



CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE

# DOSTOEVSKY AND THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION

EDITED BY  
GEORGE PATTISON AND  
DIANE OENNING THOMPSON

CAMBRIDGE

[www.cambridge.org/9780521782784](http://www.cambridge.org/9780521782784)

This page intentionally left blank

## DOSTOEVSKY AND THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION

Dostoevsky is one of Russia's greatest novelists and a major influence in modern debates about religion, both in Russia and the West. This collection brings together Western and Russian perspectives on the issues raised by the religious element in his work. The aim of this collection is not to abstract Dostoevsky's religious 'teaching' from his literary works, but to explore the interaction between his Christian faith and his writing. The essays cover such topics as temptation, grace and law, Dostoevsky's use of the gospels and hagiography, Trinitarianism, and the Russian tradition of the veneration of icons, as well as reading aloud, and dialogism. In addition to an exploration of the impact of the Christian tradition on Dostoevsky's major novels, *Crime and Punishment*, *The Idiot* and *The Brothers Karamazov*, there are also discussions of lesser known works such as *The Landlady* and *A Little Boy at Christ's Christmas Tree*.

GEORGE PATTISON is Dean of Chapel at King's College, Cambridge. He has published widely in the field of philosophy of religion and his books include *Kierkegaard: The Aesthetic and the Religious* (1992), *Anxious Angels: A Retrospective View of Religious Existentialism* (1999) and *The Routledge GuideBook to the Later Heidegger* (2000). He has also taught at St Andrew's Biblical-Theological College in Moscow.

DIANE OENNING THOMPSON is Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Slavonic Studies at the University of Cambridge and has taught Russian literature in the United States. Her book *The Brothers Karamazov and the Poetics of Memory* (1991) was recently translated into Russian and published by the Academic Project in St Petersburg. Her articles on Dostoevsky have appeared in several international collections.

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN RUSSIAN LITERATURE

*General editor* CATRIONA KELLY

*Editorial board* ANTHONY CROSS, CARYL EMERSON,  
BARBARA HELDT, MALCOLM JONES, DONALD RAYFIELD,  
G. S. SMITH, VICTOR TERRAS

*Recent titles in this series include*

*The Last Soviet Avant-Garde: OBERIU – Fact, Fiction, Metafiction*

GRAHAM ROBERTS

*Literary Journals in Imperial Russia*

edited by DEBORAH A. MARTINSEN

*Russian Modernism: The Transfiguration of the Everyday*

STEPHEN C. HUTCHINGS

*Reading Russian Fortunes*

*Print Culture, Gender and Divination in Russia from 1765*

FAITH WIGZELL

*English literature and the Russian Aesthetic Renaissance*

RACHEL POLONSKY

*Christianity in Bakhtin: God and the Exiled Author*

RUTH COATES

*The Development of Russian Verse: Meter and its Meaning*

MICHAEL WACHTEL

*Nabokov and his Fiction: New Perspectives*

edited by JULIAN W. CONNOLLY

*Russian Literature, Modernism and the Visual Arts*

edited by CATRIONA KELLY AND STEPHEN LOVELL

A complete list of titles in the series is given at the back of the book

DOSTOEVSKY  
AND THE CHRISTIAN  
TRADITION

EDITED BY  
GEORGE PATTISON  
AND  
DIANE OENNING THOMPSON



CAMBRIDGE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 8RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

[www.cambridge.org](http://www.cambridge.org)

Information on this title: [www.cambridge.org/9780521782784](http://www.cambridge.org/9780521782784)

© Cambridge University Press 2001

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provision of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published in print format 2001

ISBN-13 978-0-511-40278-4 eBook (Adobe Reader)

ISBN-13 978-0-521-78278-4 hardback

ISBN-13 978-0-521-06295-4 paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of urls for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

# Contents

<i>Notes on contributors</i>	page vii
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	x
<i>Notes on conventions and abbreviations</i>	xi
Introduction: Reading Dostoevsky religiously <i>George Pattison and Diane Oenning Thompson</i>	1
PART I DOSTOEVSKY AND THE PRACTICE OF ORTHODOXY	
1 Dostoevsky and the kenotic tradition <i>Margaret Ziolkowski</i>	31
2 Dostoevsky's markings in the Gospel according to St John <i>Irina Kirillova</i>	41
3 Icons in Dostoevsky's works <i>Sophie Ollivier</i>	51
4 Problems of the biblical word in Dostoevsky's poetics <i>Diane Oenning Thompson</i>	69
PART II DOSTOEVSKY AND CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY	
5 Dostoevsky in the prism of the orthodox semiosphere <i>Avril Pyman</i>	103
6 The categories of Law and Grace in Dostoevsky's poetics <i>Ivan Esaulov</i>	116
7 <i>The Brothers Karamazov</i> as trinitarian theology <i>David S. Cunningham</i>	134

8	Reading and incarnation in Dostoevsky <i>Eric J. Ziolkowski</i>	156
PART III READING DOSTOEVSKY RELIGIOUSLY: CASE STUDIES		
9	Towards an iconography of <i>Crime and Punishment</i> <i>Antony Johae</i>	173
10	Pavel Smerdyakov and Ivan Karamazov: The problem of temptation <i>Vladimir Kantor</i>	189
11	Beyond the will: Humiliation as Christian necessity in <i>Crime and Punishment</i> <i>Henry M. W. Russell</i>	226
12	Freedom's dangerous dialogue: reading Dostoevsky and Kierkegaard together <i>George Pattison</i>	237
	<i>Bibliography</i>	257
	<i>Index</i>	275

## *Notes on contributors*

DAVID S. CUNNINGHAM is Professor of Theology and Ethics at Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois. He is the author of *These Three are One: The Practice of Trinitarian Theology* (1998), and the co-editor of *Ecumenical Theology in Worship, Doctrine, and Life* (1999). He recently held the Alan Richardson Fellowship at the University of Durham, where he began work on a project on the doctrine of revelation.

