the general impression of Josselin's diary that the husband-wife bond was the most important in his life.²¹

The second most important relationship was the parent-child relationship. Relations between Josselin and his daughters seemed to be affectionate and caring. Josselin's relationship with this first son, Ralph, showed no mention of tension or punishment. However, his second son, John, caused him so much grief that he threatened to disinherit John.²² MacFarlane points out that in the strained relationship between Josselin and John, we see that the stability of the family and household were threatened by new ideas.²³

Though Josselin did send his children to school, and/or apprenticed, his diary shows that correspondence was kept up between the parent and child. When a child was ill, Josselin's diary showed his worryment and grief. Even after his children married there was still

much correspondence and visiting.

Another of Stone's opponents is Peter Laslett. In *Household and Family in Past Time*, Laslett attempts to prove that the process of modernization does not always presume the simplification of social relationships, and the decline of the complex family unit. In short, Laslett attempts to disprove Stone's theory of individualism.²⁴ Laslett, like MacFarlane, does not believe that affection between parents and children was a result of the Modern Revolution.

All four men are noted historians, and all use noted documents in their research. Both sides of the argument have valid statements. It is up to the individual to decide whether affective individualism is a result of the Modern Revolution. While MacFarlane argues that affection was not a creation of the Modern Revolution, the reader can still see the validity of part of Stone's argument — that individualism, especially affective individualism, did not become prominent until the eighteenth century, and it was in Britain where these developments first occurred.

Notes

1 Lawrence Stone, *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England 1500-1800* (London: Harper and Row, 1979), p.21

2 *Ibid.*, p.22.

3 *Ibid.*, p.151.

4 *Ibid.*, p.152.

5 *Ibid.*, p.153.

6 *Ibid.*, p.156.

7 *Ibid.*, p.156.

8 *Ibid.*, p.161.

9 *Ibid.*, pp.161-2.

10 *Ibid.*, p.165.

11 *Ibid.*, p.172.

12 *Ibid.*, p.172.

13 *Ibid.*, p.180.

14 Lloyd de Mause, (ed.), *The History of Childhood* (London: Harper and Row, 1974), p.3.

15 *Ibid.*, p.52.

16 *Ibid.*, p.2.

17 *Ibid.*, p.319.

18 Alan MacFarlane, Review of L. Stone's *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England 1500-1800, History and Theory*, (Summer 1979), p.114.

19 Alan MacFarlane, *The Family Life of Ralph Josselin*, (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1970), p.81.

20 *Ibid.*, p.95.

21 *Ibid.*, p.106.

22 *Ibid.*, p.123.

23 *Ibid.*, p.134.

24 Peter Laslett, (ed.), *Household and Family in Past Time*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1972), p.5.

Unclean! Unclean! A Brief History of Leprosy in Louisiana

by Patricia C. Wagner

"Unclean! Unclean!," the cries of the ragged disfigured leper would be heard, accompanied by the ringing of his bell. These pitiful remnants of humanity crept through the streets, faces masked, ringing out a warning to the healthy. It is difficult for people of today to realize or to sympathize with the plight of the individual who had contracted the most dreaded of all diseases, leprosy. As an object of man's fear, pity, disgust and hatred, leprosy had been shrouded in mystery and superstition throughout history.

The average man on the street believes leprosy to be a tropical disease, thankfully not found in our country. Few non-medical citizens realize that this disease not only exists today in America, but at one time was a real and present danger to the public health. Anyone researching the history of public health developments will be struck by the recurrence of Louisiana's involvement both in a positive as well as negative manner. Students of Louisiana history are repeatedly made aware of the tragic epidemics of yellow fever, typhoid and cholera that plagued the early citizens. Few references are made to the presence of treatment of lepers in Louisiana. It is only after deliberate research that the true picture of this horror-filled disease can be discovered. In 1960, a book on the history of medicine in America for the years 1660-1860, clearly tells us that the feared medieval scourge, leprosy, did not carry over into the colonies and if it did, "it was rare and of no consequence."¹ Such is the nature of our human psychology.

In order to discuss the history of leprosy in Louisiana, one must first understand exactly what the disease is and then how it arrived in the new world of the eighteenth century.

Leprosy has been called a "pseudo-tropical"² disease. It is not found solely in tropical parts of the world but does spread more rapidly in warm climates, notably those where winters rarely drop below 71° Fahrenheit. The disease is probably the most tissue destructive known today. It attacks every system of the body. The organism responsible for leprosy was first isolated by Dr. G. H. Armauer Hansen on February 28, 1873, in Bergen, Norway, the most unusual site of a leprosy hospital. Hansen's discovery was remarkable in that he had identified the first disease-causing organism in human beings. It was a revolutionary discovery but for the leper it only presented a method of verifying the presence of the disease. No method of prevention or treatment existed. It would be sixty-seven

years before an effective treatment would be developed, a miracle which occurred in Carville, Louisiana.

Described as loathsome, nightmarish, and hideous, leprosy distorts features, mutilates limbs and inflicts unfathomable depths of pain. Today, it is known that the leprosy organism (*Mycobacterium lepra*) enters the body through the mucous membranes of the skin and then is distributed throughout the body. Contrary to public fears, the disease is not highly contagious. It is much less communicable than tuberculosis (*Mycobacterium tuberculosis*) which is a biologically similar organism and, theoretically, of mutual genetic derivation.

Once infection has taken place, leprosy develops so slowly it may not be evidenced for years. The incubation period varies from 5-20 years. Attempts to isolate the bacteria and grow it in experimental animals were largely unsuccessful until recently. During the early 1970s, researchers at Carville infected nine-banded armadillos, opening up new avenues of research.

The distinctive symptoms of the disease give rise to the horror it inspires. The face becomes deformed due to the combination of underlying bone structure destruction and the tubercles, ulcers and crusts which grossly disfigure. Breathing becomes increasingly difficult, speech and sight are destroyed. Painful internal lesions develop, sporadic attacks of fever, and degrees of paralysis complete the picture. A typical case of the most severe type will have the facial disfigurement, claw-like ulcerated hands, stooped position, possibly missing a limb lost to the internal dry rot.

The early symptoms of leprosy can easily be missed. A burn or slight injury which normally would be painful may go unnoticed. Discolored areas and lumps may appear in the skin.

