

T. C.
İSTANBUL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
KARŞILAŞTIRMALI EDEBİYAT ANABİLİM DALI

DOKTORA TEZİ

DOSTOEVSKY'S USE OF THE OTHER
IN SEARCH OF THE SELF

İRİNA BALIK

2520160101

TEZ DANIŞMANI

DR. ÖĞR. ÜYESİ FERAH İNCESU

İSTANBUL – 2019



T.C.
İSTANBUL ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ



DOKTORA
TEZ ONAYI

ÖĞRENCİNİN;

Adı ve Soyadı : İRİNA BALYK Numarası : 2520160101
Anabilim Dalı / Anasanat Dalı / Programı : KARŞILAŞTIRMALI EDEBİYAT
ANABİLİM DALI Danışmanı : DR.ÖĞR.ÜYESİ FERAH İNCESU
Tez Savunma Tarihi : 11.07.2019 Saati : 10:30
Tez Başlığı : "DOSTOEVSKY'S USE OF THE OTHER IN SEARCH OF THE SELF"

TEZ SAVUNMA SINAVI, İÜ Lisansüstü Eğitim-Öğretim Yönetmeliği'nin 50. Maddesi uyarınca yapılmış, sorulan sorulara alınan cevaplar sonunda adayın tezinin KABULÜNE OYBİRLİĞİ / OYÇOKLUĞUYLA karar verilmiştir.

JÜRİ ÜYESİ	İMZA	KANAATİ (KABUL / RED / DÜZELTME)
PROF DR. TÜRKAN OLCAY		Kabul
DR.ÖĞR.ÜYESİ HÜLYA ARSLAN		Kabul
DOÇ.DR.NEJDET NEYDİM		Kabul
DR.ÖĞR.ÜYESİ AHMET SERDAR KÜÇÜK		KABUL
DR.ÖĞR.ÜYESİ FERAH İNCESU		Kabul

YEDEK JÜRİ ÜYESİ	İMZA	KANAATİ (KABUL / RED / DÜZELTME)
DOÇ.DR.YILDIZ KILIÇ		
DR.ÖĞR.ÜYESİ MURAT SAYIM		

ABSTRACT

DOSTOEVSKY'S USE OF THE OTHER IN SEARCH OF THE SELF

IRINA BALIK

The aim of this study is to explore Russia's perception of the self and the role of the other in the establishment of Russianness. The central focus is made on the person who interpreted Russia's Janus-faced nature, duality and broadness as constitutive qualities of Russian national identity - Fyodor Dostoevsky. The theoretical foundation of the dissertation is Iver Neumann's concept of the self/other nexus and Mikhail Bakhtin's vision on Dostoevsky's works as polyphonic and dialogical. To examine Dostoevsky's use of the other in search of the self we address some of Dostoevsky's novels to elaborate on the types of the self/other nexus he used to construct national identity. The analysis reveals that Dostoevsky's search of the self engages images of the external other personified in Europeans (dominant other) and Ottomans (common other), and the internal other represented by the Russian peasants (social other), non-Orthodox members (religious other) of the Russian Empire, and disbelievers in general (non-religious other). Examples taken from the novels demonstrate how Dostoevsky constructed the alienated and split Russian self to reestablish its integrity and define an identity based on the ability of the Russian soul to reincarnate in itself an alien nationality, comprehend the manners of different peoples, excuse and reconcile differences, eliminate all their contradictions without any racial discrimination and unite in brotherly love. Relying on these practices Dostoevsky creates the image of **vsechelovek** (pan-human) capable of brotherly love for the other, a true Christian proud of his nationality and someone who looks at the other, both internal and external, as an extension of the self.

Keywords: self/other nexus, external and internal other, self, national identity, Dostoevsky, pan-human, universal brotherhood.

ÖZ

DOSTOYEVSKY’NİN ÖZ ARAYIŞINDA ÖTEKİNİN KULLANIMI İRİNA BALIK

Bu çalışmanın genel amacı, Rusya’nın benlik algısını ve Rusluğun kurulmasında ötekinin rolünü araştırmaktır. Odağa, Rusya’nın Janus yüzlü ikilemli ve kapsamlı doğasını Rus ulusal kimliğinin kurucu nitelikleri olarak yorumlayan Fyodor Dostoyevski konulmuştur. Iver Neumann’ın öz/öteki ilintisi kavramı ve Mikhail Bakhtin’in Dostoyevski’nin romanlarına polifonik ve diyalojik olarak bakışı tezin kuramsal temeli olarak belirlenmekle birlikte, Dostoyevski’nin ulusal benliği bulmada öteki kullanımını incelemek hedeflenmiştir. Bunu başarmak maksadı ile, ulusal kimliği inşa etmekte kullanılan öz/öteki ilinti türlerini sergilemek için yazarın romanlarından bazılarını ele alıyoruz. İnceleme, Dostoyevski’nin öz arayışında, Avrupalılar (baskın öteki) ve Osmanlılar (genel öteki) olarak kişileştirilmiş dış ötekini, Rus halkının (sosyal öteki), Rus İmparatorluğu’nun Ortodoks olmayan üyelerinin (dini öteki), ve Yararıcıya inanmayan (dinsiz öteki) sınıflamalarıyla iç ötekini temsil ettiğini ortaya koyuyor. Romanlarından alınan örnekler, yazarın kurgusunda yabancılaşmış ve bölünmüş Rus benliğinin bütünlüğünün yeniden nasıl sağladığını ve Rus algısının yabancı bir milliyeti kendi içinde yeniden var etmek, farklı halkların davranışlarını kavramak, onların farklılıklarını anlayışla karşılamak ve onlarla uzlaştırmak, ırk ayrımcılığı olmadan çelişkileri ortadan kaldırmak ve kardeş sevgisinde birleşme yeteneğine dayanarak nasıl bir Rus kimliği tanımladığını göstermektedirler. Bu tutuma dayanmakla Dostoyevski, ötekine kardeş sevgisi duyabilen, milliyetiyle gurur duyan gerçek bir Hristiyan, hem dıştaki hem içteki ötekine, başka bir öz olarak bakabilen **vsechelovek** (tüminsan) imgesini yaratır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: öz/öteki ilintisi, iç ve dış öteki, benlik, ulusal kimlik, Dostoyevski, tüminsan, evrensel kardeşlik.

FOREWORD

Formation of Russian national identity has always been an issue of debate due to the immense diversity of the country and its ambivalent geo-political and socio-cultural position. Scholars and writers around the world have been trying to understand the roots of Russia's duality in its relationship with the East and West, recognize who Russians are, and determine the nation's role for mankind. One of them is Fyodor Mikhaylovich Dostoevsky, a Russian writer of the nineteenth century. Not only did he inspire and influence people like Tolstoy, Nietzsche, Freud, Hemingway, and Pamuk just to mention a few via books that are still read by all generations of people around the world seeking answers for psychological and spiritual puzzles, but he also explained some mechanisms of identity construction, offered a resolution for the national schism of nineteenth-century Russia and described the nation's mission for humanity.

Thousands of articles and books have been written on Dostoevsky and his novels in which scholars tried to analyze various dimensions and aspects of his texts. However, just a few have examined Dostoevsky's use of the other in search of the self. Therefore, in this study this aspect of Dostoevsky's oeuvre is set as the purpose of the research.

The scope of the research is Dostoevsky's novels such as **Notes from the House of the Dead**¹, **The Gambler**, **Crime and Punishment**, **The Possessed**, **The Adolescence** and **The Brothers Karamazov**. The novels were selected with an assumption that they more than others depict different types of the self/other nexus.

The dissertation consists of five parts. After a thorough review of what has been written so far on the self/other nexus and introduction to terminology and methodology used in the work, Chapter I outlines historico-cultural background of Russia's perception of the self and its encounter with the other within three historical periods. Chapter II looks into Dostoevsky's perception of Russianness and examine the role of the other in its establishment. Here, we also discuss Dostoevsky's response to the historical context and elaborate on his encounter with the other and how it effected his imagination of the self.

¹ The title of Dostoevsky's **Notes from the House of the Dead** is also used as **The House of the Dead** (**Mertviy Dom**) by the writer himself and scholars.

Chapter III is predicated upon the close reading of the novels to demonstrate via examples how Dostoevsky uses the other for national identity formation.

In Conclusion, we argue that the writer made use of the other, which was represented in at least five different types - social, religious, non-religious, dominant and common others - in order to establish the self necessary for construction of Russian national identity. The key image of the Russian national self Dostoevsky sees in **vsechelovek** (pan-human) who is capable of absorbing the genius of foreign lands and brotherly union with all nations.

The results will help to explain the role of the other in construction of Russian national identity, understand duality of the Russian self and its Janus-faced attitude to the East and West, and finally, define the image of Russian national and universal identity via the example of Dostoevskian characters.

The project is a literature-based theoretical study. The question of identity will be approached through analysis of the conceptual pair of self/other. The focus is made on dialogical reading of the relation between selves and others.

The main difficulty encountered throughout the writing process was enormous depth and width of Dostoevsky's thoughts. His tendency to dig into psychology of human behavior challenged the analysis. Moreover, interpretation of some features specific only for Russian history and translation of some of Dostoevsky's unique concepts required an extra effort.

The last but not the least, I would like to express my profound gratitude to my supervisor, Assist. Prof. Ferah Incesu, who generously offered her knowledge, time, encouragement and support, for everything from accepting supervising my thesis to its completion. I also would like to thank Prof. Dr. Türkan Olcay and Assist. Prof. Hülya Arslan for their insightful comments and suggestions concerning Russian history and literature.

Finally, I am infinitely grateful to my family: my mother, Galina Nikolayevna Sozontova, whose inexhaustible enthusiasm and industriousness to support me spiritually and financially have always been for me a model to emulate; my husband, Mustafa Balık, whose wholehearted assistance and encouragement made my study enjoyable and

worthwhile; and to my three children, Mehmed, Sinem and Enes, for their patience and understanding in times I was too busy with my studies.

IRINA BALIK

ISTANBUL, 2019



ABSTRACT	iii
ÖZ	iv
FOREWORD	v
CONTENTS.....	vii
INTRODUCTION	1

FIRST CHAPTER

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF RUSSIA'S PERCEPTION OF THE SELF AND ITS ENCOUNTERS WITH THE OTHER

1.1. Establishment of Russianness before the Reign of Peter the Great	29
1.1.1. Heterogeneous Society of the Kievan Rus.....	30
1.1.2. Conversion to Christianity.....	31
1.1.3. The Tatar-Mongol rule and Islamization of the Golden Horde.....	32
1.1.4. Moscow as the Third Rome: the Orthodox Self vs. the Religious Other...36	
1.1.5. Independence from the Tatar-Mongols	37
1.2. Russianness with the European Mask in the Eighteenth Century.....	40
1.2.1. Peter the Great's Window on Europe.....	41
1.2.2. Post-Mongolian Russia in the Eyes of Europe.....	43
1.2.3. Border Division between the Center and Periphery.....	44
1.2.4. National Split into the Cultured Self and the Social Other	45
1.3. Russianness according to Slavophiles and Westernizers in the Nineteenth Century.	47
1.3.1. Split of the Cultured Self into Slavophiles and Westernizers	49
1.3.2. Crimean War: Is Europe the Self or the Other?	53
1.3.3. Search for a New Self in Asia	54
1.3.4. The Eastern Question: the Ottoman Turk as an External Other	58
1.3.5. The Russian National Self as Bearer of Universal Brotherhood	61

SECOND CHAPTER

DOSTOEVSKY'S PERCEPTION OF RUSSIANNES AND ROLE OF THE OTHER IN ITS ESTABLISHMENT

2.1. Dostoevsky and Russianness	65
2.2. Meeting the Internal Other: the Other among the Self	
2.2.1. The Social Other.....	73
2.2.2. The Religious Other	80
2.3. Dostoevsky as a Public Activist: Triple Split of the Russian Self	84
2.4. Meeting the External Other	92
2.4.1. Europe - the Self or the Other?	94
2.4.2. The Turkish Other	99
2.5. Dostoevsky's Concepts of Vsechelovek and Universal Brotherhood as Images of the Russian National Self	
2.5.1. A Half-European Half-Asian Russian Self	103
2.5.2. From the Janus-faced Russian to Vsechelovek and Universal Brotherhood	106

THIRD CHAPTER

EXAMPLES OF DOSTOEVSKY'S USE OF THE OTHER AND THEIR FUNCTION IN SEARCH OF THE SELF

3.1. Goryanchikov's Way from Otherness of the Self to Universal Brotherhood in The House of the Dead	114
3.1.1. Split Between the Upper Classes and the Peasant Convicts	115
3.1.2. The External Other vs. the Russian Self	117
3.1.3. Muhammedans and a Jew as the Religious Others	119
3.1.4. Goryanchikov as a Bearer of Universal Brotherhood	122
3.2. Role of the External and Internal Others in Building Self-awareness in The Gambler and Crime and Punishment	123
3.2.1. Alienation of Alexey from the Europeans	124
3.2.2. Raskolnikov's Search of the Self	129
3.3. Dichotomy of the Self and the Other in The Possessed	136

3.3.1. The European Other vs. the Russian National Self from the Possessed Westernizers' Perspective	137
3.3.2. Dichotomy of the Religious Self and the Non-Religious Other	138
3.4. From the Cultured Self/Social Other Nexus to Obshechelovechnost in The Adolescence	140
3.4.1. Versilov as a Representative of the Cultured Self and his Relation to the Social Other	140
3.4.2. Construction of Obshechelovek from the Russian National Self/European Other Perspective	143
3.5. The Russian National Self as the Bearer of Universal Brotherhood in The Brothers Karamazov	146
3.5.1. The Cultured Self/Social Other Nexus as a Step toward National Integrity	148
3.5.2. The Religious Self vs. the Non-Religious Other	149
3.5.3. Use of the External Other in Search of the National Self	151
3.5.4. The Orthodox Self vs. the Religious Other	155
3.5.5. Four Features of the Cultured Self	156
3.5.6. Alesha Karamazov as a Symbol of Universal Brotherhood and Vsechelovek	160
CONCLUSION	161
BYBLIOGRAPHY	169
CV	184

INTRODUCTION

“No nation ever poured more intellectual energy into the answering the question of national identity than Russia”

James Billington¹

In this study we intend to discuss national identity formation through analysis of representations/images of the self/other nexus² in six of Dostoevsky’s novels. The need for conceptualization of the self and other was firstly grasped by ancient philosophers (for example, Plato’s dialogue “Sophist”³). After the Renaissance and Enlightenment, when nation-states strengthened, imperialistic and economic rivalry raised by the nineteenth century, the theme of the self vs. the other ascended. One of the nineteenth century theorists who specifically addressed the question of identity formation through negotiation of the self and other was Friedrich Hegel.

In the epoch of non-classical and post-non-classical philosophy, modernity and postmodernity, the phenomenon of **the other** acquired the basic status. Some of authors who addressed the philosophical reflection of the self/other opposition were F. Nietzsche, M. Heidegger, J. Lacan, J. P. Sartre, E. Levinas, Z. Bauman, M. Foucault, J. Derrida and J. Kristeva. Works of S.Z. Freud, B. Connolly, P. Ricoeur, I. Neumann and O. N. Novikova were devoted to the self/other nexus as a feature of identity formation and identification processes.

Among Russian scholars N. A. Berdyaev, M. M. Bakhtin, M. Eliade, L. N. Gumilev, Yu.S. Stepanov and A. N. Serebrennikova understand the self/other opposition as an important element of culture, which manifests itself at different levels. A. V. Shipilov, in his sociological study of the opposition **we-they**, considers it as **self-other (svoi-**

¹ James H. Billington, **Russia: in Search of Itself**, Washington, Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2004, p.12.

² Many scholars consider the self/other perspective as a factor or a part of identity formation. For example: Elena Zarova, “Obraz “Drugogo” v Stanovlenii Tsivilizatsionnoy Identichnosti”, PhD Dissertation, Saratov, 2009, p. 66; Iver B. Neumann, **Uses Of The Other. “The East” In European Identity Formation**. Minneapolis, University Of Minnesota Press, 1999, p.33; Viktoriya Felde, “Oppozitsiya “Svoy-Chuzhoy” V Kulture”, PhD Dissertation, Omsk, 2015, p. 15; Andrey Shipilov, “Svoi”, “Chuzhie” i “Drugie”, Progress-Traditsia, Moscow, 2008, p. 17.

³ Anna Romanova, et al., **Chuzhoy i Kulturnaya Bezopasnost**, Moscow, Rosspen, 2013, p. 11.

chuzhiye) in national-democratic societies, whereas in class-authoritarian societies he looks at it in the form **upper-lower (visshiye-nizshiye)**.⁴

Separate aspects of the self-other opposition are discussed in the articles by E. I. Balakina, I. Yu. Vasilyeva, L. I. Kazakova, M. B. Krasilnikova, L. B. Lavrinovich, V. G. Lysenko, V. M. Pivoyeva, N.A. Chernyak, A.K. Yakimovich and others. For example, in the article by V.G. Lysenko “Cognition of the other as a way of self-cognition” several models of the other are distinguished. The image of the other as a component of national identity is mentioned by S. G. Maximova et al., Yu. A. Kirichek, L. P. Repina. Dissertations of V. G. Felde and E. D. Zarova offer an insight on the image of the other and its relation to the self.

First of all, the concept of **identity** is used in fields such as psychology, philosophy, sociology, political science, international relations and literary studies. Therefore, there are several definitions of it. **The Cambridge English Dictionary** gives the meaning of identity “who a person is, or the qualities of a person or group that make them different from others”.⁵ **Bolshaya Psikhologicheskaya Entsiklopediya** (Great Psychological Encyclopedia) defines identity as “one’s self-image or self-conception. Who you think you are. The integrity of one’s being”.⁶ Psychologist Erik Erikson writes that identity was lodged “in the core of the individual” and this “core” was something that had to be guarded against all kinds of crises.”⁷

According to Chantal Mouffe “identity is [...] the result of a multitude of interactions that take place inside a space whose outlines are not clearly defined”.⁸ Charles Taylor resonates Mouffe and underlines that:

We define our identity always in dialogue with, sometimes in struggle against, the things our significant others want to see in us. [...] the making and sustaining of our identity [...] remains dialogical throughout our lives. Thus my discovering my own identity doesn’t mean that I work it out in isolation, but that I negotiate it through dialogue, partly overt,

⁴ Shipilov, **loc. cit.**

⁵ (Online) <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/identity>, November 23, 2018.

⁶ (Online) <https://psychology.academic.ru/755>, November 30, 2018.

⁷ Cited in Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 217.

⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 210.

partly internal, with others. My own identity crucially depends on my dialogical relations with others.⁹

Latter in the chapter we will return to dialogical interaction when discussing two principles of identity formation in the modern social sciences. Meanwhile, Andrey Shipilov, using the word **I** for **identity**, also emphasizes **I**'s interaction with others: "Becoming of "I" is a product of social experience; internal world of an individual comes to be as a result of interaction with others; individual consciousness is originally interpersonal."¹⁰ (my trans.)

Some writers use the term **self** rather than **identity** or vice versa¹¹, others use them both as identical. Iver Neumann, for example, states that **identity** and **self** are the same thing and that their etymologies are intertwined.¹²

Peter Berger, like Shipilov, considers the concept of **identity** synonymous to such concepts as **I-image**, **I-conception** and **self-description**.¹³ Stuart Hall, looking at identity from a different perspective, understands it as "a person's recognition of who he is and his idea of belonging to national culture, or identification with one's local community or a state".¹⁴ He informs that in earlier societies people were identified according to their social position, in later periods more categories of differentiation appeared.

While some researchers focus on **personal**¹⁵, the majority write about **collective identities** which can include or be replaced by **social**, **ethnic**, **cultural**¹⁶, **national** or

⁹ Charles Taylor, et al., **Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition**, Ed. by Amy Gutmann, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1994, p. 33-34.

¹⁰ Shipilov, **op. cit.**, p. 40.

¹¹ The Sociologist Charles Lemert draws a distinction between "self" and "identity on the level of human collectives; Erving Goffman abandoned the term "self" for the term "identity"; Judith Butler and Gayatri Spivak do not use "self" at all, but "identity".

¹² Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 217.

¹³ Cited in S. G. Maksimova, et al, "Obraz 'Drugogo' Kak Strukturnyy Komponent Natsionalnoy Identichnosti: Konstruktivistskaya Paradigma", **Filosofiya, Sotsiologiya i Kulturologiya**, Barnaul, Altai State University, w.date, p. 250, DOI: 10.14258/izvasu (2014) 2.2-48.

¹⁴ Stuart Hall, **Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices**, London, Sage / Open University, 1997, p. 5.

¹⁵ Olesya Blinova, "Personalnaya Identichnost v Kontekste Otnosheniya 'YA-Drugoy'", PhD dissertation., Chelyabinsk, University of Chelyabinsk, 2009, p. 22.

¹⁶ Stuart Hall, **Questions of Cultural Identity**, Ed. by Stuart Hall and Paul Du Gay, London, Sage Publications, 1996.

civilizational ones. The term **collective identities** is used by Iver Neumann, for whom to study collective identity formation means to study “ethnic groups, subcultures, villages, and other small-scale collectives.”¹⁷ He also argues that collective identity is an extension of ethnicity.¹⁸ Elena Zarova relying on A.V. Razanov states that ethnic and national identities are two varieties of civilizational identity¹⁹. While she defines **ethnic identity** as a process of awareness of oneself as part of a certain ethnic group which happens through opposition of one group against another, **national identity** is constructed in a multi-ethnic establishment and is a process of political socialization; a process of “formation of religious beliefs, customs and other cultural values that contribute to the unity of the social community, a sense of communal self-awareness and the unity of historical destiny”.²⁰ (my trans.) Another researcher who studied Russian national character from the perspective of self/other nexus, Lorina Repina discusses the establishment of ethnic representations, formation of national identity and creation of a sustainable image of the self (**obraz svoego**) under the category of ethnic and national identity.²¹

In the similar fashion, Oleg Zaznaev sees national identity as a person’s awareness of his belonging to a particular state and his identification with a certain nation, which become the basis for formation of particular political patterns of his behavior. He also believes that it is necessary to distinguish national identity from ethnic identity, which is the identification of a person with a certain ethnic group.²²

Talking of ethnicity, Valeriy Tishkov opens Zarova and Zaznaev’s definition saying that ethnicity is a form of self-awareness, identification of oneself with particular

¹⁷ Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 5.

¹⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 4.

¹⁹ Zarova defines civilizational identity as a set of rather stable forms of self-determination and self-representation, forming a certain cultural and civilizational integrity. Zarova, **op. cit.**, p. 12.

²⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 48.

²¹ Lorina Repina, “Natsionalniy Kharakter i Obraz Drugogo”, **Dialog So Vremenem**, No.39, 2012, p. 13.

²² Oleg Zaznayev, “Kanadskaya Natsionalnaya Identichnost: Problemy Formirovaniya”, **Gumanitarniye Nauki**, Zapiski Kazanskogo Universiteta, Vol.154, No.1, 2012.

culture, language, tradition, etc.²³ Differently from others, he uses the term **national identity (natsionalnaya identichnost)** as a synonym of **national self-awareness (samoznaniye)** and defines it as “solidarity and everyday loyalty, i.e. the feeling of belonging to one people and one state”.²⁴ (my trans.) What is more, this interpretation of **national identity** is very close to his understanding of **ethnic identity**, which he puts as

a group of people with some common names and common cultural elements who have a myth (version) of a common origin and thus have a common historical memory; they can associate themselves with a special geographic territory, and also demonstrate a sense of group solidarity.²⁵ (my trans.)

Such parallelism between national and ethnic identities Tishkov explains by the fact that in Russia before 1917, **Russianness** was understood primarily as a form of self-consciousness and identification with Orthodoxy - to be Russian meant to be Orthodox, and vice versa. Nationality (**natsionalnost**) of a citizen was identified not according to his ethnical origin but on the basis of religion he practiced and language he spoke. It is only after 1926 nationality was understood as ethnicity. Tishkov concludes that “**Russian identity (rossiyskaya identichnost)** and self-awareness is a cross- or supra-ethnic form” (my trans.) and that Russian people believed to be one people united by the Orthodox faith, despite their diversity.²⁶

In the same spirit, Viktoria Felde points out that Christianity removes ethnic differences, in the phrase **all men are brothers**, for example, there is neither confrontation nor opposition. She states that the religious factor becomes decisive in the formulation of relations between **the self-Christian (svoy-khristianin)** and **the other, non-Christian (chuzhoy-nekhris)**.²⁷ In support of her statement Nikolay Berdyaev postulates that

in the Russian understanding religiosity and nationality (narodnoye) are interchanged and difficult to differentiate. In Russian Orthodoxy, the religious is sometimes identified with national. The Russian people believe in a Russian Christ. Christ is the national God, the

²³ Valeriy Tishkov, “Natsionalnaya Identichnost i Dukhovno-Kulturnyye Tsennosti Rossiyskogo Naroda”, **Izbrannyye Lektsii Universiteta**, St-Petersburgh, St. Petersburg University of Humanities, Vol.105, 2010, p.10.

²⁴ Valeriy Tishkov, **Rossiyskiy Narod: Istoriya i Smysl Natsionalnogo Samoznaniya**, Moscow, Nauka, 2013, p. 22.

²⁵ Tishkov, **Etnologiya i Politika**, Moscow, 2001, p. 230.

²⁶ Tishkov, **op. cit.**, 2010, p. 13.

²⁷ Felde, **op. cit.**, p. 36.

God of the Russian peasants with Russian traits in his image.²⁸ (my trans.)

To sum up, all the definitions of **identity** mentioned above are somehow linked to nationality (**natsionalnost**) which is understood in the present study as a person's identification with a religion and a language, and his supra-ethnic (**nadetnicheskaya**) self-awareness as one people/nation, despite cultural diversity. We believe that the concept **national identity** is a generalizing term and is more appropriate for describing the process of identity crisis and search for another one that took place in the nineteenth century.

The next step is to establish our view of how Russian national identity was formed. It has been already stated that our approach to its formation will be to analyze the conceptual pair of self/other. We chose this path on the basis of the new perspective on identity construction which was introduced at the end of the twentieth and beginning of the twenty first centuries in the context of relationship between **we/us-they (my-oni)**, **self-other** (alien/stranger²⁹) (**svoy/chuzhoy**).

Boris Porshnev acknowledges that these **we-they**, **self-other** oppositions are a cultural universal which is inherent in the self-awareness of any type of community.³⁰ In addition to **we-they**, **self/other** concepts some scholars use the term **I** which is extremely close to **self**. Zarova, for instance, identifies several variations of these pairs. She writes that relationship between different civilizations/nations is built within categories such as **inoy** (other/different), **drugoy** (other/another), **chuzhoy** (other/stranger), **ne ya** (non-I) which are compared, juxtaposed or opposed with **svoy** (self) or **ya** (I).³¹

Furthermore, if **I** is close to **the self**, it is also close to **We** in a similar way. Shipilov states that **I** derives from **We**, as self-awareness of an individual derives from self-awareness of a group. He refers to A. R. Luria's investigations to show that in earlier stages of historical development common **We** often replaced the personal **I**.³² Ernst

²⁸ Nikolay Berdyaev, **Russkaya Ideya**, St.-Petersburg, Izdatelskiy Dom, Azbuka-Klassika, 2008, p. 35.

²⁹ Neumann refers to Georg Simmel's usage of "the stranger" which is defined as "an element of the group whose membership within the group involves both being outside it and confronting it". p. 11.

³⁰ Boris F. Porshnev, **Sotsialnaya Psikhologiya i Istoriya**, Moscow, 1979, p. 111.

³¹ Zarova, **op. cit.**, p. 12.

³² Shipilov, **Oppozitsiya "My-Oni" v Sotsio-Kulturnom Razvitii**, Vol.1, Voronezh, Tsentralno-Chernozemnoye Knizhnoye Izdatelstvo, 2004, p. 17.

Cassirer repeats Shipilov saying that **I** knows and is aware of itself only when it perceives itself as a member of a certain community, and when it sees itself united with other members of a clan, tribe or social union.³³ By the same token, Felde claims that **I** is capable of finding itself in **We**, and that **We** is defined through the opposition against **They**.³⁴

B. Porshnev writes that appearance of **We** depended on meeting any **They**.³⁵ Felde and Porshnev's statements are supported by Shipilov's idea that the world is divided into **We** and **They**, and that this phenomenon might be the only one that unites the people of all times and nations.³⁶

Before we continue the discussion of how these categories are used in identity formation, it might be worthwhile to clarify what the Russian words **inoy**, **drugoy**, **chuzhoy**, and **svoy**³⁷ imply in English. The English word **other** is translated to Russian in three ways: **inoy**, **drugoy**, and **chuzhoy**. According to V. Vinogradov's History of Words and V. Dal's dictionary **chuzhoy** means **a stranger, alien, unknown/unfamiliar person, not native, not of one's kin, something/somebody that belongs to somebody/something else**.³⁸ **Drugoy** is a derivative from the word **drug** which is translated as **friend**; they both mean **the same, equal, another I, the other you, related, another person, follower**;³⁹ the word **inoy** is a newer word derived from the structure **drug druga** (each other) and means **somebody else, another, other, foreign, different**.⁴⁰ **The self** is translated as **svoy**. According to the Small Academic Russian Dictionary of the Russian Language, among several other connotations, **svoy** means **appropriate**,

³³ Ernst Cassirer, "Filosofiya Simvolicheskikh Form", **Mifologicheskoye Myshleniye**, Vol.2, Moscow, 2001, p.187.

³⁴ Felde, **op. cit.**, p. 15.

³⁵ Porshnev, **op. cit.**, p. 81.

³⁶ Shipilov, **Oppozitsiya "My - Oni" v Sotsio-Kulturnom Razvitii**, **loc. cit.**

³⁷ Pronouns **I**, **we** and **they** are omitted as their translations do not suggest any connotations.

³⁸ Viktor Vinogradov, "Chuzhoy", **Istoriya Slova**, w.date, (Online) <https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Spravochniki/istoriya-slov/>, November 14, 2018; Vladimir Dal, "Chuzhoy", **Tolkoviy Slovar Zhivogo Velikorusskogo**, Vol.1, pp. x-y., w.date, (Online) <http://www.slovorod.ru/dic-dal/>, November 14, 2018.

³⁹ Dal, "Drugoy", **loc. cit.**

⁴⁰ **Ibid.**, "Inoy".

proper; native or bound by close relationships, teamwork, shared convictions, etc.⁴¹

As a rule, the word **svoy** is used in combination with **chuzhoy**, for example **svoy – chuzhoy** to emphasize binary opposition between two groups.

Different scholars use different words to debate on identity formation in relation to the self/other pair. In this study, relying on everything mentioned above, P. Berger's consideration of the concept of **identity** as being synonymous to such concepts as **I-image (Ya-obraz)**, **I-conception (YA-kontseptsiya)**, **self-description (samoopisaniye)**, Tishkov's view of national identity as **self-awareness**, Zarova's argument that every civilization imagines itself with **I-identity** and the rest of the world is represented by **the other (inoy, drugoy, chuzhoy)**.⁴² Finally, keeping in mind that **I** is a derivative of **We** (Shipilov), we will use the term **self (Ya/svoy)** and **other** without capitalization (as it is used by Neumann in **Uses of the Other: "The East" in European Identity Formation**) to imply all the concepts above, focusing on the self as a constitutive image of **national identity**. The analysis of self/other encounter will offer an explanation of how it was formed.

Having said that, it is to review how the terms **other** and **self** were used by Western and Russian scholars in their discussion of self/other nexus and what it implied. It is also to decide which principle of identity formation, dialectical or dialogical is more appropriate for the Russian case, and determine which of the three different equivalents of the term **other** better fits particularly Dostoevsky's uses of the other in his quest for the self.

To begin with, **the other** is a concept, a phenomenon that has a long history. It has become one of the key categories in the identity theory and a research topic in disciplines like history, philosophy, psychology, sociology, anthropology and theology just to mention a few. The Newest Philosophical Dictionary defines **the other** as "the concept of philosophy of the 20th century, which fixes [...] the experience of meeting **I** with an

⁴¹ "Svoy", Def.1, **Maliy Akademicheskii Slovar Russkogo Yazyka**, w.date, (Online) <https://classes.ru/all-russian/russian-dictionary-vasmer-term-11750.htm>, November 14, 2018.

⁴² Zarova, **op. cit.**, p. 66.

entity similar to it and representing it, yet, at the same time, different from it”.⁴³ (my trans.) In other words, the other is similar to the self because they exist in parallel with each other but on the opposite sides, therefore one differs from another by its position.

In the early nineteenth century Friedrich Hegel in his **Phenomenology of Spirit** writes that the subject is present within the context of the counter-subject and the first is constructed in its negation of the second. In other words, comprehension of the self is possible when it is opposed against the other.⁴⁴ In this case the **counter-subject**’s purpose of existence is the subject’s articulation.

By the twentieth century “the theme of ‘the Other’ has been at the very heart of the work of every major twentieth-century Continental philosopher”.⁴⁵ One of them is Jacques Derrida. In Stuart Hall’s opinion Derrida repeats Hegel saying that “it is only through the relation to the Other, the relation to what it is not, [...], that the 'identity' can be constructed”⁴⁶. Also, he introduces readers to Derrida’s concept of **differance** and draws attention to the idea that “identities are constructed through, not outside, difference”.⁴⁷ In his understanding **differance** matters because it is essential to meaning; meaning could not exist without difference.⁴⁸ However, he also explains that in spite of the fact difference between binary oppositions gives us meaning of one element of the opposition, this dichotomy, in our case of self and other, can be “reductionist and oversimplified”.⁴⁹ Another weakness of binary oppositions is the dominant position of one of the poles of the binary.⁵⁰

Similarly, William Connolly states that identity needs difference in order to be formed and when it is formed, it converts difference into Otherness in order to secure itself.⁵¹ Thus, through difference between **Us** and **Them**, we acquire meaning of who we

⁴³ Alexandr Gritsanov, “**Drugoy**”, **Noveyshiyy Filosofskiy Slovar**, Minsk, V. M. Skakun, 1998, p. 226.

⁴⁴ Friedrich Hegel, **Phenomenology of Spirit**, New York, Oxford University Press, 1977.

⁴⁵ Cited in Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 3.

⁴⁶ Hall, **Questions of Cultural Identity**, p. 5.

⁴⁷ **Ibid.**

⁴⁸ Hall, **Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices**, p. 234.

⁴⁹ **Ibid.**, p. 235.

⁵⁰ Relates to the idea of not-always-negative use of the other in the construction of the self.

⁵¹ Quoted in Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 207.

are, that is, we gain an identity. To secure it, we endow **Them** with otherness. To exemplify, after defeating the Mongols, Russians used Christianity as the difference to define what it meant to be Russian. In this case, Russianness meant Orthodoxy. Consequently, the non-Orthodox was associated with otherness which, at the same time, puts Russians in the dominant position. However, this “reductionist and over-simplified” binary identification led to more ambiguity of Russian national or cultural identity due to the fact that these **others** were still **us**, which we will further call **internal others**. In addition, Russians were considered as the other by Europeans in spite of being Christians and of the same Arian race.⁵² This suggests that race and religion were not always the only notions to define the other.

Another philosopher who devoted much of his writing on the self and other is Emmanuel Levinas. His concept of **alter ego** seems to have a potential to understand the Russian self’s relationship with its other since it offers a different perspective. To him “the other is known through sympathy, as another (my)self, as the alter ego” rather than an opposition.⁵³ Yet, Neumann observes a tension between Levinas’s depiction of the other as an alter ego and “the Other as what I myself am not”.⁵⁴ He draws attention to Levinas’s dilemma on how to treat the other in the real world when there are many others and when this multiplicity might raise problems and upset the order. In human history submission of the other through assimilation was applied to solve the problem. For instance, to keep order in their overseas colonies European colonizers followed the policy of cultural assimilation of the colonized people. To paraphrase, they “domesticated Otherness”⁵⁵ of the colonized with the help of Western philosophy and theories or, better to say, “abolished the Otherness of the Other”⁵⁶. As a result, the colonized other became more “knowable and visible”⁵⁷ and consequently, predictable but keeping, at the same time, its racial and social otherness. Postcolonial writers such as Frantz Fanon discuss the

⁵² Neumann, *op. cit.*, p.62, 67.