CARYL EMERSON is A. Watson Armour III University Professor of Slavic Languages and Literatures at Princeton University, with a co-appointment in Comparative Literature. Well known as a translator and critic of the Russian literary critic and philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin, she has also published widely on nineteenth-century Russian literature (Pushkin, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Chekhov), on the history of literary criticism, and on Russian opera and vocal music. Most recently she is the author of *The First Hundred Years of Mikhail Bakhtin* (1997) and a brief biography of Modest Mussorgsky (1999) in the Cambridge series 'Musical Lives'.

IVAN A. ESAULOV is Professor at the Department of Theoretical and Historical Poetics, Russian State University for the Humanities (RGGU), Moscow. He is the author of numerous articles and four monographs, of which the most recent are *Kategoriia sobornosti v russkoi literature* (*The Category of Sobornost' in Russian Literature*) (1995), and *Spektr adekvatnosti v istolkovanii literaturnogo proizvedeniia* (*The Spectrum of Adequacy in the Interpretation of the Literary Work*) (1997). He is also an editor of the periodical *Postsimvolizm kak iavleniie kul'tury* (1995– ). His main area of specialisation is in the poetics of Old Russian and Russian literature, and the philosophy of religion.

ANTONY JOHAE is Associate Professor in the Department of English

Language and Literature, Kuwait University. He has also taught in Britain, Germany, Ghana and Tunisia. His published articles on Dostoevsky include 'Idealism and the dialectic in *The Brothers Karamazov*' (1981), 'Dostoevsky's walls and Holbein's paintings' (1993) and 'Groundwork for a comparative study of Dostoevsky and Kafka' (1997). He has also published articles on Zamyatin and Trotsky as well as Swift, Coleridge, Dickens, Orwell, Soyinka, Kafka, Mann and Grass.

VLADIMIR KANTOR is Professor at Moscow State University, a novelist, philosopher and literary critic whose main scholarly interests lie in the area of the philosophy of Russian history and culture. He is the author of numerous articles, as well as a book on *The Brothers Karamazov* (1983). His two latest books are: '...est' evropeiskaia derzhava': Rossiia: trudnyi put' k tsivilizatsii: Istoriosofskie ocherki (1997) and *Fenomen russkogo evropeitsa* (1999). He is on the Editorial Board of the journal *Voprosy filosofii* (*Questions of Philosophy*). He was awarded the Heinrich Böll Prize in 1992.

IRINA KIRILLOVA is Fellow and Reader Emerita of Newnham College, Cambridge, and Lecturer in Russian (retired) in the Department of Slavonic Studies in the University of Cambridge. She has also lectured extensively on Dostoevsky in Russia. She is presently working on a book on *The Idiot*.

SOPHIE OLLIVIER is Honorary Professor of Russian Literature in the Michel de Montaigne University, Bordeaux, and has also taught at University College, Dublin and the Alliance Française, Dublin. She is the author of many articles on Russian literature. She has lately been working on nineteenth-century Irish history.

GEORGE PATTISON is Dean of Chapel at King's College, Cambridge. His publications include *Kierkegaard: The Aesthetic and the Religious, From the Magic Theatre to the Crucifixion of the Image* (1992) and *Anxious Angels: A Retrospective View of Religious Existentialism* (1999). His most recent book is *The Routledge GuideBook to the Later Heidegger* (2000).

AVRIL PYMAN is Reader Emerita in Russian at the University of Durham. She is the author of *The Life of Aleksandr Blok* (1979–80) and *A History of Russian Symbolism* (1994). She has edited several books, and translated Turgenev's *Fathers and Children*; she has also translated a collection of Russian papers on Shakespeare.

HENRY M. W. RUSSELL is Associate Professor at Ave Maria College, Ypsilanti, Michigan, and is Associate Editor of *The Formalist*. He is presently collecting materials for an encyclopedia of Christian influence in American literature.

DIANE OENNING THOMPSON is Affiliated Lecturer in the Department of Slavonic Studies in the University of Cambridge. She is the author of *The Brothers Karamazov and the Poetics of Memory* (1991) as well as a number of articles on Dostoevsky. Her main interests are in nineteenth-century Russian literature and poetics.

ERIC J. ZIOLKOWSKI is Professor of Religion at Lafayette College, Easton, Pennsylvania. He is the author of *The Sanctification of Don Quixote: From Hidalgo to Priest* (1991) and *Evil Children in Religion, Literature, and Art* (2001). He is also the Editor of *A Museum of Faiths: Histories and Legacies of the 1893 World's Parliament of Religions* (1993).

MARGARET ZIOLKOWSKI is Professor of Russian at Miami University, Ohio, and is the author of *Hagiography and Modern Russian Literature* (1988) and *Literary Exorcisms of Stalin: Russian Writers and the Soviet Past* (1998). She is currently working on a translation of the Life of Boyarynya Feodosya Morozova, a seventeenth-century Old Believer. Her field of specialisation is Russian literature in general, and she has recently been working on the image of women in Old Russian literature.

## *Acknowledgments*

The idea for this volume originated at the conference 'Crime, Punishment and Christ: Reading Dostoevsky Religiously' held at the Centre for the Study of Literature and Theology in the University of Glasgow in 1995. We are therefore greatly indebted to the Centre and to its director, Professor David Jasper. We are also greatly indebted to all who took part in the conference, especially those who contributed through the presentation of papers or participation in discussions to mould the final form of the chapters offered here.

We are especially grateful to our editor at Cambridge University Press, Linda Bree, who has helped steer this collection through many hurdles to final publication. Catriona Kelly read the whole typescript and gave us valuable advice for improving the volume. We should also like to thank Natalya Ashimbaeva of the Dostoevsky Museum, St Petersburg and the Museum itself for permission to reproduce the icon used on the front cover. For help of various kinds we are grateful to Jolita Adomeiene, John Barber, Alan Burns, Bobby Coe, Larissa Fradkin, Teresa Jones, Sue Needham, Nina Perlina, Rosemary Rodd, Natalya Rubenstein and Ray Scrivens. We wish to express our warmest thanks to Caryl Emerson for her stalwart support, for her many helpful comments and for so generously and rapidly coming to our aid with her translation of Vladimir Kantor's chapter.