Leprosy today is usually classified according to the various expressions of the disease. Each classification method is intended to offer methods of determining the degree of infection and/or the degree of communicability.³

The search for the historical origin of leprosy leads down disputed paths. Many ancient references can be found, most obviously in the Bible, placing the disease around 1400 B.C. Egyptian references written more than 4,000 years ago mention the disease. Some medical historians place the origins of leprosy on the continent of Africa, along the Nile. Aristotle referred to a disease which probably was leprosy. The disease known as leprosy gained its name from references in the Bible, probably originally referring to many externally similar diseases.

Leprosy is found repeatedly during the age of the Roman Empire. During medieval days, lepers were required to wear distinctive clothing and had to cry out "Unclean! Unclean!" to warn the public of their presence. They had to carry a bell or rattle which they also used as a warning.⁴ This practice probably developed due to the

vital statistics. He compiled the births, deaths and marriages for publication. In order to determine the deaths he had to visit the city's hospitals. It was in doing this that he discovered several remarkable facts.

Kendall discovered that there were many deaths from leprosy. One particular case led to his writing a series of articles for the paper. The case in point was that of a boy with leprosy who worked in the crowded French Market. Patients at Dr. Beard's pest house frequently handled the meat on its way to the market.

Kendall's sensational articles on the frequency of infection and death from leprosy in the city led to widespread public interest and concern. Concern turned to protest after Kendall wrote a scathing description of the pest house. A description born of a visit to the establishment after having been personally invited by a leper who appeared in his newspaper office one day.

The authorities held a community meeting without arriving at a satisfactory resolution. As a result, Dr. Dyer led a group to the State legislature presenting the problem. A bill was passed to create a Board of Control to provide a new hospital, with Dr. Dyer appointed to head the board.

Choosing a site became a difficult proposition for the board. Fear of the disease prevented selection of many sites. Finally, the Indian Camp Plantation, seventy-six miles up river from New Orleans, was leased for five years. Local citizens were misled by an intentional rumor to believe the site was to be an ostrich farm.

Shortly after dawn, December first, 1894, the initial group of lepers arrived at their new home with their physician, Dr. Wailes. There were thirty-one patients.

Conditions at the plantation were poor. Patients lived in the falling down slave cabins. The land was swampy, and malaria was an ever present threat. The situation deteriorated badly over the next two years.

In 1896, four Daughters of Charity of San Vincent de Paul Servants of the Sick Poor arrived to become a permanent part of the plantation. Dr. Dyer had approached the Order for help with staffing. Their commitment was met with teary gratitude and devotion by the lepers.

More modern cottages for the patients were built in 1902, 1903 and 1906. Special facilities for bath and disposal of wastes were incorporated in the design. The staff resided in the original mansion of the plantation. A clinic including a pharmacy was erected in 1906 also, complete with covered walks connecting the buildings.

In 1908, Dr. Ralph Hopkins, the attending physician working with Dr. Dyer as consulting leprologist, and Dr. Dyer included in their report to the Board of Control requests for studies to be done on the localities of the disease and increased education for

laryngitis and total loss of voice seen in the more severely afflicted.

The first special hospitals or asylums for lepers are seen in the fourth century. Through time, segregation became the only known method of controlling the spread of the disease.

The treatment of the disease evolved from the practice of burning the individual alive or dispossessing and ostracizing him into the humane care we have today. The progress was slow. An unfortunate association between leprosy and punishment by God for evil made better treatment difficult to pursue. However, Christian beliefs led to involvement of many religious individuals in the plight of the leper. In 1048, a special religious order, the Order of St. Lazarus, was formed to care for the lepers. The term lazaretto comes from their work.⁵

In the mid to late eighteenth century, leprosy appeared in the new world. Contrary to common belief, leprosy immigrated to the new world along with the colonists and slaves. Most medical historians writing on leprosy credit the slave population with its introduction in Louisiana. The number of afflicted increased with the immigration of the Acadians who reportedly have a genetic susceptibility to the disease.

Initial reports of leprosy are found during the mid-eighteenth century. In 1766, Don Antonio de Ulloa, the Spanish Governor of Louisiana, "founded a lazaretto for French patients at Balize, eighty miles below New Orleans on the Mississippi delta."⁶ After the lazaretto was destroyed by a hurricane soon after being established, no evidence is found for the existence of any facility for the lepers for many years.

In 1785, "La Terre des Lepereaux" was founded north of New Orleans by Don Andres Almonester, Spanish philanthropist. Accepting both negroes and whites, the leprosarium only existed for a few years. Believing the disease to be wiped out, it too closed. Nearly a century would pass before interest renewed. Leprous victims in the continental United States, and in Louisiana particularly, owe the present state of care to the events of 1891 in New Orleans. At that time, two people and the events they sparked created what was to become the national leprosarium.

Dr. Isidore Dyer was a physician at Tulane Medical College. His specialty was tuberculosis and leprosy. In 1891, lepers were cared for "in a squalid cottage rented by the city of New Orleans."⁷ Known at Dr. Beard's pest house, it was a filthy disgraceful refuge. For years Dr. Dyer had repeatedly pleaded with authorities to establish a clean, humane leprosarium for these tragic outcasts of society. His knowledge and concern went unrewarded and probably would have remained so, had it not been for John Smith Kendall.

Kendall was a seventeen-year-old news reporter with the local newspaper, *The Daily Picayune*. Given the least important and boring assignments, Kendall found his job involved making lists of the local

the medical profession as to the usefulness of the Home.

In the next decade, leprosy was to spread quietly and slowly throughout the country. In 1916, a committee of enquiry was established by the United States Senate to study the problem. The formal hearings were preceded by the dramatic surprise testimony of a young American soldier, John Early, recently returned from the Philippines. His graphic descriptions of his plight after developing the disease in the service of his country further encouraged the committee.

Dr. Dyer led the physicians in their testimony. They presented the facts that leprosy had existed in the United States for nearly two hundred years, evidence indicating its occurrence was increasing and that segregation was the sole effective means of control. Estimates of numbers of lepers ranged from 500 to 2,500 in the country. Texas, Oregon, California, Minnesota, Massachusetts and New York all had problems with increasing incidence of leprosy. Thirty-two of the fifty-nine parishes of Louisiana had leprous citizens. An interesting fact was brought out with regard to the increasing number in Galveston, Texas. All primary cases could be traced back to St. James Parish in Louisiana.⁸

During the Senate hearings, the necessity for a national leprosarium became evident. The inhumane treatment of the leper throughout the country appeared to be the norm. Only Louisiana had made a serious attempt to take care of its lepers in a humane fashion. Louisiana was also the only state to methodically maintain account of its lepers. Gross discrimination against the leper due to the public horror of the disease was rampant. However, even in Louisiana, the law pertaining to the control of lepers was identical with the law pertaining to the insane.