⁵³ Emmanuel Levinas, *The Levinas Reader*, Ed. by Sean Hand, Oxford, Blackwell, 1989, p. 47.

⁵⁴ Neumann, *op. cit.*, p.17.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

⁵⁶ Hegel, *op. cit.*, p. 340.

⁵⁷ Homi Bhabha, *The Other Question In Literature*, London, Methuen, Politics and Theory, 1986, p. 118.

phenomenon in his profound book **Black Skin, White Masks**⁵⁸ and Homi Bhabha puts it as “almost the same but not quite”.⁵⁹

It should be noted that there are some differences between the approach to the role of the other in European identity formation and in Russian. One of them is strict binarism/dichotomy between the self and other. In Edward Said’s assertion, for instance, the European identity was constructed in opposition to **the Orient Other** which in most cases was given negative characteristics.⁶⁰ Next to the Western **dichotomy** of the self and other, there were intellectuals among Russian statesmen, imperialists, financiers, economists, military and religious leaders who tended to the comparative scheme of **We** and **They** when the issue was to build the Russian nation.⁶¹ While the Western man, according to Said for instance, opposed himself to Easterners to construct his identity through racial, cultural, civilizational and economical settings, many of Russian nation-builders, particularly Dostoevsky, juxtaposed the self with the other not only to emphasize Russians’ superiority but also to assess the other as **extension of the self** or **another equal self**⁶² with an aim to adapt some of their national features, assimilate, merge with them, and sometimes try on their masks. In the following parts juxtaposition of this type will be discussed with a stress on Dostoevsky.

It has been mentioned that the word **other** has three equivalents in Russian. Different authors use them differently adding some views. In Georgiy Antipov’s opinion “the carrier of another culture is traditionally perceived as an **alien (chuzhoy)**, moreover, this **alien** concept is associated with the carriers of that culture, contacts with which are especially significant for culture of the recipient”.⁶³ (my trans.) According to Aleksey

⁵⁸ Frantz Fanon, **Black Skin, White Masks**, Trans. by Charles Lam Markmann, United Kingdom, Pluto Press, 1986.

⁵⁹ Homi Bhabha, **The Location Of Culture**, London, Routledge, 1994, p. 89.

⁶⁰ Edward Said, **Orientalism**, London, Penguin Books, 1978.

⁶¹ To ensure consistency and clarity in the following discussion the term **nation-builders** is to be used to imply intellectuals who devoted their time and knowledge to build the Russian nation and construct national identity. The figure to be focused on in this study is Dostoevsky. Apart from him such figures as historians N. Karamzin, N. Danilevsky and V. Tatishchev, activists and critics A. Herzen and V. Belinsky, writers A. Pushkin, N. Gogol and L. Tolstoy just to mention a few played the central role in the nation-building process.

⁶² This key concept of Dostoevsky is to be explained in the following chapters.

⁶³ Georgiy Antipov, et al., **Tekst Kak Yavleniye Kultury**, Novosibirsk, Nauka, 1989, p. 72-73.

Gorshkov **otherness** (**drugost/inakovost**) is dissimilarity between individuals/communities, and presence of specific values, mentality and cultural characteristics.⁶⁴

For Yuriy Lotman **the other** (**chuzhoy**) is “a carrier of another consciousness who codes the world and texts in a different way”.⁶⁵ (my trans.) He also explains that culture creates **the other** itself because it needs a partner without which it cannot realize an exchange necessary for culture’s development. Moreover, he admits that the other (**chuzhoye**) becomes the self because in the process of exchange it often transforms changing its features radically. Repina perceives this aspect slightly differently from Lotman. She indicates that the other may originally be the self, but his possession of certain qualities or knowledge makes him culturally **Inym** (other) and socially **Chuzhim** (other), or marginal. At the same time, the ethnic other can be the self by cultural and moral priorities.⁶⁶ This interpretation of Repina about the origin of the other will be applied in the following chapters to the case of the Russian peasants who were seen as the other by the upper classes because of the cultural differences between these two classes of Russian society. There were also many foreigners in Russia who were received as the self due to their Orthodoxy. This ability of the other to become the self and vice versa can be explained by the fact that the boundaries between them, as Kopelev states, are fluid, i.e. “they change not only within the limits of each epoch but also in the historical process.”⁶⁷ (my trans.)

From everything said above it can be concluded that the other is an undeniable constitutive of the self closely intertwined with it. Depending on the boundary type and historical period, the other as well as the self can try on different masks. Sometimes the other plays the role of an alien (**inoy**) or stranger (**chuzhoy**), in other cases it is simply the

⁶⁴ Aleksey Gorshkov, “Inakovost” i Genderniye Variatsii Mnozhestvennoy Identichnosti, **Identichnost Kak Predmet Politicheskogo Analiza: Sb. St. Po Itogam Vseros. Nauch.-Teor. Konf.**, Moscow, Imemo Ran, 2011, p. 169.

⁶⁵ Yuriy Lotman, **Statyi po Semiotike i Topologii Kultury**, Vol.1, Tallin, Aleksandra, 1992, p. 117.

⁶⁶ Repina, **op. cit.**, p. 16.

⁶⁷ Lev Kopelev, “Chuzhiye”, **Chelovek v Istorii**, Moscow, Odissey, 1994, p. 5.

other (**drugoy**), which can even become the self, on the other hand, the self can also become the other.

This peculiarity of the self/other concept is often touched to question Russian Janus-faced nature linked to duality of the Russian self. Although it might be seen as a handicap for identity construction, Anne Norton asserts that it is this dubiety of the self and other and their ambiguous overlapping, not simply the difference between them, which creates collective identities. In her view, one should study identity construction “in those moments of ambiguity where one is other to oneself, and in the recognition of the other as like”.⁶⁸ Duality and ambiguity of Russia’s self that root from the country’s geo-political position between West and East not only created several types of the other different from each other by ethnicity, territory, religion and language with a purpose to oppose them against the self, but also led to reciprocity between them in the process of which one was received as other to oneself, and the other was recognized as alike.

Thus, it is obvious that Hegelian concept of constructing a subject through a counter-subject, Derrida’s theory of differance and Saidian binary opposition between the Western Self and Oriental Other, just to mention a few, are not sufficient to explain Russian identity formation. Even though Levinas’s alter ego as another myself is one step closer to a different vision of identity formation, it still implies self/other dichotomy beyond which we intend to move. Taking such vision in consideration, we argue that Mikhail Bakhtin’s concepts of **dialogism** and **polyphony** offer a better understanding of identity construction particularly in the Russian case. Despite the fact that it was Hegel who used the notion of dialogism much earlier, Bakhtin developed it to the level that best fits Dostoevsky’s view of the self/other nexus and its role in search of the self, which is the topic of this dissertation.

The Russian linguist and critic defines **dialogism** as “a special form of interaction between equitable and equivalent consciousness”.⁶⁹ In his view, when two or more such individuals interact, it is not that one of them constructs meaning through difference

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁶⁹ Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problemy Poetiki Dostoevskogo*, Kiev, Next, 1994, p. 184.

between him and others (as it usually happens in Western culture), but that one finds meaning through combination of his consciousness with the other's. This combination of individual **consciousnesses** in their search of meaning through dialogue is called by Bakhtin **polyphony**.⁷⁰ Martin Irvine defines the term **polyphonic** as “many-voiced, incorporating many voices, styles, references, and assumptions not a speaker's own”.⁷¹

In addition, Bakhtin suggests that polyphony is not possible when instead of combining with another consciousness it becomes **epistemological**. He explains the latter as

a single consciousness whose purpose of dealing with another consciousness is to determine itself alone. It does not enter into relation with another consciousness and does not admit next to itself any other unity that would stand as a sovereign unity against it with its own fate. This single consciousness creates and forms only an object from an individual, never another subject.⁷² (my trans.)

The problem with epistemological consciousness is that it denies the other its uniqueness, its sovereignty, its right to be a subject. As a result, there is one single voice and encounter becomes a monologue. In monologue, Bakhtin insists, one cannot construct meaning as it happens only through dialogue with the “equitable and equivalent” other. In another essay he clarifies:

This is why the unique speech experience of each individual is shaped and developed in continuous and constant interaction with others' individual utterances. This experience can be characterized to some degree as the process of *assimilation*--more or less creative--of others' words (and not the words of a language). Our speech, that is, all our utterances (including our creative works), is filled with others' words, varying degrees of otherness or varying degrees of "our-own-ness" These words of others carry with them their own expression, their own evaluative tone, which we assimilate, rework, and re-accentuate.⁷³

Hall underlines that meaning, according to Bakhtin, “does not belong to any one speaker. It arises in the give-and-take between different speakers”.⁷⁴ Michael Holquist comparing

⁷⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 31.

⁷¹ Martin Irvine, **A Student's Guide**, Georgetown University, w.date, (Online) www.faculty.georgetown.edu/irvinem/theory/Bakhtin-MainTheory, December 10, 2019.

⁷² Mikhail Bakhtin, “Avtor i Geroy v Esteticheskoy Deyatel'nosti”, **Estetika Slovesnogo Tvorchestva**, Moscow, Iskusstvo, 1979, p.78.

⁷³ Mikhail Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, Trans.by Vern W. McGee, Texas, University of Texas Press, 1986, p. 89.

⁷⁴ Stuart Hall, “The Spectacle of the Other”, **Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices**, p. 235.

Freud and Bakhtin's concept of **the other** and **self** concludes that for Freud "the more is there the other, the less there is the self (I)", whereas for Bakhtin "the more is there the other, *the more* [my emphasis] there is the self (I)".⁷⁵ (my trans.) Hence, taking into consideration these ideas by Bakhtin, Julia Kristeva's statement that "more than binarism, dialogism may well become the basis of our time's intellectual structure"⁷⁶ and Neumann's assumption of dialogism as "the best starting point for the study of collective identity formation"⁷⁷, Bakhtin's concepts of dialogism and polyphony will be used as an alternative way to discuss identity for a framework of Dostoevsky's suggestion for a Russian image.

So far, we have described how national identity is constructed in relation to the other from perspectives of several thinkers and defined that binarism or dichotomy are not satisfactory for imagining the full picture of the relationship between the self and other in the Russia's case, whereas dialogism is.

Another way to look into Russian identity construction from the Western approach is to address such concepts/readings of identity formation as **dialogical** and **dialectical** according to Neumann. Moreover, Russian scholars such as V. Zarova and Yulia Kirichek also discuss identity construction from these two spectrums though Kirichek prefers the term **phenomenology** instead of **dialectics**. She proposes that because during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries dichotomous thinking prevailed due to the restriction of communication between states, and low degree of cultural exchange and communicativeness among peoples, other nations were seen as an enemy, a stranger capable of invasion at any moment.⁷⁸ Therefore, the word **chuzhoy** (alien) better describes the attitude of the self to representatives of different states/civilizations in those days. Nevertheless, when intercultural communication increased in the twentieth century and binary oppositions weakened, another person stopped to be looked at as an object but

⁷⁵ V. L. Makhlin, **Bakhtinskiy Sbornik**, Ed. by Yaziki Slovanskoy Kulturi, Vol.5, Moscow, 2004, p. 99.

⁷⁶ Quoted in Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 14.

⁷⁷ **Ibid.**

⁷⁸ Yuliya Kirichek, "Diskurs "Drugogo": ot Filosofskikh Traditsiy k Teorii Identichnosti", **Nauchniy Yezhegodnik Instituta Filosofii i Prava Uralskogo Otdeleniya Rossiyskoy Akademii Nauk**, Vol.13, No.4, 2013, p. 44.

became an equal unit to the subject. In the same spirit, Neumann observes that the twentieth century was the period when Hegel's ideas on identity formation started to be read dialogically and dialectically, though he also adds that most of them tended to be dialectical, not dialogical under the influence of Marx's version of a dialectical identity formation, which allows to suggest that Marx was against dialogical approach of identity formation.⁷⁹ In addition to these views, Zarova estimates that the classical dialectic concept of identity is embodied in the process of **globalization**, called by many scholars **westernization** as well. She distinguishes these two principles saying that while the dialectical one involves assimilation and abolition of differences, the dialogical principle presupposes "interaction between the self and other in which they do not fuse into one unit but preserve their uniqueness and independent development".⁸⁰ (my trans.)

Both Zarova and Neumann admit that the dialogical reading of identity formation is more in demand, but is still not sufficient enough. Moreover, Zarova agrees with Kirichenko's explanation on rather hostile dichotomy between the other (**chuzhoy, inoy**) and the self reasoning by the fact that the other is seen as an unfamiliar outsider/alien (**chuzhoy, chuzhdiy**) and as something foreign and different (**inoy**); the only thing the self can do in relation to such other is to absorb/assimilate it or confront it. According to these scholars this is dialectical understanding of the self/other nexus. The dialogical relationship is possible between the self and the other (**drugoy**) when one of the sides does not attempt to assimilate another⁸¹ or, as Neumann puts it, "it does not strive towards transcendence but rather towards harmony."⁸² In other words, relationship between the self and other is built on acceptance of each other as they are, and mutual respect of their differences, which can take place in condition of a dialogue between two equal subjects. It is this process in which Russian identity comes to be formed. According to Igor

⁷⁹ Neuman refers to the dialectical and dialogical approaches in order to discuss collective identity formation. According to him the merging of the self and other to form collective identity was first understood dialectically, i.e. merging of the self and other into some kind of a new entity. However, later there happened a shift away from dialectical understanding toward a dialogical one, which suggested existence of self and other as mutually constitutive and unbounded entities. For more info go to Neumann, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

⁸⁰ Zarova, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

⁸² Neumann, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

Yevlampiyev, Dostoevsky believed that the other should be perceived not as an object but as another subject and that it can be accomplished only through “an absolute assertion, with all the will and all the mind, of the other’s being: ‘thou art (**Ti yesi**)’”.⁸³ (my trans.) When such assertion is achieved, the other ceases to be an alien (**zhuzhoy**) to the self, and becomes another designation of it.

Thus, despite the fact that both dialectical and dialogical principles are important for understanding of identity formation, taking into consideration Dostoevsky’s understanding of Russia’s peculiar geographical position and historical development, we will focus on the dialogical reading of Russian national identity construction, that is interaction between the self and other through mutual acceptance and respect of differences rather than assimilation and abolishing of the other by the self. Instead of construction **self-other opposition**, we will mainly use Neumann’s **self/other nexus (pair)**. We argue that Dostoevsky’s uses of the self and other introduce the dialogical principle rather than dialectical.

Within the dialogical approach discussed by Neumann, Bakhtin’s understanding of dialogism between the self and other, where the self is a constitutive image of Russian national identity and other is another equal self and another subject, will be also benefited from. That is why the word **drugoy** rather than **inoy** or **chuzhoy** will be used as the Russian equivalent for **the other** in the present work.

Now when it is defined what we mean by national identity, the self and other and dialogism, in the final part of this chapter we need to distinguish which different kinds of othering dominated the processes of Russian identity formation in Dostoevsky’s time. To accomplish this it is necessary to define factors that delineate the self from the other. Neumann mentions religion, culture, climate and military-political aspect as factors in the representation of Europe’s selves and others. Taking into consideration the ambiguity of Russian identity, a more extended scheme is needed. Such scheme can be found within V.

⁸³ Igor I. Yevlampiyev, “Lichnost Kak Absolyut. Metafizicheskiye ‘Eksperimenty’ Dostoyevskogo”, **Antropologiya Dostoyevskogo** 3, w.date, (Online) www.dostoevskiy-lit.ru/dostoevskiy/kritika/evlampiev-antropologiya-dostoyevskogo/evlampiev-lichnost-kak-absolyut-metafizicheskie-eksperimenty.htm, October 8, 2018.

eleven factors⁸⁴ suggested by Felde because they seem more appropriate for the Russian case. To differentiate the Russian self from its others from Dostoevsky's perspective we will benefit from nine of the factors and change their order to form three categories assuming that in this way the scheme can be defined.

Factors of the first category are **ethno-cultural factor (etno-kulturniy faktor)**, **language factor (yazykovoy faktor)** and **factor of religious belonging (faktor religioznoy prinadlezhnosti)**. We categorise the scholar's factors that way because the chosen ones are somehow inseparable. Felde explains that in the traditional culture, the origin of a person determined his ethnic and cultural component. His belonging to a nation, religion, tradition and language depended on the cultural reality he was born and brought up in. If to project Felde's example on the Russian reality, for a person who was born into a Russian speaking family of Russian Orthodox culture, any representative of non-Russian and non-Orthodox culture is the other for him.

Due to Russia's heterogeneous population the Russian language often played the role of a signifier of the self. Felde states that **the language factor** classified the Russian speakers as the self and the rest as the other. There is a special word in Russian **inoyazychnik** that implies that the person is not **svoy** (us) because he speaks a different language. Felde also adds that language affiliation was linked with ethnicity and religion until recently. We will see this in Dostoevsky's use of the word **inoyazychnik** (speaker of a foreign language) to call a Russian who abandons the Orthodox faith in **The Brothers Karamazov**. In this study of Dostoevsky's search of the self, religion rather than ethnicity, culture and language will play the key role in identification of the selves and others owing to the practices/mentality of the time.

⁸⁴ Felde mentions eleven factors: Human (Biological) Factor, Ethno-Cultural Factor, Factor of Religious Affiliation, Factor of Social Stratification, Worldview Factor, Territorial Factor, Factor of Citizenship, Language Factor, Presence/Absence of Boundary, Factor of Cultural Superiority and Political Factor, from which we choose only nine omitting the Human (Biological) Factor and Presence/Absence of Boundary. The Human factor because it is applicable to earlier times when people of one tribe thought of representatives of another as abnormal and subhuman (**nelud**). The factor of Presence/Absence of Boundary is omitted because it covers the boundary with the Church which we find too restricted for the present study. Moreover we discuss the boundary to God referring to Felde's planes. Felde, **op. cit.**, p. 119-122.

It is necessary to open **religious belonging** from another perspective before we go to the next category. Felde adds to the factors five planes within which religion divides the world into selves and others. In the present work the plane in which a man exists in the boundary with the Absolute will be focused on.⁸⁵ Within it, Felde explains, the religious (self) is opposed to the non-religious (other), where the non-religious world is a secular world, for example Father Tikhon vs. Nikolay Stavrogin in **The Possessed**. Within other planes the scholar distinguishes such category as the sinner (other) and the righteous man (self), for example characters from **The Brothers Karamazov** Dmitri Karamazov and his youngest brother Alesha. The sinners are also divided into the heretic or anathema (other) and the weak sinner (self), who sins due to his spiritual weakness. The best example is Pavel Smerdyakov and Fyodor Karamazov because the first rejects the main Orthodox symbols and becomes anathema, and the second accepts God but does not practice the religion because of self-indulgence.

The **social stratification factor (faktor sotsialnoy stratifikatsii)**, the **worldview factor (mirovozzrencheskiy faktor)** and the **factor of cultural superiority (faktor kulturnogo prevoskhodstva)** are united under the next category due to their logical boundary with each other. The **social stratification factor** explains how the self recognizes himself among other representatives of the same ethnic nation. For example, as a result of Petrian reforms Russian society was divided into classes. Representatives of the lower classes looked at the upper classes as the other and vice versa. There was an open opposition between the narod⁸⁶/the lower classes and nobility/the educated upper classes.

The worldview factor, together with some boundaries to religion, better to say, to the view on religious practices, it is also linked with **the social stratification**. By the end

⁸⁵ **Ibid.**, p. 34.

⁸⁶ Berdyaev defines **narod** as “peasants and workers, lower class of society who live by physical labor. Therefore, a nobleman, manufacturer or merchant, a scientist, a writer or an artist are not **narod**, [...] they are opposed to it as **bourgeoisie** and **intelligentsia**.” We will use the Russian version, i.e. **narod** in the work. See Berdyaev, **Mirosozertsanie Dostoievckogo**, Pgaha, Ymca-Press, Ch.7, w.page, 1923, (Online) www.vehi.net/berdyaev/dostoevsky/07.html, May 12, 2018.

of the nineteenth century distance between the classes in Russia widened due to upper classes' westernization and secularization. Russian narod's devotion to Orthodoxy and its worldview on the faith in general differed from that of the secularized upper classes so much that they became aliens (**chuzhimi**) to each other.

Social division of Russian society and their difference in the worldview gave a way to cultural superiority of one class over another. **Factor of cultural superiority (faktor kulturnogo prevoskhodstva)** made the gap between narod and nobility even wider. Russian educated classes considered themselves cultured and civilized, and therefore, superior over the uneducated, **barbarian** and **Asiatic** narod. However, Felde warns that the factor of cultural superiority determines the self and other ambiguously. Educated Russian people, for instance, were the other for the narod because they practiced Western culture and **new religions**, i.e. nihilism, and therefore were pitied by common religious people for losing God, and were seen by them spiritually inferior.

The last three factors are the **territorial factor (territorialniy faktor)**, the **citizenship factor (faktor grazhdanstva)** and **political (politicheskiy faktor)**. They are taken into one category because three of them discuss a type of belonging to one entity, be it territorial or political. **The territorial factor** defines inhabitants of the conquered lands of Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, Central Asia and Siberia and other foreigners (Ottomans and Europeans) (**tuzemtsev, chuzhezemtsev, chuzhestrantsev, inostrantsev**) as the other (**chuzhie**).

In comparison to territorial, **the citizenship factor (faktor grazhdanstva)** defines the self and its other not according to nationality, race or religion but citizenship. All residents of the Russian Empire were the self and were united as one people called **Rossiyanе** (the civic Russians), whereas non-residents were the other.

The **political factor** will be applied to the case of Russia's political rivalry with the Western and Ottoman Empires particularly around **the Eastern Question**. Normally, the Europeans were the self for the Russians due to their being Christians and of Arian race, nevertheless, the political factor made them the other. The Asians, on the contrary,

turned out to be the self because they shared the same territory and citizenship with ethnic Russians especially after the annexation of Central Asia in the nineteenth century.

Relying on these factors and Neumann's terminology regarding self/other perspective, we will distinguish several types of the self and other. Nevertheless, because the Russian self is as multi-faced and unstable as its others, throughout the research it is to be kept in mind that the categories of self and other are slippery and porous, "reversible and corresponded to different social groups depending on the context in which they were uttered", as Maya Gubina correctly argues.⁸⁷ Thus, in different periods of Russian history⁸⁸ images of the self and other changed.

If to begin with the self, Neumann mentions national, political, religious, Christian, cultured etc. selves as well as Western, European, Russian and Bashkir selves, which means that different factors are used for their identification.⁸⁹ Applying these terms to the Russian reality, we will differentiate **the Russian national self (Rossiyanin⁹⁰)** according to **the citizenship** and **political factors**. These factors allow to identify the self from the other on account of belonging to a nation state. For instance, all residents of the Russian Empire belong to the same nation called by Dostoevsky **Russkiy narod/narodnost/natsia/natsionalnost** and are united against **external others** be it the West, Ottomans or another state. Due to Russians' different attitude to these external others, we will distinguish them as the **common other⁹¹** personified in the Ottoman Turk⁹²

⁸⁷ Maya Gubina, "The Year 1812: The Discover of What Kind of Other?", **Other Voices: Three Centuries of Cultural Dialogue between Russia and Western Europe**, Ed. by Graham H. Roberts, UK, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011, p. 179.

⁸⁸ Berdyaev in his book **Russkaya Idea** (Russian idea) differentiates five periods which created various images: Kievan Rus, Russia under Mongol Rule, Moscow, Petrian Russia and Soviet Russia. He admits a possibility that there will be another new Russia. Berdyaev, **op. cit.**, p. 31.

⁸⁹ Neumann, **op. cit.**

⁹⁰ Although there is no visual difference in the word **Russian** in phrases **the Russian Empire** and **Russian people**, they are translated to Russian differently. The Russian Empire in Russian sounds as **Rossiyskya** which supposedly derives from the word **Rus** (term used for Russia before the times of Peter the Great) and implies the multi-ethnic empire. Meanwhile, Russian people sounds as **Russkiy** to emphasize its ethnic core. The concept is discussed by Valeriy Tishkov, **Rossiyskiy Narod: Istoriya i Smysl Natsionalnogo Samosoznaniya**, Moscow, Nauka, 2013.

⁹¹ Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 34.

⁹² Neumann uses the term **the Ottoman Turk** to indicate the founders of the Ottoman Empire as successors of the Saracen who initiated military pressure on Christendom. The scholar compares the two on the basis of their influence on Europe. For more information go to Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 43.

as an external Islamic aggressor and military opponent, and **the dominant other** personified in the West as a **challenger**⁹³ to the Russian national self. Thus, in attempt to answer the question of Russian identity, one of the stages of our analysis of the self/other nexus will be relations between the Russian national self and its two external others, the Ottoman Turk as the common other and the European other as the dominant other and challenger of the Russian national self.

Another kind of othering that dominated the processes of Russian identity formation in Dostoevsky's time took place within the Russian nation under the category **internal others**, which implies "ethnically and culturally peripheral minorities".⁹⁴ As it has been mentioned above, Russia's peculiar geo-political position and its heterogeneous population caused "a complex terminological problem".⁹⁵ With reference to Neumann, in this work we distinguish two types of the internal other. Relying on ethno-cultural factor, language factor, and factor of religious belonging we will start with Russia's indigenous population different from the Russians ethnically and culturally which actually means religiously.

A modern Russian ethnologist Valeriy Tishkov distinguishes two categories of the Russian Empire's population: the Russian **narod** (nation) and other ethnic minorities of non-Christian faith under the name of **inorodtsy** (aliens by origin) and **inovertsy** (aliens by religion), natives of conquered territories **tuzemtsy** and other nationalities.⁹⁶ Besides, Vasily Tatishchev⁹⁷ explains that the word **inozemtsy** (comers from foreign lands) is applied by Russians to **inovertsy** (those of a different faith), **inorodtsy** (those of a different kin) and **inoyazychniki** (speakers of a foreign language) in spite of the fact that

⁹³ If Neumann sees Europe's dominant other and its challenger in face of the Ottoman Turk since the foundation of the Ottoman Empire in the early fourteenth century, Russia's dominant other and challenger will be in this study Europe/West since Peter the Great's time. **Ibid.**, p. 49.

⁹⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 39.

⁹⁵ Tishkov, **op. cit.**, p. 254.

⁹⁶ Tishkov, **op. cit.**, p. 47.

⁹⁷ Vasily Nikitich Tatishchev (1686-1750), Russian economic administrator and historian who was the first to produce a comprehensive Russian history, worked in the service of Peter the Great, (Online) www.britannica.com/biography/vasily-nikitich-tatishchev, September 14, 2018.

inozemtsy means a foreigner, not a subject of the state where he is located.⁹⁸ Hence, it is essential to distinguish that **inozemtsy** means subjects of a foreign country, and **inorodtsy** means the Russian Empire's subjects with different ethnicities and religions.⁹⁹ **Bolshaya Rossiyskaya Entsiklopediya** generalizes and states that all representatives of non-Christian religions were officially called **inorodtsy** (aliens).¹⁰⁰ Another scholar L. Shternberg looks at the term from a different perspective. To him **inorodstvo** is basically characterized by language: "Only the population which speaks the Great Russian dialect has a privilege to be called the Russian people (**ruskiy narod**)".¹⁰¹

In some sources **inorodtsy** are called **svoi** or **nawi** (our). For example, the semiotician Yuri Lotman informs that Russians in those days also defined themselves in relation to **svoi pagany** (our pagans).¹⁰² They were considered pagans because they were not of the Orthodox faith, and therefore not the self. Nevertheless, they were the residents of the Russian Empire, and therefore, the self. Dostoevsky, to speak of the Asians, Muslims, Tatars, Kirgiz etc. often addressed them as **nawi** (our) too.¹⁰³ Moreover, his images of Russia's non-Russians (ethnically and religiously), as a rule, were a constitutive part of the Russian national self. In **The Dairy of a Writer** when talking of the unified Russian **narod** he meant **inorodtsy** too, for example in the phrase "one hundred million people of ours".¹⁰⁴ Neumann underlines that such situation leads to "the inevitable ambiguity of identity formation and the inherent uncertainty of the categories us/them and self/other".¹⁰⁵ We assume that using different types of the other and self will suggest a resolution of this ambiguity.

⁹⁸ Tatishchev, **Leksiyon Rossiyskoy Istoricheskoy, Geographicheskoy, Politicheskoy i Grazhdanskoy**, St. Petersburg, 1793, p. 90, (Online) <https://www.prlib.ru/item/425836>, September 14, 2018.

⁹⁹ Aleksey Konev, "Inorodtsy" Rossiyskoy Imperii: K Istorii Vozniknoveniya Ponyatiya", **Istoricheskiye Nauki, Teoriya i Praktika Obshchestvennogo Razvitiya**, 2014, No.13, p. 119.

¹⁰⁰ N.A. Proskuryakova, **Bolshaya Rossiyskaya Entsiklopediya**, (Online) www.bigenc.ru/domestic_history/text/3249696, November 14, 2018.

¹⁰¹ L. Shternberg, "Inorodtsy: Obshchiy Obzor", **Formy Nacionalnogo Dvizheniya v Sovremennykh Gosudarstvakh. Avstro-Vengriya, Rossiya, Germaniya**, Ed. by A.I. Kastelianskiy, St. Petersburg, Obshchestvennaya Polza, 1910, p. 529.

¹⁰² cited in Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 9.

¹⁰³ Fyodor Dostoevsky, **Dnevnik Pisatela**, Moscow, Knizhnyi Klub 36.6, 2011, p. 505.

¹⁰⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 547.

¹⁰⁵ Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 9.

All these facts point at the complexity of the category of the internal other. However, despite the fact that the other was often distinguished according to the territorial factor, ethno-cultural and language factors, taking into consideration the key role of religious belonging in national identification and Orthodox Christianity as the main marker of Russianness in the nineteenth century, the Russian narod, as Tishkov and others classified it above, will be identified with Orthodoxy and addressed as **the Orthodox self** and tied to **the religious other** represented mainly by **the Islamic other** (Tatars, Turks, Kirgiz, Asians etc.) and occasionally other **inorodtsy** (aliens).

For the self category we prefer the term **Orthodox** rather than **Christian** to avoid confusion with Europe's **Christian self**¹⁰⁶ who was mainly Catholics. In short, although ethnicity, culture, language and territory remained the factors in the representation of the first category of the internal other, the religious aspect dominated. Therefore, **inorodtsy** will be considered as Orthodoxy's other. Thus, in the internal level, the first actor which represented Russianness in Dostoevsky's time was the Orthodox self and the second, directly related to the first was **inorodtsy**, the Islamic internal other.

The second type of the internal other is not less complicated than the first one. It is another Russian peculiarity which adds to the ambiguity of national identity. The factors of the first category, i. e. the social stratification factor, the worldview factor and the factor of cultural superiority, help to represent the self and other in this context. As a result of the Petrian reforms, Russian society was divided into classes. The lower classes included the narod (common people, uneducated peasants, slaves) and the upper classes - westernized nobility, who were narod's masters. In other words, the narod was represented as the other according to the social stratification factor. In addition, Aleksander Etkind argues that the Russian Empire, unlike western empires which defined their other according to geographical and racial criteria, distinguished its other according to class and religion.¹⁰⁷ If to consider religion as a worldview on religious practices, the narod was othered by the nobility because according to them narod's religiosity was fanatic,

¹⁰⁶ Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 43.

¹⁰⁷ Aleksandr Etkind, **Vnutrennaya Kolonizatsiya. Imperskiy Opyt Rossiya**, Trans. by V. Makarov, Moscow, Novoye Literaturnoye Obozreniye, 2013, p. 206.

unreasonable, and barbaric. At the same time, nobility was othered by narod due to the first's secularism. The reason to indicate these factors here is that they convey the internal other more distinctively.

Similarly, Neumann mentions two axes of us-them.¹⁰⁸ The first axe points at Christianity as **Us** and Islam as **Them**, which is more appropriate for the discussion of the Ottoman other and the internal religious others. However, the second axe, **ancient Christians** vs. **contemporary Christians** is what sheds lights on the relation of narod and the upper classes. Moreover, it is added that due to a shift from a religious cosmology during the Renaissance the ancient Christians-contemporary Christians dichotomy was “supplanted by one that was based not on religion but on whether one was educated or not”.¹⁰⁹ Later on, it was modified as **cultured**, the new common ground which would unite the fractured Christendom.¹¹⁰ If to project this on Russia, the Orthodox Russian narod did not shift from Orthodoxy, and therefore, can be associated with **the ancient Christians**, whereas majority of the upper classes, under influence of westernization and secularization would prefer being classified as **educated** and **cultured** instead of **contemporary Christians**. As a result, narod became **the social other** with characteristics such as uncivilized, uneducated and uncultured and was juxtaposed with (by Dostoevsky) and opposed against (mainly by Westernizers) the civilized, educated and cultured upper classes, which we named **the cultured self**.¹¹¹

Another reason of this kind of terminology and classification of the self and other is Dostoevsky's use of the **we-the/us-them** category where by **We** he meant the upper classes nobility, “the civilized Russian Europeans” and by **They**, narod “the common Russians” is signified.¹¹² In addition, Dostoevsky wrote a lot about the state of being cultured as the major characteristic that divided the two classes of the Russian people. For example, in such phrases as “a high cultural type is taken from the highest cultural

¹⁰⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 72.

¹⁰⁹ **Ibid.**

¹¹⁰ **Ibid.**

¹¹¹ Despite the fact the similar points have been mentined above, they are repeated here to focus on Dostoevsky's uses of the paradigm.

¹¹² For an example see **Dnevnik Pisatela**, 2011, pp. 392, 403, 405, 43, 500 etc.

stratum of the Russian people”¹¹³, “our cultural period”¹¹⁴, “we are cultured people when compared to narod”¹¹⁵, he points at the existence of two socially divided classes in Russian society, **We** as the cultured self vs. narod as its other.

Similar terminology is used by Bhabha in **The Location of Culture** to debate on the post-colonial period. To exemplify, he discusses that as the result of “the nation split within itself”, which also happened in the Petrian period in Russia, **hybrid political identities** or **cultural hybridity** emerge.¹¹⁶ He classifies these hybridities as **otherness of the self**, and **cultural** or **social otherness** which happens when “we identify ourselves with the other”.¹¹⁷ In the Russian case **we** identified themselves with Europeans, who were the other for the narod.

Such nation split within the ethnic Russians became another reason of uncertainty of identity formation. However, there is one more. This time the nobility split within itself. The intellectual Russian upper classes separated into two camps, Westernizers and Slavophiles. The first believed that the Russian nation should develop in the Western way and identified themselves with Europeans, while the second stood for uniqueness of the Russian nation, different from the West.¹¹⁸ Yet, especially after 1953-1956 Crimean war many Westernizers questioned their ideas regarding the West. If before many Russian nation-builders used “the idea of ‘the Turk’ as the other [...] to bolster the case for Russia’s own Europeanness”¹¹⁹, later on they realized that the West would not give up looking at Russia as another Eastern empire¹²⁰ like the Ottoman¹²¹, and at Russians - as another barbarian other¹²² like the Turks.

¹¹³ Dostoevsky, **The Adolescent**, Trans. by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, w.place, Vintage, 2004, p. 325.

¹¹⁴ Dostoevsky, **Dnevnik Pisatela**, p. 252.

¹¹⁵ **Ibid.**, p. 324.