## *Note on conventions and abbreviations*

All quotations from Dostoevsky's works are, in the case of Russianist contributors, taken from the Academy Edition, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v tridtsatykh tomakh*, Leningrad, 1973–90. Volume and page numbers are indicated in brackets; volumes split into two separate books are indicated by volume number, i or ii, followed by page numbers. Translations from the Russian are by the individual contributors.

Contributors using English translations of Dostoevsky's works provide the names of translators and editions in notes, with page numbers being indicated in brackets within the text of their chapters. Contributors' ellipses within quotations are indicated by < . . . >. The transliteration system used has been divided into two parts: (1) the British Standard is used for proper names, hence, Dostoevsky rather than Dostoevskii; (2) the Library of Congress system has been used to transliterate all quotations of Russian words as well as proper names and titles for publications cited or available only in Russian.



## *Introduction: Reading Dostoevsky religiously*

*George Pattison and Diane Oenning Thompson*

Dostoevsky has emerged as the most provocative writer in Russian literature, the one who speaks most to the modern human condition. His influence on world literature has been immense. Artists working in other media have found inspiration in Dostoevsky for their own translations of his works into opera, drama, film and the graphic arts. He has stimulated writers and thinkers of the most diverse persuasions and callings (philosophers, theologians, marxists, conservatives, psychologists, literary critics). Books, articles, critical debates, comments, allusions abound. His themes of crime, urban alienation, family breakdown, psychic derangement, the decline of religious faith, as well as his penetrating psychological insight and prophetic grasp of the murderous potential of modern totalitarian ideologies and of the social and spiritual chaos spawned by unrestrained capitalism, profoundly resonate with the twentieth century. Other nineteenth-century writers took up these themes; few matched Dostoevsky's psychological acumen, none his ideological prescience.

But what is above all peculiar to Dostoevsky is his genius for eliciting strong pro or contra responses, for tempting us to make global, essentially religious statements. Dostoevsky had a gift, virtually unique among modern writers, for making Christianity dynamic, for subtly forcing the ideological challenges of the modern age to interact dialogically with his Christian vision and for embodying this vision in psychologically compelling characters. To 'read Dostoevsky religiously', then, would mean to engage with this dialogue which runs through his entire post-Siberian oeuvre. This makes those who would rather bypass the religious issues uneasy; they are more comfortable discussing the psychology of his characters and the ideas debated in his fiction. But, given the prominence of biblical motifs and of references to doctrinal, liturgical and devotional elements in

the Christian tradition, it is almost impossible *not* to read Dostoevsky religiously. His treatment of the human personality is at once modern – he was a master at conveying the very feel of consciousness, with its acute self-awareness, its tensions between conflicting thoughts, impulses and desires – and biblical, in that he translated psychological complexity into a struggle between good and evil in the human soul. Eric Auerbach attributed Dostoevsky's powerful impact in Europe to the peculiar nature of Russian realism which was based on old Christian realism, complicated by the Russians' 'coming to terms with European civilization', ever vacillating between categorical acceptance and rejection.<sup>1</sup> A brief historical survey may clarify the peculiar concatenation of social and cultural forces which engendered these extreme oscillations and nurtured and stimulated Dostoevsky's singular artistic vision.

#### THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Until the eighteenth century, Russian literature was almost exclusively Christian in form and content (hagiographies, sermons, liturgical works, spiritual verses, religious folk verse). Even the chronicles, heroic folk songs and patriotic epics (*byliny*), though not sacred genres *per se*, served to promote the pre-eminence of Christianity. For example, *The Lay of Igor's Campaign*, the literary masterpiece of medieval Russia, ends with a paen to the princes 'who fight for the Christians against the infidel hosts'. The *byliny* on *Il'ya of Murom* typically extol those 'mighty heroes in Holy Russia' who 'defend the Christian faith'. However, Peter the Great (1672–1725) saw his princely role in quite a different light. His aim was to turn Russia into a great power on an equal footing with the major powers of Western Europe. In pursuance of this goal, Peter adopted the ideology of enlightened absolutism and by sheer force of will drove Russia on a course of rapid modernisation. All institutions were absorbed into the bureaucratic machinery and routine of the state. The Church was deprived of its autonomy and made subordinate to the state, the clergy became, in Georges Florovsky's words 'state servitors'. As Florovsky says, what was most revolutionary in Peter's reforms was not the Westernisation or modernisation of Russia but its secularisation.<sup>2</sup> For along with the modernisation of the state according to Western models, came a massive influx of Western ideas which at that time were steeped in the values of the Enlight-

enment. The Enlightenmenters, inspired by the growth in scientific knowledge, placed their faith in reason, rejected traditional authority and revelation, and were largely anti-religious, empiricist, naturalist and materialist. The impact of these ideas in Russia resulted in the bifurcation of Russian society into two different, mutually uncomprehending nations: a small, educated, Westernised elite and the enormous mass of peasant believers who – at least until the mid-eighteenth century – resided in a patriarchal world, shaped by centuries of Orthodoxy and serfdom and scarcely touched by Western influences.