On March 25, 1916, the United States Senate of the Sixty-fourth Congress passed the bill S.4086, providing for the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy and for the prevention of the spread of leprosy. The national leprosarium was to be administered by the United States Public Health Service. Lepers were then legally under the authority of the United States quarantine acts.

American entry into World War I delayed the culmination of the plans for a national leprosarium. In 1919, a search for an appropriate site began with poor results. Public opposition to selected sites led to the decision to use the existing leprosarium in Louisiana, the Indian Camp Plantation.

The United States Marine Hospital, number 66, was the new name as of February 1, 1921. Through the years it has become known as Carville after the nearby town.

During the 1930s, the patient numbers rose to approximately four hundred. Local inhabitants of nearby areas altered their attitudes and slow improvements in accommodations and treatment began.

At the start of the new decade, a new Medical Officer in Charge

arrived, Dr. Guy H. Faget. Coming from a well-known New Orleans family, Faget had an extensive and appropriate medical background. Faget's first task was to improve the medical treatment of the lepers. In January, 1941, Faget began a series of voluntary experimental treatments with a new drug. The new drug was promin, a type of sulfonamide, which had previously been used against tuberculosis. The results of the drug trials became the "Miracle at Carville." At last a drug had been found which actually prevented the spread of the bacteria and in many cases led to a remission or "cure" of the symptoms.

Stanley Stein, a blind patient at the institution, initiated a magazine, *The Sixty-Six Star* in May 1931.⁹ It began as a house journal with local gossip and general information. Soon it developed into an attack against the stigma attached to leprosy, in particular the Roman Catholic Leper Mass. Stein began an impressive campaign to eradicate the misconceptions about the disease and to change the name of the disease to Hansen's disease, after the discoverer of the causative organism. His crusade to abolish the terms leper and leprosy has gained world-wide acceptance. In 1967, Stein died and a three-man editorial board took over the reins of the *Star*. By 1970, the magazine had a circulation of 40,000 copies, and had readers in 105 countries.

During the 1960s, serious research on the microbiology of Hansen's disease began at Carville.

The first successful attempts to cultivate the myobacterium lepra occurred there. By 1970, separate research departments for microbiology, biochemistry, pharmacology, and pathology were established. Today, the hospital at Carville is called the National Hansen's Disease Center with formal federal legislation pending to make the title official.

The Center has expanded to 347 acres located at the original site of the Indian Camp Plantation. Five years ago, a major renovation project began with many new modern facilities evident. The Center is presently one of the country's major research centers with both clinical and laboratory research in progress.

There are approximately 4,000 visitors to the Center a year with 800 of them professional medical students. A formal agreement with Tulane University and Louisiana State University provides for their students to participate in a clinical experience at the Center.

The Daughters of Charity are still a vital part of the Center. Fourteen Sisters provide various nursing and medical related services, with federal employees composing the remaining staff.

Leprosy in Louisiana and in America has come a long way since Ulloa's lazaretto and Dr. Beard's Pest House. A great deal of credit for this progress can be given to the compassion and concern of the people of Louisiana.

Notes

1 Richard Harrison Skyrock, *Medicine and Society in America, 1660-1860* (New York: New York University Press, 1960), pg.83.

2 Erwin H. Ackerknecht, M.D., *History and Geography of the Most Important Disease* (New York: Hafner Publishing Company, 1965), p. 109.

3 Eugene Garfield, *Current Contents* (Philadelphia: Institute for Scientific Information, No. 37, Sept. 15, 1980), p. 5-11.

4 Howard W. Haggard, M.D. *Devils, Drugs and Doctors* (New York City: Blue Ribbon Books, Inc.), p. 194.

5 Patrick Feeny, *The Fight Against Leprosy* (New York: American Leprosy Mission, Inc. 1961), p. 131.

6 John Duffy, *History of Medicine in Louisiana* (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1958), Vol. 1, p. 260.

7 Louis Boudreaux, ed. . . . *The Star*, 41:1, (Septmeber-October, 1981), p. 5-9.

8 Senate Report No.: 306, 64th Congress, 1st Session, March 25, 1916.

9 Feeny, p. 145

10 Louis Boudreaux, ed. . . . *The Star*, 41:1, September-October, 1981), p. 5-9.

The Old Believers

by Paul Deutsch

History Department "Best Essay Award 1982"

The terms "Old Believer" refers to one side of a schism in Russia that began in the late seventeenth century. This side clung to the old beliefs and the old ways amidst religious, cultural, and political changes. To try to begin explaining some of the reasons for this schism, which was of such magnitude that it threatened to split Russian society itself, one must go back to the roots of the Christian Church in Russia and of the Muscovy Government. Over the course of Muscovy history, the state and Church intertwined, forming a theocratic state. However, as the Romanov tsars tried to bring Russia up to the level of the rest of Europe, great tremors ran through the Church and the state due to a power struggle within the Church and the growing secularization of the state. As the Old Believers clung to the past, they cut themselves adrift, cut off from both Church and state.

According to legend, Grand Prince Vladimir I decided that it was in the best interest of the Kievan lands to adopt either Islam, Roman Catholicism, Judaism or Eastern Catholicism. His envoys were much impressed with the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople and the beautiful symbolism in the liturgy--its aura of awesomeness and other-worldliness. Thus, Vladimir chose to follow Constantinople, and in 988 A.D., he and his court were baptized, beginning the conversion of the Slavic tribes under the Kievan rule from paganism to Christianity. By the middle of the twelfth century, the predominance of Kiev was gone, and power was spread among the princes, each with his own appanage. By this time, however, the Slavic people had accepted this new religion, and they carried it with them as they began to migrate in a northeasterly direction in search of new land. This migration became a flood a century later when the Golden Horde swept in and destroyed Kiev and other major Russian settlements; the people sought the comparative safety of the central and northern Russian forests.