¹¹⁶ Bhabha, 1994, **op. cit.**, p. 146.

¹¹⁷ **Ibid.**

¹¹⁸ Batunsky, **op. cit.**, p. 54.

¹¹⁹ Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 59.

¹²⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 150.

¹²¹ **Ibid.**, p. 73.

¹²² **Ibid.**, p. 44.

Some contemporary scholars such as M. Tlostanova, A. Etkind, M. Bassin, V. Tolz, etc. write on this issue that the Russian nation as a whole was looked at and treated by the West as a subaltern nation.¹²³ Such attitude toward Russia caused an **inferiority complex**¹²⁴ vis-à-vis Western Europe among the Russian elite. To Mark Bassin this sense of inferiority led to a “willful turn away from Europe”¹²⁵ which deepened the ambivalence of national identity. In other words, Russia’s Janus-faced nature and ambiguity of national identity and the self is caused by the triple split.

We agree with Dostoevsky that the national identity crisis started with the split of the cultured Russian upper classes, whom Dostoevsky called **our Russian Europeans**¹²⁶, from the narod. The second split was between the Orthodox Russians and inorodtsy, who were **svoi/nashi** (our) but, at the same time, the religiously other. Neumann notices that the religious others, including the external other/the Turks, were often used by Russians to stress their belonging to Europe on the account that they both belonged to Christendom. Despite these attempts of the Russians to identify with Europe, the last constantly excluded “the ‘Asiatic’ Russians from the European self”.¹²⁷ In this case, we assume, not religion but being cultured becomes the key factor. Consequently, it can be elaborated that the cultural superiority was the factor in representation of narod as the educated Russian self’s other by Russian Westernizers who tried to promote European culture by that way. In the same way, it was the factor in representation of the Russian nation as Europe’s other by Europeans who tried to distinguish themselves as a more civilized nation than Russians. Such view of the Russians by Europeans persuaded the Russian intellectuals, and

¹²³ Madina Tlostanova, **A Janus Faced Empire: Notes on the Russian Empire in Modernity, Written from the Border**, Moscow, 2003, p. 9, (Online) www.researchgate.net/publication/273947828, June 12, 2017.

¹²⁴ The term **inferiority complex** is used by historians such as Mark Bassin, **Imperial Visions: Nationalist Imagination and Geographical Expansion in the Russian Far East, 1840–1865**, UK, Cambridge University Press, p. 263. Elena Andreyeva, **Russia and Iran in the Great Game: Travelogues and Orientalism**, Oxon, Routledge, 2007, p. 3, 10, 34. Galina M. Yemelianova, **Russia and Islam: A Historical Survey**, New York, Palgrave, 2002, p. 29. Tlostanova, **op. cit.**, pp. 18, 33, 65.

¹²⁵ Bassin, **op. cit.**, p. 263.

¹²⁶ Dostoyevsky, **The Diary of a Writer**, Trans. by Boris Brasol, New York, George Braziller, 1919, p. 843.

¹²⁷ Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 100.

particularly Dostoevsky, “to play up the alterity of [the West] *in order* to increase the integration of the [the Russian national] self”.¹²⁸ Therefore, the author of the novels of our scope classified the narod as the educated self’s other and the West/Europe as the Russian national self’s other.

In general, in the nineteenth century Russians defined themselves in relation to such kinds of otherness as external and internal. The first external other were the Europeans as the dominant other of the Russian national self and the second, the Ottoman Turk, as the national self’s common other; the internal others were the **inorodtsy**, the religious other in relation to the Orthodox self; and the narod, different socially and culturally from the cultured self. Finally, dialogical reading of the relation of the selves and others offers reading of Russian national identity formation for this study.

To sum up, Dostoevsky devoted many pages to convince the Russian Europeans that the future of the Russian nation is not in copying the Western identities but in turning to the Russian narod who managed to preserve their own. Moreover, he strongly believed that Russians are as much Europeans as they are Asians and that being Janus-faced, both European and Asian, master and slave allows to gain genuinely Russian identity, that is, reincarnate your spirit in the spirit of foreign nations and achieve the final goal of universality and pan-humanity.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 112.

¹²⁹ Dostoevsky, **op. cit.**, Vol.2, p. 426.

FIRST CHAPTER

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF RUSSIA'S PERCEPTION OF THE SELF AND ITS ENCOUNTERS WITH THE OTHER

“Historical material allows us to conclude that the history of religion, like the history of society, is the history of clarifying the relationship between the self and the other.”

S.D. Bakulina¹

1.1. Establishment of Russianness before the Reign of Peter the Great

To understand the process of identity construction from perspective of self/other paradigm, it is necessary first to map out the historical context in which Russianness took the stage until it reached the form Dostoyevsky used to build on. A framework offered by the context will be applied for textual analysis of the writer's novels in order to demonstrate his quest for identity construction in the last chapter of the thesis.

The history of Russia's perception of the self and its encounters with its other has been divided into three periods: before the reign of Peter the Great, the eighteenth century and the nineteenth century due to several reasons. The first period is taken back to the foundation of the Kievan Rus and conversion of the Slavic tribes to Christianity in the tenth century because accepting of the Byzantine version of Christianity defined the following relations of the Russians both with the Catholic West and Islamic East. Another reason to consider the establishment of Russianness before the reign of Peter the Great in 1682 is the political and religious worldview of the Muscovy Rus which was dramatically changed by the new Russian tsar, Peter the Great. If the Muscovy Rus saw itself different from the West and closer to the East after about two centuries of being ruled by the Tatar-Mongols, then with coming of Peter the Great the country acquired a new status of an empire and turned its all attention to Europe, which changed the Russian nation irreversibly. The change to be focused on in the last section of this chapter is the split of

¹ Svetlana Bakulina, *Tolerantnost: ot Istorii Ponyatiya k Sovremennym Sotsiokulturnym Smyslam*, Omsk, Omsk State Pedagogical University, 2010, p. 33.

the nineteenth-century intelligentsia into Westernizers and Slavophiles in Dostoevsky's time. In short, in this chapter we will read these three periods.

1.1.1. Heterogeneous Society of the Kievan Rus

Russia has come through a great metamorphosis from the Kievan Rus to Muscovy and the Russian Empire. What never changed even today is its heterogeneous society, a melting pot of different races, ethnicities, cultures, religions, languages etc. mainly due to the country's geo-political position between the West and East. It is this position what made Russian national identity Janus-faced and ambiguous.

Russia started its evolution as a territory populated with the Eastern Slavic tribes (whom we call **Russians** for simplicity) and many other peoples, who had comparatively peaceful co-existence.² The population was first subjugated by the Jewish Khazars. When Varangians (of Scandinavian origin) came to rule, they united the people in the **Kievan Rus**. Bartold informs that for the local Slavs it did not matter who they were ruled by as they paid tribute in any case in the form of furs and silver dirhams, the currency of the Arab Caliphate.³ The Arab money was coming from their influential Muslim Bulgar and Tatar neighbors whose factor was so central that Islam could have become the Kievan Rus's official religion in 986 when Muslim Volga Bulgars almost convinced the Knyaz Vladimir to convert to Islam. Nevertheless, originally pagan Kievan rulers proclaimed Greek Orthodoxy as the official religion in 988.⁴

Interestingly, Batunsky and Bartold speculate that the Mongols and Byzantium were the main obstacle for Islamization of the Rus.⁵ According to them, Byzantium, being previously attacked by the Kievan Rus grown in power in the Black Sea, could not allow them to take the side of the Muslim enemy. It would be devastating not only for Byzantium but for the whole Christian world which had been under Islamic threat since the eighth

² Galina M. Yemelianova., **Russia and Islam. A Historical Survey**, New York, Palgrave, 2002, p. 3.

³ Vasiliy Bartold, "Istoriya Izucheniya Vostoka v Yevrope i Rossii", **Lectures**, 2 edition, Leningrad, Leningrad Institute of Study of Living Eastern Languages, 1925, Vol.8, p. 165.

⁴ Cited in Yemelyanova, **op. cit.**, p. 8.

⁵ Mark Batunsky, **Rossiia i Islam**, Vol.2, Moscow, Progress-Traditsiya, w.date, p. 2.

century. On this occasion, Said observes that “not for nothing did Islam come to symbolize terror, devastation, the demonic, hordes of hated barbarians. For Europe, Islam was a lasting trauma. Until the end of the seventeenth century the ‘Ottoman peril’ lurked alongside Europe to represent for the whole of Christian civilization a constant danger”.⁶ This **constant danger** was associated with Tatars, Mongols, and other nomadic peoples in the Byzantine sources.⁷ Their goal was to spread the pro-Christian and anti-Islamic propaganda emphasizing **the Islamic threat**.

1.1.2. Conversion to Christianity

After the Kievan Rus’s conversion to Christianity in 988, Byzantine high culture entered the land of the Rus with a new status. The common religion between the two enabled the Russian rulers “to present themselves as perpetuators of the Byzantine imperial and spiritual traditions”.⁸ However, by getting closer to the Byzantine tradition the gap widened not only among the Kievan Rus, pagan and Muslim Asiatic nomads, but also between the Kievan Rus and the Roman Catholic Church, which led to more dramatic isolation of Russia from the rest of Europe. It should be clarified that the isolation was more ideological rather than cultural and social because the Kievan ruling family used to have close relationship with many reigning houses of Europe.⁹ The gap will expand during the years of the Kievan Rus’s dependence upon the Khazar, Bulgar and later the Mongols until the time Ivan the Terrible took Kazan and Peter the Great **opened the window** to Europe.

Overall, during the pre-Mongolian period the proto-Russians, being pagans and often having peaceful co-existence with peoples of various origin and religion, put the first brick in the nation-building after converting to the Byzantine version of Christianity and accepting Byzantine culture. However, Christianization of the Kievan Rus did not cut

⁶ Said, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

⁷ Nikolay Karamzin, *Istoriya Gosudarstva Rossiyskogo*. Vol.5, Ch.3, w.page, (Online) www.azbyka.ru/otechnik/Nikolaj_Karamzin/istoriya-gosudarstva-rossijskogo/, May 1, 2018.

⁸ Yemelyanova, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

the people from their Asian nomadic neighbors (Pechenegs, Kipchaks or Polovtsy and Tatars) with whom they continued to have close territorial and cultural boundaries and who played a key role in formation of Russian national identity as its constitutive part.

Nevertheless, the Kievan Rus's ideological devotion to Byzantine culture did sharpen the discursive lines between now Orthodox Slavs and still multi-confessional nomads mainly of Turkic origin. Under the influence of Byzantine propaganda against Islam which was uncritically accepted and adopted by Kievan authorities, the nomadic neighbors started to be conceptualized as **Oriental**¹⁰ or **the religious other** and were gradually identified with Islam in spite of the fact the majority of the nomads converted to Islam much later.¹¹ In addition, because of frequent contact through trade and intermarriage with neighbors of the nomadic world, in most cases there were no clear distinctions between the self and other. The self was a combination of Slavic and Asian features which gave a way to the Janus-like nature of the Russian self. Nevertheless, after Mongols' first stroke on the northeastern Russian principalities in 1237-1238¹², the self came to be distinguished as a reaction against the Muslim Mongolian occupation. So we assume that when Islam spread among peoples of the Asian steppe during the Mongol Rule, the religion became the key factor to differentiate the self and the other. Consequently, the terms **Asiatic** and **Muslim** became synonyms and interchangeable. Therefore, we will refer to them as a single notion - the religious other.

1.1.3. The Tatar-Mongol Rule and Islamization of the Golden Horde

The Tatar-Mongol conquest of the Kievan Rus of the thirteenth century became a decisive moment in Russian identity construction. According to Andreyeva it was the

¹⁰ In this work, to avoid confusion between Said's terminology of **the Oriental Other** and Russia's other, we will use the term **the religious other**. We assume it is a better term for the Russian case as the other was imagined differently from the West. Moreover, Russia itself was considered the Orient by the Europeans. Thus, the term **Orient** will not be used in discussion of newly acquired territories by the Russian Tsars.

¹¹ Mark Batunsky, "Islam and Russian Mediaeval Culture." **Die Welt Des Islams**, Vol.26, No.1/4, 1986, p. 8, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/1570755.

¹² Yemelyanova, **op. cit.**, p. 16.

major event in its formation.¹³ For more than two centuries princes of the Kievan Rus, subjugated by the Mongols (Genghisids), had to pay tributes to the Mongol khans who originally practiced various religions.¹⁴ This period was eventually called by the Russians **the Tatar-Mongol Yoke**.¹⁵ Particularly at this period the Russian conflict with the nomadic peoples intensified. They became the major regional opponents and traditional enemies for the Christian Rus. Asiatic hordes who came from Mongolian steppes and their allies, generically called **Tatars**¹⁶ were considered the Asiatic villains and associated with the evil, darkness, monsters and a party whose destruction had to be stopped for the good of all people. Russian historian Karamzin describes relationship between the Russians and Tatars:

The Tatars were at first idolaters, and then - the Mohammedans: we [Russians] called their customs pagan (unclean); and the easier we accepted the Byzantine customs, sanctified by Christianity, the stronger we abhorred those of the Tatar's, associating them with a hated evil. In addition, despite the humiliation of slavery, we felt our civil superiority in relation to the nomads. The consequence was that the Russians came out from under the yoke more with a European than Asian character. Europe did not recognize us because it changed for these 250 years, and we stayed as we were.¹⁷ (my trans.)

The Mongol invasion followed for nearly 250 years, but Mongols and Tatars remained in the collective memory of Russians as “instruments of the Devil”¹⁸ for centuries. Notably, as it has been mentioned before, majority of the negative images were adopted from Byzantine sources where the Mongol invasion was shown as a terrible misfortune for the Rus and were found in Muscovite chronicles written by church people.

¹³ Andreyeva, **op. cit.**, p. 26.

¹⁴ Yemelyanova, **op. cit.**, p. 18.

¹⁵ David Schimmelpenninck van der Oye, **Russian Orientalism: Asia in the Russian Mind from Peter the Great to the Emigration**, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2010, p. 20.

¹⁶ Schimmelpenninck (22) writes that the word “Tatars” was a generic label for the Chinese’s pastoral neighbors across the Great Wall and that they were the Mongols’ tribal archenemies on the eastern steppe. Eventually this label was used by Arabs, Indians, and Europeans to describe nomads. Later, the term “Tatar” was applied to the Turkic, Islamic descendants occupying the Golden Horde’s former domains on the steppe. (Schimmelpenninck, **op. cit.**, p. 22) Yemelyanova argues that the Mongols used the term as a generic name for peoples who inhabited western Eurasia. (Yemelyanova, **op. cit.**, p. 16).

¹⁷ Karamzin, **op. cit.**, Ch.3, w.page.

¹⁸ Charles J. Halperin, **The Tatar Yoke: The Image of the Mongols in Medieval Russia**, Bloomington, Indiana University, 2009, p.66.

On the other hand, the religious other was not always as pejorative among ordinary people as it was presented in the chronicles. The Russian historian Karamzin did admit the devastating effect of the Mongols but he also revealed that Russians did not always put all the blame on the invaders but also perceived them as God's punishment for their own sins.¹⁹ He also acknowledges that during the Mongol rule autocracy was restored and Moscow was strengthened, and that the Muscovy "owed its greatness to the khans".²⁰ In the similar fashion, modern sources acknowledge that the Mongols never occupied the Kievan land, nor did they rule it directly or interfere local administrative, economic and religious practices of the local population which is another difference from the Western type of colonization. In addition, they recognized the exclusive rights of the Varangian dynasty of Rurik to govern the Slavic Rus. Commercial activity took even greater expansion due to incorporation of almost all Eurasia within the Genghizid Empire, more security on the roads, and relative political stability within its borders.²¹ Moreover, all religions and beliefs were given an equal status, the clergy were exempted from taxation.²² There was no penalty for converting to this or that religion, people had freedom to convert to either Christianity as a number of the Mongol nobles did to join the Russian elite, or to Islam, Buddhism, Shamanism, or Judaism, or to stay pagan.²³ Also, very often the ruling family and the upper classes of Muscovy had marital ties with their Asian masters.²⁴ Thus, there was "symbiosis rather than struggle" during the period of the Mongolian Rule over Russian principalities.²⁵ On this account, Yemelyanova asserts that ordinary Russians did not have "the Crusade mentality against Muslims" like Western Europeans had.²⁶ This mentality against any confession was impossible in Russia because it absorbed various beliefs and kinship, and the adoption of Orthodox Christianity could not considerably

¹⁹ Karamzin, *op. cit.*, pp. 260, 261.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 480.

²¹ Yemelyanova, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

²² V.O. Kluchevskiy, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-57; K. Gadzhiev, "Razmyshlenia o Politicheskom Kharaktere Sovremennoi Rossii", *MEiMO*, No.2, Moscow, 1996, p. 27.

²³ Yemelyanova, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

²⁴ Nikolay Baskakov, *Russkie Familiyi Turkskogo Proiskhozhdeniia*, Moscow, Nauka, 1979, p.45.

²⁵ Schimmelpenninck, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

²⁶ Yemelyanova, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

change the existing patterns of relations between people of Russia. As a result, the vision of Russia as a symbiosis seems to be more realistic and benign than the one expressed in “anti-Islamic Byzantine language”²⁷ adopted by Russian churchmen.

However, whatever the gains were, the period of Mongol invasion was “a lasting trauma” for the Rus as Islamic invasion was for Europe. This period became the breaking point between Russia and Asia, between the Slavic inhabitants of the forest and Asiatic nomads of the steppe. To differentiate the Russian self from the religious other became the primary need but first it was necessary to develop a sense of national identity which was weaker than it was among Western Europeans.²⁸ The period when national identity gains its contours and Russians identify themselves with Orthodox Christians of Slavic origin vis-a-vis steppe nomads of Turkic Islamic origin is independence from the Genghis Khan’s descendants, the Mongol rulers of the Rus for the last two and a half centuries until the Petrian reforms.

Furthermore, in the early fourteenth century one of the powerful Mongol khans (Khan Uzbek) did the Sunni Islam the official religion of the Golden Horde.²⁹ A few Mongol nobles who did not want to accept Islam, Yemelyanova informs, converted to Christian Orthodoxy and joined the Rus elite.³⁰ So, while the ruling class of the empire, Tatars, Volga Bulgars and other peoples of Turkic origin professed Islam and the rest Christianity, the majority of people stayed pagans, mainly shamanists.³¹ Particularly after the fall of Constantinople the Ottomans strengthened their links with the Golden Horde and the Islamic mainland. As a result, Muslims gained more power and privilege among the inhabitants of the steppe until annexation of the Mongol territories by the Russian Tsar when suppression of Islam was encouraged in the name of the common peace, economic prosperity and spiritual domination which could be achieved by Christianization.³² It has been mentioned that churchmen, missionaries and some ideologists of Christianization of

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 22.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 7

²⁹ Vera Tolz, *Inventing the Nation: Russia*, London, Arnold, 2001, p. 150.

³⁰ Yemelyanova, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 37.

non-Russian subjects using the Byzantine anti-Islamic rhetoric “called for the crusade against ‘godless’ Kazanians and other Muslims”.³³ Suppression of Islam was also encouraged through a doctrine originated by an abbot from Pskov and named “Moscow as the Third Rome”.³⁴

1.1.4. Moscow as the Third Rome: the Orthodox Self vs. the Religious Other

The concept of **Moscow as the Third Rome** was promoted as a basic ideology of the campaign against Islam. In the official chronicles Moscow was portrayed as the center of the Christian world that succeeded in overcoming the Mongol invasion, stopping the spread of Islam, and staying untouched by Catholicism. Riasanovskiy explains that this doctrine “described three Romes: the Church of Old Rome, which fell because of a heresy, the Church of Constantinople brought down by the infidels, and finally [...] Moscow as the Third Rome would stand permanently, for there was to be no fourth”.³⁵ In parallel, Bassin refers to the vision of Muscovy as the Third Rome in which Russia becomes “the bearer of a special mission for the deliverance of Europe and the world”.³⁶ To quote from Berdyaev, the messianic idea is peculiar to the Russian people as it was to the Jewish people, and it goes through the whole Russian history up to communism.³⁷

The image of Orthodoxy was accepted as the symbol of Russianness, and Islam became synonymous with the Tatar darkness and wickedness.³⁸ In the similar manner, Batunsky writes the Russian clergy imposed the image of Muslims as infidels, Eastern heathens and evil against the Orthodox Christians as bearers of true religion, defenders of light and goodness. He also explains that comparatively short after the fall of Constantinople to the Turks, Russians renounced their allegiance to the khan and

³³ **Ibid.**

³⁴ Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, **A History of Russia**, 6th Edition, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 114.

³⁵ **Ibid.**

³⁶ Bassin, **op. cit.**, p. 45.

³⁷ Berdyaev, **Russkaya Ideya**, p. 36.

³⁸ Bassin, **op. cit.**, p. 37.

announce being the successor to the Golden Horde.³⁹ On the other hand, Ivan the Terrible adopts the Byzantine title **tsar** to indicate being the successor to Byzantium and imagined Moscow as the Third Rome.⁴⁰ Russia to him was the only Christian land at that time where Orthodoxy took over **basurmanstvo** (widely used by Russians and slightly orientalist term for Islamdom). Moreover, the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks contributed to the Russians' antagonistic attitude to them in greater degree. Since then, due to religious and cultural boundaries between the Ottomans and Russia's Tatar-Mongol overlords, Russians associated Turkic peoples of the empire with the Turks and Islam and looked at them as **religious others**.⁴¹

In short, Russians were defined by Orthodoxy which became the Russian religion as the only true faith.⁴² According to Berdyaev, such use of religion as a mark of national identity resulted in duality of the idea of Moscow as the Third Rome and led to another national crisis, the schism (**raskol**) of the Russian Church. He reveals that it initiated duality of Russian life and history, and what is the worst - the internal schism, which would result in a split of Russian society into **the internal other** and self during the Petrian period. In addition, the Russian tsar announces himself the successor of the Byzantine Empire and the Golden Horde, the savior and protector of Christian land against Muslim invaders whose image was associated with the Ottoman Turk and other Muslim nomads in the inner Asia. So, at the realm of independence from the Mongol khans the image of **the Asiatic other** transforms into **the religious other** to represent Asiatic nomads and the Ottoman Turk and oppose them against **the Orthodox self**.

1.1.5. Independence from the Tatar-Mongols

The Tatar-Mongols' invincibility was destroyed by Russians in the battle of Kulikovo in the late fourteenth century and by the mid-sixteenth century the Muscovite

³⁹ Batunsky, **op. cit.**, p. 521.

⁴⁰ Yemelyanova, **op. cit.**, p. 36.

⁴¹ Riasanovsky, **op. cit.**, p. 96.

⁴² Berdyaev, **op. cit.**, p. 37.

state managed to subjugate its former overlords.⁴³ Karamzin compares the Tatar-Mongol rule with a disease which the Russians came over and, as a result, became stronger: “A man, having overcome a serious disease, becomes convinced in his vital forces and all the more hopes for longevity: Russia, oppressed, suppressed by all sorts of disasters, survived and rebelled in new greatness.”⁴⁴ By the beginning of the eighteenth century Russia absorbed the majority territories of the Golden Horde including Crimea.⁴⁵ The Russian rulers separated from the Mongol political context and continued its appeal to Byzantium’s which was interrupted by the Mongol invasion. The Byzantine title **tsar** replaced the title **khagan**. The Byzantine symbol of two eagles was adopted as Russia's insignia. In spite of all these and other borrowings and adaptations from Byzantine culture, Russia continued to resemble the Genghizid (Mongol) analogues.⁴⁶ In a nutshell, indigenous, eastern Slavic, Islamo-Genghizid and Byzantine traditions became a foundation for the political and cultural make-up of the Russian state⁴⁷.

If before conversion Russians had more **neighbor** relationship with other Asiatic tribes, after it the gap widened, especially during the Mongol rule, and led to a turning point for the Rus from Asia toward Europe. In the earlier stage Byzantine propaganda against Asians and Islam did not gain weight because Russians had enough empirical knowledge about Asians and Muslims. However, the growth of animosity and hostility between Russians and Asian nomads, and Russians’ devotion to Byzantine culture created situations that favored a textual attitude to the other.⁴⁸ Yet, such textual perception of the

⁴³ Robert D. Crews, **For Prophet and Tsar: Islam and Empire in Russia and Central Asia**, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 2006, p. 4.

⁴⁴ Karamzin, **op. cit.**, Vol.5, Ch.4, w.page.

⁴⁵ Riasanovsky, **op. cit.**, p. 69.

⁴⁶ Yemelyanova, **op. cit.**, p. 26.

⁴⁷ Donald Ostrowski, **Muscovy and the Mongols: Cross-cultural influences on the steppe frontier, 1304-1589**, UK, Cambridge University Press, 1998, p. 189.

⁴⁸ According to Edward Said there are two situations that favor a textual attitude. The first is when someone closely confronts closely something relatively unknown, previously distant and threatening. The second situation is when someone succeeds in experiencing what he learnt from reading. For more information go to Said, **op. cit.**, p. 93.

other, especially from the religious point of view, would spread in the later period.⁴⁹ Meanwhile, there was no evident opposition of the Russian self vis-a-vis its other on the basis of religion, but a conceptualization of opposition of order and chaos no matter whether it came from the West or East. There was no division into Europe and Orient, or Western and Oriental, white and black, civilized and uncivilized. There was one common territory populated with peoples somehow related to each other, some of which became a threat for one group (settled Russians⁵⁰) because another (nomadic Asians) spread chaos and destruction during raids. In order to unite and stop the invaders, this status of an **invader**, be it another neighboring tribe or a people from Western Europe or Far Asia⁵¹, became the difference (in Derridian sense) inside which Russian identity was constructed. And to secure it, the nomadic Asian origin of the invaders and their religion, paganism and Islam as a rule, became the criteria for otherness. This is how the first image of the other was represented in relation to the self.

Overall, the period from conversion to Christianity up to independence from the Tatar-Mongols is remarkable for an open struggle against invaders and **infidels**. Though by this time apart from Muslims there were Christians, Buddhists, shamanists and other confessions among the Mongols, the victory over them was celebrated by the Muscovites as a victory of Orthodox Christianity over Islam mainly because of the Byzantine propaganda, orientalist attitude of the Russian clergy to non-Christians and state ideology of Moscow as the Third Rome. The following period was remarkable by mass Christianization of the newly acquired territories. To make the process more efficient and speedy missionaries aimed at implanting into the mass consciousness of the Orthodox Russians the idea of their “moral superiority over non-Orthodox inhabitants of the Russian state”.⁵² Their final goal was a complete eradication of Islam in Russia. However, the

⁴⁹ John P. Hope, **Manifestations of Russian Literary Orientalism**, PhD Dissertation., Michigan, University of Michigan, 2003, p. 44.

⁵⁰ By the word **Russians** we do not mean only Slavs but all ethnicities who populated the territory and had the settled way of life in comparison to nomadic. Karamzin for his matter uses word **Rossiyanе** which describes the situation the best.

⁵¹ Yemelyanova, **op. cit.**, p. 21.

⁵² **Ibid.**, p. 38.

Russian rulers did not achieve any significant results in eradicating the powerful Genghizid and Islamized Eastern influences on the Russian state and society. The period when the policy brought its best results was the time of the westernizing reforms of Peter the Great in the eighteenth century.

1.2. Russianness with the European Mask in the Eighteenth Century

As concluded in the previous part, Russia's victory over the Mongols was propagated as the victory of Christianity over Islam, light over darkness, goodness over evil. Non-Orthodox inhabitants/aliens became the other and mission of the self was to convert them to Christianity and make the Muscovy state a homogeneous society. Those who refused to convert were attributed negative images and treated as the other. Yemelyanova assumes that during this period Russians' attitude to the religious other was mainly xenophobic and it was a consequence of **inferiority complex** Russians had after two-and-a-half century of slavery under the Tatar-Mongols.⁵³ The purpose of dark, evil and barbaric image of the Asiatic Muslim other was created to declare normality of the self and establish its moral and religious superiority.⁵⁴ However, the image of morally and religiously superior self happened to be internally split due to, firstly, schism of the Russian church which put under doubt Russia's messianic mission of Moscow as the Third Rome because, as Berdyaev writes, "imperialistic temptations enter the messianic consciousness" of Russian statesmen.⁵⁵ Secondly, split of the Russians into upper and lower classes as a result of westernization reforms of Peter the Great and Catherine II and, thirdly, intensified imperial and civilizational antagonism between Christians and Muslims for domination on the Crimea, Caucasus and Central Asia became effective.

⁵³ Yemelianova, **op. cit.**, p. 27; Andreeva, **op. cit.**, p. 26.

⁵⁴ Victoria Lysenko, "Poznaniye Chuzhogo Kak Sposob Samopoznaniya: Zapad, India, Rossiya", **Voprosy Filosofii**, Moscow, No.11, November, 2009, p. 69.

⁵⁵ Berdyaev, **Russkaya Ideya**, p. 37.

Undoubtedly, separating yourself from other members of the family was as painful as cutting a finger of the hand. Unfortunately, in the Russian case some fingers were cut off simultaneously: the Old Believers⁵⁶, aliens and peasants receive the status of **the internal other** and happened to be opposed against the **Russian Orthodox self** and **cultured self** (the upper classes nobility). Berdyaev writes on this occasion that the internal split started with the schism of the Russian church in the seventeenth century and continued until the Russian revolution. He calls the split “the crisis of the Russian messianic idea”⁵⁷. In his opinion reforms of Peter the Great on Russia’s westernization and modernization put the messianic idea of Moscow as the Third Rome under question and another one was needed.

1.2.1. Peter the Great’s Window on Europe

Coming of Peter the Great to the throne became a turning point in the Russian history and its relation with the West and East. To cleanse Europe from Asiatic barbarism and chaos became Russia’s new mission. Not only would Westernization and modernization reforms open a door to Western civilization and its culture but also would guarantee Russia a release from its Asiatic features and to accomplish its mission in the universal arena. However, Peter’s reforms deepened the split of the Russian self which deteriorated the duality.⁵⁸ Correspondingly, Batunsky describes the epoch as era of adaptation of the principle of the **duality of truth**.⁵⁹ The first emperor of Russia, Peter the Great, aimed at giving the Asiatic Muscovy state a new image of a Westernized/Europeanized Russian Empire. Although the Petrian and post-Petrian periods passed in struggle between the West and East inside the Russian soul⁶⁰, through

⁵⁶ The Old Believers or Old Ritualists – **raskolniki**, **starovery** or **staroobriadtsy** – are a group of Orthodox Russians who rejected the Church reform of Nikon in the seventeenth century because they saw in it the end of the world, and in Nikon the Antichrist. For more information go to Riazanovsky, **op. cit.**, p. 185.

⁵⁷ Berdyaev, **op. cit.**, p. 39.

⁵⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 44.

⁵⁹ Batunsky, **op. cit.**, Vol.2, p. 24.

⁶⁰ **Ibid.**

violent and cruel reforms he managed to make Muscovy Russians put on a Western mask and turn Russia from Asia to Europe. Since then, having shut **old doors** to the former pre-Petrine Russia⁶¹ and opened a brand new **window on Europe**, his only aim was to rebuild the Asiatic Tatar Russia into a European state. Watching the world from his window, Russian upper-classes, **the cultured self** formed their self-image primarily referring to Europe.⁶²

The problem is that the western mask never became Russia's true face due to Russia's geographical and social peculiarities. When Peter the Great imposed Western identity on Russian nobility, Russian peasants and aliens continued to practice their own indigenous traditions. What is more, with Russia's growing in power, its confrontation with Europe grew too, which led to rejection of European standards especially starting from the beginning of the nineteenth century. By the middle of the century Europe again becomes **the dominant external other** as it was before the Petrian epoch particularly in the eyes of Slavophiles.

Thus, Peter the Great became a devoted Westernizer because he genuinely believed in barbarism and primitiveness of Russian traditional institutions and customs and therefore promoted idea of superiority of Western Europe over Russia. During his reign Western cultural and social patterns were literally imposed on Russian society. Russians were ordered to behave, dress, speak, look, think, even eat, drink and smoke in the Western way. The European model adopted by Peter served as a tool to refashion **Asian** Russia and make it another European country. Even though a lot had been taken from the Byzantine Empire since Christianization of the Rus in order to distance itself from the Asiatic nomads, the Petrian period is marked by historians and scholars as the most crucial period for Russia's struggle to become a European nation.⁶³ Peter's radical reforms aimed at unity with the civilized West having taken a proper place within its realm

⁶¹ Andreeva, **op. cit.**, p. 27.

⁶² Irina Semenenko, "The Quest for Identity: Russian Public Opinion on Europe and the European Union and the National Identity Agenda", **Perspectives on European Politics and Society**, Routledge, Vol.14, No.1, 2013, p. 102. DOI.org/10.1080/15705854.2012.732396.

⁶³ Riazanovsky, **op. cit.**, p. 190; Yemelyanova, **op. cit.**, p. 42; Batunsky, **op. cit.**, p. 13.

but with maximum departure from Russia's Eastern boundaries. A new identity was essential for the newly **dressed** Russia. It was achieved at the expense of centuries-long genuine Russian tradition and relationship with the Asian steppe and its peoples. The newly found conception of Russia as a Christian European colonial power was contrasted to the **barbarian** Islamic Asia, the tactic so successfully applied by the West to orientalize the Orient. The trick was that Russia in European eyes was a part of the Orient, as well.

1.2.2. Post-Mongolian Russia in the Eyes of Europe

If to rely on Berdyaev, the West had been afraid of Russia's growth in strength since the first days of intercourse between the Muscovy tsardom and the West in the fifteenth century. As Neumann explains Russians were imagined by the Westerners as **a race of savages** and a **barbarous race**.⁶⁴ No matter how Russia tried to prove the opposite, it "has always been in subaltern position in relation to Western Powers".⁶⁵ Moreover, in the European imagination Russians were often related to the Ottoman Empire, politically and otherwise.⁶⁶ In other words, in spite of Russia's being a Christian state and of Arian race, its Asiatic roots were so deep that for Europeans the Russians were not much different from other peoples of Asia including the Ottoman Empire. The French proverb "scratch a Russian and you find a Tartar"⁶⁷ illustrates this.

Such attitude forced Russian nation-builders to create an image radically different from anything Asian. The image of the Asiatic Muslim other created in earlier period included hostile Ottomans and was contrasted against Russian Christian self to convince Europe of Russia's dissimilarity with the Eastern other. From the beginning of Peter the Great's reforms until Napoleon invasion in 1812, Russians' ultimate task was to learn from Europe and join its intellectual world so different from Muscovy.⁶⁸ The West, in return,

⁶⁴ Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 77.

⁶⁵ Tlostanova, **loc. cit.**

⁶⁶ **Ibid.**

⁶⁷ "Scratch a Russian and you find a Tartar", **The Oxford Dictionary of Proverb**, 5th ed., Ed. by John Simpson and Jennifer Speake, Oxford University Press, 2009, (Online) www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/, December 1, 2018.

⁶⁸ Riasanovskiy, **op. cit.**, p. 262.

admitted Russia's self-proclaimed civilizing mission and Russian arguments about so-called Asian inferiority⁶⁹ hoping to gain in Peter's Russia a valuable ally against the Turk.⁷⁰

1.2.3. Border Division between the Center and Periphery

The first step toward the goal of becoming a part of European state system was to set borders between the Russian center and its periphery. Otroshenko states that nomadic culture of the Mongols and their vision of space and borders radically influenced Russians' perception of the world, ethics, aesthetics, and so on.⁷¹ Until the seventeenth century, when Russia's self-image was associated with Moscow as the Third Rome, the border between Asia and Europe had no significance.⁷² For geographic purposes the ancient European concept that the border was the Azov Sea and the Don was applied. The right bank of the Don was called the Crimean side and was imagined as the beginning of the space of the Mediterranean civilization whereas the left bank, Nogai (nomadic) side was Asian nomadic civilization. This border divided two different civilizations, the East from West.⁷³ However, westernization by Peter the Great changed this concept. To construct a new self-image of modern Russia and give it a new European identity, the space of the former Muscovy state was separated from Asia at the Urals. Vasiliy Tatishchev, a geographer, historian and a passionate defender of the imperial ideology, suggested posing the Urals as a natural border between the Russian European center and its Asiatic periphery.⁷⁴ The European component was represented by the image of dynamic St. Petersburg and the Asiatic one by "the inhospitable, desolate and uncivilized

⁶⁹ H. B. Paksoy, **Alpamysh: Central Asian Identity under Russian Rule**, w.place, Association for the Advancement of Central Asian Research, 1989, Ch.1, w.page.