The Petrine reforms also introduced Western cultural forms (primarily French) into Russia on a large scale so that, by the end of the eighteenth century, Russian literature, which was mainly fashioned on French Neoclassicism and the West European baroque, had become almost totally Europeanised and secularised. New secular forms and themes (nature, love lyrics) appeared, and classical allusions, sometimes implying a humanist ideal, became common. Not that Christian themes had disappeared; we have only to recall the devotional odes of Lomonosov and various lyrics of Derzhavin and Zhukovsky to be reminded that religious faith was still the norm. But by the late eighteenth century expressions of Christian piety were mostly cast in secular, literary forms (the lyric, ode, epic, drama, short story and, in the nineteenth century, the novel), and the sacred genres had virtually disappeared from mainstream literature. When, almost a century later, Dostoevsky wrote a saint's life complete with sermons ('The Russian Monk'), into which he poured his most cherished beliefs, he did not publish it as a separate work but boldly incorporated it into a novel (*The Brothers Karamazov*). This was very risky in that the novel, pre-eminently a secular form, threatens to relativise the religious content. 'The Russian Monk' remains, artistically and ideologically, the most controversial part of the great novel. But then, Dostoevsky himself said he wrote Zosima's discourses only 'for the few' (30,105).

The early nineteenth century saw a religious revival largely stimulated by the new secular conditions and the challenge they posed to the religious heritage. The tension between Western European ideas, from the Enlightenment to utopian socialism, and the native religious tradition gave powerful stimulus to a period of extraordinary creativity in literature. After the Napoleonic invasion of 1812, Russian writers broke with French Neoclassicism, and

turned for inspiration to the new works of the German and English Romantics as well as to native folklore and the literature of pre-Petrine Russia. The stylistic rules of Neoclassicism had come to seem constraining, artificial, lacking those expressive possibilities which were called for by the new sensibility of Romanticism and, subsequently, realism. The search for new forms and modes of expression became entangled with the question of nationalism as Russian writers sought to discern what was unique about Russia, what was its particular national character. Pushkin entered this debate in an essay of 1822 in which he defined Orthodoxy as the distinctive feature of the Russian national character: 'the Greek creed, different from all others, gives us our particular national character'.<sup>3</sup> However, from the late 1830s, initially under the influence of Russia's first prominent radical critic, Vissarion Belinsky, Russian literary criticism was dominated by the revolutionary democrats who were atheist, anti-religious and materialist. The intelligentsia became progressively polarised between those who urged the adoption of Western ideas as a solution to Russia's problems and those who identified with the people's faith and native traditions, a split which is reflected in Dostoevsky's depictions of his contemporary society and which is still evident today. Dostoevsky is a pivotal figure who gave his allegiance to Christianity and at the same time registered with acute sensitivity the pressures bearing down on it from the imminent modern age.

Belinsky's ideological progeny (N. G. Chernyshevsky, N. A. Dobrolyubov, D. I. Pisarev) of the 1860s, the high point of radical criticism, adopted a utilitarian approach according to which works were judged by their usefulness in the political struggle. Art was treated as a social document, its purpose, to portray objective reality from a socially critical perspective. These ideas were later to have a marked influence on Lenin, a lifelong admirer of Chernyshevsky, and in 1934 hardened into the baleful Communist Party dogma of Socialist Realism. Fortunately the great nineteenth-century writers of the post-Pushkin period (Gogol, Tyutchev, Lermontov, Turgenev, Leskov, Tolstoy, Chekhov) went their own way, paying scant heed to the radicals' call for socio-political relevance, and in the process they created one of the world's great literatures. But it was Dostoevsky who had the most acute ear for the historical implications of the radicals' utopian programmes. His remarkable prescience finds, perhaps, its most succinct expression in *The Brothers Karamazov*.

Towards the end of Ivan Karamazov's nightmare conversation with the devil, the key idea which led to the parricide is finally revealed. Appropriately, it comes from the mouth of the devil, as he taunts Ivan by quoting his most recent work on the imminent advent of a new age which will place its faith in the triumph of science:

The new people [the radicals of Ivan's generation] propose to destroy everything < . . . > Stupid people, they didn't ask me! < . . . > one only needs to destroy in mankind the idea of God < . . . > Once humanity to a man renounces God < . . . > all the former morality will fall away and everything new will begin! < . . . > man will conquer nature without limits by his will and science. (15,83)

Indeed, Dostoevsky's worst forebodings about obliterating 'the idea of God' and constructing society on 'science' were realised in the Soviet period. For the Communist Party went much farther than Peter the Great: its aim was the total obliteration of religion, the total secularisation of Soviet life. The Soviet rulers, determined to impose their militantly atheistic ideology of Marxism–Leninism on the religiously diverse lands over which they ruled, engaged in ruthless, wide-scale attempts to expunge religion (including Judaism, Islam and others) from Soviet life. The Orthodox Church, to which the majority belonged, was (especially after 1929) subjected to wholesale persecution. Many priests were imprisoned, tortured or murdered, numerous churches were looted, closed or razed, religious education was abolished, seminaries were closed, and religious 'propaganda' was prohibited.<sup>4</sup> Those who openly held to their faith were subjected to ridicule, ostracism or worse. It became totally taboo to discuss religious topics in literature and historiography. At the same time, the State, in promoting its creed of atheism, borrowed the symbols and iconography of Christianity and transformed them into its own image.<sup>5</sup> The anti-religious campaign extended to a philistine orthographical censorship; initial capitals designating divine persons were reduced to small-case letters in all publications, including reissues of pre-1917 texts. (Unfortunately, some Western critics citing Soviet editions perpetuate this censorship). The Church finally capitulated and agreed to be 'legalised' by the regime. During the Second World War, Stalin, in a cynical effort to drum up patriotism, relented. The Church was allowed to hold services, rebuild its administrative structure and open a few theological schools. During 1959–64, however, these gains were severely curtailed. Khrushchev renewed the persecution of the Church,

though more covertly by corrupting it from within. KGB operatives were placed to oversee Church affairs and priests were to report any confessions deemed anti-Soviet. Other faiths also suffered suppression. The Brezhnev era was one of stagnation in all areas of national life. The turning point came in 1988 when, for the first time, a Soviet leader of state, Mikhail Gorbachev, shared a national platform with the Patriarch in celebration of the Millennium of Christianity in Russia. Three years later the atheist state collapsed. This historical situation is reflected in the history of Dostoevsky criticism.