In the last part of the thirteenth century and in the fourteenth century, the appanage of Moscow began to rise in prominence due to its rulers' ability to collect taxes and stay in grace with the Golden Horde. As Moscow began to grow, the Church became visibly linked with it as Metropolitans Peter and Theogostus supported the princes and preached loyalty to Moscow.¹ Thus, from the very beginnings of Muscovy, the Church and state closely interacted. The government was a theocracy--the salvation of the souls of his subjects was a deep

concern for the prince. The people of Muscovy came to see the prince, later tsar, as their father, and because of this, they accepted much abuse from their "father." It is understandable, then, the deep agony that the Old Believers felt when their interpretations of the signs of the times showed that Tsar Alexis, their beloved tsar, was the Anti-Christ. To believe such went so much against their tradition, for the tsar was God's representative and their true father.

When Kievan Russia accepted Byzantine Christianity, it accepted a belief that included an elaborate liturgy, a very formalistic liturgy. Although it inherited its faith from Constantinople, it did not inherit a desire for knowledge.² Few Russian church scholars knew Greek, Latin or Hebrew, and thus the Russian Church had no source of doctrinal rejuvenation, no ability to go back to its roots, especially to the Church Fathers. When Constantinople fell in 1453 to the Turks, the Russian Church was cut off from its past.

The people began to see their Church as a finished whole received from Christ; to alter it was sinful and was contaminating to this divine gift.³ Practically cut off from its past and with little theological resources, the Church began to gather pious accretions and superstitions. Since the liturgy and Scriptures were composed by God, people preserved the letter but let their imaginations soar in interpreting each word for hidden meanings.⁴

In the last part of the fifteenth century and during the sixteenth century, the Jesuits began to exert a powerful influence in Poland, seeking to convert the whole country to Roman Catholicism. They pressed hard on the Orthodox Church, which obtained a truce by agreeing to accept the pope as its head. Still the Jesuits pushed. To be able to defend themselves, the Orthodox opened a school, like ones run by the Jesuits, to train their clergy and a special group of scholars in Latin, Greek, dialectic, rhetoric, philosophy and foreign languages.⁵ This new group of scholars, in their defence of Orthodoxy, went back to the Latin and Greek sources. In this process they began to notice errors in the liturgical missals and in the popular beliefs. Under Patriarch Mogil, these scholars moved to Moscow where they began to correct the missals.⁶ Later, these corrections would become a focal point of controversy when Nikon forced the corrections on the people in the 1650's. However, there is still at least one big part of the picture missing, for the Russian Orthodox Church had survived textual corrections in the missals in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and earlier in the seventeenth century.⁷ Why was this time to explode in schism?

To supply this missing piece, one need only to look at the social upheavals in this seventeenth century. The first two decades were occupied with the Times of Troubles, but each succeeding decade had its own major upheaval.⁸ Stenka Razin headed a revolt in the 1650's. Khmel'nitsky led a bloody revolt in the Ukraine in the 1640's and

1650's. During the middle of the century, there were uprisings in many cities, including the towns of Pskov and Novgorod, and the plague spread.⁹ Twice one-third of the population died due to war and its companions of famine and plague.¹⁰ In 1660, around Moscow the women outnumbered the men by ten to one.¹¹ Truly, this was a century of upheaval; truly, the people desired a time of rest. However, the method of seeking it tended to depend upon one's social class. The upper class prevailed, persuading Tsar Alexis to call a *zemskii sobor* and promulgated the new law code in 1649, the *Ulozhenie*. This law code greatly rigidified society, reducing most to serfs, which only increased the violence.

Two big results of this century of upheavals were in the areas of the Church and in the attitude of the Russian people toward foreigners and their customs. Many saw the Times of Troubles as a punishment from God and thus turned back to the Church with renewed piety, seeking leadership from the monasteries.¹² The monasteries had grown stronger during this time and emerged from the Times of Troubles untarnished, whereas the royalty and upper classes were suspect because of their conniving to gain power. The Russian people also came to have a deep hatred and distrust for foreigners, especially the Poles and Swedes, who took advantage of her during her civil strife.¹⁴

The desire for a return to faithfulness and piety gave rise to a reform movement in the 1630's and 1640's called the Zealots of Piety.¹³ This movement was headed by Stepan Vonifater, Alexis's confessor for a time.¹⁶ He was seconded by Neronov, a very gifted preacher.¹⁷ The movement sought a rebirth of Orthodoxy by a moral reformation, liturgical revival and a renewal of individual piety. An example of this individual piety can be seen in the night prayer of Avvakum and his wife, as he describes in his autobiography:

I did three hundred bows, six hundred 'Prayers of Jesus' and one hundred prayers to the mother of God, and my wife did two hundred bows and only four hundred prayers because she had to care for the children who were crying.¹⁸

The goal of the Zealots of Piety was to permeate the lives of the Russian people with the teachings of Christ and the ideals of an Orthodox tsardom.²⁰ To achieve this, they preached, and they were good preachers. Neronov preached in Nizhny-Novgorod and Moscow and was known as the second Chrysostom.²¹ It was his preaching that spearheaded the movement, which enjoyed much success and popularity until its clash with Patriarch Nikon over his reforms. It was during this heyday that both Nikon (before becoming patriarch) and Avvakum were drawn to this revival and became members.²² In his autobiography, *Zhitiie*, Avvakum showed that being a preacher within this movement could be physically dangerous because the preachers had few qualms about mentioning the names of public officials that

were abusing the powers of their offices; he himself was beaten at least once.²³

Beneath this surface of revival, however, all was not well. Religion was becoming a haven from the upheaval of the time, a piece of security in the midst of social change, and the people, mostly the lower classes, would rebel when not only the old beliefs but the old ways would come under attack from Nikon and from the Romanov tsars after Nikon was deposed. The tsars were changing the country from a theocracy to a secular empire and modernizing Russian culture. The people will not want to change and will rebel when the tsars enforce the religious, governmental and social changes. Although the lower classes rebelled against cultural and political changes in addition to the religious, their expression would be in religious terms.²⁴

Another strand in the reform of the Russian Church was due to the rise in power of the monasteries after the Times of Troubles. When Filaret became patriarch in 1620, he used his authority and his influence over his son, Tsar Michael, to begin to curb this power of the monasteries and center it in the patriarchate and in the ecclesiastical hierarchy.²⁵ Just by this position of great power and influence that Filaret occupied, he was to become a precedent for Nikon, who would desire to establish the patriarch as superior to the tsar in both Church and state affairs. This drive, called the theocratic answer, to increase the strength, and discipline also, of the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the prestige of power of the patriarch was a continuation of the push by the Zealots of Piety to permeate all of Russian society with religion.²⁶ Mogil succeeded Filaret and sought to arm the clergy theologically; it was at this time that the new scholars appeared who headed the textual reforms.²⁷ Joseph followed Mogil and pushed catechesis, bringing in use of the printing press.²⁸ Nikon followed Joseph and brought to a culmination the efforts of the three before him. He would try to establish his authority as having precedence over the tsar, and he pushed forcefully the liturgical and textual reforms by catechesis and by demanding obedience.²⁹