⁷⁰ Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 76.

⁷¹ Vladislav Otroshenko, **Taynaya Istoriya Tvoreniy. Kniga Esse-novell**, Moscow, Kulturnaya Revolutsiya, 2005, p. 226.

⁷² Helena Duffy, "The East as a Career: Russia, The Occident and the Orient in Andreï Makine's Once upon the River Love", **Orientalism / Occidentalism: Languages of Cultures vs. Languages of Description**, Ed. by Steiner, Moscow. Sovpadeniye, 2012, p. 254.

⁷³ Otroshenko, **op. cit.**, p. 122.

⁷⁴ Hope, **op. cit.**, p. 41.

domains”, in other words, Asia and its inhabitants were orientalized according to patterns adopted from the West.⁷⁵

There was another imaginary border that separated not the territory of the empire but its people into upper classes and the *narod*.⁷⁶ To make the Muscovy state an imperial power strong enough to resist Europeans in the West and Ottomans in the south, Peter the Great sacrificed his own people by dividing them into classes: the Europeanized nobility was to become **the cultured self** and the rest became its binary other, **the internal other**. As a result, there were two borders in the Russian imagination. The first separated the imperial center mainly populated by Slavic Orthodox Christians from the periphery populated, as a rule, by Asiatic Muslim nomads of Turkic origin and other minorities. From this perspective Russian national identity was constructed through binary opposition between **the Russian Orthodox self** and **the religious other** including the Turks.

The second border was represented by European education and culture and separated ethnic Russians into Europeanized upper classes nobility and intellectuals and lower classes uneducated *narod*. The upper classes, to build a new identity for imperial Russia, adopted the European model of civilized self vs. barbarian Oriental other and modified it to fit the Russian reality. First, both Orthodox peasants and aliens were orientalized and then colonized by the Russian nobility which led to creation of binary opposition of **the cultured self** against **the internal other** represented by **the social other** personified in the peasants and **the religious other** personified in the aliens. The situation deteriorated the split of the Russian people adding to its Janus-faced nature.

1.2.4. National Split into the Cultured Self and the Social Other

If the seventeenth-century split divided Russian Christian society into Old Believers and the rest, the split of the eighteenth century happened between educated upper classes and peasants (**narod**). The difference is that in the first case it was peoples’

⁷⁵ Duffy, *loc. cit.*

⁷⁶ To avoid confusion the Russian word **narod** will be used to imply representatives of the lower class in the nineteenth century Russian society.

choice to stay Old Believers or to accept and follow the new church reforms, while in the second case, the upper classes were urged to adopt Western culture and traditions and lower classes were orientalized and colonized by the government. Tolz and Yemelyanova clarify that Westernization affected only the upper classes, who were “ordered to [...] cook Western meals and drink coffee”⁷⁷ and was not applied to churchmen, merchants and peasants who continued to practice their traditionally Russian customs.⁷⁸ It is the view of Etkind that beardless secular nobles in European clothes and speakers of German or French were to represent visually a **Westerner** in contrast to other **barbarians** both Russian and aliens. He argues that the class division substituted racial differences and Western clothes and absence of the beard substituted the skin color.⁷⁹ Just like the European colonizer differed from the Oriental colonized by skin color so the Russian upper classes differed from the low classes by their beardless faces and European clothes. In Petrian Russia the new image of the cultured self was created to contrast it against the social other in order to justify the first’s superiority and the second’s inferiority and colonize the second just as Europe did in its oversea colonies. In addition, Etkind correctly argues that Petrian reforms led to sudden and rapid social changes and by doing so, deteriorated the split between the narod and upper classes.⁸⁰ The problem is that such scission of the Russian Orthodox self into two opposing images of **the cultured self** and **the social other** resulted in identity crisis of the nineteenth century, which inspired Russia’s most talented intellectuals including Dostoevsky to pour all their energy to answer the question of national identity.

In conclusion, Russia’s westernization during the reign of Peter the Great reorientalized relationship among Russia, Europe and the East. Petrian Russia’s wish to differ from the East became the main aspect in identifying Russia with the civilized West. To unite with the West, the Russian upper classes was forced to put on a Western mask and refashioned itself in the European manner which led to the split of the nation into the

⁷⁷ Yemelyanova, **op. cit.**, p. 42.

⁷⁸ Tolz, **op. cit.**, p. 35.

⁷⁹ Etkind, **op. cit.**, p. 80.

⁸⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 14.

cultured self and the social other. In addition, with Russia's expansion to Siberia, central Asia and the Caucasus, Russians had a closer intercourse with the Ottoman Empire and Persia, the main outcome of which became representation of the external religious other and contrasting it against the Russian Orthodox self. In spite of rich scholarly tradition and literary culture the East possessed, Russian intellectuals obtained knowledge of the East through the Western filter. The knowledge was used by Russian orientalists to fix the country's status as a European nation. Europeanization happened in parallel with orientalisation and colonization of neighboring countries to the east and south of the Russian border. Propaganda campaigns on civilizational mission forged the ideology of state patriotism through incorporating myths of **Us** versus **Them** into the Russian national consciousness in the eighteenth century.

1.3. Russianness according to Slavophiles and Westernizers in the Nineteenth Century

“[...] shift, finally, the center of gravity of our religious and cultural life from the European North to the semi-Asian South, and to tear off the European mask that the iron hand of Peter I smeared on our face, [...]”

Konstantin Leontyev⁸¹

Europeanization of Russia started by Peter the Great obstructed the Russian nation-building project. Under his initiative Russian nobility had to associate themselves with Europe and construct the image of the self in opposition to the rest residents of the empire. The period of Catherine the Great became the pick of Russian educated class's identification with the West in such extent that fashion, culture and language of the French became the Russian upper classes's; many members of Russian intelligentsia could not even write or read in Russian.⁸²

⁸¹ Konstantin N Leontyev, *Zapiski Otshelnika*, Moscow, Direkt-Media, 2014, p. 30.

⁸² Maya Gubina, “The Year 1812: The Discover of What Kind of Other?”, *Other Voices: Three Centuries of Cultural Dialogue between Russia and Western Europe*, Ed. by Graham H. Roberts, p. 178.

When westernization of the Russian elite was accomplished and Russia's European identity was regarded almost axiomatic in Russia, Europe obscured this identification considering the first as barbaric and uncivilized as the rest of the East. The fact that Europe saw the Russian people as "slaves and hang-overs" (Dostoevsky) and "dressed up Tatars" (Kluchevskiy) "with customs, clothes and morals similar to Asian rather than European" (Voltaire) shattered the pride of the Russians and made scholars question benefits of identification with Europe. Moreover, after Napoleon's invasion in 1812 and the Decembrist uprising in 1825, the similarity between Russia and the West was doubted even more.

As a consequence of 1812 war and 1825 revolt, the Russian educated upper classes reconsidered its identification with the West. The French invaders became the other whereas the "Cossacks, the soldiers, peasants [...] are on our side. Outside the battlefield, however, the distinction is quite different. Here, **we** means the French, the [Russian] soldier, the [Russian] Sovereign, and the [Russian] nobility, while the Cossacks, the peasants and the Poles are the other".⁸³ Research by Maya Gubina suggests that in the aftermath of Napoleon's invasion some commentators, comparing well-educated Frenchmen, the external other, with "hordes of savages", the internal other, concluded that "the Tatars [...], these vulgar and pagan tribe respected our God's cathedrals, [whereas] [...] Christians destroy, pillage and desecrate Christian churches".⁸⁴ The war became a turning point in the Russian imagination of the other and the self: Europe becomes the dominant other which challenges the Russian national self. In addition, the upper classes's attempt to revolt against the Russian imperial government made the last realize that they were not on the same side, either. The revolt deteriorated the split of the Russian nation. A new theory of nationality distinct from Western Europe has to be constructed and developed.

⁸³ Gubina, **op. cit.**, p. 179.

⁸⁴ **Ibid.**

1.3.1. Split of the Cultured Self into Slavophiles and Westernizers

At the beginning of the nineteenth century the educated class of Russia happened to be under influence of German Romanticism which provoked further discussion about Russia's place in the world. In 1836 **First Philosophical Letter** of Russian philosopher Petr Chaadayev initiated the most powerful and shocking debates among the intelligentsia. Developed by Chaadayev ideas about Russia as "an orphan among the family of nations without history or identity"⁸⁵ and the Russian nation's disability to become truly European divided the Russian intelligentsia into Slavophiles and Westernizers. They, as a response to Chaadayev's pessimism about Russia's historical mission, developed the two most important independent schools of thought in nineteenth century Russia. Berdyaev defines the dispute between the schools as an argument about the fate of Russia and its mission in the world looked at from two different sides.⁸⁶ For Herzen, Slavophiles and Westernizers "had one love, but it was not the same".⁸⁷ He called them **two-faced Janus**; "Both loved freedom. Both loved Russia. Slavophiles loved it as a mother, Westerners - as a child."⁸⁸ (my trans.) A similar point of view is also stressed by Türkan Olcay who writes that Westernizers and Slavophiles had a lot in common: both were united around necessity of social reforms in Russia.⁸⁹ Yet, the paths they chose differed.

The Slavophiles' central idea was the opposition between the West and Russia. To alienate Russia from Western civilizations they identified three elements such as the Roman-Catholic Church, old Roman culture, statehood that emerged out of violence and contrasted it against supreme historical mission of Orthodoxy and the peasantry as the restorer of Russian national spirit and uniqueness.⁹⁰ Slavophiles underlined integration, peace, and harmony among men as Russia's fundamental vision. To them, Russia can "overcome the Western disease" if it returns to native principles. After being cured, Russia

⁸⁵ Schimmelpenninck, **op. cit.**, p. 143.

⁸⁶ Berdayev, **op. cit.**, p. 68.

⁸⁷ Cited in Berdayev, **loc. cit.**

⁸⁸ **Ibid.**

⁸⁹ Türkan Olcay, **Rus Edebiyatında Dogalcı Okul**, İstanbul, İ.Ü. Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 2003, p. 21.

⁹⁰ Riazanovsky, **op. cit.**, p. 336.

would “take its message of harmony and salvation to the discordant and dying West”⁹¹ and “redeem mankind through herself”.⁹² Remarkably, Slavophiles were neither enemies nor haters of Western Europe. Berdyaev states that classical Slavophiles did not completely deny the West, and they did not talk about the decay of the West. Khomyakov, for instance, talked of Western Europe as “the land of holy wonders”.⁹³ But, because of Western rationalism and individualism, Western Europeans lost **freedom of life, freedom of spirit** and **freedom of conscience** in contrast to those Russians who managed to preserve it by sticking to Orthodoxy. Talking of freedom Berdyaev affirms that “the vastness of freedom is one of the polar principles in the Russian people, and the Russian idea is connected with it”.⁹⁴ (my trans.)

According to Lotman the same Russia-West opposition created **the Russian Westernizer type (russkiy zapadnik)** whose role was to represent the West in Russian society. He points out that the West was imagined in association with the Westernizers. The problem was that the Russian Westernizer scarcely resembled a real person from the West because he constructed its image in contrast to the Russian reality. In the similar way Slavophiles constructed the image of Russia. As a result, the images were not real but ideal. The scholar concludes that when such a Russian Westernizer confronted the real West, as well as a Russian Slavophile’s confrontation with real Russia, as a rule, they both experienced tragic disappointment.⁹⁵

In addition, the Westernizers were inspired by German idealistic philosophy like Slavophiles but came to different conclusions. Instead of stressing the uniqueness of the Russian mission and superiority of its moral principles over those of the West, the Westernizers argued that European “rationalism, the rule of law, and the primacy of the individual” had to be the model for Russia to follow.⁹⁶ They criticized the Russian system

⁹¹ **Ibid.**

⁹² Wayne Vucinich, **Russia and Asia: on the Influence of Russia on the Asian Peoples**, Stanford, Hoover Institution Press, 1972, p. 81.

⁹³ Berdyaev, **op. cit.**, p. 70.

⁹⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 76.

⁹⁵ Lotman, **op. cit.**, p. 117.

⁹⁶ Schimmelpenninck, **op. cit.**, p. 143.

of the Muscovy period, praised the work of Peter the Great and supported further Westernization of Russia, to what the Slavophiles were strongly opposed. They interpreted Peter's Westernization reforms as the betrayal of Russia.⁹⁷ On this regard, Berdyaev draws attention to both sides' misconception on Peter's reforms. To him, Slavophiles did not understand the inevitability of Peter's reform for the very mission of Russia in the world. And Westernizers did not understand Russia's uniqueness; they did not want to acknowledge the painfulness of Peter's reform and see the peculiarity of Russia.⁹⁸ Regarding religion, the Westernizers tend to secularism unlike the Slavophiles who anchored their ideology in appraisal of Orthodoxy as the core of Russianness.⁹⁹

Another point of disagreement was Westernizers' attitude to Asiatic features in Russian culture. After Chaadayev's negative characterization of Asia another passionate Westernizer Belinskiy "had nothing but contempt for the Orient".¹⁰⁰ Most of all he ridiculed the Oriental's fatalism and contrasted it against rationality of the West which made the last superior over the first: "Asia is the land of so-called natural immediacy, Europe is the land of consciousness; Asia - the land of contemplation, Europe - of will and intellect!".¹⁰¹ (my trans.) On the pages of his **Kolokol** he expressed his belief in "irresistible historical fate of Russia, the world mission which consists in the transfer of enlightenment from Europe to Asia".¹⁰²

Batunsky characterizes the first half of the nineteenth century as the period when a typical Russian intellectual imagined all non-European as porous and inert.¹⁰³ In another place he postulates that for the elite of that period "to renounce the Asian (Tatar-Mongolian) heritage, [...] meant an intellectual and emotional transition to the camp of the 'forces of progress' led by the West".¹⁰⁴ Paradoxically, just as Chaadayev's **Philosophical Letters** initiated the split in the Russian intellectual society into two-faced Janus, in the

⁹⁷ Berdyaev, **op. cit.**, p. 69.

⁹⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 70.

⁹⁹ Riazanovsky, **op. cit.**, p. 337.

¹⁰⁰ Schimmelpenninck, **op. cit.**, p. 144.

¹⁰¹ V. G. Belinskii, **Polnoe Sobraniye Sochineniy**, Moscow, Akademiya Nauk USSR, 1954, Vol.5, p. 99.

¹⁰² Bassin, **op. cit.**, p. 55.

¹⁰³ Batunsky, **op. cit.**, p. 103.

¹⁰⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 52.

similar way his **Apology of a Madman** suggested reconsidering Russia's role as a part of Western Europe. Berdyaev informs that in it Chaadayev expresses some basic ideas for all Russian thought of the nineteenth century.¹⁰⁵ Later on, Beliskiy, during his travels in Europe, got disappointed in Europe.¹⁰⁶ Herzen experienced the same disappointment which leads him to condition in which Westernism came into contact with Slavophilism. On his return from exile, Alexander Herzen "broke with the Westernizers and began to look closer to home, to Russia's peasant communes."¹⁰⁷ In Andrzej Walicki's words, Herzen happened to share his belief with the Slavophiles in the Orthodox faith's being "more faithful to the teaching of the Gospels than Catholicism" and that Russian narod's civilizational isolation from Europe had enabled them to remain apart from **sick** Europe."¹⁰⁸ Also, instead of repeating the Asian origin of Russia's stagnation, Herzen started to emphasize fresh young energy that came from the Orient. He concluded that Russia could become a model for the West and the East and "serve as a bridge between the Europe and Asia".¹⁰⁹ Vasiliy Grigoryev, one of nineteenth century Russia's most prominent specialists on history of Asia, offered a new messianic mentality for his country. He argued that it was Russia's destiny to serve "as a counterweight to the preponderance of Western principles that oppress our national development."¹¹⁰ In short, the ambivalence of Russia's attitude to the West was similar to Russia's view of the East. The further **two-faced Janus** looked towards the West and East, the more distant it became from the both. The gap grew so deep and precipitous that it resulted in the Crimean war in 1854-1856 in which Russia was defeated.

¹⁰⁵ Berdyaev, **op. cit.**, p. 66.

¹⁰⁶ **Ibid.**, p. 91.

¹⁰⁷ Schimmelpenninck, **op. cit.**, p. 145.

¹⁰⁸ Andrzej Walicki, **The Slavophile Controversy: History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-century Russian Thought**, London, Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 587.

¹⁰⁹ Tolz, **op. cit.**, p. 98.

¹¹⁰ Bassin, **op. cit.**, p. 56.

1.3.2. Crimean War: Is Europe the Self or the Other?

The policy that caused the Crimean War has got various interpretations. Some historians argue that Russian aggressiveness toward Turkey can be explained by Russia's geopolitical as well as economic pursuits in the Balkans and the Black Sea, while others suggest that the war was provoked by religious conflicts between the "sprawling Moslem state which believed in the Koran and oppressed its numerous Orthodox subjects" and another state whose mission was to protect the Orthodox Christians from the infidels.¹¹¹ The biggest complexity of this war was to identify the enemy. Christian Russia did not fight only against the Islamic Ottoman Empire but also against other Christian states like Great Britain and France. The trauma of the Crimean war became the major force for Russia to reconsider its standing as a part of Europe and provoked intense re-examination of Russian identity. According to Vovchenko, spread of Pan-Orthodox and Pan-Slav irredentism in the aftermath of the war helped to shape Russian national identity.¹¹² The Crimean War, together with a common history of Great Wars of the past two centuries finally pointed to Europe as the dominant other, the European other. Now that Russia finally turned away from Europe not only geopolitically but spiritually and morally too, it redirected its energy and attention back to the East.¹¹³ However, even though Russian nation-builders turned to Asia to confront Europe and stress Russian identity separate from the West, "they universally saw themselves acting as European agents".¹¹⁴ Many scholars explain this ambiguous attitude to the West by Russia's injured pride which led to deeper split of Russia's national character.¹¹⁵ Truly believing in their mission to protect the West from barbarian hordes of infidels, it was a moral challenge for Russian elite to realize that the West united with **Ottoman infidels** against Russia. In search of remedy they appealed to the narod who managed to retain their cultural and religious authenticity and their

¹¹¹ Riazanovsky, *op. cit.*, p. 305.

¹¹² Denis Vovchenko, "Gendering irredentism? Self and other in Russian Pan-Orthodoxy and Pan-Slavism", *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol.34, No.2, February 2011, p. 251.

¹¹³ Bassin, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁵ Susan Layton, *Russian Literature and Empire: The Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy*, Cambridge and New York, Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 288.

sobornost (communal spirit). Orthodoxy and the communal way of life became the main features to make Russia different from Western Europe and indicate a different path of development.¹¹⁶ Another remedy was hoped to be found in the East, where Russians intended to exercise their mission of salvation as civilizers and Enlighteners, and use “unenlightened indigenous populations” as “ethnographic material”¹¹⁷ to build a new civilization, Eastern by origin, Western by culture and Orthodox by religion.

1.3.3. Search for a New Self in Asia

While Bassin observes that Russia’s turn to the East was a result of its break with the West, Layton argues that Russian romantics started to enhance Asia “rather than consistently acclaiming Western civilization in which they knew they did not fully belong”.¹¹⁸ Russia’s civilizing activities started in Catherine’s era when Russia began advancing in the Caucasus and Crimea, the conquest/**annexation**¹¹⁹ of which was depicted as a civilizing mission. Central Asia was widely annexed by the end of the nineteenth century. These newly acquired territories were imagined by the Russians as their own exotic Orient and Russia’s relations with it was conditioned by relationship with Western Europe. Russia’s expansion southward was often associated with Western colonial wars also due to the fact that Russia copied its colonial model of modernization to impose on the Caucasus and Central Asia.¹²⁰ The **Oriental** territories were expected not only to give Russia prestige among western empires but also supply it with raw materials and provide a market for Russian manufactured goods.¹²¹

¹¹⁶ Sydney Monas, “Self’ and ‘Other’ in Russian Literature”, Ed. by Ewa M. Thompson, **The Search for Self-Definition in Russian Literature**, John Benjamins Publishing Company Amsterdam, 1991, Vol.27, p. 88.

¹¹⁷ Bassin, **op. cit.**, p. 186.

¹¹⁸ Layton, **op. cit.**, p. 75.

¹¹⁹ “In the late nineteenth century the Russian historian Adolf Berzhe objected to the very word ‘conquest’ by arguing that the annexation of the Caucasus had unfolded over the centuries in a haphazard, virtually unwilling manner”, cited in Layton, **op. cit.**, p. 3.

¹²⁰ Madina Tlostanova, “Life in Samarkand: Caucasus and Central Asia vis-à-vis Russia, the West, and Islam”, **Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge** 5, No.1, 2006, p. 109.

¹²¹ Riazanovsky, **op. cit.**, p. 358.

The central point of the civilizing mission was to spread Christianity. Religion was again used as the most effective motive for imperial expansion. It was Catherine's government who represented Russian incursion first into the Caucasus and Crimea and later into Central Asia as "the defense of Christian civilization against Islam".¹²² It is Batunsky's assertion that Russian chauvinists, missionaries, and Eurocentrists constructed the image of Islam as totally other being.¹²³ He also informs that words such as **Mohammed, basurmanin Tatar, Turk, Asian** etc. were synonymous to such tropes as **savage, barbarian, wild, unclean** continuing to be related to the concept of Islamic East and were kept fresh in the minds of the lower classes as well.¹²⁴

On the other hand, Russia's encounters with Islam was never based on absolute rejection and antagonism. Petr Chaadayev wrote in his **Philosophical Letters** that "religion of Mohammed, together with other more powerful causes, contributed to the eradication of polytheism, and then because it spread [...] the concept of a single god and universal belief."¹²⁵ Particularly after Napoleon's invasion and tsarist oppressive regime, the best representatives of the nineteenth century Russian intelligentsia such as A.S. Griboyedov, A.S. Pushkin, M.Yu. Lermontov, A.I. Herzen, N.G. Chernyshevsky, N.A. Dobrolyubov, T.G. Shevchenko, V.G. Belinsky, L.N. Tolstoy and F.M. Dostoevsky expressed their respect for the mountaineers of the Caucasus who were often associated with image of the lover of liberty, freedom fighter and are depicted in Russian oriental poetry as "spirited men of the East (**zhivoy chelovek Vostoka**)."¹²⁶ Zakharov in his article clarifies that Mikhail Lermontov's massive poetry on the Caucasus was a source for writers who were not hostile to the East and Islam.¹²⁷ He concludes his analysis of Lermontov's orientalism with an image of Russia as the middle essence located between

¹²² Layton, **op. cit.**, p. 4.

¹²³ Batunsky, **op. cit.**, p. 141.

¹²⁴ **Ibid.**

¹²⁵ Peter Chaadayev, **Letter Seven**, Necropolis, February 16, 1829, (Online) www.librebook.me/filosoficheskie_pisma_sbornik/vol2/7, June 3, 2018.

¹²⁶ Batunsky, **op. cit.**, p. 115.

¹²⁷ Vladimir A. Zakharov, *Filosofskaya Mysl: Retseptsiya i Interpretatsiya Rossiyskiy Oriyentalizm V Interpretatsii Lermontova i Saida*, **Filosofskiye Nauki**, w.place, No.3, 2015, p. 66.

the **old** Europe and the **old** East and due to this cultural and geographical position Russia can be imagined as the bearer of cultural synthesis.¹²⁸

By the same token, Layton in her discussion of the conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy suggests that the writers, particularly Pushkin in **The Prisoner of the Caucasus**, “converted the Circassians into clarifiers of the Russian self”.¹²⁹ In her interpretation the tribesmen of the Caucasus were attributed “a sublime, gloriously ‘wild’ character” and often were imagined as **children of nature** and **severe offspring of the Caucasian mountains**.¹³⁰

In short, Muslim mountaineers became a symbol of freedom, faith, bravery, and a close connection to nature in the beginning of the nineteenth century. In the following decades images of the religious other spanned a wider spectrum: some referred to Borodin’s **noble Khan Konchak**, others discussed Vereshchagin’s **exotic barbarians**, and the third saw Prezhevsky’s **sub-human Asiatic swarms**.¹³¹ Nathaniel Knight discovers that the non-European other had two faces in the Russian imagination: on the one side it was “the ignorant perfidious oriental” and was opposed against the image of rational, moral, civilized Western man; on the other, “the noble savage” who managed to save his authenticity via his love for freedom and faith.¹³²

Apart from the messianic mission, the Russians believed that they had the civilizational mission to spread Western knowledge and high culture to the peoples of the East. Russians imagined themselves as agents of Western civilization who “have the superiority of social life and civilization on [their] side” and who are “better equipped than Europe for the task of civilizing Asia”.¹³³ Petrashevskiy¹³⁴ expressed it as:

For us, it is necessary to be to these peoples [of Asia] that which the European peoples are for us. We must believe that our settlements in Siberia or in Siberian

¹²⁸ **Ibid.**

¹²⁹ Layton, **op. cit.**, p. 103.

¹³⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 104.

¹³¹ Nathaniel Knight, “Grigor’ev in Orenburg, 1851–1862: Russian Orientalism in the Service of Empire?”, **Slavic Review**, Vol.59, No.1, 2000, p. 2.

¹³² **Ibid.**

¹³³ Bassin, **op. cit.**, p. 202.

¹³⁴ Mikhail Vasilyevich Butashevich-Petrashkevsky, commonly known as Mikhail Petrashevsky, was a Russian revolutionary and Utopian theorist. He was the organizer of Petrashevsky Circle where Fyodor Dostoevsky recited Vissarion Belinsky’s letter to Nikolay Gogol and later on was exiled for it.

Asiatic Russia have been predestined [...] first to teach these peoples the results of science and civilization, and then to introduce them fully into the sphere of universal intercourse between all peoples. Here [in Asiatic Russia] is the environment in which the moral and industrial strengths of Russia can manifest themselves freely and independently, with the least constraint.¹³⁵

If to rely on Petrashevskiy's other words, it becomes clear that in his view the true purpose of Russian settlement in the East was not only to educate its peoples but more than that to use Russian successes in Asia

as a means to triumph over the West, they would paradoxically represent incontrovertible proof to the world that Russia was worthy of the designation "European" in the first place. Through its missionary and civilizing activities in Asia, Russia could definitively prove its moral worth and join fully in the European community without any qualification or hesitation.¹³⁶

After Russia's defeat in the Crimean war Russians, states Bassin, had "to demonstrate their worth and even their superiority in the framework of European values".¹³⁷ The expansion into central Asia would serve as "a tonic for Russian Empire's wounded pride".¹³⁸ Vasiliy Grigoryev, one of Russia's foremost specialists on the history and languages of Central Asia and the Near East believed that the Easterners would serve as a part of endeavor of national self-definition to minimize Western domination.¹³⁹

Such vision of Asia allowed nation-builders to admit that Russia was essentially more Asian than European and differed not only from the Western Europeans but even from other Western Slavs. Leontyev, for instance, writes that

The very character of the Russian people has very strong and important traits, which are more similar to those of Turks, Tatars and other Asian nations, or perhaps no one at all, than the Southern and Western Slavs. We are more indolent, fatalistic, much more submissive to our ruler, more dissolute, good-natured, insanelly brave, unstable, and so much more inclined to religious mysticism than the Serbs, Bulgarians, Czechs and Croats.¹⁴⁰

On what concerns the European other in relation to the Russian national self, a Russian playwright Denis Fonvizin suggests an image of "France as a cramped realm of cold

¹³⁵ Cited in Bassin, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 204.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 205

¹³⁸ Schimmelpenninck, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

¹³⁹ For more information go to Nathaniel, *op. cit.*

¹⁴⁰ Cited Schimmelpenninck, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

calculation, the cash nexus, legalism, hypocrisy and stupidity masked by witty manners and politesse” in opposition to Russians who possess “a pleasing simplicity, generous feeling, authenticity in human relations, a richer spiritual life and truer sense of freedom despite all the lack of liberty and civil rights in tsarist society”.¹⁴¹

However, it should be noted that in spite of the enthusiastic identification with Asia, Russians continued to show their contempt for the Asians who were nothing but “the ostensibly rude and barbaric inhabitants of Asia”.¹⁴² As it has been mentioned before, the internal religious other since particularly the era of Catherine the Great’s annexation of the Caucasus and Crimea up to subjugation of the peoples of Central Asian steppes, deserts and oases was a means to construct such a self who is welcomed to enter the family of European nations.¹⁴³ Apart from Russia’s internal others, using whom the Russian elite would assert European identity in a civilizing role, Russian nation-builders frequently used the external common other represented in the Ottoman Turk in the search of the self. Although this **common other** has been present in the Russian consciousness since the days when the Ottomans seriously threatened the Byzantine Empire and finally took Constantinople, it had been attributed more stereotypical and orientalist characteristics in the times when **the Eastern Question** began to concern the whole Europe and Russia.

1.3.4. The Eastern Question: the Ottoman Turk as an External Other

The Eastern Question is as old as the concepts of the East and West. Different scholars define it from different perspectives. Westerners look at it as a struggle between the West and East; Russian scholars, Dostoevsky including, have more ambivalent interpretation due to Russia’s being both Western and Eastern. A Russian philosopher Vladimir Solovyev defines the Eastern Question of the nineteenth century as “one of the phases of the initial struggle between Europe and Asia, where the first personifies the

¹⁴¹ Layton, **op. cit.**, p. 81.

¹⁴² Crews, **op. cit.**, p. 246.

¹⁴³ **Ibid.**

beneficial and life-giving influence of the world, and the second is the deadening influence of the steppe, [...], the struggle between them constitutes the most essential content of history”.¹⁴⁴ (my trans.) According to Neumann the term **Eastern question** is the European discourse on how to order relations with the Ottoman Turk.¹⁴⁵ Victor Taki informs that the Eastern Question was a result of the Ottoman Empire’s decline which started in the 1700s with Peter the Great’s unsuccessful attempt to get access to the Black Sea. During the reign of Catherine the Great the Russian army won several wars with Turkey, the declining empire of the sultan served as a counter-image of post-Petrian Russia.¹⁴⁶

When in the nineteenth century the Ottoman Empire was losing its power in the Balkans much due to the Greek revolution for independence in 1821-1829, the Crimean war of 1853-1856 and the last Russo-Turkish war of 1877-1878, Russians presented it as their messianic mission to save peoples of the Balkans from “the sick man of Europe (Turkey) [who] was now about to succumb to his long-term illness”.¹⁴⁷ Riasanovskiy indicates that the Balkans during the nineteenth century were not Russia's main spectrum of economic, strategic, military, and cultural interests but rather a tool successfully used against Turkish and European influence in the Caucasus, Central Asia and subsequently on the Far East.¹⁴⁸ He also admits that Turkey was considered as an important element in the European balance of power. For Europeans it was a tool to prevent the Russians from taking Constantinople¹⁴⁹, whereas Russians believed that control over the Balkans would guarantee Russia's success in preventing the European expansion in the Far East.

What concerns identity construction, the Ottoman Turk played an important role. The more the Russian army showed its military success in numerous Russo-Turkish wars and the Russian elite grew familiar with the western accounts of the Ottoman Empire, the more the image of the Turkish other was attributed negative characteristics and contrasted

¹⁴⁴ Cited in Batunsky, **op. cit.**, p. 157.

¹⁴⁵ Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 54.

¹⁴⁶ Viktor Taki, **Tsar and Sultan: Russian Encounters with the Ottoman Empire**, New York, I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd, 2016, p. 23.

¹⁴⁷ Alex Marshall, **The Russian General Staff and Asia, 1860-1917**, Oxon, Routledge, 2006, p. 117.

¹⁴⁸ Riazanovsky, **op. cit.**, p. 85.

¹⁴⁹ Frederick Engels, **The Turkish Question**, w.date, (Online) www.marxengels.public-archive.net/en/ME0719en.html, August 30, 2017.

against the Russian national self. It reached its peak during the Eastern Question. Just like the idea of Crusade against **the Saracen**, Christendom's Islamic other, promoted solidarity among European Christians¹⁵⁰, the Russian Crusade¹⁵¹ against **the Ottoman Turk** in the Balkans would increase the integrity of the Russian national self.

Nevertheless, seeing that the West would never accept Russia to its family, Russia's attitude to the Ottoman Empire took an ambiguous direction. Some scholars¹⁵² describe Russia's relationship with the West and Ottomans as **triangular**, in which instead of traditional bi-polar (East and West) worldview there were East, West and Russia whose role was to mediate between the first two. Russian nation-builders tried to construct an identity which was neither Oriental nor Occidental. Consequently, references to the Ottoman Empire used different purposes: sometimes the image of the Ottoman Turk was opposed against the Russian national self to confirm Russia's status of a Western-style empire, in other cases it was used to contrast it against the West to emphasize Russia's difference from the West. The Russian Slavophile Leontyev wrote that the Ottoman Empire was "half-evil, half-good because this Turkish world hostile to Christianity was yet a significant obstacle to the spread of a greater evil - European utilitarian and godless style of public life."¹⁵³ (my trans.) He recommended his co-citizens to see in the sultan an ally rather than an enemy and claimed that "we [Russians] like the Sultan more than a **clean** European atheist".¹⁵⁴ (my trans.)

Ambiguity in Russia's attitude to the Ottomans shifted to hostility after the brutal Turkish suppression of a Bulgarian uprising in 1875. Pan-Slavism played an active role in creating a public opinion both within the country and abroad to propagate "Russia's responsibility to conduct a crusade against the Ottoman Empire to the south, in order to 'liberate' Constantinople from the rule of the infidels and resurrect it as the capital of the

¹⁵⁰ Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 43.

¹⁵¹ Dostoevsky, **Dnevnik Pisatela**, p. 548.

¹⁵² Taki, **op. cit.**, p. 350; Tolz, **op. cit.**, p. 141; Sara Dickinson, "Russia's First 'Orient': Characterizing the Crimea in 1787", **Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History**, Vol.3, No.1, 2002, p. 5.

¹⁵³ Batunsky, **op. cit.**, p. 178.

¹⁵⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 182.

future Slavic union”.¹⁵⁵ Vovchenko explains that the press, instead of commenting on brave resistance of the Bulgarians against the Ottoman army, focused on featuring atrocities perpetrated by the Turks against their Christian subjects. To him, the agitation aimed at stirring up the crusading spirit which would urge the public and hesitant Russian government to declare war on the Ottoman Empire.¹⁵⁶

In Vovchenko’s view to consolidate self-confident national identity of the Russians, Russian nation-builders, inspired by the situation in the Balkans, constructed a self-image of Russian crusaders whose mission was to protect the only true form of Christianity, i.e. Orthodoxy from the Oriental infidels, and image of Russian saviors of the Slavs from Ottoman despotic domination.¹⁵⁷

When the Russians realized that the constructed self-image of visible crusader and selfless savior was accepted neither by the West (Russia was diplomatically humiliated at the Congress of Berlin in 1878)¹⁵⁸ nor by the liberated Slavs (more and more concerns about Russia’s intention to annex the Balkans were pronounced by Balkan peoples), they had to find another mission which would reestablish confidence of their national identity. The Janus-faced Russian eagle turned to Central Asia once more.