#### THE VICISSITUDES OF DOSTOEVSKY CRITICISM

Dostoevsky lived at a time when the Christian tradition was far more familiar than it is today, and in a society which shared a common Christian culture. But even then he keenly felt its encroaching erosion. In his notebooks for *The Brothers Karamazov*, there is a sketch for a conversation in which Miusov, Ivan and Fyodor Karamazov mangle biblical quotations, after which Dostoevsky laments: 'No one knows the Gospels', and polemically proceeds to correct his fictional characters' errors (15,206). Nevertheless, during the last decade of his life, he was increasingly hailed as a spiritual guide and prophet. Ordinary readers saw him as a 'teacher of life' and turned to him for consolation, advice and solutions to their dilemmas. While Dostoevsky's works attracted considerable favourable attention in his lifetime, negative responses to his Christianity were occasionally voiced and they came from both ends of the ideological spectrum. Shortly after Dostoevsky's death in 1881, the radical atheist critic M. A. Antonovich published an article on *The Brothers Karamazov* with the title 'A Mystic-Ascetic Novel' in which he condemned it as a 'reactionary' work and perversely identified the Grand Inquisitor's views with those of Dostoevsky. Another critic on the left, N. K. Mikhailovsky, in an article of 1883, pronounced Dostoevsky a 'cruel talent'. Maxim Gorky styled him an 'evil genius' and in 1913 opposed the staging of *The Devils* by the Moscow Arts Theatre. On the conservative side, Dostoevsky was upbraided for being insufficiently Orthodox. The writer Konstantin Leontiev, who died a monk in 1891, took strong exception to Dostoevsky's 'made up' depictions of monastic life and 'rosy' Christianity. More pertinently, Leontiev found his Christianity heretical because he never abandoned the socialist utopian promise of paradise on earth rather

than in heaven. Indeed, many members of the Church hierarchy have, with some reason, regarded his Christianity with uneasiness, if not suspicion. Dostoevsky was a confessed Orthodox Christian, but his relationship with official Orthodoxy remains unclear since, unlike some of his contemporaries, notably Tolstoy and Turgenev, he was very private about his own spiritual experience and not given to public personal confessions. Moreover, although his art was nourished by the Orthodox tradition, it also bears significant traces of German Pietism and Protestantism.<sup>6</sup> However, Dostoevsky's literary reputation continued to grow. From his death until 1917 a number of prominent writers, among them, D. S. Merezhkovsky, V. V. Rozanov, A. L. Volynsky, V. L. Komarovich, Viacheslav Ivanov and the religious philosopher Vladimir Soloviev illuminatingly explored the Christian themes in his works.

If negative criticism of Dostoevsky's Christianity did not begin with the Soviet period, at least before 1917 it benignly co-existed with sympathetic evaluations. After the Bolshevik Revolution, however, it began to matter that Lenin, who was held up as the infallible judge in all artistic and ideological matters, had called Dostoevsky 'ultra-repulsive'. He was reported to have pronounced Dostoevsky's writings to be 'trash' and singled out *The Devils* and *The Brothers Karamazov* (of which he read no further than the early monastery scenes) as 'putrid works'.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, the 1920s and early 1930s saw the publication of important textological, editorial, biographical and literary studies (L. Grossman, A. S. Dolinin, Iu. N. Tynianov). In 1929 M. M. Bakhtin, Dostoevsky's greatest critic, published his seminal study *Problems of Dostoevsky's Creative Work* (*Problemy kvorchestva Dostoevskogo*).

The 1930s, however, marked a turn for the worse. At the First Congress of Soviet Writers in 1934, Gorky, the keynote speaker, renewed his attack on Dostoevsky, though he allowed that his 'genius was indisputable; perhaps only Shakespeare equals him in power of portrayal'.<sup>8</sup> The mid 1930s to mid 1950s, was a dismal period for interpretative and speculative studies on Dostoevsky. The Soviet overseers of literature proscribed a sympathetic treatment of Dostoevsky's religious themes; if treated, they had to be accompanied by ritual denigrations of the 'cult' of Christianity, and sprinkled with quotes from Lenin or Stalin.<sup>9</sup> Two important studies, V. Kirpotkin's (1946) and A. S. Dolinin's (1947), were submitted for publication, but they came under the censure of A. Zhdanov, Stalin's notorious

spokesman for cultural affairs, and were published only after Stalin's death.

In 1955, thanks to the literary 'thaw', some favourable remarks about Dostoevsky reportedly made by Lenin came to light to the effect that he was a writer of 'true genius' who examined 'some sore spots' in Russian society.<sup>10</sup> An official re-evaluation took place that emphasised and approved Dostoevsky's early involvement with socialist utopian ideals, his humanitarian concerns, his anti-capitalist stance and his realistic representations of the poor and oppressed, but condemned his religious philosophical views and routinely warned readers of the dangers of taking them seriously. *Notes from the House of the Dead* was extolled for its exposure of the brutal tsarist penal system. Yet, Dostoevsky's religious concerns were still taboo, to be mentioned only in the context of vilification. The works that came in for the most vehement criticism were *Notes from the Underground*, *The Devils* and *The Brothers Karamazov*. Among those who periodically attacked Dostoevsky's religious views, V. V. Ermilov was particularly vociferous, going so far as to assert that *The Brothers Karamazov* illustrates the 'amorality' of Christianity in that it shows Christ as having purchased the 'right to torment children' because 'he redeemed all men's sins.'<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, in 1963 Bakhtin's study was reissued in a revised and expanded edition under the title *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Bakhtin was profoundly aware of the Christian foundation of Dostoevsky's poetics, but, given the constraints of Soviet censorship and his own precarious position, could never treat it openly. Near the end of his life, he poignantly spoke of his deep regret that he was not able to write 'directly about the main questions', to do justice to what had 'tormented Dostoevsky all his life – the existence of God < . . . > I had constantly to prevaricate < . . . > to keep myself in hand. As soon as a thought came, I had to stop it.'<sup>12</sup>