Neronov could not accept the reforms by Nikon, especially when he was allowed no response, so he found himself heading a grass-roots opposition.³⁰ He was condemned and exiled by a Church council in 1656.³¹ Avvakum took his place as head of the opposition although he himself spent most of his remaining years in exile or prison. This opposition also wished to permeate society with religion; however, it saw the permeation on the individual level, the fundamentalist position, spreading from person to person.³² It occurred from the roots up, not being enforced from up top. The opposition also saw no reasons for Nikon's reforms — Russian Orthodoxy was the true faith. Therefore, this opposition balked at the increased demands to accept changes in the Old Belief without any imput. It was the job of the patriarch and the tsar to preserve the true faith, to protect it from

defilement, not to change it. The opposition saw the source of all the troubles of society as all these innovations coming in from Western Europe, which were straight from the devil. New things like tobacco, hops, instrumental music, representational art and Frankish icons were strenuously resisted.³² Thus this group came to be called the Old Believers for they clung to the old beliefs and ways. Their clinging was quite single-minded, admitting no other positions; they eventually found themselves adrift, cut off from both Church and state.

On the surface, both groups sought to increase the role of the Church and fight against the influence of foreigners, but they clashed on how to effect their desires. These two common drives can be expressed by the terms *khitrost'* and *blagochestie*.³⁴ *Khitrost'* connotes cleverness and skill, sophistication and cunning, in activities outside of religious ritual and was used in description of foreigners and those who followed their ways. *Blagochestie* expresses a religious intensity, special reverence, faith and faithfulness, an ardent loyalty — such as were expected of the Russian people for their tsar. The idea *blagochestie* was seen in the straight forward Yaroslavl *muzhik*, who fought for the tsar during the Times of Troubles. Both groups professed *blagochestie*, especially in fighting *khitrost'*. This ardent loyalty and contempt for foreign ways brought to the foreground two *muzhiks* from the Upper Volga, Nikon and Avvakum, who engaged one another in a death struggle.³⁵

Nikon impressed Alexis, and with a little help from the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Paisius, he was named the metropolitain of Novgorod.³⁶ Paisius influenced Nikon greatly. He passed on to him the dream of a new Moses to free the Orthodox Church throughout the world and the appreciation of a lavish retinue.³⁷ In July of 1651, after the death of Joseph, Nikon became patriarch.³⁸ It was at this time that Alexis would accept the Ukraine under his protection and was dreaming of expansion, liberating the Slavic people and Constantinople. Nikon's great emphasis on discipline and conforming to Greek Orthodoxy might have been an attempt to assist Alexis's dream and his own of a new Moses.³⁹ As Nikon began to move forcefully to realize the goals of the theocratic answer, Alexis's admiration began to wane. Nikon demanded complete obedience, made correction in the missals so that they corresponded with the Greek Orthodox, and accepted only submission in response to his actions.⁴⁰ (See figure one, footnote 41) While Alexis was away on campaign, he would usurp state power to quell any resistance to his commands.⁴²

Why did Nikon almost willfully aggravate the majority of the Russian people? Maybe This seems to be indicated by his voluntary abdication of the patriarchate in 1658.⁴³ Supposedly one of his court was struck or beaten by a man under Alexis's authority. Alexis refused

Nikon's demand of an apology, so Nikon stepped down and retired to the country as did Ivan the Terrible, evidently hoping for the people to demand his return and for Alexis to relent. After eight years, Nikon gave up waiting and returned to take up his office again. However, the Moscow Council of 1666-67 deposed him.

The Council of 1666-67 accepted Nikon's reforms conforming the Russian Church with Greek Orthodoxy, but it rejected Nikon along with his attempts to strengthen the patriarchate.⁴⁴ Nikon's dream of truly forming a "Third Rome" with Tsar Alexis was crushed. In his drive to advance the power of the Church, he had even destroyed the power that it had held before him.⁴⁵ Peter, who would eventually succeed Alexis, did away with the patriarchate and subjected the Church to the state. Nikon who became the focal point of all resentment of the Russian people, was exiled in 1667.

As mentioned earlier, it was upon Avvakum's shoulders that the leadership of the opposition fell. He drew followers to himself by his great moral strength, which showed forth both in his preaching and in his writing. Even Alexis admired him and refused to have him executed when he broke with the official Church.⁴⁶ While imprisoned at Pustozerk, he wrote his autobiography, *Zhitie*, which was a great support to his followers, not to mention an outstanding piece of literature in the vernacular. He was not confident of his skill as a writer, but he was forced to write because of his years in Siberia and in prison.⁴⁷ He wrote:

I am ignorant in knowledge of the word but not in that of reason. I was not taught dialectics, rhetoric and philosophy, but I have within me the understanding of Christ.⁴⁸

Avvakum spent the last thirty years of his life defending the Old Rites, approximately twenty of those years in prison or exile, and in this defense his emotions often knew no bounds. He even asked Tsar Alexis once for permission to dismember Nikon and dispose of Nikon's followers as Elijah had done to the prophets of Baal.⁴⁹ Yet, his personal enemies he forgave and left to Christ judgment of fault.⁵⁰ In his cry, "Give us back our Christ!" he expressed the agony of the Old Believers as they saw the liturgy given them by Christ being changed.⁵¹ In 1664, while Nikon was retired in the country, Avvakum and his wife, whom he portrays as the epitome of faithfulness in his *Zhitie*, returned from exile.⁵² For a short while their hopes were high as Nikon was deposed, but these were dashed when the Council confirmed Nikon's changes and anathematized all who did not accept them.⁵³ Still Avvakum strove on. He was imprisoned at Pustozersk in 1667, where he continued his writing.⁵⁴ On April 14, 1682, he was burned at the stake with these last words:

Brethern, pray always with the sign of the cross and you will never die, but you shall perish if you abandon it.⁵⁵

Superficially, the fight was about such minor changes as the shape of the cross, the way of crossing oneself, the direction of processions, the reading of one of the articles of the Nicene Creed, the spelling of the name of Jesus, the inscription on the crucifix, the number of repetitions of alleluia, the number of holy breads to be consecrated.⁵⁶ Minor changes to risk completely splitting a nation. It is true that formalism in the Russian Orthodox Church had reached the same importance as the content — the liturgy was the faith.⁵⁷ Presuming that the need of the people for stability was such that they could not accept religious change at this time, why could the tsar, who was charged with the care of the souls of his subject, not have slowed down the changes?