1.3.5. The Russian National Self as Bearer of Universal Brotherhood

Taking Constantinople, what Russians looked forward to in the period of the 1877-1878 Russo-Turkish war in the Balkans would change Russia’s destiny. Possession of the this city, a linkage between the West and East, would not only gain the Russian Empire strong geopolitical position, but also, as a symbol of Orthodoxy taken by infidels from Russians’ cultural predecessors and their spiritual guru, Byzantium, would endorse Russia’s self-image of a crusader and savior of the Slavs. Moreover, in Leontyev’s opinion, “on the shores of the Bosphorus, we [Russians] may finally be stripped of the

¹⁵⁵ Paksoy, *op. cit.*, w.page.

¹⁵⁶ Vovchenko, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 248.

¹⁵⁸ Schimmelpenninck, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

European mask that the iron hand of Peter I smeared on our face”.¹⁵⁹ When the dreams of Constantinople did not realize, there was the only destination to focus on - Central and Far Asia. Russians once more understood that the empire’s destiny lay in Asia because they could still face particularly this part of the world with confidence and strength, unlike the West which drastically disappointed the Russian upper classes.

The events in the Balkans inspired the Russian thinkers to reconsider their mission in the world. Many of them started to stand for peaceful incorporation of various individual cultures into one universal culture which would be developed into a theory of Russia’s mission to unite all nations into universal brotherhood. A Russian academician of the Soviet era Dmitriy Likhachev maintained that as a result of Russian historical encounter with various peoples they developed an ability to absorb foreign nations and their cultures which allowed Russian nation-builders to argue about Russia’s universalism, tolerance to difference and concern for others. He claimed that not a conquest or subjugation of other peoples but rather their voluntary incorporation into the Russian world had made the establishment of universalism possible.¹⁶⁰ Another Soviet philosopher Ilya Ilyin repeats Likhachev in the idea that integration of numerous ethnic groups of the Russian Empire was not based on civilizational suppression but on brotherly attitudes towards other cultures. His words “neither forced baptism nor extirpation or all-equalizing Russification, [Russia] never did” exemplify it.¹⁶¹

Supposedly, to come to these conclusions Soviet Russian thinkers referred to eighteenth and nineteenth centuries writers such as a Russian poet of the eighteenth century P.A. Plavilshchikov who characterized the Russian man being

capable of understanding anything, [...] penetrating with his thoughts into the core of the matter reaching the bottom, and clearly comprehend its essence. Not imitation, but creative assimilation of achievements of other nations and their transformation into the Russian way of thinking is the main task.¹⁶² (my trans.)

¹⁵⁹ Cited in Batunsky, **op. cit.**, p. 177.

¹⁶⁰ Dmitry Shlapentokh, “Russian Nationalism and Soviet Intellectuals under Gorbachev”, Ed. by Thompson, p. 123.

¹⁶¹ Ilya Ilyin, “Chto sulit miru raschleneniye Rossii” (What Russia’s dismemberment promises the world), **Iz istorii russkoy gumanisticheskoy mysli**, Moscow, Prosvesheniye, 1999, p. 260.

¹⁶² Cited in Batunsky, **op. cit.**, p. 425.

One of the political leaders of Decembrism Pavel Pestel wrote that it was Russians' Christian duty to take care of those **wild nomads** who dwelled in the territories of the Russian Empire and improve their situation with the Orthodox faith and education so that they would become brothers.¹⁶³ Regarding the Russian Muslims Pestel preached that Russians' friendliness and meekness might persuade them toward Orthodoxy. Supposedly, his aim of propagating religious and cultural conversion of the non-Christian religious others was not to abolish the otherness of the other to keep the other under control as it often happened in European overseas colonies, but unite

all tribes [...] into one nation [...] and all different shades into one common mass [...] so that the inhabitants of the whole space of the Russian state are all Russians [...], so that [...] all of Russia [...] would demonstrate a kind of homogeneity, uniformity and like-mindedness.¹⁶⁴ (my trans.)

Pestel talks of the time when the Russian Empire was actively annexing its neighboring territories. The Russians must have experienced resistance from local communities, however, it looks like the readiness of the Russians to assimilate creatively, keeping the different shades did not make the process of incorporating the aliens so radical as it was in American and European colonies.

Thus, as the result of the described historical process of Russia's relationship with neighboring countries and various peoples within the empire borders previously annexed, many Russian nation-builders, both Westernizers and Slavophiles were united by the new universal mission and preferred to define Russia and Russians as bearer of **universal brotherhood** which implied mutual respect for the other's difference. Together with other characteristics which define a nation, particularly Russia's Janus-faced nature and Russians' potentiality to incorporate with the other peacefully, absorb its culture and transform into the Russian national self, seem to play an important role in formatting national identity.

To sum up, the historical material addressed above has been used to explore Russia's perception of the self and look into relationship between the self and the other

¹⁶³ Cited in Batunsky, **op. cit.**, p.100.

¹⁶⁴ **Ibid.**

which is necessary as a framework to apply to the novels under consideration and demonstrate how Dostoevsky uses the other in search for the self. As a result of examining the events which had taken place within three periods of Russian history starting from the foundation of the Kievan Rus and conversion of the Slavic tribes to Christianity, reforms of Peter the Great to westernize Russia and splits of the nineteenth-century Russian society, we have come to the conclusion that the new mission of Russia as bearer of universal brotherhood propagated by Russian nation-builders in Dostoevsky's time gained popularity for its potential to reunite the split and alienated nation and rebuild the national integrity. Among many nation-builders there was one whose ideas regarding Russians' capability to incorporate with the other, be it external or internal, peacefully, absorb its culture and transform into the Russian national self inspired and gave hope for a brighter future. The person who expressed this idea in the most powerful way was Fyodor Dostoevsky.

SECOND CHAPTER

DOSTOEVSKY'S PERCEPTION OF RUSSIANNES AND ROLE OF THE OTHER IN ITS ESTABLISHMENT

“Russia and Dostoevsky, Dostoevsky and Russia are like a question and answer, and an answer and a question. [...]. Understanding Dostoevsky is the same as understanding Russia.”

A.S. Steinberg¹

2.1. Dostoevsky and Russianness

For many the role of Dostoevsky in establishment of Russianness is obvious. He has been one of the most quoted writer ever since not for nothing. However, there must be something new to say regarding Dostoevsky's role in Russian national identity formation especially if to rely on George Gibian's statement that “Dostoevskian themes [...] about [...] Russian characteristics are not merely the unifying threads, they are the backbone of the story”.² Yet, Dostoevsky's universal popularity was not bound only to the Russian reality and Russians' search for the self. He was popular also because, as Igor Volgin powerfully expressed, he managed “to embody that ideal world principle, to which the innermost strings of the Russian national spirit are so responsive”.³ (my trans.) When Dostoevsky was only eighteen years old he wrote to his brother that his purpose of life was to puzzle out the mystery of being a human.⁴ Closer to the end of his life he seems to have puzzled out the mystery. The epigraph⁵ he chose for his final novel **The Brothers Karamazov** allows to suggest that the mystery of being a human was to be like **a corn of**

¹ Aaron Shteinberg, **Sistema Svobodi F.M. Dostoyevskogo**, Berlin, Skythen, 1923, p.10.

² George Gibian, “The Quest for Russian National Identity in Soviet Culture Today”, Ed. by Thompson, p. 10.

³ Igor Volgin, **Posledniy God Dostoyevskogo**, Moscow, Izdatelstvo AST, 2017, p. 485.

⁴ Dostoevsky, Pisma 10, Received by Mikhail Dostoevsky, Petersburg, August 15, 1839, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.15, Petersburg, Nauka, 1996, p. 21, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/354.htm, January 21, 2018.

⁵ “Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.” (The Gospel of John, Vol.24, Ch.xii).

wheat whose mission is to be ready to sacrifice himself for the brighter future of the next generations.

Fyodor Dostoevsky was born some years before the Decembrist revolt which marked the epoch of “long and deadly duel between the Russian intelligentsia”⁶ and the government of the tsar. In Joseph Frank’s opinion Dostoevsky was born out of the inner moral and spiritual crises of this intelligentsia - out of its self-alienation and its desperate search for new values on which to found its life”.⁷ He describes the atmosphere Dostoyevsky grew up in as “confusion and moral chaos” which led to “the breakup of the traditional forms of Russian life” and “lack of a unified social tradition”.⁸ Aaron Steinberg characterizes nineteenth-century Russia to which Dostoevsky was born as the split of intelligentsia and bifurcation of most fundamental ideologies:

[...]: head of the eagle which spread its wings [toward Europe and Asia], forked, in Herzen’s words, into the Westernizers and Slavophiles, into the European socialism and Populism, into the idea of the world and the idea of oneself, into cognition [poznaniye] and consciousness [soznaniye].⁹ (my trans.)

Despite the fact the Dostoevskys belonged to the gentry, his family and he struggled with financial difficulties throughout his life. When Dostoevsky was a child he and his siblings were allowed to mingle with serf children and older peasants which contributed to shaping Dostoevsky’s later social ideas and propagate “the same harmonious unity between the educated classes and the peasantry that he remembered having known as a child”.¹⁰ (my trans.) In **The Diary of a Writer** in 1873 he declares that he was one of those for whom it was easy to “return to the popular root, to the understanding of the Russian soul, to the recognition of the people's spirit”.¹¹ He also stayed tightly connected to the traditional Russian culture thanks to piety of his parents.

⁶ Joseph Frank, **Dostoevsky: A Writer in His Time**, Ed. by M. Petrusiewicz, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 2010, p. 4.

⁷ **Ibid.**

⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 5.

⁹ Shteinberg, **op. cit.**, p. 15.

¹⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 15.

¹¹ Dostoyevsky, **The Diary of a Writer**, Trans. by Boris Brasol, New York, George Braziller, 1919, p. 152.

Another important moment from Dostoevsky's childhood was his love for literature developed in him by his parents. Since his early age he and his siblings had been taught not only the Gospel but also they had been accustomed with Russian as well as European literature and "already knew virtually all the principal episodes in Russian history from Karamzin whom, in the evenings, father used to read aloud to us."¹² In Frank's opinion, from Karamzin's **Letters** young Dostoevsky adopted the idea "that Europe was a doomed and dying civilization".¹³ However, the fact that Dostoevsky loved European culture not less than Russian allows to question this opinion. For instance, the two Russian writers whose works built the inner world of young Dostoevsky and, later on, became a foundation of his oeuvre were Pushkin and Gogol. For Törkan Olcay, for instance, Dostoevsky is their successor.¹⁴ Next to them and some other, he gobbled up novels by Victor Hugo, Balzac¹⁵, George Sand, Hoffman and Goethe.¹⁶ In addition, he writes in his Dairy:

I assert and repeat that every European poet, thinker, humanitarian is, among all countries of the world, with the exception of his native land, always most intimately understood and accepted in Russia. Shakespeare, Byron, Walter Scott and Dickens are more akin and intelligible to Russians than, for instance, to Germans [...]. [...] same Schiller was much more national and much more akin to the barbarian Russians than to France- [...]. Yet, in Russia, together with Jukovsky, he [Schiller] soaked into the Russian soul, left an impress upon it, and almost marked an epoch in the history of our development.¹⁷

Europe for Dostoevsky was the holy land of great monuments but, at the same time, it was a **cemetery** because they spread atheism, individualism and materialism. Similarly, Russia for Dostoevsky was destined to save humanity from going astray. On the other hand, most of his writing was devoted to criticism of Russian peoples' depravity. Lunacharskiy together with many other scholars explain it with the phrase "the contradictory nature and

¹² **Ibid.**

¹³ Frank, **op. cit.**, p. 31.

¹⁴ Olcay, **op. cit.**, p. 148.

¹⁵ Nikolay Berdyaev advocates that Balzac was the writer Dostoevsky was the most connected to. See Berdyaev, **Mirosozertsanie Dostoyevskogo**, Ch. 1, w.page, (Online) <http://www.vehi.net/berdyaev/dostoevsky/01.html>, March 23, 2018.

¹⁶ Frank, **op. cit.**, p. 34.

¹⁷ Dostoevsky, **The Diary of a Writer**, p. 343.

duality of Dostoevsky's own social personality".¹⁸ (my trans.) This **internal splitting** in Dostoevsky's attitude to Europe and Russia is interpreted by Berdyaev who believes that in it we see universalism of the Russian spirit, the ability of the Russians to live through everything that happens in the world as their own.¹⁹ In other words, Dostoevsky's ambiguous and Janus-faced reaction to events in the world can be explained by his enormous love for humanity and the deepest sorrow for its sinfulness. His works may suggest that he loved people in spite of their moral ugliness. In his writing he sounds to emphasize peoples' capacity to purify themselves from their sins and unite with each other in peace and love.

When Dostoevsky was only sixteen he lost two people he loved the most: his mother and his favorite poet Alexander Pushkin. In his future life he would suffer similar pain of losing his father, most beloved brother Mikhail, his first wife, and two of his little children. He almost lost his own life at the age of twenty eight for reading a letter at one of Petrashevsky's meetings where educated youth gathered to share their revolutionary ideas on the future of Russia and its people. Together with his compatriots he was sentenced to death and in December 1849 brought for execution to the Semenovskiy Square in St. Petersburg. Moments before the actual execution the death penalty was changed to four years of hard labor in Siberia which became a turning point in his life. He describes it in his letter to his brother Mikhail

[...] that head is already cut off from my shoulders. [...]. Never before have such abundant and healthy reserves of spiritual life boiled over in me [...]. [...] Now I live once again! [...]. There is no bile and malice in my soul, I look back at the past and think about how much time was spent, how much time was lost in delusions, in mistakes, in idleness, in inability to live; [...]. Now, changing life, I am reborn into a new form. Brother! I swear to you that I will not lose hope and keep my spirit and my heart pure. I am reborn for the better.²⁰ (my trans.)

¹⁸ Mikhail Bakhtin, **Dostoevsky's Polyphonic Novel**, Ed. and Trans. by Caryl Emerson, Vol.8, London, University of Minnesota Press, 1984, p. 34.

¹⁹ Berdyaev, **Mirosozertsaniye Dostoevskogo**, Ch. 7, w.page.

²⁰ Dostoevsky, Pisma 37, Received by Mikhail Dostoevsky, Petropavlovskaya Krepost, December 22, 1849, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, p. 82, (Online) <https://rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/381.htm>, January 3, 2019.

Coming from a religious Orthodox family Dostoevsky was a devout believer in God and Christ. However, after meeting Belinsky, “the revered idol of Russian radical youth”, “passionate socialist”²¹ and a devoted Westernizer, Dostoevsky was introduced to Socialism and atheism as the “new Christianity” of Utopian Socialism, which was based on an opposition between “the true religion of Jesus Christ - a religion of hope and light, of faith in the powers of man as well as in the beneficence of God - and a false religion of fear and eternal damnation that distorted Christ’s teaching”.²² In addition to his dual attitude to Europe, he was split “between a revolutionary materialistic socialism and a conservative religious worldview”.²³ While in the Siberian exile he confesses in his letter to N. A. Fonvizina that he has been “a child of the century, a child of disbelief and doubt so far and [would be until] the grave lid”.²⁴ (my trans.) In the same letter he accepts that his thirst to believe cost him terrible tortures and that the more powerful it grew in his soul, the more opposing arguments came up in him. Yet, he also adds that

God sends me sometimes instants when I am completely calm; at those instants I love and feel loved by others, and it is at these instants that I have shaped for myself a *Credo* where everything is clear and sacred for me. This *Credo* is very simple, here it is: to believe that nothing is more beautiful, profound, sympathetic, reasonable, manly, and more perfect than Christ; and I tell myself with a jealous love not only that there is nothing but that there cannot be anything. Even more, if someone proved to me that Christ is outside the truth, and that *in reality* the truth were outside of Christ, then I should prefer to remain with Christ rather than with the truth.²⁵

He was one of those few Russian writers who lived all his life in dilemma. It is difficult to talk about such a man, writer and his views with certainty. Therefore, he is a suitable person to talk about Janus-faced nature and duality of the Russians and people in general.

In his next twenty seven years he would experience many national and personal splits, spiritual dilemmas and inner duality. Being born in the days of national split between Slavophiles and Westernizers, the upper classes and narod, revolutionary revolts

²¹ Dostoevsky, *The Dairy of a Writer*, p. 6.

²² Frank, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

²³ Bakhtin, *Dostoevsky's Polyphonic Novel*, p. 34.

²⁴ Dostoyevsky, Pisma 39, Received by N. D. Fonvizina, Omsk, February 20, 1854, *Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah*, p. 96, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/383.htm, January 21, 2019.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

of the educated class against the tsarist government, split among the Orthodox Russians into followers of **the new Christianity**²⁶ and the one practiced by narod, young Dostoevsky combined all this duality and ambivalence in himself, reached his maturity with it, wrote his masterpieces and died with it.

One year before his death, in his letter to one of his readers E. F. Yunge, he admits that this **split (razdvoyeniye)** she experienced, was always in him. He encourages her saying that this **duality (dvoystvennost)** is the most ordinary trait of extraordinary people. “It is a great torment, but at the same time a great pleasure. It is a strong consciousness, need for self-report and [...] for moral duty to yourself and to humanity” (my trans.) is how Dostoevsky understood the most specific characteristic of the Russian people - duality.²⁷ He can be considered to be the one who managed to resolve this duality and find the remedy for the spiritual and identity crises - the remedy was in unity, first personal and national, and through them, the universal.

On this account, Bakhtin thinks that Dostoevsky's duality allowed him to create the most original genre of European literature, **the polyphonic novel**. He also bounds three phenomena to it. The first is the epoch in which Dostoevsky lived - the epoch of “the objective complexity, contradictoriness and multi-voicedness”; the second is Dostoevsky's “position of the déclassé intellectual and the social wanderer, his deep biographical and inner participation in the objective multi-leveledness of life”; and the last is “his gift for seeing the world in terms of interaction and coexistence”.²⁸ Bakhtin compares this gift which he also defines as a “gift for hearing and understanding all voices immediately and simultaneously” with that of Dante.²⁹

Shipilov writes that a person of a developed society exists in it within several social systems simultaneously and he can be connected to different communication channels,

²⁶ Similar phenomenon is mentioned by Neumann who determined the split of the European Christians into ancient and contemporary. For more information see Neumann, **op. cit.**, p. 72.

²⁷ Dostoyevsky, Pisma 221, Received by Ye. F. Yunge, Peterburgh, April 11, 1880, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, p. 601, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/565.htm, January 21, 2019.

²⁸ Bakhtin, **Dostoevsky's Polyphonic Novel**, p. 31.

²⁹ **Ibid.**

which leads to more tolerance in his perception of **the other**.³⁰ Dostoevsky was one of those rare people who could hear voices of people from various classes and status and interpreted them in such a way that everybody would benefit from what was said. His sensitivity and life experiences allowed him to connect to any kind of personality, be it the self or the other. Bakhtin correctly concludes that

where others saw a single thought, he was able to find and feel out two thoughts, a bifurcation; where others saw a single quality, he discovered in it the presence of a second and contradictory quality. [...] Thus Dostoevsky's world is the artistically organized coexistence and interaction of spiritual diversity, not stages in the evolution of a unified spirit.³¹

In contrast to this view of Dostoevsky's duality, Boris Bursov regards his splintering as a cause of "his lifelong tossing in the same circle" and "total violation of all norms, standards, boundaries".³² However, Rinata Galtseva and Irina Rodnyanskaya rightly point out that Dostoevsky lived through most of his characters' dilemmas in his imagination of a genius. The scholars prove that wholeness is achieved through splitting and those who succeed are geniuses. Dostoevsky, in their opinion, "remained the master and healer of his own bifurcation, and therefore he was realized as a genius".³³ (my trans.)

The last but not the least reason why it is Dostoevsky is **dialogism** as a central feature of his artistic world. Bakhtin believes that

everything in Dostoevsky's novels tends toward dialogue, toward a dialogic opposition, as if tending toward its center. All else is the means; dialogue is the end. A single voice ends nothing and resolves nothing. Two voices is the minimum for life, the minimum for existence. [...] Dostoevsky carries dialogue into eternity, conceiving of it as eternal co-rejoicing [**so-radovaniye**], co-admiration [**so-lubovaniye**], concord [**so-glasiye**]. At the level of the novel, it is presented as the unfinalizability of dialogue, although originally as dialogue's vicious circle.³⁴

In his understanding, Dostoevsky's basic scheme for dialogue is the positioning of **the I** to **the other** where **the other** is not an object but is another subject, equal to **the I**.³⁵ The

³⁰ Shipilov, "Svoi", "Chuzhie" i "Drugie", p. 41.

³¹ Bakhtin, 1984, **Dostoevsky's Polyphonic Novel**, p. 30-31.

³² Rinata Galtseva, Irina Rodnyanskaya, "O Lichnosti Dostoyevskogo", **k Portretam Russkikh Misliteley**, Moscow, Petroglif, 2012, p. 40.

³³ **Ibid.**, p. 54.

³⁴ Bakhtin, **Dostoevsky's Polyphonic Novel**, p. 252.

³⁵ **Ibid.**

scholar also states that affirmation of someone else's **I** not as an object but as another subject is Dostoevsky's fundamental principle.³⁶ Bakhtin clarifies that it was Vyacheslav Ivanov who first found it. According to Ivanov, the task of Dostoevsky's characters was to "transform the other person from a shadow into an authentic reality", from **He** to **thou art (ty yesi)**.³⁷ Talking of Ivanov's concept of **thou art** another Russian scholar Igor Yevlampiyev underlines the notion of **proniknoveniye** (penetration) as a subject's **transcension** into the other (**chuzhoye Ya**), in other words, the act of love. In case of this kind of transcension, an alien being ceases to be alien to **I**; **You** becomes for **I** another designation of itself. According to Ivanov, explains Yevlampiyev, Dostoevsky's **thou art** means not "you will be known by me", but "your being is experienced by me as my own" or "I will know myself through your being".³⁸ (my trans.) As Bakhtin perceptively states Dostoevsky aimed at "*representing someone else's idea*, preserving its full capacity to signify as an idea, while at the same time also preserving a distance, neither confirming the idea nor merging it with his own expressed ideology."³⁹ The purpose of communication and interaction between the self and other, or, **I** and **thou art**, was not dialectical, that is assimilation, but dialogical, that is coexistence and interaction.

To sum up, having been bestowed with deep sensitivity to people around, Dostoevsky could feel spiritual struggles and dilemmas of the nineteenth-century Russian society. His sincere love for Christ and humanity in general together with his intellect, literary gift and industriousness resulted in creation of the world's most readable pieces of literature written mainly after the Siberian exile. In the literature he created during this period "a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses"⁴⁰ can recognize themselves through their active dialogue with the other which can help to analyse the self/other nexus and its role in establishment of Russianness.

³⁶ **Ibid.**, p. 11.

³⁷ **Ibid.**, p. 10.

³⁸ Yevlampiyev, **op. cit.**, w.page.

³⁹ **Ibid.**, p. 85.

⁴⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 6.

2.2. Meeting the Internal Other: Otherness of the Self

2.2.1 The Social Other

Four years of hard labor in prison and three years more of exile in Siberia was the period when Dostoevsky did not just meet the internal other but became one of them. It was the period when he truly comprehended the Russian narod and made it the major character of his writing, believing that anybody but the narod was able to revitalize the cultured self lost in Westernism and Slavophilism, European socialism and Populism, wrong idea of Russia's mission and man's universal purpose in general.

Galtseva and Rodnyanskaya metaphorically differentiate this period as the time when the second Dostoevsky came to be.⁴¹ The scholars declare that the first Dostoevsky was Dostoevsky of the 40s who had not found himself yet, a young man ready to suffer for what he never firmly believed.⁴² While they might be right, we would rather describe Dostoevsky of the 40s as a young writer of *The Poor Folk* and *The Double* who is in search of solution of the dilemma between Socialism and traditional Christianity, Westernism and Slavophilism. Despite the fact the young Dostoevsky was interested in Socialism as an alternative for traditional Christianity, he never stopped believing in Christ. Later in his novels Westernizers such as Belinsky, Herzen and alike would embody the non-believer and therefore the non-religious other in relation to the religious self - the narod. Neumann refers to such non-believers as the contemporary Christians because they supplemented religion by modern education.⁴³ Thus, these followers of new Christianity became in Dostoevsky's novels the other and were juxtaposed with the self represented by characters devoted to their Orthodox faith.

The second Dostoevsky is "a recent convict, a semi-adventurous Petersburg journalist and a wanderer in foreign countries".⁴⁴ During this stage of his life Dostoevsky seems to have reached maturity that resulted in his great novels. His life in Siberia and later in Europe allowed him to gather various images of the other which he used to

⁴¹ Galtseva and Rodnyanskaya, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

⁴² *Loc. cit.*

⁴³ Neumann, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

⁴⁴ Galtseva and Rodnyanskaya, *loc. cit.*

construct the image of the **true (nastoyashiy)** Russian self, the most complete image of whom was depicted by Dostoevsky of the last decade, Dostoevsky of **Staraya Russa** and Ems, strengthened by his wife's support, pulled out from the public isolation by the success of **The Diary of a Writer**. The bearer of this image became the main character of his final novel **The Brothers Karamazov**, Alesha Karamazov.

While the first Dostoevsky was extensively influenced by schism and duality of the epoch he grew up in, the second was influenced by his experience of the katorga (hard labor imprisonment) in Siberia. The katorga, his exile in the present day Kazakhstan and his compelled stay in Europe were the environments which allowed him to meet the other and, through interaction with it, explain to his readers what the self could be. Nikolay Dobrolyubov in his study of Peter the Great writes that

the great historical transformers have a great influence on the development and course of historical events in their time and in their nation; but one should not forget that before their influence begins, they themselves are under the influence of the concepts and customs of that time and of the society on which they then begin to act with the power of their genius.⁴⁵ (my trans.)

In a similar way Dostoevsky must have been influenced by the time and society he lived in. Before he could act as a national public activist and prophet, philosopher and psychologist not only concerning Russians but humanity as a whole, he experienced influence first of Russian and Western philosophers and writers, Russian revolutionary intellects such as Belinsky and Petrashevsky, and in the second stage of his life his world view was formed under influence of the narod he met in Siberia. His four years in the katorga gave him a chance to study the common people's culture and psychology. From his experience there he brought out numerous images of the narod and used them throughout his literary life.

As it has been mentioned in the first chapter, the Russian nation during Peter the Great's reign was divided into upper classes, nobility and gentry, and lower classes, the narod. As a rule, the upper and lower classes did not have much interaction apart from relationship of a master and slave. On this account, Leo Yakovlev argues that among great

⁴⁵ Nikolay A. Dobrolyubov, "Perviy Godi Ysarstvovaniya Petra Velikogo", **Sobraniye Sochineniy**, Vol.2, St. Petersburg, 1862, p. 152.

writers of the time such as L. Tolstoy, Leskov and Chekhov, Dostoevsky was the least aware of the life of the common people, and pictures of their life in his works are often unreal and fantastic. He also adds that the image of **the Russian man** and **the Russian soul** Dostoevsky created in his works is also fantastic.⁴⁶ Notably, the word **fantastic** (**fantasticheskiy**) is Dostoevsky's favorite. He used it in different contexts both in his journal writing and novels. For example, in his **Diary of a Writer** he states that Russians completely forgot that the truth is more fantastic than a lie a human being is capable of.⁴⁷ His other words are: "In Russia, truth almost invariably assumes a fantastic character. [...] they [Russians] will chase after a fabrication precisely because they look upon it [the truth] as something fantastic and utopian."⁴⁸ Thus, it is correctly noted by Yakovlev that Dostoevsky's **Russian man** was fantastic and was his fantasy, because, firstly, the writer did not come out of narod, and secondly, people he met during his katorga years were only a tiny part of the narod and were only criminals. Nevertheless, in our opinion, the fact that Dostoevsky was not one of the narod and experienced **otherness of the self** in katorga allowed him to notice their personal qualities more concisely than if he had been one of them. In his letter to his brother Mikhail after he was released from the prison and sent to his forced military service place, Dostoevsky confirms our words saying that

during the four-year katorga with criminals I finally distinguished people. Will you believe there are deep, strong and beautiful characters, and how fun it was to find gold under the rough bark? And not one, not two, but several. Some of them have to be respected, others are decidedly beautiful. [...] So many folk types, characters did I carry out of the katorga! I lived [**szhilsa**] with them and therefore, it seems, I know them decently [...]. What wonderful people. In general, time is not lost for me. If I didn't learn Russia, I did learn Russian people well.⁴⁹ (my trans.)

Keeping memories of the commoners from his childhood, and his life side by side with other convicts in the katorga among whom were people of different classes, cruel murderers and innocent people wrongly accused made it possible to create a more genuine

⁴⁶ Leo Yakovlev, **Dostoyevskiy: Prizraki, Fobii, Khimery**, Harkov, Karavella, 2006, p. 100.

⁴⁷ Dostoevsky, **Dnevnik Pisatelya**, p. 182.

⁴⁸ Dostoevsky, **The Diary of a Writer**, p. 135.

⁴⁹ Dostoyevskiy, Pisma 38, Received by Mikhail Dostoevsky, Omsk. January 30 - February 22, 1854, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, p. 92, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/382.htm, January 21, 2019.

image of the Russian man and define the Russian soul. Moreover, in opposition to Yakovlev's statement Dostoevsky says that

true events, depicted with exclusiveness of their occurrence, nearly always assume a fantastic, almost incredible, character [...] The aim of art is not to portray these or those incidents in the ways of life but their general idea, sharp-sightedly divided and correctly removed from the whole multiplicity of analogous living phenomena.⁵⁰ (my trans.)

To conclude on Yakovlev's assumption, Dostoevsky's representation of the Russian narod was not a fabrication, and though it may look as something fantastic, it was Dostoevsky's vision of the true self, which readers were free to accept or reject.

Furthermore, the narod theme became the central in Dostoevsky's oeuvre for many reasons. One of the reasons we focus on in this study is the narod's role in constructing national identity. Dostoevsky more than others could have seen the border between the ordinary people and the intelligentsia, between the peasants and the gentry. It was obvious for him that unless the classes united, the Russian nation would become an ethnographic material for other nations. Dostoevsky strongly criticized the upper classes for their admiration of everything European and contempt for everything Russian, particularly the traditional Russian culture and religiosity. In his **Winter Notes on Summer Impressions** (1863) he clearly distinguishes the Russian Europeanized nobility, "a bunch of privileged and patented people" (my trans.) of only one hundred thousand in number, from the rest fifty million common Russians still seriously considered as nobody by that bunch, and laughed at for the fact that they do not shave their beards.⁵¹ Even though Dostoevsky addresses the Russian upper classes as **Oni** (they) or **Vy** (you), more frequently he uses the pronoun **My** (we) which allows to conclude that he included himself into **the bunch**.

In his novels as well as his journal writing he speculates on the Russian modern tradition to distinguish the upper classes from the rest by the fact of being educated and cultured, and therefore European. For example, in his response to Mr. Avseyenko, a literary critic and writer, Dostoevsky questions the man's statement whether the narod is

⁵⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 90.

⁵¹ Dostoevsky, "Zimniye Zametki Letnikh Vpechatleniyakh", **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.4, Leningrad, Nauka, 1989, p. 393, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol4/23.htm, December 1, 2018.

the one “to bow to the upper classes only because the latter represent Europe and are cultured, whereas the former is only Russian and passive”.⁵² (my trans.) Another feature Dostoevsky uses to characterize the nobility is being an emigrant. He writes that most of the Russian elite did not become emigrants but were born such.⁵³ By such words he wants to emphasize that most of the Russian intelligentsia felt themselves Russian only by the fact of blood, from all other perspectives such as food, dress, language, education, faith etc. they believed to be fully Western and therefore different from the commoners. Throughout his **Dairy of a Writer** he challenges the upper classes’s usage of French. He writes that their children are ceased to be born with a live language and pronounce their first words in French and when they learn Russian at school by the grammar, they acquire some kind of an artificial language.⁵⁴ As a result, just by this fact, “we, the upper classes, are sufficiently detached from the people, that is, from the living language (‘language’ and ‘people’, in our tongue, are synonymous, and what a wealthy, profound thought this is!)”.⁵⁵ This statement of Dostoevsky not only points at the social gap between the upper classes and the commoners, but also draws attention to the fact that the educated Russian elite ceased to be Russian by the matter of the language. To him, by rejecting speaking the Russian language they rejected being Russian. Dostoevsky accuses “all the progressive intelligentsia” of passing by the narod, of not knowing it and of being a stranger to it.⁵⁶ He writes that the elite would never accept the narod’s ideas because “in their European world view they find them Tatar”.⁵⁷ In his **Winter Notes of Summer Impressions** he refers to an article in which its writer, relying on a Russian national custom, inculpatates the commoners’ national, spontaneous barbarism in comparison to the Europeanism of our high noble society.⁵⁸ In criticism of the article Dostoevsky questions whether such attitude to the narod is an act of impudence toward it or slavish admiration for European forms of

⁵² Dostoevsky, **Dnevnik Pisatela**, p. 331.

⁵³ **Ibid.**, p. 47.

⁵⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 452.

⁵⁵ Dostoevsky, **The Diary of a Writer**, p. 400.

⁵⁶ Dostoevsky, **Dnevnik Pisatela**, p. 500.

⁵⁷ **Ibid.**, p. 501.

⁵⁸ Dostoevsky, “Zimniye Zametki o Letnikh Vpechatleniyakh”, p. 405.

civilization. Dostoevsky points at this wrong action on behalf of the upper classes throughout his writing career because, in his opinion, the deepest wound of the Russian nation was this split between the narod and the Russian elite. He believed it to be his mission to cure the wound.

Berdyayev underlines that for Dostoyevsky the cultured class was torn off the narod and was opposed to it and its beliefs. The narod in their view, he writes, “is first of all **not-I (ne-ya)**, my opposite”, which means that its truth, culture, traditions, language etc. is opposite to the nobility’s.⁵⁹ Vera Tolz agrees with Dostoevsky’s view that the Westernized elite wronged and persecuted narod and adds that it was shared by other great writers like Gogol and L. Tolstoy.⁶⁰

This split between the Russian elite and ordinary people Dostoevsky must have felt with every cell of his exhausted body the moment they passed the European border of Russia on the way to Siberia. In the same letter to his brother Mikhail he confesses that

I met the katorga people in Tobolsk, and here in Omsk I settled down to live with them for four years. These people are rude, irritated and angry. The hatred of the nobles surpasses all their limits, and therefore we, the nobles, were met with hostility and with vicious joy about our grief. They would eat us if we were given to them. However, judge yourself of how much protection there was when you had to live, drink, eat and sleep with these people for several years, [...]. ‘You nobles, iron noses, you pecked us. Before he was a master and tormented the people, but now he is worse than the last, he has become our brother’ is a topic that has been playing for four years. One hundred and fifty enemies could not get tired of pursuing [us], it was their love, entertainment, occupation, [...]. They were always aware that we were superior to them. [...], and therefore we did not understand each other, so we had to endure all the revenge and persecution with which they live and breathe, to the nobility.⁶¹ (my trans.)

The gap between the classes grew faster because both sides were getting further from each other. Not only did the nobility keep distance from the narod, narod did not want to get in touch with the upper classes too. Bhabha’s term **otherness of the self** which he understands as a process of miscognition between the colonizer (upper classes) and the colonized (narod)⁶² describes how a representative of the nobility felt himself among the narod and vice versa. In spite of being one nation, the narod was the other for the elite,

⁵⁹ Berdyayev, *Mirosozertsaniye Dostoevskogo*, Ch. 7, w.page.

⁶⁰ Tolz, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

⁶¹ Dostoevsky, Pisma 38, *Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah*, p. 88.