Dostoevsky studies took a more favourable turn in the 1970s. In 1973 the first volume of the Academy Edition of Dostoevsky's complete works appeared. The late Academician G. Fridlender, in a heroic feat of editorship, saw the whole project through to its completion in 1990. This outstanding work of devoted scholarship, to which some of the best scholars in Russia contributed, suffers from one serious flaw which was not the fault of the editor and contributors; namely, they were not allowed to use Dostoevsky's capitals for divine persons. Evidently, this was one factor which

prompted V. N. Zakharov to undertake a new complete edition in the old orthography in which Dostoevsky wrote his works.<sup>13</sup> This is not just nitpicking pedantry. In 1928 Dmitry Likhachev, the distinguished Russian medievalist, in response to the 'particularly merciless attacks on the Church' during 1927–28, wrote a paper ('half in jest, half seriously') in which he mounted a spirited attack on the alphabet reform imposed by the Bolsheviks in 1918, and defended the old orthography on linguistic, historical, aesthetic and Orthodox grounds.<sup>14</sup> He declared that the imposition of the new orthography was 'the act of an anti-Christ power', and a further rupturing of the Russian language from its Church Slavonic roots which, because the abolished letters were spiritually symbolic, drained Russian of some of its most Orthodox features.<sup>15</sup> For example, he decries the loss of the common letter *iat'*, whose shape symbolises the Church with a cross on top. Within days Likhachev was arrested and sent to the notorious camp of Solovki. This paper was used as evidence against him. The loss of the old letters and the abolition of initial capitals for divine persons affect interpretations. The Grand Inquisitor's speech is replete with capitalised pronouns for his addressee, and *iat's* as well as other old letters abound, a feature totally lost in translation. Here it becomes visible that the Grand Inquisitor is defeated even orthographically by Christ.

Given this situation in their native country, it was left to the Russian emigrés to pursue the religious dimension in Dostoevsky's writings. Here too his works attracted an outstanding group of literary critics and religious philosophers, among them K. Mochulsky, N. Berdyaev, L. Shestov, M. Slonim, N. Trubetskoy and N. Lossky. Some read Dostoevsky perhaps too religiously, seeing him as a prophet and messenger of God to the exclusion of some of the complexities of his work. Berdyaev concluded his well-known book on Dostoevsky with what may be the most exalted tribute ever paid to a writer of fiction: 'So great is the worth of Dostoevsky that to have produced him is by itself sufficient justification for the existence of the Russian people in the world; and he will bear witness for his countrymen at the Last Judgment of the nations.'<sup>16</sup> Given that such a vital part of Russian life was under violent attack in their native land, it was understandable that they looked to Dostoevsky as a refuge and repository of Orthodox spirituality, as, in Berdyaev's words, a 'spiritual homeland'.

At present we are witnessing in Russia a great upsurge of interest

in religion and a revival of the Orthodox Church. This has created an atmosphere favourable to religious readings. Held back for decades by Soviet censorship, Russian scholars are freely exploring the religious themes in their literature. Since the collapse of the Soviet regime, Dostoevsky studies in Russia have entered a particularly active phase. Symposia, seminars, exhibits, meetings and studies by young as well as established scholars are proliferating, among them V. E. Vetlovskaya, V. N. Zakharov, B. N. Tikhomirov, I. A. Esaulov, N. Ashimbaeva, L. I. Saraskina, to mention a few.<sup>17</sup> The publication of previously forbidden emigré critics, thinkers and philosophers of religion as well as seminal Western works have greatly enriched debates and scholarly work within Russia.<sup>18</sup> If just occasionally there is an exaggerated emphasis on Russian Orthodox concerns, this is only part of the process of restoring to Russia its cultural memory, of salvaging its best and of coming to terms with its worst, with those events which should be remembered but never repeated. Russia is a traumatised nation, deeply scarred by the horrific events of the twentieth century. This is not always sufficiently appreciated by those who live in stable democratic societies. We have only to imagine St Paul's Cathedral in London being turned into a museum of atheism, Notre Dame de Paris being replaced by a swimming pool, or the Vatican being closed to the public and occupied by an atheist government to gain some idea of what it must have been like for many to witness helplessly (to protest was futile or dangerous) such vandalistic desecration of their religious heritage. As the Russians search for new values, or rediscover old ones to fill the moral vacuum left by the collapse of the Soviet regime, Dostoevsky's works have acquired fresh relevance, as the contributions of Esaulov and Kantor to this volume demonstrate. This gives renewed impetus to the question of what it may mean to read Dostoevsky religiously now.

Two main tendencies can be discerned, each corresponding to the two main senses of 'religiously'. Neither is new. The first adopts a reverential attitude towards Dostoevsky's creative writings, turning them into a springboard for 'co-philosophising' or sermonising. This runs the danger of 'monologising' them, of forgetting that they are works of the imagination subject to aesthetic judgment and rhetorical analysis. However, Dostoevsky's prophetic and spiritual insights resonate beyond the concerns of aesthetics, rhetoric and literary criticism. To read him religiously in the sense of seeking spiritual

illumination is a common and potentially rewarding approach. As Caryl Emerson observes in her 'Translator's afterword' *apropos* Vladimir Kantor's reflections, rereading Dostoevsky may make Russia wiser in confronting contemporary moral, spiritual dilemmas, and thus better able to guard against future catastrophes. The devout approach, then, is not necessarily illegitimate. St Augustine's remark that there are some things which one understands only when one believes is not to be dismissed. Believers, and especially those who come from within the Orthodox community, can offer insights and perspectives unavailable to or remote from the views of 'outsiders'. Sympathy with Dostoevsky's Christian aspirations does not entail succumbing to his political and nationalist prejudices, to what Bakhtin called 'the small Dostoevsky'.