This whole question of religious change was complicated by Russia's changing culturally and politically. The tsars were striving to catch up with the rest of Europe, and to do so, they had to create a new social order, one capable of meeting the demands of this new society. This new social order called for subjecting the Church to state authority. The schism (or *raskol*) provided this opportunity, and the Romanov tsars took advantage of it.

The Old Believers argued their case with Alexis, Sophia (daughter of Alexis who served as regent for her brother Ivan V and for Peter, her half brother) and Peter and received a deaf ear from them all.⁵⁸ They were at a loss to grasp what was happening and what to do next. They pleaded that the Old Rites were inseparable from the Russian way of life; to deny them was to deny Russia's roots. They claimed that Moscow was the Third Rome — the vanguard of Orthodoxy; it should be the Greeks conforming to the Russian Rites, for Greek Orthodoxy had received its sign of God's displeasure when Constantinople fell in 1453. To deny that Moscow was the Third Rome was to say that it was no longer the guardian of the true faith but of foolish errors and thus that it was heading the way of the first two Romes, shepherding in the reign of the Anti-Christ.

Following through in their reasoning, the official church not only could not offer salvation but was an obstruction to salvation. Also, the state was forming a secular religion; to belong was to lose one's salvation.⁵⁹ However, accepting these conclusions meant being cut adrift from both Church and state. Their response, then, was to withdraw into their own communities, some with priests, many without. Those without formed theologies that accommodated this fact that they had no ordained clergy and no line of ecclesiastical authority to do so, thus most of these communities denied all the sacraments except baptism.⁶⁰ The Old Believers had little theological training to guide them in their search for answers, thus many strayed into a spiritual abyss and wild extremes.⁶¹

Even though the Council of 1666-67 had anathematized those following the Old Rites, it was the occurrence of three other events

that actually brought about the *raskol*.⁶² The first was the rebellion of Solovetskii Monastery (on the White Sea) against the reforms of Nikon that were confirmed by the Council. Tsar Alexis sent troops that besieged the monastery from 1668 until 1676; when it finally fell, all of its inhabitants were killed. The second event was the uprising headed by Stenka Razin in 1670-71. Solovetskii Monastery was suspected of assisting him, which may have been the reason for the severity of its sentence. The third occurred in May 1682 when the *streltsy* (the muskateers of the Russian army) rebelled against Sophia. The *streltsy* had petitioned for tolerance of the Old Believers, not knowing that Avvakum had been executed a month earlier, but Sophia refused, seeing tolerance as an insult to her father. She finally put down the rebellion and executed the originator of the petition. As a result of the uprising, in 1684 it became a state crime to be an Old Believer — the *raskol* had begun. From now on many social rebellions would march under the banner of the Old Beliefs.

With the birth of Peter, all hope was lost of retaining the old ways.⁶³ Peter had a great love for innovations, especially mechanical. His travels around Europe in the 1690's showed him how backward and isolated Russia was. Upon his return, he immediately began to enforce change in dress; he shocked the people by calling for men to wear trousers and to shave off their beards. He also enjoyed the military, and as tsar, he was to create Russia's first standing army along European lines and its first naval fleet and to involve Russia in many wars.

To support his military adventures, his building of a new westernized capital — St. Petersburg — and other ventures to modernize Russia, he needed money. In this also he followed other European countries; he created a secular state.⁶⁴ This secular state was necessary to mobilize more effectively the country's resources and necessarily brought with it a reordering of society. These changes caused those adhering to the old ways to withdraw even more from society. Not only was the tsar not caring for the salvation of the souls of his subject, he was seeking their damnation by setting up a new religion — the secular state. The lower classes did not enjoy the benefits of this new religion; thus they dared not lose the only redemption of their lives — eternal salvation. To miss out after such a hard life would truly be hell.

Peter did not intend to let the Old Believers quietly withdraw and abstain from society for his new state required the participation of all. Therefore, to withdraw was a treasonable act because it was rejection of the state.⁶⁵ With this reluctance to participate in the new state and new religion, the leadership of the country came to be dominated by the Ukraine while Great Russia was slipping into the shadows.⁶⁶

Whether or not Peter was a religious man, he definitely saw the importance of the Church as a stabilizing force within the fabric of

society.⁶⁷ He allowed the Roman Catholics to build their first church, and although he subjected the Russian Church to the state, he supported it. In many places Old Believers were tolerated as long as they did not evangelize and paid double taxes.⁶⁸ Old Believers formed communities in far northern Russia along frozen lakes and rivers, away from the harassment of the state. In order to support themselves, they traded and/or produced commercial goods, and thus they became valuable to Peter because of their colonization and their productivity.⁶⁹ One such community — the Vyg community — was located along the Vyg River up by the White Sea; in 1720 it numbered 1,500 believers.

This development gave an impetus to Old Believer communities to become commercial centers, bulwarks of the middle class merchants. On the whole, the Old Believers, as compared to their counterparts in the official Church, were more literate and better off financially.⁷⁰ Most of the intelligentsia of Great Russia were Old Believers; few Great Russians show up in lists of writers and artists until the middle of the eighteenth century because of their adherence to the Old Beliefs.⁷²

Even though Peter tolerated some communities of Old Believers, other communities, especially along the lower Volga, were urged strongly to accept the faith of the official Church.⁷³ When possible, the communities withdrew outside of the state's reach; however, families and whole villages committed mass suicide by fire instead of submitting to the state and losing their salvation. These mass suicides peaked under Peter as tens of thousands died; after Peter the suicides continued but at a much lower number until the 1860's⁷⁴ when civil and economic privileges began to be restored. Avvakum accepted and advocated this course of action: "Burning your body, you commend your soul into the hands of God."⁷⁵ Although the Old Believers had held back for awhile from identifying Alexis as the Antichrist, they hated Peter for his rejection of the old ways and setting up a secular state. People bent all different circumstances and names to fit their proofs that Peter was the Antichrist.⁷⁶ There were some who claimed that Peter was a substitute for the true Peter, either switched at birth or during his travels abroad, for the true tsar would not reject the old ways.⁷⁷