⁶² Bhabha, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

and the elite was the other for the narod. The most tragic thing is that this kind of relationship leads to a phenomenon Bhabha calls **less than one and double** which we understand that as long as social classes of a state stay alienated from each other, unity cannot be achieved; without unity there cannot be a strong nation but a split and, therefore, weak , less than one, nation. In this regard Dostoevsky some months before his death wrote in **The Diary** that the narod would take the Russian Europeans for their own only when he agrees to

first, learn to love my [narod's] sanctity; begin to revere that which I revere,-then you will be, even as I, my brother, irrespective of the fact that you dress differently, that you are a gentleman, a boss, and that, at times, you don't know how to express yourself decently in Russian.⁶³

Moreover, Dostoevsky underlines that fellowship does not mean to live on good and loving terms with each other, but it can be achieved only in case of recognition of the other as one's own (**svoim**). The moment both sides recognize each other as one's own and find in each other the self; the moment the educated classes spiritually unite with the narod, only then, Dostoevsky assures, a mighty, creative, blissful and united nation would arise in Russia.⁶⁴

In his **House of the Dead, Crime and Punishment**, and journal writing he would also suggest that this gap between the educated self and its social other can be overcome the moment the educated self realizes that the Russian narod, together with its Orthodox culture, religion and language can save Russia from becoming material for other nations. Overall, the split between the classes in Russia which resulted in otherness and alienation of the narod in relation to the elite was one of the key problems Dostoevsky aimed to resolve until his last days. Yet, next to the social other, there was a religious other the writer depicted in his works in order to decipher the self.

⁶³ Dostoevsky, **The Diary of a Writer**, p. 1030.

⁶⁴ **Ibid.**

2.2.2. The Religious Other

Taking into consideration the heterogeneous population of the Russian Empire in the nineteenth century it is interesting to note what Dostoevsky meant by the words **narod** and **narodnost** (nationality). In the episode mentioned above, Dostoevsky mentions the number fifty million people and compares it to one hundred thousand members of the upper classes. Throughout **The Diary of a Writer** published between 1876 and 1880, however, he mentions numbers like “ninety millions of us, Russians”⁶⁵; “hundred-million bulk”⁶⁶ and “a hundred million mass”⁶⁷; “there are many of us, eighty millions”⁶⁸, “eighty million Russian peasants”⁶⁹, “All the eighty millions of its population represent such a spiritual unity”⁷⁰ etc. In the Commentary to **The Dairy of a Writer** it is stated that the numbers Dostoevsky used started a polemical remark by V.V. Vorontsov in the journal **Vesnik Evropy** (European Bulletin) where the author blames Dostoevsky for inaccuracy in using the population data.⁷¹ He explains his argument pointing at Dostoevsky’s reference to eighty million Russian people who “represent such a spiritual unity as is, of course, nonexistent - and cannot exist - anywhere in Europe.”⁷² In the same piece he calls all the eighty millions of Russia’s population **Russian peasants**.⁷³ Lastly, in his earlier journal writing he writes that Russians possess “[...] unity, the spiritual indivisibility [...], and their closest communion with the Monarch” and that “should the Czar’s great word sound, they all will rise - the whole hundred million mass of them - and will do everything within the power of such a hundred million mass inspired by one impulse, in accord, as one man.”⁷⁴ Vorontsov draws attention to the fact that in that time eighty million (or ninety) made up the population of the Russian Empire including many other nationalities

⁶⁵ **Ibid.**, p. 189.

⁶⁶ **Ibid.**, p. 489.

⁶⁷ **Ibid.**, p. 566.

⁶⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 581.

⁶⁹ **Ibid.**, p. 663.

⁷⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 962.

⁷¹ V. Raka, et al., Commentary to **Dnevnik Pisatelya** by Dostoevsky, p. 710.

⁷² Dostoevsky, **The Diary of a Writer**, p. 962.

⁷³ **Ibid.**

⁷⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 566.

besides the Russians who were supposedly only thirty-five millions; beside the Orthodox there were millions of Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Mohammedans, hundreds of thousands of pagans.⁷⁵ Another objection came from K.D. Kavelin who questioned Dostoevsky's declaration of spiritual unity among the eighty millions. While he admitted existence of tribal, church, state, language unity, he doubted there was spiritual unity even within the Orthodox Russians.⁷⁶

Thus, Dostoevsky's reference to fifty-million Russian commoners in **The Winter Notes** shows that he distinguished them from alien nationalities of the empire. While such division might be interpreted as discrimination, we assume it is not because reference to fifty million of ethnic Russians was used only in **The Winter Notes** and only once, whereas the numbers eighty, ninety and a hundred million are mentioned frequently throughout **The Dairy of a Writer** to indicate population of the Russian Empire as a whole. Vorontsov, talking of thirty-five millions Russians, must have meant only Great Russians (**velikorusy**). However, because for Dostoevsky the Great Russian, Little Russian, and White Russian were all the same, he called all of them Russian and considered them "the master of the Russian land".⁷⁷ The point that stays unclear is on what basis Dostoevsky believed that the Orthodox Russians and non-Orthodox foreigners and aliens who inhabited the empire's borders in the nineteenth century can be "inspired by one impulse, in accord, as one man" in spite of evident hostility between the Russians and conquered peoples such as the Tatars, Caucasians, peoples of Siberia and Central Asia. Supposedly, the writer's experience in the *katorga* of living side by side with people of various nationalities, faiths and languages allowed him to believe such unity could be achieved. As evidence, in the *katorga* he taught a young Circassian the Russian language and literacy⁷⁸ and became a beloved friend of a Kirgiz geographer, ethnographer, and translator, Chokan Valikhanov (1835-1865).⁷⁹ In the autobiographical piece **The House**

⁷⁵ **Ibid.**

⁷⁶ **Ibid.**

⁷⁷ **Ibid.**, p. 450.

⁷⁸ Dostoyevskiy, Pisma 38, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, p. 92.

⁷⁹ For studies exclusively dealing with Dostoevskii and Valikhanov's relationship, see L.

of the Dead the writer described several non-Orthodox convicts without whom his imprisonment would have been unbearable.⁸⁰

During his forced military service in the present day Kazakhstan, Dostoevsky meets Valikhanov and falls in love with him. They carried on a correspondence throughout the late 1850s and early 60s. In one of his letters Dostoevsky expresses his fascination with the young Russophone officer:

You write to me that you love me. And I tell you without ceremony that I have fallen in love with you. Never, not to anybody, not even my own brother, have I felt such an attraction as I do to you, and God knows how this has come about. One could say much in explanation, but why should I praise you! And you will believe in my sincerity even without proof, my dear Vali-khan, [...].⁸¹ (my trans.)

In the same letter Dostoevsky inspires Valikhanov to

explain in Russia what the Steppe is and its significance, and about your people in relation to Russia, and at the same time you can serve your native land through enlightened intercession [**khodotaistvo**] on its behalf to the Russians. [...] Moreover, fate has made you an exceptional person, and has given you a soul as well as a heart.⁸² (my trans.)

At the same period Dostoevsky becomes more interested in Islam and asks his brother Mikhail to send him Quran.⁸³ Pavel Alekseyev informs that despite lack of clear evidence on how well Dostoevsky knew Islamic culture, it is known that he, as a well-educated and intelligent man, might have been acquainted with O.I. Senkovsky's (a Russian orientalist) journal **Biblioteka Dla Chteniya** (Library for Reading), a French translation of the Quran by M. Kazimirsky (1840), the Russian translation of the book of V. Irving **History of Mahomet and his Successors** (1849-1850), and the German study of G. Weil **Mohammed der Prophet** (1843).⁸⁴ The scholar also admits that Dostoevsky enriched his

P. Grossman, **Zhizn i Trudy. F. M. Dostoevskiy**, Moscow, 1935, pp.76, 382; A. S. Dolinin, "Istoriya Sozdaniya Romana Podrostok", **Tvorcheskaya Laboratoriya Dostoevskogo**, Leningrad, Sovetskiy Pisatel, 1947, pp. 127–130; M. O. Auezov, "F. M. Dostoevskii i Chokan Valikhanov," **Druzhba Narodov** 3, w.place, 1956, pp. 154–155.

⁸⁰ Go to page 114 for information.

⁸¹ Dostoevsky, Pisma 54, Received by Chokhan Valikhanov, Semipalatinsk, December 14, 1856, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, p. 157, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/398.htm, January 29, 2019.

⁸² **Ibid.**

⁸³ Dostoevsky, Pisma 38, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, p. 92.

⁸⁴ Pavel Alekseyev, "Musulmanskii Vostok v Poetike F.M. Dostoyevskogo", **Vestnik Omskogo Universiteta**, No.4, 2013, p. 288.

knowledge of Islam during his imprisonment and military service in Siberia directly from his Muslim friends.

To conclude, in spite of the feeling of otherness he had during the first crossing of the border between European Russia and Siberia, after meeting the internal other, both social and religious, and sharing with them their beliefs and knowledge, Dostoevsky realized how vital it was for the upper classes to unite with the narod. Looking at them as another equal being, he aimed at learning from them and teaching them at the same time. His letters, journal writing and novels point at his tendency to see a human being in every person regardless of his origin and social status. Katorga allowed him to widen his worldview of the other through dialogue between equals. Irina Kuznetsova expresses a similar view saying that “Dostoevsky believed that every individual is born into a particular ethnic community and develops by assimilating the distinctive features nurtured by that community”.⁸⁵ The writer believed that if we, people, listen to each other and learn from each other, we can get rid of our stereotypes, have a broader worldview and be acquainted with values of various peoples and, by doing so, raise ourselves to universal brotherhood. Thus, Dostoevsky returns to Petersburg with an enormous arsenal of knowledge of another face of the Russian self and devotes himself to active journalism to persuade the Westernized society of European Russia to turn its face to the narod living both in the center and periphery of the empire. Having met the internal others in Siberia, Dostoevsky never changed his love and admiration for their devotion to religion and readiness to suffer for their beliefs. This narod became the sparkling star in the darkness of the nineteenth-century Russian national split, schism and spread of nihilism among the intelligentsia. After his trip to Europe and forced stay there for four years, he had an opportunity to meet the external other, relation with which would add to a construction of the Russian national self within his works.

⁸⁵ Irina Kuznetsova, “The Possessed: The Demonic and Demonized East and West in Thomas Mann’s *Der Zauberberg* and Dostoevsky’s *Demons*”, **The German Quarterly**, Summer, 2012, American Association of Teachers of German, University of Virginia, p. 284.

2.3. Dostoevsky as a Public Activist: Triple Split of the Russian Self

When Dostoevsky is freed from the imprisonment and sent to his military service further into the Kirgiz (Kazakh) steppe, he promises to his brother that

these years will not be fruitless. [...] I must be allowed to publish in six years, and maybe even earlier. After all, a lot can change, but now I will not write nonsense. You will hear about me. It is clear in my soul. My whole future and everything that I will do is before my eyes. I am happy with my life.⁸⁶ (my trans.)

In spite of anger and cruelty he saw in the prison, and hopelessness and despair for being far away from his family, he was fulfilled with joy and excitement about the future. He felt so, firstly, because katorga allowed him to experience absolutely different feelings and meet people of all sorts. Secondly, there he reconsidered his convictions and beliefs regarding Europe and Asia profoundly, especially during the years of the Crimean war of 1853-1856. Judging by his letter to his friend A. N. Maikov he was captured by the general patriotic enthusiasm experienced by various sections of Russian society.⁸⁷ It is in these years the themes of liberating the Slavs from under the yoke of the Ottomans and future triumph of the Orthodox East over the Catholic West became most discussed.

Despite being far from the center of Russia and living among people of Siberia who were not much interested in the war, Dostoevsky, as a patriot of Russia, felt excited because the war also demonstrated whose side Europe preferred. Knowing that he would not be published, he still wrote three poems on the event. The poem of 1854 is written in a form of an appeal to Europeans to express what the Russians think of the war. As a rule, in these poems through negative images of the religious other (the Tatar) and the external other (Western nations, the Ottomans) Dostoevsky constructs positive image of the Orthodox self. To exemplify:

Davil yeye tatarin pod pyatoy, A ochutilsya on zhe pod nogami.	The Tatar pressed her [Rus] under its heel, And he himself is found under feet.
---	--

⁸⁶ Dostoevsky, Pisma 38, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, p. 91.

⁸⁷ Dostoevsky, Pisma 46, Received by A. N. Maikov, Semipalatinsk, January 18, 1856, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, p. 120, (Online) <https://rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/390.htm>, January 29, 2018.

[...]	[...]
S nevernymi na tserkov' voyevat', To podvig temnyy, greshnyy i besslavnyy!	Together with infidels you attacked the Church That feat is dark, sinful and inglorious!
Khristianin za turka na Khrista! Christ! Khristianin - zashchitnik Magometa!	The Christian sides with the Turk to attack The Christian is the protector of Mohammed!
Pozor na vas, otstupniki kresta, Gasiteli bozhestvennogo sveta ⁸⁸	Shame on you, apostates of the cross, Slayers of Divine Light (my trans.)

When Dostoevsky was in the Siberian banishment, he was desperate to be allowed to publish. There is a view⁸⁹ that the poems of 1854-1856 meant Dostoevsky's refusal of a number of ideas he had shared with the Petrashevtsy before his arrest, whereas we know from his letters that he renounced these ideas earlier. Although he never changed some of his initial assertions such as abolishment of serfdom, for instance, most of them took a direction towards **pochvennichestvo**⁹⁰, a native-soil conservative movement, and were publicly presented in the journals **Vremya** (Time) and then its successor **Epokha** (Epoch) he founded with his brother Mikhail and published in the 60s, the post-war years of reconsideration of the future of Russia by its most active parties of Westernizers and Slavophiles.

The announcement for the journal starts with the words: "we live in an era supremely remarkable and critical."⁹¹ (my trans.) According to him it is so because representatives of the educated class finally realized that the Russians are too a unique

⁸⁸ Dostoevsky, "Na Yevropeyskiye Sobytiya v 1854", **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.10, pp. 339-341, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol10/02annex/03poetry/01poetry/65.htm, November 13, 2018.

⁸⁹ Remarks to the Poems, w.date, w.page, (Online) www.dostoevskiy-lit.ru/dostoevskiy/stihotvoreniya/primechaniya.htm, June 16, 2018.

⁹⁰ Frank explains that the literal meaning of the word **pochva** is **soil**, it also has the accessory sense of **foundation** or **support**. **Pochvennichestvo** is an independent social-cultural tendency of the Russian literature. "The **pochvenniki** believed in the primacy of helping to forward a new Russian cultural synthesis from the fusion of the people and their cultivated superiors." Frank, **op. cit.**, p. 285; Kandemir argues that the **philosophy of Pochvennichestvo** emerged from synthesis of Westernizer and Slavophiles' thoughts dominant in the first half of the nineteenth century and played the part of a **mediator** between the two. Hüseyin Kandemir, "Dostoyevski Düşüncesinde Türk-İslam Olgusu Ve Osmanlı Rus Savaşı Çerçevesinde Doğu Sorunu", **Avrasya Uluslararası Araştırmalar Dergisi**, Vol.4, No.8, January, 2016, p. 14.

⁹¹ Dostoyevskiy, "Obyavleniye o Podpiske na Zhurnal Vremya na 1861 God", **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.11, Leningrad, Nauka, 1993, p. 7, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/tocvol11.htm, December 1, 2018.

nationality. He states that the quality it lacks is a new native form which must be taken from the Russian soil and the spirit of the Russian people. At the same time, the publisher of the journal assures that having returned to the native soil, the upper classes do not refuse their past because they realize that Westernization has broadened Russia's horizons and allowed to comprehend its future values in the great family of all nations.⁹² With this clearly defined mission Dostoevsky starts his career as a public activist.

The journal was designed to discuss various topics from poems and novels to news and politics. The article Dostoevsky publishes the next year after the announcement (1861) is particularly interesting. Titled "Dva Lagerya Teoretikov" (Two camps of Theoreticians) it discusses some of the most important issues for Dostoevsky: one of them is the split between the Russian Christians into the Orthodox and schismatic (**raskolniki**), split between the narod and the elite as the result of Peter the Great's reforms, and the third split of the intelligentsia into Westernizers and Slavophiles. Another issue he raises is uniqueness of the Russian nationality and, finally, Russia's role among other nations and its mission for humanity. Yet, there is one issue without handling which others cannot be resolved. It is the question of the narod which Dostoevsky considered as the question of life. Dostoevsky believed if Russian society finds the answer for this particular question, it would live forever. Thus, in this article Dostoevsky summarizes his ideas and thoughts on the internal problems of the Russian nation from the political and social perspectives. Many points touched in it would be repeated and developed in his novels and journal writing.

If to summarize the article, the first answer Dostoevsky suggests is to repair the splits which led to identity crisis of all levels of Russian society. He starts with the dispute between the Westernizers and Slavophiles on the future path Russia should follow. The writer insists on finding a compromise, first of all. He, personally, does not support either of them. Igor Volgin correctly identifies that what Dostoevsky was opposed to is **classical** Slavophilism as well as **classical** Westernism.⁹³ Even though many of his ideas regarding

⁹² **Ibid.**

⁹³ Volgin, **op. cit.**, p. 457.

uniqueness of Russian culture are in tune with the Slavophiles, he, at the same time, backs up the Westernizers for their experiences, more sophisticated awareness of the reality and intellectual dynamism.⁹⁴

On the other hand, he accuses the Westernizers for their condemnation of the Russian life only because it differed from the theory of Western European universal life they have compiled for themselves.⁹⁵ Slavophiles, on the contrary, accepted the old Moscow **idealchik** (minor ideal) as a norm and condemned anything that did not fit into their narrow frame.⁹⁶ Another mistake of the Westernizers, he writes, is their “wish to make from all of mankind, from all nations something very impersonal; something that would remain the same in all countries of the globe, under all different climatic and historical conditions”, in other words, fit all peoples of the world into “one general type of the person developed in the West”.⁹⁷ He finds it erroneous to force non-Western people “to abandon their attempts to bring something from themselves to the process of developing a perfect human ideal and limit themselves only to the passive assimilation of the ideal formed by Western books”.⁹⁸ Instead, Dostoevsky suggests that “every nation develops on its own beginnings”, establishes “its own worldview, its unique mindset, customs, laws of public life” and adds it all to the common pot.⁹⁹ To exemplify what happens if to apply only the Western pattern to another nation, he refers to Peter the Great whose Westernization reforms created “a society that often betrayed narod's interests, completely dissociated from the masses of people, moreover, became hostile to it”.¹⁰⁰ Kuznetsova, commenting on this idea of Dostoevsky, correctly notices that the writer “stresses the undesirability of transferring cultural forms from one soil to another” as the Westerners used to do. She identifies that Dostoevsky was critical of imposition on all

⁹⁴ Berdyaev, **Mirosozertsaniye Dostoevskogo**, loc. cit.

⁹⁵ Dostoyevskiy, “Dva Lagerya Teoretikov”, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.11, p. 219.

⁹⁶ **Ibid.**

⁹⁷ **Ibid.**, p. 220.

⁹⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 221.

⁹⁹ **Ibid.**

¹⁰⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 223.

peoples a “pan-human ideal” developed in the West because it rejects distinctive features nurtured by this or that community and makes us ignore diversity.¹⁰¹

Pointing at these errors of the Westernizers, Dostoevsky, at the same time, criticized the Slavophiles. This camp of the Russian intelligentsia was wrong in recognizing life only among the narod, and rejecting life in literature and high society. The Slavophile voice that announced “a lie in enlightenment... A lie in the inspirations of art ... A lie in literature” Dostoevsky calls the voice of **fanatism**.¹⁰² In the article he asks Slavophiles how the contemporary literature’s desire of progress and civilization, its desire to improve Russian life as much as possible, the educated class’s attention to social issues and their discontent with the current life can be a zero, a lie, a fake.¹⁰³ While the writer agrees with Slavophiles in criticism of Peter’s erroneous attempts to make the Russian people change their manners, customs, and views according to Western standards, he also draws attention to the fact that, as Pushkin said, Peter cut a window to Europe and pointed to the West, where there was a lot to learn. Dostoevsky assumes that if it had not been for the despotism and haste of Peter’s ways to modernize Russia, Russian society would not have split into two hostile parts alien to each other. On the one side, there were the Russian elite educated in the Western way who saw in the narod uncivilized barbarians, on the other side, there was narod who: “does not feel any attachment to our brother [elite], we do not have common, binding ties with him, there are no shared interests. So the narod sees in us some kind of Tatars, infidels.”¹⁰⁴ As a result, neither of the parties considers another the self and addresses it using pronoun **nash** (our), from which both suffer.

In addition to the split of the Russian nation into classes and split of the intelligentsia into two opposite camps, there was a third one that might be at the root of the other two: a schism (**raskol**) between the Russian Christians into those who accepted the Greek inspired reforms of the Russian liturgy in the seventeenth century and those

¹⁰¹ Kuznetsova, **op. cit.**, p. 284.

¹⁰² **Ibid.**, p. 224.

¹⁰³ **Ibid.**, p. 225.

¹⁰⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 234.

who did not. The schism led to the religious fermentation and the proliferation of various dissenting sects of Old Believers. Dostoevsky describes the results of the schism as monstrous not only for the unity of the Russians but for the schismatics (**raskolniki**) themselves. While the narod was supported by the Slavophiles, and the educated secular intelligentsia - by the Westernizers, the schismatics were left alone by everybody. According to Dostoevsky

the Slavophiles, cherishing in their hearts only one Moscow ideal of Orthodox Russia, cannot sympathize with the people who have betrayed Orthodoxy. The Westerners, judging about the historical phenomena of the Russian life according to the German and French books, see in the schism only Russian self-indulgence, ignorance of the Russians [...]. Neither figured out in this strange rejection passionate desire for truth, deep discontent with the reality.¹⁰⁵ (my trans.)

In Frank's interpretation, particularly useful to understand the origin of uniqueness of Russian culture, Dostoevsky wanted to suggest that schismatics "created an indigenous Russian culture independent of European influence", and that "the positive values of Russian life for which the upper classes was seeking so eagerly could perhaps be found among the dissident sects".¹⁰⁶

The writer finishes his article with a call to become one united people. Only when it is accomplished, it is possible to facilitate mankind. He warns that one can comprehend universal interests only after he masters his national ones. Remarkably for the view on Dostoevsky's nationalism and chauvinism, even xenophobia, his next words show irrelevance of such characteristics:

Speaking, however, about nationality, we do not imply that national exclusivity, which very often contradicts the interests of all mankind. No, we imply here the true nationality, which always acts in the interest of all nations. Destiny has distributed tasks between them: to develop one or the other side of the universal man. [...] Only then will humanity complete its development cycle, when every nation, as much as it is within its material capacity, performs its task. There are no sharp differences in the tasks because at the basis of each nationality lies one common human ideal just shaded by local colors. Therefore, there can never be antagonism among nations as long as each of them understands their true interests. The problem is that such understanding

¹⁰⁵ Dostoevsky, "Dva Lagerya Teoretikov", p. 238.

¹⁰⁶ Frank, **op. cit.**, p. 285.

is extremely rare, and people seek their glory only in empty primacy before their neighbors.¹⁰⁷ (my trans.)

Referring to narrow national egoism of the British, Germans and the French, he argues that it does not exist in the Russian character because the Russian narod is always open to ruthless self-criticism and ready to talk about their ulcers in front of the whole world. He agrees that there are many shortcomings among the narod, but he refuses to accept its insignificance.

Nazan Coşkun Karataş also interpreted the national splits in her doctoral research “Alienation Fact of F.M. Dostoevsky in the Context of Russian Thoughts”. First of all, she prefers using the term **alienation** for what we call split. Secondly, she suggests that the experience Dostoevsky gained during the imprisonment and exile does not cause alienation towards the past or the future, or, initiates an identity split, but, on the contrary, “leads to a sort of synthesis, takes a shape of desire to regenerate.”¹⁰⁸ (my trans.) She also writes that within the frame of **pochvennichestvo** (native-soil movement), Dostoevsky reconsiders the problem of alienation (split) between the Russian people and the upper classes, between the Westernizers and Slavophiles, and among the Orthodox and other schismatics, and, having built a bridge between the past and the future, tries to create a social theory.¹⁰⁹

Overall, in 1861 in **Time** Dostoevsky introduces his famous doctrine of Russian **pan-humanism** (**vsechelovechnost**) which he would fully develop in his later writings such as the novel **The Brothers Karamazov** and the Pushkin speech. In Dmitry Merezhkovsky words, the idea of pan-humanism became for Dostoevsky “a definite and great phenomenon of Russian culture, which could be [...] contrasted and indicated to Europe”.¹¹⁰ (my trans.) Moreover, Dostoevsky in the early 60s starts to emphasize the necessity of fusion of all parts cut of the national body throughout Russian history.

¹⁰⁷ Dostoevsky, “Dva Lagerya Teoretikov”, p. 236.

¹⁰⁸ Nazan Coşkun Karataş, “Rus Düşüncesi Bağlamında F. M. Dostoyevski’de Yabancılaşma Olgusu”, PhD dissertation, Istanbul, Istanbul University, 2018, p. 211.

¹⁰⁹ **Ibid.**

¹¹⁰ Dmitry Merezhkovsky, **L. Tolstoy i Dostoyevsky**, Ed. by Ye. A. Andrushchenko, Moscow, Nauka, 2000, p. 7.

Dostoevsky's aim is to convince his readers that instead of dividing into different camps and arguing about the right path for Russia to take, the educated class with all its knowledge should turn to the narod and prove its devotion to him, focus on the uniqueness of the Russian nationality best secured in the narod. The moment it is achieved, the Russian nation, united and strong, can say its pan-human (**vsechelovechnoye**) word to mankind.

However, **Time** gets banned after the publishing of Strakhov's article titled "Rokovoy Vopros" (The Fatal Question) in which he raises a question of Russo-Polish relationship. Dostoevsky, in his letter to Turgenev, explains that the main idea of the article was misunderstood. While the authors meant to state that "the Poles despised us [Russians] as barbarians and are proud of belonging to the European civilization so much so that their honest (that is, the most enduring) reconciliation with us is hardly foreseen in the future" (my trans.), it was understood as if its writers themselves assured their readers that the Poles were so higher than the Russians in civilization that the Poles were right, and the Russians were wrong.¹¹¹

With the ban on **Time**, bureaucratic problems regarding starting **Epoch**, debts, deaths of his beloved brother Mikhail and wife Maria Dmitriyevna made him reconsider the meaning of life and role of other people in it. After spending some hours beside his wife's corpse in severe self-scrutiny, the following day in his notebook in a way of philosophical reflections "Will I ever see Masha again?" he sought to unriddle some perennial enigmas about the confrontation in the human soul between egoism and self-sacrifice, about the possibility of future world harmony, about the continuous connection of man with those who lived before him and who would replace him.¹¹² Frank confesses that "nowhere else does he tell us so unequivocally what he really thought about God, immortality, the role of Christ in human existence, and the meaning of human life on

¹¹¹ Dostoyevskiy, Pisma 76, Received by I. S. Turgenev, Peterburg, June 17-19, 1863, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, p. 219, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/420.htm, January 29, 2019.

¹¹² T.I. Ornatskaya, Commentary to Pisma 91 by Dostoyevskiy, Received by A. Ye. Wrangel, Peterburg, March 31 - April 14, 1865, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, pp. 714-717, (Online) <https://rvb.ru/dostoevski/02comm/435.htm>, October 19, 2018.

earth.”¹¹³ This piece of writing also contains some fundamental ideas of his future philosophy.

Apart from that, the piece is another example of Dostoevsky’s inner struggle with duality and ambiguity which followed him throughout his life. On the one hand, he accepts that human nature is incurably rotten, on the other hand, he knows that strengthened by God’s grace it can struggle against its own limitations and fulfill the law of Christ. Sometimes, he admits that it is impossible to “love man like *oneself* according to the commandment of Christ, [...]. The law of personality on earth binds. The *Ego* stands in the way”.¹¹⁴ At other moments, he strongly believes that

the highest use a man can make of his personality, of the full development of his Ego - is, as it were, to annihilate that Ego, to give it totally and to everyone undividedly and unselfishly. In this way, the law of the Ego fuses with the law of humanism, and in this fusion both the Ego and the all (apparently two extreme opposites) mutually annihilate themselves one for the other, and at the same time each attains separately, and to the highest degree, their own individual development.¹¹⁵ (my trans.)

The idea of achieving the highest individual development through annihilation of the Ego will be developed in the next years and reflected in image of **the corn of wheat**, which becomes an epigraph to **The Brothers Karamazov**.

In conclusion, his life after the Siberian exile in Petersburg and Moscow as a journal writer and public activist was not easier than before. He, ruined financially and morally, flees to Europe and stays there in another four-year exile where he lives together with the external other, who becomes the dominant other in defining the Russian national self.

2.4. Meeting the External Other

Even though the term **external other** has been defined according to citizenship and political factors, it has a deeper meaning. To define the outsider only with these factors

¹¹³ Frank, **op. cit.**, p. 407.

¹¹⁴ Dostoyevskiy, Pisma 91, Received by A. Ye. Wrangle, Petersburg, March 31 - April 14, 1865, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, p. 715, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/435.htm, November 29, 2018.

¹¹⁵ **Ibid.**

is insufficient as it is insufficient to divide the world into the East and West. Kipling, in his **Ballad of East and West**, opposes the belief in the border between East and West because there are no such notions, he writes, but there are only “two strong men stand face to face”. Berdyaev similarly writes that the opposition between Russia and Europe, between East and West is the subject of a different matter - it is “a contrast of two worldviews, two types of culture within Europe, within Russia, in the West as well as East”.¹¹⁶ (my trans.) Dostoevsky himself frequently repeated that the main opposition that can exist between people is the opposition of ideas, for example he wrote in 1880 in his **Diary** that “a collision of two diametrically opposed ideas occurred: the man-god encountered the God-man”.¹¹⁷ Kipling’s two strong men facing each other are Dostoevsky’s man-god and God-man. If to admit Dostoevsky’s association of Europe with the man-god, and Russia with God-man, it becomes clear what Coşkun Karataş means by stating that Europe’s choice to follow the way of man-god becomes the main reason of Russia’s alienation from it due to their choice to take the path of the God-man.¹¹⁸

It is necessary to clarify that when the idea of Europe as a doomed and dying civilization was propagated in nineteenth-century Russia, particularly by Dostoevsky, it was directed towards spiritual crisis of the Western thought.¹¹⁹ While the Europeans, Russia’s dominant external other, were attacked by Dostoevsky for their individualism, materialism, liberalism and atheism, they stayed to be an example of endeavor for science, education and progress. Another external other, the common other personified in the Ottoman Turk, was referred to by Dostoevsky as an aggressor of the weak and was contrasted against Russians’ readiness to sacrifice for the well-being of the oppressed. In short, the European and Ottoman Empires are defined as Russia’s external other not because one is West and another is East, or because each has its own political interests in acquisition of territories and influence over them, but because they embody qualities which oppose the image of the Russian national self as Dostoevsky imagined it.

¹¹⁶ Berdyaev, **Mirosozertsaniye Dostoevskogo**, loc. cit.

¹¹⁷ Dostoevsky, **Dnevnik Pisatela**, p. 476.

¹¹⁸ Coşkun Karataş, **op. cit.**, p. 400.

¹¹⁹ For more reading go to Frank, **op. cit.**, p. 32.

2.4.1. Europe – the Self or the Other?

After his first trip to Europe in 1862, Dostoevsky describes his first reactions to European life in **Winter Notes on Summer Impressions**. In Frank's opinion the notes are filled with "the most serious cultural and social-political reflections".¹²⁰ If to some scholars¹²¹ **Winter Notes** focus on the opposition **we-they**, to the others¹²² the text is a vehicle for commenting on Dostoevsky's vision of Russian national identity in the nineteenth century in relation to the West.

Frank compares this travelogue of Dostoevsky with Karamzin's **Letters of a Russian Traveler** where the author describes "a splendid panorama of the mythical European world they [Russian readers] tried so desperately to emulate from afar"¹²³ and which was read and discussed in the Dostoevsky household. However, Frank concludes that Karamzin's **Letters** also form Dostoevsky's vision of Europe as a doomed and dying civilization whose path should not be followed because it leads to subversion and social chaos. In addition to Karamzin, Frank proposes, Balzac was the writer "who probably first persuaded him [Dostoevsky] that Europe was totally in thrall to Baal, the flesh-god of materialism".¹²⁴ In other words, Dostoevsky's attitude to Europe was another case of dual feelings - love and hate, which he shared with many educated Russians.

Dostoevsky starts the **Notes** with confession of his childhood dream to go to Europe about which he first learnt from his parents' evening readings he listened "open-mouthed and dying from delight and horror".¹²⁵ The writer also states in the **Notes** that despite the fact he, "like the rest journal-reading Russian public, knew Europe twice (or

¹²⁰ Frank, **op. cit.**, p. 351.

¹²¹ Nina Perlina, "Vico's Concept of Knowledge as an Underpinning of Dostoevsky's Aesthetic Historicism", **The Slavic and East European Journal**, Vol.45, No.2, 2001, p. 334, (Online) www.jstor.org/stable/3086332, March 19, 2017.

¹²² Ingrid Kleespies, "Caught at the Border: Travel, Nomadism, and Russian National Identity in Karamzin's 'Letters of a Russian Traveler' and Dostoevsky's Winter Notes on Summer Impressions", **The Slavic and East European Journal**, Vol.50, No.2, 2006, p. 231, (Online) www.jstor.org/stable/20459249, March 19, 2017.

¹²³ Frank, **op. cit.**, p. 31.

¹²⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 58.

¹²⁵ Dostoyevskiy, "Zimniye Zametki Letnikh Vpechatleniyakh", p. 388.

even ten times) as well as Russia” (my trans.), he expected much from this trip.¹²⁶ Yet, from the very first lines, one can feel Dostoevsky’s duality regarding the West. On the one hand, Europe is “the land of holy miracles”, “the country of long longing and expectations”; things such as “progress, science, art, citizenship, humanity, everything, everything is from there”.¹²⁷ On the other hand, he strongly criticizes Europeans for their passion to “accumulate fortune and have as many things as possible - it turned into the most important code of morality”.¹²⁸ He declares that although the Western man considers brotherhood as the great driving force of humanity, there is no brotherly principle in the nature of the Western man, on the contrary, he imagines himself a single warrior demanding his rights with a sword in his hand.¹²⁹ From this point of view, commoners who live in Russia are different from Europeans because the principle of brotherhood and love for another person is in their blood. Dostoevsky elaborates on it appealing to his image of the Russian man ready to “voluntarily put your belly for everyone, go for everyone to the cross, to the fire”.¹³⁰ What is more, the writer assures that this “self-willed, completely conscious [...] self-sacrifice in favor of all is, in my opinion, a sign of the highest development of the personality, its highest power, the highest self-control, the highest freedom of his own will”.¹³¹ We assume Dostoevsky’s biggest wish was to see such personality in all people of the world, however, due to Europeans’ passion to acquire wealth, their departure from true Christianity and individualism as much as those of the Europeanized Russians, they went astray and the Russian narod, born and grown up within the brotherly commune, could have led them to the right path.

Notably, Dostoevsky criticizes Europeanized Russians harsher than Western Europeans for their servility to the dominant other’s stance and their deliberate loss of Russian identity. The writer ridicules those Russians who worship the West, especially

¹²⁶ **Ibid.**

¹²⁷ **Ibid.**, p. 394.

¹²⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 424.

¹²⁹ **Ibid.**, p. 429.