The second approach takes 'religiously' in the sense of faithfully, conscientiously and scrupulously disclosing, analysing and interpreting the Christian basis of Dostoevsky's art, its themes, ideas and symbols. This does not require allegiance to Dostoevsky's ideals or beliefs, but it does entail taking account of them, and making an effort to understand them on their own terms, as best we can from our increasing historical distance. Readings which denigrate or trivialise the Christian dimension in Dostoevsky are impoverished; those which wilfully ignore or excise it are mendacious. To read Dostoevsky without reference to his Christian beliefs is the same as to deny the paramount role of Christianity in Dante, to reduce the *Divine Comedy* to a struggle in Florentine politics. To interpret past writers exclusively within the horizon of present concerns is to overlook the possibility that they knew some things we do not know, or have forgotten. On the other hand, the scholarly, analytical approach does not preclude sharing Dostoevsky's Christian beliefs, but it does require a modicum of critical distance, of openness to new perspectives on literary analysis, and an awareness of the problematic nature of his work. Of course, any reading bears traces of an interpreter's own responses which Dostoevsky so pre-eminently provokes. This is as inevitable as it is legitimate since there is no such thing as an absolutely objective reading. Probably the way to get the most out of Dostoevsky is to read him dialogically, probing, interrogating and challenging him. Perhaps this is to read him religiously in the fullest sense.

## DOSTOEVSKY AND THE RELIGIOUS CRISIS OF THE WEST

The reception of Dostoevsky's work in the English-speaking world is, of course, a topic that goes far beyond the scope of this introduction. Even if we limit ourselves to his impact on religious thought we risk getting entangled in the criss-crossing threads of a *Rezeptionsgeschichte* that, although not vast in scope, is extraordinarily complex in its detail.

This complexity has a number of sources. The first is simply the variety of responses to Dostoevsky's writing, ranging from those that see in it a thinly-disguised avowal of atheism to those that see Dostoevsky as one of the great prophets of Christian faith for a post-Nietzschean world. The second has to do with the fact that, by the 1940s, Dostoevsky had become identified for good or ill (and in varying degrees) with existentialism – precisely in the period when existentialism was not only the most fashionable but also the most controversial of European philosophical movements. Questions as to whether Dostoevsky was or was not 'a good thing' and whether his work was or was not compatible with Christianity became inseparable from analogous questions about existentialism in general. Third, there is the difficulty (or, better perhaps, the challenge) that, whilst theologians and religious writers are very often also readers of novels and are often ready to acknowledge the influence of novels on them, this influence is often only fleetingly acknowledged in their work.<sup>19</sup> It is really only in the relatively recent past that the study of literature has come to be seen as a *bona fide* pursuit for a professional theologian. Connected with this is the fact that theologians and religious writers are also capable of reading critical literature that is not primarily theological, with the result that the view of Dostoevsky found in theological writing is often (though not invariably) dependent on critical appraisals that theologians themselves are not (or have not regarded themselves as being) competent to judge. Fourth – and by no means least importantly – we need to have a sense for the extreme complexity of the routes by which Dostoevsky entered into the English-speaking religious consciousness. In part this follows from what has already been said about the relationship between literature, criticism and theology. So, for example, Dostoevsky was discovered and became fashionable in literary circles in Britain in the period 1912–21, whereas his impact on religious thought probably peaked a generation later, from the mid-1940s onwards. The

theologians' 'image' of Dostoevsky was thus already impressed with a significant history of interpretation. But the situation is still more complex, since this history included not only the previous British literary reception of Dostoevsky, but the theological, philosophical and literary reception of his work in Germany, France and elsewhere (including, of course, Russia itself) – and, as we shall see, theologians elsewhere had made a significantly earlier start than those in Anglo-Saxony. Here we also have to take into account the different confessional interests that play a part in the story: the English-speaking Protestant world was, of course, most receptive to the kind of Dostoevsky interpretation associated with Barth and dialectical theology, whereas others would come to see him more as a paradigmatic representative of Orthodoxy.

We cannot, therefore, hope to construct any simple linear narrative history: all we can aim to achieve here is to signal some of the main reference points that any such history would need to incorporate.

It has already been noted that the first wave of Dostoevsky reception in Britain (and we shall focus on Britain rather than on the United States here) can be dated to the period 1912–21, partly because this was the period when Constance Garnett's translations of the novels and short stories was appearing, and although these were not the first translations to appear, this was *the* publishing event that first allowed English language readers to grasp the full scope of his fiction. These translations were complemented by a critical reception that included works by J. A. T. Lloyd, John Cowper Powys and John Middleton Murry. Middleton Murry's *Dostoevsky: A Critical Study* (1916) was in many ways paradigmatic of the 'Dostoevsky cult' of that time.<sup>20</sup> According to Middleton Murry the final significance of Dostoevsky's work is a 'desperate and courageous fulfilment of humanity', produced by one who 'ventured against the unknown with no other armour than human personality'.<sup>21</sup> Implicit in this acclamation, however, is the judgment that, in his novels, Dostoevsky has transcended what Middleton Murry regarded as the constraints of Christianity. Thus Alyosha, whom Middleton Murry judges to be the very epitome of Dostoevsky's ideal of human personality, 'is not a Christian. He has passed beyond the Christian revelation < . . . > for his knowledge of the great Oneness needs no belief in God for its support, and the beast which he knows within him is no more a beast. He has transcended these sublunary things. Their names are but earthly and blunted symbols for the reality which bears within

him [sic].<sup>22</sup> Dostoevsky is no apologist of the old faith but a prophet of the new, pointing the way to a post-Christian humanism (albeit a humanism of a different kind from that of positivistic science). Is it merely coincidental that he almost sounds like Nietzsche's Zarathustra?