The Old Believers came to be seen as obscurantists.⁷⁸ However, most of the lower classes rejected the reforms, practically splitting Russia into two parts: 1) a modernized upper class of around 10% to 15%, and 2) the rest of Russia, mostly Great Russia.⁷⁹ Because of this clinging to the old ways, the conservative element of Great Russia had little constructive input in the building of a new social order.⁸⁰ The Old Believers withdrew and waited for the end of these "last days." Many people converted to the Old Beliefs, seeking the stability — the way it used to be. The lack of desire to effect a change continued until the

present day. They played a major role in the education of the lower classes, since Peter's reforms in education only touched the upper class.⁸¹ They also cared for the destitute in Moscow.⁸² Nevertheless, their main concern was the preservation of dogma and the old ways in their communities.⁸³

Mainly, the opposition of the Old Believers was expressed passively by withdrawing. Along the lower Volga also lived peasants and Cossacks, who were more active in their resistance. Sometimes the two different courses of action overlapped and reinforced each other, as when this region erupted in revolt under the leadership of Pugachev in the 1770's.⁸⁴ At the peak of this revolt, one-fifth of the country had rallied to Pugachev — mostly Great Russians; he got within one hundred miles of Moscow before Russian troops led by the great Austrian officer Suvorov stopped him.⁸⁵

The persecution of the Old Believers continued until late in the eighteenth century, until Catherine II ended it. The Old Believers began to move from the country and the forests into the cities where they became tradesmen and industrialists. They prospered; the communities of Rogozhisky and Preobrashensky in Moscow came to have the greatest concentration of wealth in Moscow. The Old Believers, especially a few leading families, helped bring about the economic evolution in the nineteenth century. However, they were too prosperous; their rapid extension and growth in the economic power caused alarm and triggered a renewal of persecutions in the 1840's under Nicholas I.

The Old Believers were denied recognition as a religious body, even after organizing a hierarchy with the help of a retired Greek metropolitan; they were denied the religious toleration extended to Roman Catholics, Protestants, Moslems and Jews.⁸⁶ N. Melnikov investigated the Old Believers in the middle of the nineteenth century for the tsar and became recognized for his scholarship on the Old Believers. He felt that the Old Believers held the key to revitalizing Russian society but only after they were converted to the official Church because he believed that if the sanctions against the Old Beliefs were lifted, all of Great Russia would convert back.⁸ Thus, the persecutions continued for about twenty years; Alexander II ended them slowly.

In 1863, some civil and economic privileges were returned to the Old Believers, and in 1883 the government restored most civil rights, including identification papers and the ability to change professions as others were able. However, they were still restricted in military and government service and were not respected in their beliefs. The archbishop of Nizhy-Novgorod was made a private and sent to the front during the Russo-Japanese War while the clergy of religions were exempt from military service.⁸⁸

In 1906, the Act of Religious Tolerance gave them full civil

rights, but it did not gain their support as Tsar Nicholas II had hoped. Those who fought with the tsarist forces were anti-revolutionaries; most sat back and watched. In the Time of Troubles, the bourgeoisie and peasants had fought to preserve and restore the tsardom; not in 1917.⁸⁹

In explaining the schism, some historians espouse the Orthodox position: the Old Believers were heretics who confused ritual with its substance.⁹⁰ In their rebellion against all changes by the Church and the state, they found themselves in extremes of fanaticism rife with internal theological and ritualistic contradictions, and they refused any help out of their plight that was extended to them.

Other historians, including Soviet historians, follow the liberal position.⁹¹ This position sees the schism as superficially a religious split but more deeply as an expression of social and political protest against changes brought in from West Europe. These historians point to the *Ulozhenie* (1649), which made most of the lower classes serfs, as the beginning of secularization. Also, though the Old Believers were mostly lower class people, they cannot be explained away as a backward and superstitious people because their literacy rate was higher than their counterpart's in the official Church.

In addition to the points that both positions make, it can also be pointed out that all factions used religion as an expression of their views. The Old Believers clung to the old beliefs, but they, and those sympathetic to them, used their cry for the old beliefs to wage a struggle against the social changes by the Romanov tsars. Peter himself used this theological schism for his own ends in bringing about social change, especially subjecting the Church to the authority of the state; even his secular state was seen as a new religion—a religion of the state. Russia was just in a time period when great popular movements expressed themselves in religious form.

In looking at the schism from another angle, it can be described as Byzantine in form and Western in content.⁹² The Byzantine influence is seen in the splitting of hairs in ritual reform, the court intrigue, the appeal to tradition and the Church Fathers by both sides, and apocalyptic and prophetic passages. The Western content is seen in the doctrinal rigidity and violence, which is epitomized in the struggle between the two *muzhiks* from the Upper Volga — Nikon and Avvakum. Both fought for the extension of the sway of religion against the intrusion of western customs, but in their great fight against one another, both lost, leaving the field open for secularism.

This same story had been played out in preceding years in several West European countries between Roman Catholics and Protestants.⁹³ In some ways, the Roman Catholics were similar to the theocratic answer held by Nikon — rigid dogmatism, Church authority greater than that of the state, and infallibility; and the Protestants mirrored the Old Believers in their fight against ec-

clesiastical power, in their splitting into groups with clergy and without, and in their being well trained in scripture. The outcome was much the same as both forces exhausted themselves fighting each other, leaving a vacuum for secularism to step into with neither side able to combat it.

When the Old Believers lost their battle against Nikon and had no effect on the new secularism, they interpreted the times as the "last days," for there was no salvation in the Church or in the state. They withdrew, cutting themselves off from both state and Church. Although they did good works within society, such as providing education for the lower classes and helping the destitute in Moscow, and although they gathered many converts to the Old Beliefs, they no longer saw their role as one of social change but one of maintaining their traditions. The communities preserved the ancient customs, ideology and family structure. The preachers extolled the virtues of purest Orthodoxy, and the writers defended the faith and cautioned against the dangers of sectarian and cosmopolitan culture.⁹⁴

This separation can be seen in their communities today. Unless forced, an Old Believer will not share table with other Christians.⁹⁵ In 1968, a group splintered off from a large community of Old Believers in Oregon and moved to an unsettled area in Alaska to protect their children from the lures of sinful culture.⁹⁶ The anathemas against the Old Believers have been lifted, yet little has changed.⁹⁷ For they cling to their true ways in the past and cannot move forward, while the Church and the world have moved forward and cannot go back.