¹³⁰ **Ibid.**

¹³¹ **Ibid.**

France.¹³² He writes that such Russians belong to “a very special type of our Russian Europe”; representatives of such type are cute and enthusiastic people who, while suffering and appealing to both Russia and the soil, leave Russia for Europe.¹³³ The writer agrees with the French in their characterization of the Russians as “skeptics and mockers” and adds that “we [the educated Russians] are cynics, we cherish what is ours less, we do not even love it, at least, we do not respect it [...]; we thrust into European, pan-human interests without belonging to any nation”.¹³⁴ The biggest drama, according to the writer, is the Russian Europeans’ inability to establish their belonging. Ingrid Kleespies correctly points out that “this elite figure fluctuates between identity-poles: he is aware of the otherness of the Russian narod, and is convinced of its barbarity, yet is still tied to it by a certain native connection.”¹³⁵ As a result, such educated Russian feels himself a foreigner when he is in Russia, and when he is in Europe, he feels himself a stranger too. In other words, he is alienated both at home and abroad and becomes neither fully European, nor fully Russian. In Boris Syromyatnikov’s view, the biggest error of the Russian intelligentsia of the second half of the nineteenth century according to Dostoevsky was to “try to satisfy its spiritual thirst not from the wellspring of the national spirit but from the muddy streams of Western European philosophy”, drinking from which they soon became infected with “the virus (**trikhiny**) of atheism, selfishness and pride.”¹³⁶ (my trans.) It is these qualities of Europeans that Dostoevsky condemns just as he does with those of the Russians. And his purpose of doing so is to help people, be they Europeans or Russians, or anybody else, to see their mistakes and correct them.

After his first trip to Europe, Dostoevsky returned there some years later together with his new wife, Anna Grigoryevna, to escape Russian creditors.¹³⁷ These years seem to have been the hardest in Dostoevsky’s life. He was to overcome frequent attacks of

¹³² *Ibid.*, p. 393. Dostoevsky means here Belinsky’s circle.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, p. 407.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 445.

¹³⁵ Kleespies, *op. cit.*, p. 242.

¹³⁶ Boris Syromyatnikov, *Poetika Russkoy Idei v “Velikom Pyatiknizhii” F. M. Dostoyevskogo*, St.Petersburgh, Mamatov, 2014, p. 8.

¹³⁷ Frank, *op. cit.*, p. 445.

epilepsy, addiction to roulette, humiliation and poverty.¹³⁸ Yet, the struggles and challenges he experienced there must have become material for his following novels. First he writes **The Gambler** where he describes what it feels like to lose everything playing roulette, and then **Crime and Punishment** through which one visualizes extreme poverty of the student Raskolnikov.

Thing that strikes is since his forced stay in Europe Dostoevsky's bitterness had grown about Europeans whom he detested more and more In one of his letters to Maikov, for example, he sounds harsh and disgusted with them:

Foreigners are seen here as an income item; all what they think is how to deceive and rob. But what is the worst of all is their uncleanness! Kirghiz lives more cleanly in his yurt (and here in Geneva). I am terrified; I would have laughed in my eyes if I had been told this about Europeans before. But to hell all of them! I hate them beyond the last limit! ¹³⁹ (my trans.)

When judging these lines, one should take into consideration that he and his wife lived in extreme conditions. In addition to the difficulties mentioned above, they lost their first child and got desperate about impossibility to go home. The most painful for Dostoevsky was to stay far from his beloved Russia and live in Europe. In the moments of homesickness he might have found Europeans unfriendly and egoistic in comparison to simplicity of the Russian narod he missed so much. On this ground, he confirms and develops his earlier thoughts about the Russians. In another of his letters to Maikov comparing Europeans and Russians he observes that

our [Russian] essence [...] is infinitely higher than that of Europe. And in general all moral conceptions and aims of Russians are higher than those of the European world. We have a more direct and noble belief in goodness which is expressed in Christianity and not in a bourgeois resolution of the problems of comfort. The world awaits a great renewal through the Russian idea (which is tightly welded to Orthodoxy).¹⁴⁰ (my trans.)

He will promote this idea of Christian goodness in the Russian character in his other writings combining them with the idea of pan-humanism and universal brotherhood fully expressed in **The Brothers Karamazov**. Meanwhile, he is inspired with an idea to write a

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 458.

¹³⁹ Dostoyevskiy, Pisma 130, Received by A. N. Maikov, Veve, June 22, 1868, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, p. 374, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/474.htm, November 19, 2018.

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 349.

novel, he later calls **The Possessed**, about a recent murder of a young man committed by a group of revolutionary conspirators in Russia. Even though he starts writing it in Europe and finds European influence as the main source of destructive revolutionary spirit reflected in the novel, the main content of the novel is the capacity of the Russian character to cope with the inner **demons** that dwell inside every human being. Another problem he points at in the novel is loss of identity as a consequence of detachment from the native soil and attachment to Europeanism. Before starting the novel he shares his idea with Maikov and writes that the theme of **The Possessed** is a situation when people lose their roots and nationality, and having lost them they lose both their father's faith and God.¹⁴¹ When the novel is finished, in his letter to the future czar Alexander III he describes the novel saying that it is his view on the Nechaevsky crime which he sees as

a direct consequence of the age-old detachment of the Russian enlightenment from the native and authentic principles of the Russian life. Even the most talented representatives of our pseudo-European progress long ago came to conviction that to dream about our authenticity is a crime for us, Russians. The most terrible thing is that they are absolutely right because the moment we felt proud of calling ourselves Europeans, we denied being Russian. In embarrassment and fear of being far behind Europe mentally and scientifically, we forgot that we, Russians, thanks to the depth and tasks of the Russian spirit, are endowed with an ability, perhaps, to bring new light to the world, on condition of developing in our original way. We have forgotten, in delight at our own humiliation, the most immutable historical law, according to which unless we feel *arrogant* for our own universal significance as a nation, we can never be a great nation and leave at least something distinctive for the benefit of all humanity.¹⁴² (my trans.)

The main use of the European other in this novel and in the one mentioned before is to stress the fact that the Russian self is efficient in its authenticity: "our force could be our faith in our own specific identity, in the holiness of our destination".¹⁴³ Until the lost identifies his national peculiarity, accepts it as his own and feels proud of such possession, he will be never respected by another nation and stay a lackey of somebody's tradition and idea. In 1877 he would write in his **Diary**: "Having become ourselves, we should at last acquire a human, and not apish, countenance. We should acquire the appearance of

¹⁴¹ Dostoevsky, Pisma 150, Received by A. N. Maikov, Dresden, October 9 (21), 1870, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, p. 467, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/494.htm, October 19, 2018.

¹⁴² **Ibid.**, p. 494.

¹⁴³ **Ibid.**, p. 468.

free men, and not that of slaves, lackeys [...].”¹⁴⁴ Thus, Dostoevsky use the other, in this case the European external other, not to emphasize the dominance and superiority of the Russian self over the other, but, on the contrary, to eradicate the idea of inferiority of the Russian self in relation to the European other. His purpose was to convince Russian readers that as long as they know, value and love their native soil, they can represent Russia as a great nation and gain the right to pronounce their own authentic word to mankind. Also from a psychological perspective, unless one is capable of loving oneself, s/he cannot love another. For instance, despite his vision of Europeans as the other in relation to the Russian national self, Dostoevsky would “adore, even admire the summit of the European spirit”.¹⁴⁵ His writings suggest that he sincerely believed in the existence of spiritual bonds between Europeans and Russians, and in the Russian potentiality to teach the Westerners how to love the other with brotherly love. He also intended to convince the Europeanized Russians that it is vital for a nation to be one’s authentic self rather than imitate the other.

When the novelist finally returns to Russia after four years of forced stay in Europe, he enters the last phase of his life, in which he, with his wife’s support, manages to realize himself as a national journal writer, novelist, public speaker and, the most important, psychologist of the human soul. In his next novel **The Adolescent** he continues to develop his idea of the necessity for the Russian elite to turn to the narod, and his view of the role of the West in establishing Russian identity and introduces the image of **vsechelovek** (pan-human).

2.4.2. The Turkish Other

Before Dostoevsky finalized his vision of the Russian self as the bearer of universal brotherhood in **The Brothers Karamazov** and the Pushkin speech, he uses another type of the external other, the Ottoman Turk. The writer had been interested in the Turks, as any Russian activist, since his youth. For example, he allows his main character

¹⁴⁴ Dostoevsky, **The Dairy of a Writer**, p. 582.

¹⁴⁵ Volgin, **op. cit.**, p. 457.

in **The Double** (1846), Mister Golyadkin, to express his orientalist opinions regarding the Turks and Muslims who are Russia's most traditional territorial rivals. Nevertheless, the Turkish other becomes the topic of Dostoevsky's discussion much later, in the period of currency of the Eastern Question, which had in Dostoevsky's opinion "incomparable global significance, far beyond ordinary political combinations".¹⁴⁶ (my trans.)

In fact, the topicality of the Eastern Question existed for centuries. As an example, Dostoevsky referred to the Kazan kingdom (**tsarstvo**) which dominated over the east of Russia in the sixteenth century until "the young tsar Ivan Vasilyevich decided to end with this Eastern question and take Kazan".¹⁴⁷ In the period of the Crimean war the Eastern Question started to be discussed again. Dostoevsky, being still in the katorga, took it extremely close to the heart, and when the Balkan crisis was on the go, he devoted many pages to discuss Russia's role in the Eastern Question and its resolution. It was his assertion that the Question, "eternally irreconcilable Eastern Question" can be the major reason for another meeting with Europe but this time much more original.¹⁴⁸ Dostoevsky equates the Eastern Question to the national question calling them both great and vital for the future of Russia because he saw in it a chance to renew Russian Christianity spiritually and militarily.¹⁴⁹ He was convinced that the debate between the Westernizers and Slavophiles could have been brought to the end with the answer for the Eastern Question.

Although Dostoevsky agreed with the common belief that the Eastern Question came to be a result of the decline of the Ottoman Empire, he, at the same time, had a different view, a more global one. He postulates that "the revolution in Constantinople and the outburst of Muslim fanaticism, and finally, the dreadful slaughter of sixty thousand peaceful Bulgarians, old people, women and children by bashibazouks and Circassians" were only a consequence of "irresolution and procrastination of the great Powers, the diplomatic twist of England".¹⁵⁰ It was his prophetic prediction that the last

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 35.

¹⁴⁷ Dostoevsky, *Dnevnik Pisatelya*, p. 498.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 406.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 440.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 410.

word in the struggle of the Turks and Russians would be announced by Europe. He did use the image of the Turks in binary opposition with the Orthodox self, however, his final target was always Europe. To exemplify:

But the main thing is the spirit: they [Slavs] are taking the field, believing in their right and in victory, whereas among the Turks, despite their fanaticism, there is a serious lack of discipline, as well as confusion. It would not be surprising if even after the first encounters confusion turned into panic. [...] Briefly, all Europe will be watching the struggle of the Christians against the Sultan, without intervening, but . . . only for the time being . . . till the division of the heritage.¹⁵¹

Kandemir has a different view on Dostoevsky's attitude to the Turks. According to the scholar Dostoyevsky appears to be their fierce enemy especially after suppression by the Ottomans of the Slavic uprising in the Balkans.¹⁵² He also sees Dostoevsky's use of newspaper and magazine news both in his journal writing and novels as "speculative black propaganda" and defines as an "uninhibited romantic nationalism".¹⁵³ (my trans.) Furthermore, after examining Dostoevsky's references to the external other in general, Kandemir concludes that the writer views not only Turks but also Europeans negatively because of his xenophobia which he understands not in a psychological context, but as Dostoevsky's general historical-sociological fear and hatred of the foreigners. So, instead of describing Dostoevsky as an enemy of the Turks, Kandemir suggests that it is more appropriate to characterize the writer as **xenophobic** in general.¹⁵⁴ Berdyaev chooses another term to describe Dostoevsky's "unfair comments on other nations", for example, the French, Polish and Jews: **chauvinism**.¹⁵⁵ While it is true that Dostoevsky often sounds xenophobic and chauvinistic, we would rather support Kasatkina's point who stresses that Dostoevsky saw mankind as one organism.¹⁵⁶ She uses the metaphor of the hand; if a finger hurts, other fingers, hand and the whole body feel the pain. The same, she says,

¹⁵¹ Dostoevsky, *The Dairy of a Writer*, p. 358.

¹⁵² Kandemir, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

¹⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

¹⁵⁵ Berdyaev, *Mirosozertsaniye Dostoevskogo*, *loc. cit.*

¹⁵⁶ Kasatkina, "Roman Bratya Karamazovy kak Vyskazyvaniye Vsego", *YouTube*, uploaded by Zhivoye Obsheniye, May 4, 2018, 35:04, (Online) www.youtube.com/watch?v=s-xd6rHqPuY&t=4452s, May1, 2018.

happens to humanity nations of which are like the fingers of a hand.¹⁵⁷ In the same spirit, Olcay underlines that according to Dostoevsky, tolerance and humanism are the phenomena which can unite people and nations.¹⁵⁸ Thus, taking into consideration these views of Kasatkina and Olcay, and Dostoevsky's ideas on "true nationality, which always acts in the interest of all nations"¹⁵⁹, we suggest that Dostoevsky was neither chauvinist nor xenophobic.

Moreover, when he refers to the Turks, he does not mean to stress inferiority of the Turkish other in relation to the Russian self, what he aims at is to persuade the West and Russian Europeans that the true Russians would never fight for "seizure [or] violence, but [for] supreme service to mankind".¹⁶⁰ Everything he wrote about the Eastern Question and the 1877-1878 Russo-Turkish war addressed Europe's distrustful and suspicious attitude to Russia's mission in the Balkans. He also addressed the Westernizers and everyone in Russia who were against the war calling them not "to be afraid of their [Europe's] verdicts: in the self-denying disinterestedness of Russia is her whole power, so to speak, her whole individuality and the whole future of Russian destiny."¹⁶¹ In other words, he believed that Russia would show her true face and spirit only if it follows its mission of disinterested service to the tortured and oppressed. He also hopes that when the Eastern Question is settled, "would Russia finally be in a position - for the first time in her whole history - to come to terms with Europe and to become intelligible to her."¹⁶²

Overall, whenever a national crisis came to the picture, a new other was created. Similar to the time when Russians united against the common enemy, Tatar-Mongols in the sixteenth century to free the Russian land from them, Dostoevsky among others called the public to unite against the Ottomans because they were **torturing** the Russians' Slav brothers in the Balkans. The mission to unite against the Eastern enemy initiated in the first Russian sources was reassessed by Dostoevsky. However, despite uses of the negative

¹⁵⁷ **Ibid.**

¹⁵⁸ Olcay, **op. cit.**, p. 150.

¹⁵⁹ Dostoevsky, "Dva Lagerya Teoretikov", **op. cit.**, p. 236.

¹⁶⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 360.

¹⁶¹ **Ibid.**

¹⁶² **Ibid.**, p. 429.

images of the Turkish other contrasted by the writer against the Russian self, whom he depicts as the crusader fighting against the Ottoman oppressor to save the Slavic brethren, he appeals to Europe and her supporters calling them to believe in Russian humanism. In other words, the Turk is the common other in the eyes of Dostoevsky as long as it oppresses Christians, whereas the European other in relation to the Russian self stays to dominate the construction of national identity. With such ideas that sharpened more in the aftermath of the war with the Ottoman Empire, he takes his last steps to polish his idea of the Russian self as **vsechelovek** and bearer of universal brotherhood.

2.5. Dostoevsky's Concepts of Vsechelovek and Universal Brotherhood as Images of the Russian National Self

“The brotherhood of various nationalities is a great, beautiful, the most Russian thing, that is, the most Russian goal. Afterwards, everyone will understand that this is one of the main Russian goals.”

F. M. Dostoevsky¹⁶³

2.5.1. A Half-European Half-Asian Russian Self

After meeting the external others personified in the Europeans and the Ottomans, Dostoevsky confirms his idea that the Russians are “alone and they [England, France and the Ottoman state] are together”.¹⁶⁴ He interprets the Eastern Question and the war with the Ottomans as another misunderstanding with Europe. First, during the Crimean war and after the Russo-Turkish war in 1877-1878, Dostoevsky realizes that Russia would always be “alien to their [Western] civilization; they regard us as strangers and impostors” despite the common Christian religion and Aryan race.¹⁶⁵ Being a genius, he does not put all the blame on them, but identifies reasons why they think of the Russians in this way. Moreover, he offers solutions how to convince the West in Russians’ selflessness and good intentions so that they can unite in brotherhood.

¹⁶³ Yakovlev, **op. cit.**, p. 121.

¹⁶⁴ Dostoevsky, Pisma 150, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, p. 467.

¹⁶⁵ Dostoevsky, **The Dairy of a Writer**, p. 1046.

One of the reasons is “the slavish fear that Europe will call us Asiatic barbarians, and that it will be said that we are more Asiatics than Europeans. This fear that Europe might regard us as Asiatics has been haunting us for almost two centuries. It has particularly increased during the present nineteenth century, reaching almost the point of panic”.¹⁶⁶ Another mistake he finds in the Russians, to be concise, in the **Russian Europeans**, is “their efforts to assure Europe that we have no idea whatsoever, and that we can have none in the future; that Russia is incapable of possessing an idea of her own, being capable of mere imitation; that we shall always imitate, and that we are not Asiatics, not barbarians, but just as they - Europeans.”¹⁶⁷ Dostoevsky declares that “our skirmishes with Europe are coming to an end: the role of a window cut through to Europe is finished and there ensues - or, at least, must ensue - something different”.¹⁶⁸ This difference is a turn to Asia because “Russia is not only in Europe but also in Asia; because the Russian is not only a European but also an Asiatic. Moreover, Asia, perhaps, holds out greater promises to us than Europe. In our future destinies Asia is, perhaps, our main outlet!”¹⁶⁹ His recommendation to Westernizers and Slavophiles is to stop quarreling about whose form to apply and to “pass from the drawing-room directly over to business”.¹⁷⁰ And the business for Dostoevsky should start in Asia where the Russians would go as **masters**¹⁷¹, not as “hangers-on and slaves” they had been in European eyes.¹⁷² He challenges his opponents who doubt that Asia can contribute to Russia’s independence and argue that Russia may “fall asleep in an Asiatic fashion”, with the belief that once “we turn to Asia, with our new vision of her, in Russia there may occur something akin to what happened in Europe when America was discovered”. He predicts that with the turn to the East, Russians will get rid of the inferiority complex before the West; “with our aspiration for

¹⁶⁶ **Ibid.**

¹⁶⁷ **Ibid.**

¹⁶⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 351.

¹⁶⁹ **Ibid.**, p. 1044.

¹⁷⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 579.

¹⁷¹ The word **master** is taken from Dostoevsky’s **Dairy of a Writer** (see footnote above). In this context the words **master** and **slave** do not concern the colonizer and the colonized as they do in postcolonial criticism. Dostoevsky seems to use them to stress impropriety of the Russians’ complex of inferiority toward the Europeans.

¹⁷² **Ibid.**, p. 1048.

Asia, our spirit and forces will be regenerated”.¹⁷³ Moreover, Aleksey Lesevitskiy notices that Dostoevsky called his people to pay more attention to the great Islamic and Buddhist cultures because for centuries they have made their invaluable contribution to the formation of the Russian multi-ethnic consciousness.¹⁷⁴ Dostoevsky aimed to assure his readers that the Russian nation is stronger not in isolation from Asia but in the brotherly union with it.

In the article “In Europe We are Mere Canaille” he mentions a view that Europeans do not want to recognize Russians as their own because Russians allegedly are Tatars.¹⁷⁵ He also wrote that it became the main reason why the Westernizers despised their own nationality. Dostoevsky, however, expresses a strong opinion that Europeans despised Russians not because they are Tatars but because Europeanized Russians despised their nationality in order to please the West.¹⁷⁶ On this account he tells the educated Russians to stop wriggling before Europe, and he would prefer the Europeans to understand that Russians seek to be cosmopolitan rather than just Russian.¹⁷⁷ The most profound thought of Dostoevsky is that to be Russian means to be cosmopolitan, in other words, when a person believes cosmopolitanism is a Russian national idea, he becomes a Russian, which also means not to despise his own people. He promises that the moment

the European perceives that we have begun to respect our people and our nationality, he will at once begin to respect us. Indeed, the stronger, the more independent we grow in our national spirit, the stronger and closer shall we reflect ourselves in the European soul, and having become related to it we shall at once become more intelligible to it. Then they would no longer haughtily turn away from us but would listen to us.¹⁷⁸

This and other lines allow to conclude that Dostoevsky did not suggest turning away from Europe towards Asia and stay there because Russia is too Asiatic for European standards as many intellectuals wrongly accused the writer, he rather suggested accepting Russia's

¹⁷³ **Ibid.**

¹⁷⁴ Aleksey V. Lesevitskiy, “Yevraziyskiye Sententsii v “Dnevnikhe Pisatelya” F. M. Dostoyevskogo”, **Kulturologiya i Iskuststvovedeniye Voprosy Teorii i Praktiki**, Tambov, Gramota, 2015, No.5 (55), p. 109.

¹⁷⁵ Dostoevsky, **The Dairy of a Writer**, p. 581.

¹⁷⁶ **Ibid.**

¹⁷⁷ **Ibid.**

¹⁷⁸ **Ibid.**

true origins and showing Europe that she is proud of them. Dostoevsky believed that only in this case Europeans would start to respect Russia and look at it as equal.

To summarize, according to Dostoevsky, in order to gain respect from the West, and convince them to trust, Russians need to gain their authentic identity, the true self. To accomplish this it is necessary to stop imitating the West and be yourself, i.e. to accept the Asiatic roots of the Russian nation, give up being ashamed of them and stop despising the Russian nationality for this. The writer highlights that Russians have to feel proud of being half-European half-Asiatic, because this quality allows the nation to become true cosmopolitan. However, for Dostoevsky cosmopolitanism was not the final destination the Russian nation should strive for, it was to become **vsechelovek** (universal man) and achieve universal brotherhood.

2.5.2. From the Janus-faced Russian to Vsechelovek¹⁷⁹ and Universal Brotherhood

In his novel **The Adolescent**, Dostoevsky puts in the mouth of Versilov, a representative of **Russian Europeans**, ideas on what it means to be **obshechelovek** (cosmopolitan). This character is another Janus-faced Russian who is split between the Orthodox faith and atheism, between Russianness and Westernness, between individualism and cosmopolitanism, between **obshechelovechnost** (cosmopolitanism) and **vsechelovechnost** (pan-humanism). Notably, the novel is first published in the radical

¹⁷⁹ **Vsechelovek** and **obshechelovek** are two of Dostoevsky's most essential terms in his conception of a human being. Different scholars and interpreters translate them to English differently mainly due to the complexity of their meaning. Despite occasions when Dostoevsky uses them synonymously, as a rule they imply different things. Zakharov explains that **obshechelovek**, which he translates as **common pseudo-human** is a special type of Russian man that appeared after the reforms of Peter the Great. Such **common pseudo-human** differs from other Russians by not maintaining his nationality, instead, he strives to be anyone - a European, liberal, cosmopolitan - but Russian. Frank prefers using the term **cosmopolitan** and **general man** for **obshechelovek** as well as Brasol, the translator of **The Dairy of a Writer**. All three specialists (Zakharov, Frank and Brasol) translate **vsechelovek** as **pan-human**. Brasol also translates **vsechelovek** as **universal man**. At the same time, for **obshechelovek** written in quotation marks, he uses "**universal man**" as well. According to Dostoevsky himself **vsechelovek** means a perfect Christian proud of his nationality and lover of mankind, whereas **obshechelovek** can be applied to someone who lost his roots, native soil and his father's faith. To avoid confusion the original Russian terms will be used in this work.

journal, **Notes of the Fatherland**. Syromyatnikov postulates that Dostoevsky took this opportunity to be able to address **the alien** audience because it was always his “constant desire to reconcile and unite all the morally healthy forces of Russian society”.¹⁸⁰ He clearly saw that it was time to gather all advantages of the Janus-faced nature of Russian society and build from them a strongly united nation.

If to say more about the novel, initially Dostoevsky planned to write his **Fathers and Sons** but refrained from doing so explaining it by not being ready, so **The Adolescent** became the first proof of his thought.¹⁸¹ The final proof was offered in his last novel **The Brothers Karamazov**. Even though the subject of both novels is the breakdown of the Russian family, the messages in the second are much deeper and various. In Frank’s opinion one of them is “the loss of firmly rooted moral values among educated Russians stemming from their loss of faith in Christ and God”.¹⁸² While in **The Adolescent** the main character is caught in dilemma between the Christian faith of Russian narod and European rationalism and humanism, **The Brothers Karamazov** appeals to various stages of such dilemma. Its characters struggle with inner contradictions typical for Russian radicals of those days who “had now accepted the moral-social values of Russian peasant life, rooted in the Christian Orthodox faith, but they still refused to accept that faith themselves, the source of such values, and continued to cling to their atheism”.¹⁸³ In order to resolve the dilemma and establish the national identity, he addresses various images of the other such as the religious, social and external others.

Through the religious other Dostoevsky targets to demonstrate that the basis of the national idea of a people is “in religion, and not in geographic, biological, or even social, economic, and political premises”.¹⁸⁴ The purpose of using the social other is, as before, to reconcile the cultured class with the narod so that the first can get rid of its European mask and regains its national identity. What concerns the external other, together with

¹⁸⁰ Syromyatnikov, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

¹⁸¹ Dostoevsky, *The Dairy of a Writer*, p. 160.

¹⁸² Frank, *op. cit.*, p. 849.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. xvii.

¹⁸⁴ Syromyatnikov, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

other uses, it mainly serves to carry the Russian national self to a universal level where all nations are united like grains in the wheat eye. However, it is also possible to claim that Dostoevsky's uses of all types of the other in their relation with the self serve to develop the image of **vsechlovek** (pan-human, universal man) as the final destination of any human being, which he succeeds to do in **The Brothers Karamazov**, the Pushkin speech and his last publications of **The Dairy of a Writer**.

Dostoevsky devotes many lines to explain what he means by the concept **vsechlovechnost** (universalism, pan-humanness) which often derives from and sometimes replaces the concept **obshechlovechnost** (cosmopolitanism), and is synonymous to **universal brotherhood (bratstvo)**. Before Dostoevsky, the terms **obshechlovek** and **vsechlovek** were introduced by the Slavophile naturalist and publicist, Nikolay Danilevsky (1822-1895), who in the article "The Ratio of the National to the Universal" (1869) made a distinction between them.¹⁸⁵ Despite some cases when Dostoevsky uses **vsechlovechnost** and **obshechlovechnost** synonymously and when these concepts are translated to English as **universal**¹⁸⁶, as a rule, he distinguishes one from the other.

First of all, Dostoevsky writes that **obshechlovechnost** means to believe that "the natural barriers and prejudices which until now have impeded the free intercourse of nations by the egoism of their national aspiration, some day will fall before the light of reason and consciousness, and that the peoples will then start living in one congenial accord, like brethren, sensibly and lovingly striving for universal harmony."¹⁸⁷ However, he often uses the term with some negative shadow to stress Westernizers' exaggerated interest in European cosmopolitanism and its misinterpretation. For example, to address them he uses such words as **cosmopolitan, Russian gentilhomme, your highly liberal soul**¹⁸⁸; "our present-day 'universal men' and self-renouncers"¹⁸⁹. He also opposes the

¹⁸⁵ Dostoevsky, "Commentary", **Dnevnik Pisatelya**, p. 736.

¹⁸⁶ For example go to Dostoevsky, **The Dairy of a Writer**, p. 557.

¹⁸⁷ **Ibid.**, p. 557.

¹⁸⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 32.

¹⁸⁹ **Ibid.**, p. 668.

Westernizers in their concern that racing after nationality, cosmopolitanism may be harmed. He explains that only after being national, a person can become cosmopolitan, for example, an Englishman who firstly seeks to preserve his nationality and only then, as the next stage of development, endeavors to love mankind.¹⁹⁰ In other words, Dostoevsky points out Westernizers' misunderstanding of **vsechlovechnost**.

From another perspective at **obshechlovechnost**, Dostoevsky attacks Westernizers because they do not want to notice that the Russian faith in cosmopolitanism is more "universal, live, fundamental" than Europe's and is shared by "both the educated strata and, through live instinct, the common people", whereas in Europe it "exists not otherwise than in the form of a metaphysical conception".¹⁹¹ Moreover, the writer warns the Westernizers that not they alone of all the Russian intelligentsia are cosmopolitans - Slavophiles and nationalists share the same ideas and believe in them even more firmly.¹⁹² He also writes that instead of arguing on the question how one believes, Russian society should focus on the fact that "despite all the discordance, [Russian] people still agree and concur in this ultimate general idea of the universal (**obshechlovecheskoye**) fellowship of men".¹⁹³ Finally, the writer underlines that because this idea is, in all Russians, solid and thus, national, the only thing the Russian nation can benefit from is to finish all dissensions and become Russians and national as quickly as possible.¹⁹⁴ To him, there is no point to argue whether to become cosmopolitan or not because it is already a part of the Russian national character.

Secondly, Dostoevsky widens the concept of **obshechlovechnost** to **vsechlovechnost** and **vsebratstvo** (universal brotherhood). He preaches that all Russians have already appreciated that their greatest designation is to serve not only to Russia, not only to Slavs in general, but to all the human race. The writer draws attention of the Westernizers to Slavophiles' belief that **vsechlovechnost** is the principal personal

¹⁹⁰ Dostoevsky, **Dnevnik Pisatelya**, p. 23.

¹⁹¹ **Ibid.**, p. 557.

¹⁹² **Ibid.**

¹⁹³ **Ibid.**, p. 578.

¹⁹⁴ **Ibid.**

characteristic and description of a Russian.¹⁹⁵ Despite accepting that all this needs much explanation, he firmly states that service to the universal idea is diametrically opposite to “the light-minded roving from place to place, all over Europe, voluntarily and grumblingly forsaking the fatherland”, as Versilov from **The Adolescence** used to do. Batunsky correctly points out that Dostoevsky contrasts **vsechelovek**, “a true Russian, and therefore a true European”, to **obshechelovek** - “Russian Westerner and cosmopolitan who has lost his national identity”¹⁹⁶ for example, Versilov. A similar point of view is shared by Vladimir Zakharov who clarifies that **obshechelovek** is a special type of the Russian man formed after the reforms of Peter the Great. In his interpretation, Russians of such type, having lost their roots and native soil, strive to be anyone but Russian. Whereas the term **vsechelovek**, used by Dostoevsky without capitalization unlike Danilevsky, denotes a perfect Christian, a person signed with the image of God.¹⁹⁷ To be concise, Dostoevsky does not imply that **obshechelovechnost** must be replaced with **vsechelovechnost**, what he wants to emphasize is that a person is capable of serving mankind only if he is a believer. If **obshechelovek**, may he be a Russian or a European, cosmopolitan or not, is a devoted believer, he automatically becomes **vsechelovek**. So he concludes that because Russians managed to preserve their true religion in Christ unlike Europeans, “among all nations the Russian soul, the genius of the Russian people is, perhaps, most apt to embrace the idea of the universal (**vsechelovecheskoye**) fellowship of man, of brotherly love, - that sober point of view which forgives that which is hostile; which distinguishes and excuses that which is desperate; which removes contradictions.”¹⁹⁸ As the next step of human development he introduces the term **vsechelovecheski-bratskoye**¹⁹⁹ (all-humanitarian brotherly fellowship) which he uses to stress that if a person is proud of his nationality and is a true Christian, he looks at others with brotherly love and sees in them a fellow,

¹⁹⁵ Dostoevsky, **Dnevnik Pisatelya**, p. 393.

¹⁹⁶ Batunsky, **op. cit.**, p. 513.

¹⁹⁷ Vladimir Zakharov, “Khudozhestvennaya Antropologiya Dostoyevskogo”, **Zhurnalnyi Klub Intelros “Problemy Istoricheskoy Poetiki”**, Vol.11, 2013, p.150, (Online) www.intelros.ru/readroom/problemy-istoricheskoy-poetiki/vyp-11-2013/29739-hudozhestvennaya-antropologiya-dostoyevskogo.html, June 2, 2018.

¹⁹⁸ Dostoevsky, **The Dairy of a Writer**, p. 962.

¹⁹⁹ Dostoevsky, **Dnevnik Pisatelya**, p. 449.

never a rival or enemy. The one who succeeds in doing so gains a new, hitherto unheard nationality - **vsebratskaya** (all-brotherly) and **vsechlovecheskaya** (all-humanitarian).²⁰⁰ Such new nationality Dostoevsky saw in those Russians who left their families and homes to sacrifice their lives for freedom of the Balkan Slaves during the 1877-1878 war. Much earlier, about forty years ago, there lived a young man who became a model of the **vsechlovechnost**, particularly for Dostoevsky - the most national Russian writer and poet Alexander Pushkin. The term **vsechlovechnost** becomes a key term in the Pushkin speech which Dostoevsky makes in the last year of his life.

Although it is true that **The Diary of a Writer** and **The Brothers Karamazov** made Dostoevsky popular, the peak of the popularity was reached after the Pushkin speech. Volgin informs that with the publications of the Dairy Dostoevsky's personal and social connections grew rapidly. People of all classes and ages, atheists and believers, prisoners, women, philosophers etc. wrote and visited him.²⁰¹ However, after reading the legendary Pushkin speech, some months before his death, despite being haunted by a large part of the so-called liberal press, young people continued to literally carry Dostoevsky in their arms; he is greeted by unknown people on streets because in their eyes he is the national property.²⁰² There are many reasons why it affected the society that much. Volgin, for instance, thinks that the Pushkin speech was made at the crucial moment when the country was at a crossroads, when there still was a choice.²⁰³ The indisputable reason is the topic of the speech - Alexander Sergeyevich Pushkin.

Pushkin had been Dostoevsky's favorite writer since his early childhood. Three years before making the speech, he had already expressed the main idea of the Pushkin speech in his article "Anna Karenina as a Fact of Special Significance" published in the **Diary**. There he identifies two main ideas of Pushkin that

comprise the symbol of the whole future character, of the whole future mission of Russia, and, therefore, of our whole future destiny. The first idea is the universality (vsemirnost) of Russia, her responsiveness and actual, unquestioned and most profound kinship with the geniuses of all ages and nations of the world. [...] Pushkin's

²⁰⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 476.

²⁰¹ Volgin., **op. cit.**, p. 236.

²⁰² **Ibid.**, p. 485.

²⁰³ **Ibid.**, p. 341.

second idea is his turn toward the people, his sole reliance upon their strength; his covenant that in the people, and only in them, we shall fully discover our Russian genius and the cognizance of its destiny.²⁰⁴

For Dostoevsky Pushkin is the best model of **vsechlovechnost** (pan-humanism) because

he was a man of the ancient world; he was a German; he was an Englishman, profoundly cognizant of his genius, of the anguish of his aspirations (Feast During the Plague) , and he was also the poet of the East. He said and proclaimed to all these peoples that Russian genius knew them, understood them,- was contiguous with them, that, as a kin man, it could fully reincarnate itself in them; that universality [**vsemirnost**] was given only to the Russian spirit -the future mission to comprehend and to unite all the different nationalities, eliminating all their contradictions.²⁰⁵

He repeated this vision of Pushkin in 1880 at the unveiling of the Pushkin Monument in Moscow. Referring to all types of the other he sets Pushkin as an example of a person capable of reincarnating in himself an alien nationality. To express his perspective of the self/other nexus and its role in establishing national identity Dostoevsky addresses the present and future generations saying that

[...] we began to strive impetuously for the most vital universal all-humanitarian [**vsechlovecheskoye**] fellowship [...] in a friendly manner, with full love, we admitted into our soul the genius of foreign nations, without any racial discrimination, instinctively managing almost from the first step-to eliminate contradictions, to excuse and reconcile differences, thereby manifesting our readiness and proclivity to enter into an all-embracing [**vseobsheye**] universal [**obshechlovecheskoye**] communion with all the nationalities of the great Aryan races. Yes, the Russian's destiny is incontestably all-European and universal [**vsemirnoye**]. To become a genuine and all-round Russian means, perhaps (and this you should remember), to become brother of all men, a universal man [**vsechlovek**], if you please. Oh, all this Slavophilism and this Westernism is a great, although historically inevitable, misunderstanding.²⁰⁶

Just as Dostoevsky thought throughout his life, he repeats his ideas in his final public speech which changed hearts of hundreds of people and continued affecting readers' vision of the self through its relation to the other. He was one of the first writers who expressed such strong belief in the universal all-humanitarian fellowship. Even though we, people have never achieved it and most probably will not, we know the way to follow - it is the way of friendship and mutual love; it is the way of admitting the other into your

²⁰⁴ Dostoevsky, **The Dairy of a Writer**, p. 784.