If this kind of Dostoevsky-reception created an image that almost inevitably repelled religiously-minded readers, a very different kind of reception was developing in the German-speaking world. Karl Barth's commentary on St Paul's *Letter to the Romans* signalled his own indebtedness to Dostoevsky as an aid in reading the New Testament.<sup>23</sup> Barth also acknowledges a debt to Eduard Thurneysen, a friend and colleague who had introduced him to Dostoevsky's work. Thurneysen's own Dostoevsky book, although not published in English translation until 1964, gushingly expounds the kind of view of Dostoevsky that Barth built on and that became standard amongst those influenced by Neo-Orthodoxy (in this context, of course, Protestant and not Russian Orthodoxy). Dostoevsky's achievement, according to Thurneysen, is to call into question everything human in such a way and to such a degree that the only possible remaining answer is God. Like Middleton Murry, Thurneysen envisages Dostoevsky as standing at the very outermost edge of the old order, experiencing and transcribing its collapse and pointing to a radical overcoming of its contradictions – only this time the transcendence is said to be exclusively and decisively religious since humanity is powerless to bring about its own transformation: 'the dawn of the new day which is visible in Dostoevsky's work breaks forth only in the deepest night of human uncertainty'.<sup>24</sup>

This view of Dostoevsky as the prophet of the religious horror of a life without God is concentrated in an extraordinary panegyric that is worth quoting at length, because it is so characteristic of the important line of theological Dostoevsky interpretation first found in Thurneysen.

Whoever comes to Dostoevsky from the regions of secure humanity, of the pre-war period for instance, must feel like one who has been looking at such domesticated animals as the dog and the cat, the chicken or the horse, and then suddenly sees the Wild before him, and without warning finds himself face to face with the yet untamed animal world, jaguar and puma, tiger and crocodile, the slithering of the snakes and the fluttering of the wings of the eagle and the condor < . . . > He has been led out past the farthest border posts, past the limits of known humanity; with

pounding heart he looks on the unknown face of a man who shares with him the common name of 'man', and who yet appears to live beyond all the concepts tied with this name, beyond good and evil, wisdom and folly, beauty and ugliness, beyond even state and family, school and church. And just as one who returns from the wilderness to domesticated animals rediscovers in the four-footed creatures who share his house, and whom he had previously regarded sympathetically, the traces of original wildness, and sees himself even in his own four walls confronted at a stroke with dangerous, unsuspected slumbering possibilities, so there proceeds from an encounter with the world and the men of Dostoevsky something of hidden trembling and fear.<sup>25</sup>

A major event in the English-speaking reception of Dostoevsky was the publication in 1934 of a translation of Berdyaev's enormously influential study – published in London, interestingly, by Sheed and Ward, a Catholic publishing house. Perhaps the most significant contribution Berdyaev's book made to the theological understanding of Dostoevsky in the West was his emphasis on the abyssal freedom of the individual. Whereas the Neo-Orthodox view saw in Dostoevsky's novels a revelation of the profound bondage of the human will, desperately seeking and longing for redemption but utterly incapable of self-deliverance, Berdyaev argued that Dostoevsky's religious teaching was inseparable from his insistence on the freedom of the human spirit. He wrote that 'those of [Dostoevsky's] characters who deny this freedom deny God, and inversely. A world in which goodness and righteousness reign by compulsion, whose harmony is ensured by undeniable necessity, is a godless world, a rationalised mechanism, and to reject God and human liberty is to push the world in that direction.'<sup>26</sup> Both the interpretation of Dostoevsky brought into focus by this quotation and the interpretation of Christianity offered by Berdyaev could not be further removed from that of Thurneysen and the Neo-Orthodox.

Berdyaev was widely perceived in the 1940s and 1950s as a 'Christian existentialist' and there is no doubt that his advocacy of Dostoevsky helped both to strengthen the perception of Dostoevsky himself as being some kind of Christian proto-existentialist as well as to stir the debate as to whether there could indeed be any such thing as 'Christian existentialism'. Certainly he provided a significant line of defence for Christians who did not wish to cede the entire territory of human freedom to Sartrean atheism, although that line had simultaneously to be defended against the Calvinism of Barth and his followers.

Curiously, given his extremely difficult relationship with the Orthodox hierarchy (in 1914 he was awaiting trial on a charge of blasphemy), Berdyaev's involvement with the YMCA and with the ecumenical movement in the 1930s meant that he was often called upon to represent the Orthodox voice at theological and Church conferences. For many Western Christians he was one of the defining voices of Russian Orthodox spirituality. In this respect he was widely linked with Sergy Bulgakov, who also reflected the influence of Dostoevsky.

A study by L. A. Zander in 1942, published in English by the Student Christian Movement Press in 1948, drew a number of links between Dostoevsky and Bulgakov. The Dostoevskian theme of 'the life-giving power of the earth and its mysterious bond with man'<sup>27</sup> is said both to be an 'ancient mystical teaching' of the Russian Church and to find philosophical articulation in Bulgakov's sophiological doctrine. Here the thought of humanity's unity with nature is contextualised in a larger picture of the cosmic unity of all beings within the divine Wisdom or Sophia. A 'Sophian' dimension is also seen by Zander in Dostoevsky's female characters and in the various 'humble ones' who people his novels. Finally, Dostoevsky's vision of human destiny culminates in the promotion of active love, the 'deeds', as Zander calls them, of 'faithful service, loyalty, marriage', deeds in which 'Christ overtakes the human soul and the Holy Spirit comes to dwell in it, so that "the servant" becomes "a friend", the creature – a temple.'<sup>28</sup> In similar terms Zander sees Dostoevsky's understanding of human destiny as drawn from the imagery of the New Testament: becoming 'the friend of the Bridegroom' (an image that is once more said to be central to Bulgakov). The 'limits' of Dostoevsky's thought are in this way not pictured as bordering on a future of radical humanism, nor yet as requiring recourse to 'grace alone', nor even revealing our abyssal freedom, but as 'the gates leading to an Orthodox world-conception.'<sup>29</sup>

But this is by no means the end of Dostoevsky's very varied appearances as a religious thinker.

One element singularly lacking (or at least significantly underplayed) in the interpretations examined so far is any Christological reference. This was, however, provided by Henri de Lubac in his study *The Drama of Atheist Humanism*, a drama in which Dostoevsky emerges as the prophet (once more) of a kind of Christian faith that has taken the measure of modern atheism and lived to tell the tale.