Notes

1 David MacKenzie and Michael W. Curran, *A History of Russia and the Soviet Union* (Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1977), p. 90.

2 *Ibid.*, pp. 50-51.

3 Anatole Leroy-Beaulieu, *The Empire of the Tsars and the Russians* (3 vols.; New York: Annis Press, 1969), II, p. 3.

4 *Ibid.*, p. 4.

5 MacKenzie and Curran, p. 168.

6 Jame H. Billington, *The Icon and the Axe* (New York: Vintage Books, 1966), pp. 127-9.

7 Michael Cherniavsky, "The Old Believers and the New Religion," *Slavik Review*, XXV (March, 1966), p. 6.

8 Billington, pp. 118-9.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 129.

10 *Ibid.*, p. 119.

11 *Ibid.*

12 *Ibid.*

13 *Ibid.*, p. 124.

- 14 Serge A. Zenovsky, "The Russian Church Schism: Its Background and Repercussions," *The Russian Review*, XVI (October, 1957), p. 39.
- 15 Cherniavsky, p. 6.
- 16 *Ibid.*
- 17 Billington, p. 6.
- 18 Serge A. Zenovsky, "The Old Believer Avvakum: His Role in Russian Literature," *Indiana Slavic Studies*, I (1956), p. 28.
- 20 Zenkovsky, "Schism," p. 39.
- 21 Billington, p. 136.
- 22 *Ibid.*, p. 125.
- 23 Zenkovsky, "Avvakum," p. 28.
- 24 Leyroy-Beaulieu, pp. 297-8.
- 25 Billington, p. 127.
- 26 *Ibid.*
- 27 *Ibid.*, p. 127-8.
- 28 *Ibid.*, p. 129.
- 29 Cherniavsky, p. 9.
- 30 Billington, p. 137.
- 31 Zenkovsky, "Schism," p. 37.
- 32 Billington, pp. 135-7.
- 33 *Ibid.*, p. 136.
- 34 *Ibid.*, p. 121-4.
- 35 *Ibid.*, p. 156.
- 36 *Ibid.*, p. 131.
- 37 *Ibid.*
- 38 *Ibid.*
- 39 Zenkovsky, "Schism," p. 46.
- 40 Billington, p. 46.
- 41 Cherniavsky, pp. 7-8.
- 42 Billington, p. 137.
- 43 MacKenzie and Curran, p. 135.
- 44 Billington, p. 135.
- 45 *Encyclopedia of Russia and the Soviet Union*, (1961), s.v. "Orthodox Church," by Michael T. Florinsky.
- 46 Zenkovsky, "Avvakum," p. 26.
- 47 *Ibid.*, p. 18.
- 48 *Ibid.*
- 49 *Ibid.*, p. 31.
- 50 *Ibid.*
- 51 Billington, p. 138.
- 52 Zenkovsky, "Avvakum," p. 29.
- 53 Cherniavsky, p. 8.
- 54 Zenkovsky, "Avvakum," p. 1.
- 55 *Ibid.*, p. 32.
- 56 Leroy-Beaulieu, p. 228.
- 57 *Ibid.*, p. 289.
- 58 Zenkovsky, "Schism," pp. 41-2.
- 59 Cherniavsky, p. 36.
- 60 Leroy-Beaulieu, p. 314.
- 61 *Ibid.*
- 62 Cherniavsky, pp. 18-20.
- 63 Billington, p. 148.
- 64 Cherniavsky, p. 35.
- 65 *Ibid.*, p. 36.

- 66 Zenkovsky, "Schism," p. 47.
- 67 Billington, pp. 184-5.
- 68 Cherniavsky, p. 33.
- 69 Billington, p. 194.
- 70 *Ibid.*, p. 193.
- 71 Zenkovsky, "Schism," p. 52.
- 72 *Ibid.*, pp. 47-8.
- 73 Billington, p. 194.
- 74 Cherniavsky, p. 21.
- 75 Billington, p. 157.
- 76 Cherniavsky, p. 31.
- 77 *Ibid.*, p. 29.
- 78 Zenkovsky, "Avvakum," p. 2.
- 79 MacKenzie and Curran, p. 175.
- 80 Billington, p. 195.
- 81 Ethel and Stephen P. Dunn, "Religion as an Instrument of Cultural Change: The Problem of the Sects in the Soviet Union," *Slavic Review*, XXIII (September, 1964), p. 460.
- 82 Billington, p. 197.
- 83 Zenkovsky, "Schism," pp. 50-1.
- 84 Billington, p. 192.
- 85 Zenkovsky, "Schism," p. 53.
- 86 *Ibid.*, p. 54.
- 87 *Ibid.*, p. 52.
- 88 *Ibid.*, p. 54.
- 89 *Ibid.*, pp. 54, 57-8.
- 90 Cherniavsky, pp. 1-2.
- 91 *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.
- 92 Billington, pp. 150-1.
- 93 *Ibid.*, pp. 150-9.
- 94 Zenkovsky, "Schism," pp. 50-1.
- 95 Jim Rearden, "A Bit of Old Russia Takes Root in Alaska," *National Geographic*, CXLII (September, 1972), p. 418.
- 96 *Ibid.*, pp. 410-11.
- 97 Anton S. Beliajeff, "The Old Believers in the United States," *Russian Review*, XXXVI (January, 1977), p. 78.

Figure 1

Summary of Ecclesiastical Controversy	
1652-4	Nikon decrees changes in ritual and publishes new missals.
1654-6	Through a series of councils, Nikon forces acceptance of his changes and condemnation of the priestly opposition.
1656	Small number of priestly opposition led by Avvakum is severely punished and exiled.
1658	Abdication or removal of Nikon — opposition returns and pleads for reversal with Tsar Alexis. So far, only ecclesiastical controversy and question of obedience.
1666	Council of Russian bishops offer a compromise to Avvakum and his group — refused.
1666-7	Patriarchal Council. Old Practices and texts — heretical and refusing to obey — anathemized called for secular punishment. Avvakum—tongue cut out and imprisoned at Pustozersk, burned at stake in 1682.
1680's	Schism spreading all over Russia.

Loyola University Student Historical Association

Thomas Maher President
Susan Bonin. Vice-President
Bruce Salmestrelli Secretary
Keith Kramer. Treasurer
Dr. David Moore Advisor

Phi Alpha Theta

Dinah Payne President
Jane Macke Vice-President
Keith Kramer Secretary
Jan Barrett Treasurer
Dr. David Moore Advisor