²⁰⁵ **Ibid.**

²⁰⁶ **Ibid.**, p. 979.

soul without any racial discrimination; it is the way of eliminating contradictions, excusing and reconciling differences between us. All Dostoevsky wants to show is this way, following which we might reach the final destination where all nationalities live in all-embracing universal communion. Nationalism for him does not mean dominance of one nation over another, it means love for your origins and respect for other nations. He teaches that a person can love mankind only if he loves his own people first, and only this kind of person is capable of embracing all others in all-brotherly love and becomes **vsechelovek** and the provider of universal brotherhood.

THIRD CHAPTER

EXAMPLES OF DOSTOEVSKY'S USE OF THE OTHER AND THEIR FUNCTION IN SEARCH OF THE SELF

“I am conscious of myself and become myself only while revealing myself for another, through another, and with the help of another. The most important acts constituting self-consciousness are determined by a relationship toward another consciousness (toward a *thou*). Separation, dissociation, and enclosure within the self as the main reason for the loss of one's self.”

Mikhail Bakhtin¹

3.1. Goryanchikov's Way from Otherness of the Self to Universal Brotherhood in *The House of the Dead*

Dostoevsky writes his first semiautobiographical **The House of the Dead** on his return to Russia from the Siberian katorga and exile. For the first time Russian readers are presented with outstanding descriptions of the religious character, behavior, and practice of Poles, Jews, Christians, Muslims and other minorities of the Russian Empire together with the portrait of the Russian narod who possessed their own norms and values so different from those of the gentry. The work can be considered as a cultural landmark and an event in the life of the Russian nation. It is also one of the first examples of Russia's vision of its self vis-a-vis Europe, to be concise, Dostoevsky's vision of the Russian self not through the eyes of a Europeanized nobleman, but through the eyes of a common Russian man. In addition, Lyudmila Sarbash argues that Dostoevsky not only depicts self-consciousness of the Russian commoners but also describes the foreign phenomena of the Russian reality through images of different nationalities and cultures.² According to

¹ Bakhtin, *Dostoevsky's Polyphonic Novel*, p. 287.

² Lyudmila Sarbash, “Polietnokonfessionalnaya Rossiya V ‘Zapiskakh iz Mertvogo Doma’ F.M. Dostoyevskogo”, *Vestnik Chuvashskogo Universiteta*, Cheboksary, 2012, No.4, p. 307, (Online) www.cyberleninka.ru/article/n/polietnokonfessionalnaya-rossiya-v-zapiskah-iz-mertvogo-doma-f-m-dostoyevskogo, April 3, 2018.

Perlina Dostoevsky's **House of the Dead** was viewed by him "as a sort of a teleological prospectus for all of his future writings".³ She also proposes that scenarios outlined there were treated by Dostoevsky as the most potent issues of his future masterpieces.⁴ In support to her statement Dostoevsky wrote that he carried from the katorga so many various types of narod that they were enough for many volumes.⁵ As a rule, these types have been categorized as the internal other which is separated into the social and religious others, however, the borders between the categories tend to shift from time to time.

3.1.1. Split between the Upper Classes and the Peasant Convicts

The first striking experience the narrator of **The House of the Dead** is an enormous split between the upper classes and peasant convicts. The first thing that points at the split is the use of pronoun **They** (peasant convicts) and **We** (the upper classes). Secondly, through dialogues of the narrator Goryanchikov with other gentlemen and his interaction with the commoners, readers see that, on the one hand, the ordinary convicts are embittered at the nobles clearly expressing their dislike for them, on the other hand, the upper class convicts see in themselves "a different sort of people, unlike them [serfs and soldiers]"⁶. Both seem so alien to each other as if they are of different nationality born in different countries. Dostoevsky picturesquely describes how one common worldview allows strangers to befriend each other, and how difference in the social strata makes representatives of the same nation alienated from one another:

two hours after his arrival an ordinary prisoner is on the same footing as all the rest, is at home, has the same rights in the community as the rest, is understood by everyone, understands everyone, knows everyone, and is looked on by everyone as a comrade, it is very different with the gentleman, the man of a different class. However straightforward, good-natured and clever he is, he will for years be hated and despised by all; he will not be understood, and what is more he will not be trusted. He is not a friend, and not a comrade, and though he may at last in the course of years attain such a position among them that they will no longer insult him, yet he will never be one of them, and will forever be painfully conscious that he is solitary and remote from all. [...] They are divided from the peasants by an impassable gulf, and this only becomes

³ Nina Perlina, *op. cit.*, p. 323.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Dostoevsky, *Pisma* 38, p. 92.

⁶ Dostoevsky, **The House of the Dead and Poor Folk**, Trans. By Constance Garnett, New York, Barnes & Noble Classics, 2004, p. 34.

fully apparent when the gentleman is by force of external circumstances completely deprived of his former privileges, and is transformed into a peasant. You may have to do with the peasants all your life, you may associate with them every day for forty years, officially for instance, in the regulation administrative forms, or even simply in a friendly way, as a benefactor or, in a certain sense, a father - you will never know them really. It will all be an optical illusion and nothing more.⁷

Nevertheless, Goryanchikov does not want to shut himself off from other peasant prisoners, he tries to be on a par with them despite their hostility.⁸ He, a member of the upper classes, presents the narod, as a rule, more positively than negatively and warns that to see the truly positive face of the social other it is necessary, at first, “to take off the outer superimposed husk and to look at the kernel more closely, more attentively and without prejudice, and some of us will see things in the people that we should never have expected”.⁹ Knowing well the Europeanized Russian nobility, the writer contrasts the educated self against such features of the social other as having “a sense of their own dignity”, “sense of justice and their eagerness for it”, without “desire to be cock of the walk on all occasions and at all costs”, and “respect not for money, but respect for oneself”.¹⁰ Dostoevsky compares the nobles with the narod to show that the Russian commoner, having been devoid of prejudice and biases towards representatives of different races or faiths, is capable of respecting each of them equally and can teach the nobles to do the same. It is true that the peasant convicts were strict and discriminative against the gentlemen prisoners, however, the nobles were treated this way not because of their nationality or religious belonging but because of their attitude which will be exemplified in the following paragraphs. Thus, the image of Goryanchikov demonstrates Dostoevsky’s conviction that if Russia wants to become a great nation, the first thing to do is to reunite the upper classes with the narod. Unless it is achieved, these two parts of the same body can never function efficiently and be respected by other nations and the search of the self cannot be finalized.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 259.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 96.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 156.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

3.1.2. The External Other vs. the Russian Self

The next image Dostoevsky depicts is the image of the Polish other. In **The House of the Dead** he writes that the hard labor prison was **a mixed rabble** of peoples, beliefs and cultures forced to live together.¹¹ Among the prisoners were representatives from each corner of Russia. Although the Polish territory was under control of Russia, for criticism here we still regard it as a European country. Most of the Polish prisoners look at the rest of the convicts as the other, and one notices orientalist attitude on the part of the Poles. For the Russian prisoners, the Poles are also the other/strangers, but such an attitude, Dostoevsky argues through the narrator's mouth, is only a response to the bias practiced by the Poles: "what was worse they regarded everyone around them with intense prejudice, saw in the convicts nothing but their brutality, could not discern any good quality, anything human in them, and had indeed no wish to do so".¹² The difference is that the Poles orientalized the Russian prisoners whereas the latter did not: for example, Goryanchikov says that "disdain of the Poles did not irritate the convicts in the very least, and they were welcomed quite politely. The convicts treated our foreign prisoners respectfully in prison, far more so than the Russian 'gentlemen' prisoners indeed, and they never touched them".¹³ This reveals that the narod's problem was with the Russian upper classes, not with the ethnic other or foreign-origin men.

Yet, the Poles are not loved by the peasant prisoners, not because of their background, religious or political views, but because of their contempt, disgust and hatred of the Russians.¹⁴ This underlines the narod's patriotism and nationalistic integrity, national pride.

No less remarkable is the fact that the Polish political prisoners dislike only Russians; they treat the Caucasians, Old Believers and Jews with love.¹⁵ Dostoevsky, a good psychologist, notes that their hatred and hostility can be explained by their

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 274.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 154.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 104.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 274.

homesickness. Also, the Poles must have associated with the Russian convicts the aggressor and the oppressor of their freedom. They do not want to notice anything human in the Russians because all they have seen in them for ages is a territorial enemy. The narrator believes that the source of their bile is not in their origin or views, but in the circumstances and fate. That is to say, the author, without associating with belonging to a particular nation or status, unfolds that the morally exhausted people express their pain and longing through hatred toward others being guided by prejudices and stereotypes.

In addition to the Poles, the European other is personified in the Germans. Unlike other foreigners, they are sometimes “reproached” for their origin by the commoners although more often “they are only laughed at”.¹⁶ Peasants see a comic figure in them.¹⁷ Such attitude can be explained by wars with the Germans throughout the Russian history for territory. The Russian peasant does not regard them as threat or inconvenience and take them seriously. A comparison how the peasant convicts treat the nobles and the foreigners in general: “the convicts treated our foreign prisoners respectfully in prison, far more so than the Russian ‘gentlemen’ prisoners indeed, and they never touched them”¹⁸ discloses that the latter are respected more than the first. For narod it seems a kind of class sensibility or collective social reaction is the matter in its interaction with the upper class or its representatives. The text presents that the external other, foreign ethnicity and culture do not constitute resentment as much as the native/domestic upper class, alienated from the Russian narod. Though seemingly far-fetched, we can relate it to Dostoevsky’s point of view which reveals that to become Russian it is enough for a German as well as for an Asian to become Orthodox, which also stands for comprehensive affinity or elemental and brotherly bondage. It also exemplifies that the ethnic origin is not a barrier to become Russian, and the other (non-Orthodox) can become self if he accepts Orthodoxy. As a result, Dostoevsky draws negative images of the Poles, Germans and other non-Orthodox prisoners not to oppose them against the self but in order to describe the common weaknesses and inclinations any human might experience in this or that situation.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 279.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 274.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

3.1.3. Muhammedans and a Jew as the Religious Others

Another component that matters for the search of the self is the image of the religious other, particularly the non-Christian other such as Muhammedans¹⁹ and Jews. As for the first, there are “two Lezghis, one Tchetchenian and three Daghestan Tatars” who are categorized by the narrator as “mountaineers from the Caucasus”.²⁰ While he finds some of them horrible, gloomy and morose creatures, he adores the others - Lezghin Nurra and Dagestani Aley.²¹ These two become the most positive and are loved by every convict in **The House of the Dead**. For example, this is how Goryanchikov describes Nurra: “He was always good-humored and cordial to everyone, he worked without grumbling and was calm and serene, [...] Everyone liked him and believed in his honesty. ‘Nurra’s a lion,’ the convicts used to say, and the name ‘lion’ had stuck to him. Kind, simplehearted Nurra!”²² Even more than Nurra, Goryanchikov loves Aley

who won my [Goryanchikov’s] heart from the first minute. I was so thankful that fate had sent me him as a neighbor rather than any other. It was hard to imagine how this boy was able during his prison life to preserve such a gentle heart, to develop such strict honesty, such warm feelings and charming manners, and to escape growing coarse and depraved. I look back upon my meeting with him as one of the happiest meetings in my life.²³

It has been mentioned in Chapter two that Aley embodies a real person whom Dostoevsky met in the katorga. However, there is another representative of the religious other whom the writer met during his forced military service in Semipalatinsk, Chokhan Valikhanov. One of Russian scholars Irina Strelkova suggests that Aley is the extension of Valikhanov.²⁴ Another scholar, Marat Seitov sees in Aley Valikhanov’s reflection.²⁵ Seitov also argues that Aley is a collective image of non-Russian people Dostoevsky met

¹⁹ Dostoevsky used the word **Muhammedans** instead of Muslims as it was used in most Western sources.

²⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 63.

²¹ **Ibid.**

²² **Ibid.**

²³ **Ibid.**, p. 100.

²⁴ Irina Strelkova, **Valikhanov**, Molodaya Gvardiya, Moscow, 1983, p. 284.

²⁵ Seitov Marat, “Predyevraziystvo F.M. Dostoevskogo: Istoki i Khudozhestvennoye Voploshcheniye”, PhD dissertation, Magnitogorsk State University, Magnitogorsk, 2010, p. 73.

in Siberia. From a religious perspective, the image of Aley becomes in **The House of the Dead** a symbol of unity of people of different faiths.

Then with a dignified and gracious, that is, a typically Mussulman, smile (which I love so much, and love especially for its dignity) they turned to me and repeated that Jesus was a prophet of God, and that He worked great marvels; that He had made a bird out of clay, had breathed on it and it had flown away . . . and that that was ritten in their books. They were convinced that in saying this they were giving me great pleasure by praising Jesus, and Aley was perfectly happy that his brothers had deigned and desired to give me this pleasure.²⁶

Through the episode when Goryanchikov and Aley together with his brothers come to an agreement on the holiness of Jesus, Dostoevsky demonstrates the possibility of reconciliation of Christianity and Islam both as religions and cultures because there are more similarities than differences. We assume this example targets Christians rather than Muslims due to the fact that the latter acknowledge Jesus Christ as a prophet sent before their prophet.²⁷

In addition, Gary Rosenshield postulates that the Muslim Aley is the closest of all prisoners to a Christian ideal - the ideal Dostoevsky tried to depict in Prince Myshkin in **The Idiot** and in Alesha Karamazov in **The Brothers Karamazov**.²⁸ In Seitov's view, through records of encounter with Aley, Dostoevsky offers his readers the path that humanity should take in striving for universal harmony and unity.²⁹ He concludes that Aley is an object of an experiment in the framework of international and intercultural dialogue.

Another religious other is the Kirghiz and the Kirghiz steppe. They are included in this category due to official Islamization of Central Asia in the fourteenth century.³⁰ Both the Kirghiz steppe and its inhabitants frequently appear in Dostoevsky's writing, for

²⁶ **Ibid.**, p. 68.

²⁷ Tarif Khalidi, "Jesus through Muslim Eyes", September 3, 2009, (Online) www.bbc.co.uk, July 11, 2019.

²⁸ Gary Rosenshield, "Religious Portraiture in Dostoevsky's 'Notes from the House of the Dead': Representing the Abrahamic Faiths", **The Slavic and East European Journal**, Vol.50, No.4, 2006, p. 582, (Online) www.jstor.org/stable/20459366, February 12, 2018.

²⁹ Seitov, **loc. cit.**

³⁰ Yemelyanova, **op. cit.**, p. 56.

instance, in **The Gambler** and **Crime and Punishment**. In **The House of the Dead** when convicts are at work “one suddenly notices dreamy eyes fixed on the blue distance, where far away beyond the Irtysh stretch the free Kirghiz steppes, a boundless plain for a thousand miles”.³¹ For the narrator, which means for Dostoevsky, everything in the steppe is “the hot brilliant sun in the fathomless blue sky and the faraway song of the Kirghiz floating from the further bank” was “sweet and precious”.³² Although the Kirghiz steppe is shown as a periphery separated by a river-border from home, European Russia, and the Kirghiz are called **poor** and **barbarous**, both are identified with freedom - one of the key criteria of Russian identity.

The last religious other in this part we suggest adding to the images of Aley, Nurra and the Kirghiz as an experiment of intercultural dialogue is the image of the Jew Isay Fomitch. In general, Dostoevsky often raised the Jewish question in his **Dairy** and novels. Perlina reminds that Dostoevsky the journal writer was accused by his contemporaries of hatred toward the Jews, whereas in **The House of the Dead** it is not explicitly expressed.³³ As a response to these accusations Dostoevsky explains in his article “Pro-and-Con” that he does not hate the Jews as a people, what he is critical of is Judaism and the Jewish idea.³⁴ As evidence he refers to his experience in the katorga:

one thing I do know for sure, and I am ready to argue about it with anyone, namely, that among our common people there is no preconceived, a priori, blunt religious hatred of the Jew, something along the lines : “Judas sold out Christ.” Even if one hears it from little children or drunken persons, nevertheless our people as a whole look upon the Jew, I repeat, without a preconceived hatred. I have been observing this for fifty years. I even happened to live among the people, in their very midst, in one and the same barracks, sleeping with them on the same cots.³⁵

The same impression is given in **The House of the Dead** through the image of Isay Fomitch. Despite some unflattering characteristics of him such as “he was a most comical mixture of naivete, stupidity, [...], impudence, [...], timidity boastfulness and

³¹ Dostoevsky, **The House of the Dead and Poor Folk**, p. 238.

³² **Ibid.**, p. 232.

³³ Perlina, **op. cit.**, p. 336.

³⁴ Dostoevsky, **The Dairy of a Writer**, p. 650.

³⁵ **Ibid.**, p. 644.

insolence”³⁶, Dostoevsky claims that “the convicts never jeered at him, though they sometimes made a joke at his expense”³⁷, and confesses that “everyone really seemed to like him and no one was rude to him”.³⁸ The day when Isay Fomitch celebrates his Friday Sabbath is a day when convicts from other wards come on purpose to see the ceremony, which pleases Isay Fomitch a lot.³⁹ The narrator informs that religious worshipping is never prohibited or restricted in prison and that everybody, even the majors, respect the other’s faith and the way of practicing it.⁴⁰ In short, the image of Isay Fomitch, not only exemplifies Dostoevsky’s absence of hatred toward the Jews, but also confirms sincerity of his hope of living with the Jews in brotherhood which he repeats fifteen years later in his **Dairy**:

let us come together in one spirit, in complete brotherhood, for mutual assistance and for the great cause of serving our land, our state and our fatherland! Let the mutual accusations be mollified; let the customary exaggeration of these accusations, hindering the clear understanding of things, disappear! One can pledge for the Russian people: oh, they will accept the Jew in the fullest brotherhood, despite the difference in religion and with perfect respect for the historical fact of such a difference. Nevertheless, for complete brotherhood-brotherhood on the part of both sides is needed. Let the Jew also show at least some brotherly feeling for the Russian people so as to encourage them.⁴¹

3.1.4. Goryanchikov as Bearer of Universal Brotherhood

Thus, Goryanchikov’s close friendship with such characters as Lezghin Nurra, Dagestani Aley, the Jew Isay Fomitch and other convicts’ kind attitude to them indicate that religion and origin of a person are never an obstacle for the other to become the self, and that the most important issue is the personality, not ethnic or religious affiliation. Dostoevsky, through use of self/other dialogical interaction, shows, firstly, that Russian narod is “ready to forget any tortures for the sake of a kind word”⁴² from the upper classes. The writer’s purpose here is to stress that the cultured self has a chance to fix its split from

³⁶ Dostoevsky, **The House of the Dead and Poor Folk**, p. 117.

³⁷ **Ibid.**

³⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 119.

³⁹ **Ibid.**, p. 120.

⁴⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 121.

⁴¹ Dostoevsky, **The Dairy of a Writer**, p. 653.

⁴² **Ibid.**, p. 196.

the commoners through kindness, respect and devotion, and readiness to see an equal in narod, not the social other. Secondly, through images of the Polish convicts Dostoevsky does not underline superiority or inferiority of the self and other but constructs the image of the Russian self in his dialogical relation with the other as another self. His aim is to show how instead of taunting them “with their nationality and their religion, or their ideas”⁴³ Russians can try to understand the reason of their hostility and biased attitude. Finally, the religious other is used by Dostoevsky to exemplify how dialogue with convicts of different confessions suggests a way to unite different nations. It also demonstrates that the religious other is a part of the common body of the Russian self.

In short, the katorga depicted by Dostoevsky as “a mixed rabble [... of] a Kantonist, another will be a Circassian, a third an Old Believer, a fourth will be an Orthodox peasant [...], the fifth will be a Jew, the sixth a gipsy, and the seventh God knows who”, symbolizes a microscopic model of the Russian nation, peoples of which, like convicts, “all got to live together, [...] got to get on together somehow, eat out of the same bowl, sleep on the same bed”⁴⁴. Just as Dostoevsky interacted with other convicts in the katorga through dialogue of the equals, consumed their knowledge and shared his, so the Russian people should do if they want to establish their identity. Therefore, all images of the other introduced in **The House of the Dead** we consider as images that construct the Russian self which can be considered as the prototype of Dostoevsky’s **vsechelovek**.

3.2. Role of the External and Internal Others in Building Self-awareness in The Gambler and Crime and Punishment

Just as Dostoevsky comes from the exile in the east of Russia to go to Western Europe for different purposes, so he carried the plot of his next novel **The Gambler** from Siberia to Europe. **The Gambler** is Dostoevsky’s another autobiographical novel written at the crucial moment of his life. There are several reasons of choosing this comparatively

⁴³ **Ibid.**, p. 279.

⁴⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 34.

short work in the analysis of Dostoevsky's uses of the other in search of the self. Firstly, it is the only novel⁴⁵ of Dostoevsky where the setting is Europe, the place of spiritual degradation of the main character. Secondly, Dostoevsky introduces in this novel several national types such as French, English, Polish and juxtaposes them with young Russian intellectuals who prefer leaving their fatherland to purposeless wandering in Europe. Finally, it is **the satellite (planeta sputnik) of Crime and Punishment** because there is one circle of ideas, one mega text.⁴⁶ Thus, **The Gambler** will allow to examine the external other personified in Europe and serve as a transition to Dostoevsky's first great novel **Crime and Punishment**.

3.2.1. Alienation of Alexey from the Europeans

One of the central ideas of Dostoevsky in **The Gambler** is to juxtapose the Europeans with Russians and introduce the type of the Russian Europeans. According to Volgin, the foundation of the novel is the ideological conflict between European polished forms and Russian unrestrained nature.⁴⁷ Dostoevsky himself describes the plot of the novel which talks about "one type of a foreign Russian. And indeed, a modern moment (if possible, of course) of our inner life will be reflected. I take a direct nature, a man, however, highly developed, but unfinished in everything, distrustful and not daring to disbelieve, rising to authority and fearing it."⁴⁸ (my trans.)

In **The Gambler** Dostoevsky depicts the image of the Russians as Europe's other. In the second chapter it has been explained why the West looked at Russia as the other. Dostoevsky allows his character to express feelings in this regard, which he himself most probably had when living in Europe. That Russians were discriminated and stereotyped

⁴⁵ **Winter Notes of Summer Expressions** is the publicistic form of Dostoevsky's ideas about Europe and Russian Europeans, whereas the **Gambler** is a novel.

⁴⁶ Igor Volgin, "Spets Kurs: Igrok", **YouTube**, uploaded by Academia, Kultura channel, 29 August, 2015, (Online) <https://youtu.be/yviC9QPkRBc>, October 15, 2018.

⁴⁷ **Ibid.**

⁴⁸ Dostoevsky, *Pisma* 78, Received by N. N. Strakhov, Rome, September 18(30), 1863, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, p. 226, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/422.htm, January 29, 2018.

by Europeans can be realized via some phrases like “impossible for Russians to dine at a *table d’hôte*”⁴⁹, “impossible to utter a word if you happen to be Russian”⁵⁰, “He simply couldn’t understand how an insignificant Russian dared put himself on the same level as Monsignore’s guests”⁵¹, “With the greatest insolence he [the Parisian abbé] looked me up and down from head to foot, as though delighted to be able to insult me, [...]. The abbé looked at me with unutterable hatred [...]”⁵². Dostoevsky speculates that the reason of such attitude could be the political rivalry between Europe and Russia for Poland, which Aleksey Ivanovich, the main character and the gambler expresses saying that “in Paris, on the Rhine, and even in Switzerland, there are so many wretched little Poles and their French sympathizers”⁵³. The lines exemplify Dostoevsky’s conviction that particularly France sympathized with the Poles and supported them in their resistance against Russia. Most probably, the image of Russia as an aggressor served the Europeans to contrast themselves against the Russians. To exemplify, the abbé treated Alexey Ivanovich politely⁵⁴ because he does not want to awake a barbarian⁵⁵ and poke the bear⁵⁶ in the Russian and because politeness is what makes him a European. But he is at the same time cold with the Russian in order to keep a border which divides them into **Us**, the Europeans, and **Them**, the Russian insignificant other.

Another feature that alienates Alexey from the Europeans and positions him as the other in relation to the Europeans, particularly the French, Germans and English is their passion for material prosperity. According to the narrator if someone starts to acquire wealth like Western men, identity transformation might take place. Alexey is sure that Russians, on the contrary, are simply incapable of acquiring wealth.⁵⁷ In his opinion, Europeans “work like slaves” to “make a pile”⁵⁸ and become masters over others and

⁴⁹ Dostoevsky, **The Gambler**, Trans. by Jessie Coulson, Penguin Group, England, 1966, p. 21.

⁵⁰ **Ibid.**

⁵¹ **Ibid.**, p. 22.

⁵² **Ibid.**

⁵³ **Ibid.**, p. 21.

⁵⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 22.

⁵⁵ **Ibid.**

⁵⁶ **Ibid.**, p. 206.

⁵⁷ **Ibid.**, p. 13.

⁵⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 46.

“instantly punish [...] anybody [...] who is different from them”.⁵⁹ Alexey, by contrast, prefers being the master of his life and free and, if necessary, “fritter away his whole life in a Kirghiz tent”⁶⁰ and be a lackey rather than working like a slave. In other words, Alexey claims that it is better to be poor but free rather than being sealed by life-long desire to acquire wealth for the sake of material possessions.

Also, The Englishman Mr. Astley states that roulette is a Russian game, with which Alexey agrees, admitting that it was “created expressly for Russians” to meet their needs to spend money outrageously and earn it without working.⁶¹ He accepts that this “scandalous Russian goings-on” is bad but he also questions whether it is worse than “German capacity for making a pile”⁶².

The next question that is raised by Dostoevsky to underline the difference of the Russians from the Westerners is the question of form. In this regard the writer contrasts long-established⁶³ and thoroughly elegant form⁶⁴ of the Europeans against the Russians’ lack, and even absence, of form⁶⁵. To describe this state of having no form Dostoevsky uses the word **bezobraziye** which means without an image, shape, aim. In other words, Dostoevsky develops an idea that Russians are still looking for a shape/form, for an identity and this search is more promising than the established images of the German idol, French form or English efficiency. From another perspective, the established form of the Europeans leaves no space for dialogical interaction and exchange of ideas, it is all **monologic**⁶⁶, whereas the Russian form, being in the state of development, requires another consciousness to establish its contours. Bakhtin correctly states that without another consciousness a human being cannot find fullness in himself.⁶⁷ That is why

⁵⁹ **Ibid.**, p. 48.

⁶⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 46.

⁶¹ **Ibid.**

⁶² **Ibid.**

⁶³ **Ibid.**, p. 72.

⁶⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 206.

⁶⁵ **Ibid.**, p. 55.

⁶⁶ Bakhtin, **op. cit.**, p. 64.

⁶⁷ **Ibid.**, p. 393.

Dostoevsky's main technique to find the self was dialogical exchange of ideas with other voices.

If to take Europeans separately, each nation is given some specific features in the novel. The most negative features are ascribed to the French for their common habit to put on extraordinary airs, to treat everybody in haughty and negligent manner.⁶⁸ As mentioned above, the French form is what Dostoevsky finds the most problematic. He writes, for instance, that "it is only the French and perhaps a few other Europeans who have such a well-defined form that they can look extremely worthy and yet be utterly unworthy".⁶⁹ Through the voice of Alexey, Dostoevsky suggests to his readers that even though Russians might look like bears next to the French national type, they are not as "affected, distorted and perfumed" as the French are.⁷⁰

Apart from using images of the Europeans, Dostoevsky refers to a few Asian images to stress otherness of the Russians and, particularly, alienation of Alexey from the Europeans. Mentioning Asian connection via the protagonist also reminds Russia's Janus-faced nature and duality. The Asiatic images such as "my whole life in a Kirghiz tent"⁷¹, "my Tartar blood"⁷², "Russian is a calmouk"⁷³ used in the novel by Alexey, indicate his acceptance of being Asian as well as Russian and, by doing so, add more contrast between Russians and Europeans. Dostoevsky's words written in his **Dairy** also support this stance:

European culture in many of its manifestations has always, ever since Peter, been hateful and has always been felt alien to the Russian soul? I do think so. Of course, it stands to reason that this protest has nearly always been an unconscious one; but the thing that is precious is the fact that the Russian instinct has not died: the Russian soul, though unconsciously, has been protesting precisely in the name of its Russism, in the name of its Russian own, and against its suppression.⁷⁴

⁶⁸ Dostoevsky, **The Gambler**, p. 21.

⁶⁹ **Ibid.**, p. 55.

⁷⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 206.

⁷¹ **Ibid.**, p. 46.

⁷² **Ibid.**

⁷³ **Ibid.**, p. 194.

⁷⁴ Dostoevsky, **The Dairy of a Writer**, p. 352.

Finally, Dostoevsky through the voice of the characters, mainly Alexey, criticizes the Russian Europeans, the cultured self, living abroad for their being

sometimes too faint-hearted and terribly afraid of what people will say, or what will be thought of them, and they worry about whether it will be proper to do this thing or that, and in short behave as though they were wearing stays, especially those with pretensions to importance. What they like best of all is some preconceived, established code, which they follow slavishly – in hotels, out walking, at assemblies, on journeys [...].⁷⁵

He also attacks their acceptance of the role of a slave afraid of “uttering a squeak” and “ready to deny that we are Russians”.⁷⁶ The main problem here is not the loss of identity but a purposeful denial of it. Through such image of the cultured self Dostoevsky intends to draw attention to the wrongness of such servility and ugliness of the European mask on the Russian face. In addition, he compares Russians abroad and Russians “at home in Russia [where] the Orthodox buy out the Orthodox”⁷⁷ - the phenomenon unlikely to happen in Europe because Russian Europeans have not only lost their true face but their religious affiliation as well.

Thus, Dostoevsky’s discussion of Westerners’ view of the Russians as the other serves two different purposes: the first is to remind that Russians have been always stereotyped and alienated by the Europeans no matter how much the former try to become European; the second is to draw attention, especially of the Russian Europeans, for the opinion that there is nothing wrong in having Tartar blood and being different from the Europeans. To support this idea he opposes the Russians’ love of freedom and lack of capacity for making a pile against the Europeans’ life-long desire to acquire wealth. Alexey alienates from the Europeans, first, because he is othered by them, and second, because he is critical of Western materialism and Russian Europeans’ imitation of Western values and presumption. Moreover, the writer’s reference to the Russian Europeans as alienated cultured self describes how Dostoevsky sees the identity crisis of the Russians abroad.

⁷⁵ Dostoevsky, *The Gambler*, p. 70.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 203.

3.2.2. Raskolnikov's Search of the Self

As the next step in the search of Dostoevsky's uses of the other, it is time to discuss his first greatest novel **Crime and Punishment** which we regard as an extension of **The Gambler**. If Alexey Ivanovich is the embodiment of Russians abroad, Raskolnikov embodies the Russian intelligentsia of the nineteenth-century central Russia. He describes the plot to Katkov as follows:

It is the psychological report of a crime.

The action is modern, happened this year. A young man, expelled from the university, a petty bourgeois by birth, living in the direst poverty, by frivolity and unsteadiness of moral convictions falling under the influence of the strange "unfinished" ideas floating in the air, decides to break out of his disgusting position at one stroke. I wanted to express it particularly on an educated man, on a man of the new generation, [...].⁷⁸

Dostoevsky on purpose chooses a young and educated man, just like the gambler Alexey, to indicate their connection with the West not only via Western knowledge but also via modern theories of atheism, socialism, liberalism and alike. Also, Raskolnikov represents the cultured self with multiple split personality: he is split from the Russian tradition, narod, and even his family. As a consequence, he is split from within between being Russian Orthodox and Europeanized atheist. Raskolnikov's name means **split**. Belov, going deeper into etymology of the name, stresses that Rodion Romanovich Raskolnikov embodies a split of the mother earth that bore him, (the name **Rodion** means motherland).⁷⁹ Split and bifurcation are the most characteristic traits of Raskolnikov. In Merezhkovsky's interpretation there are two opposing faces, two **Ies**, a struggle of the man-god and God-man in Raskolnikov⁸⁰. By the same token, just like Coşkun Karataş sees in the struggle between man-god and God-man one of the main reasons of alienation⁸¹ in Russian thinking, so we see it in the split personality of Raskolnikov. Syromyatnikov states that the split personality of the main character is connected with the split of the

⁷⁸ Dostoevsky, Pisma 98, Received by M. N. Katkov, Wiesbaden, September 10-15, 1865, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.15, p. 273, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/442.htm, November 29, 2018.

⁷⁹ Sergey Belov, **Vokrug Dostoyevskogo: Statyi, Nakhodki i Vstrechi Za Tridtsat Pyat Let**, St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg University, 2001, p. 219.

⁸⁰ Merezhkovsky, **op. cit.**, p. 285.

⁸¹ Coşkun Karataş, **op. cit.**, p. 400.

public consciousness.⁸² Thus, Raskolnikov is the best example of the Janus-faced nature of Russianness. The duality of the main character will be discussed further from both positive and negatives sides.

Moreover, to overcome split and to restore integrity was one of Dostoevsky's primary goals. In Oleg Kovalev's opinion Dostoevsky saw it possible through reestablishing borders between the self and the other.⁸³ The image of the external other will be used to examine Raskolnikov's search of the national self. The internal other, both social and religious, Raskolnikov meets in katorga in Siberia will be additional in examination of Raskolnikov's transformation from a typical cultured self influenced by ideas from the West to a new self attached to the Russian traditional religion and another person to love and serve.

If to start with the external other, Dostoevsky refers to two Greeks (Lycurgus⁸⁴ and Solon⁸⁵), a Frenchman (Napoleon⁸⁶) and an Arab (Mahomet or Muhammad⁸⁷) so as to introduce readers to Raskolnikov's theory of division of all men into ordinary and extraordinary. Dostoevsky's choice of the people who come from different epochs, countries and cultures, speak different languages and practice different religions allows to suggest that neither origin nor religion mattered for the writer; all he saw in them was their

⁸² Syromyatnikov, **op. cit.**, p. 32.

⁸³ Oleg Kovalev, "Problema Drugogo v Tvorchestve F.M. Dostoyevskogo: Narratologicheskii Aspekt", **Izvestiya Altayskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta**, No.2, 2012, p. 157.

⁸⁴ Lycurgus from Sparta lived in the 7th century BC. He is traditionally believed to be a lawgiver who founded most of the institutions of ancient Sparta. ("Lycurgus", **Encyclopaedia Britannica**, Ed. by Adam Augustyn et al., w.date, (Online) <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Lycurgus-Spartan-lawgiver>, July 4, 2018).

⁸⁵ Solon (630 BC - died 560 BC). was an Athenian statesman and poet known as one of the Seven Wise Men of Greece. (Theodore John Cadoux, "Solon", **Ibid.**)

⁸⁶ Napoleon I, French in full Napoléon Bonaparte, byname the Corsican **or** the Little Corporal, French byname Le Corse or Le Petit Caporal, was born in 1769 in Corsica and died in 1821 in St. Helena Island. He was a French general, first consul (1799–1804), and emperor of the French (1804–1814/15), and one of the most celebrated personages in the history of the West. (Jacques Godechot, "Napoleon I", **Ibid.**)

⁸⁷ The Prophet Muhammad was labeled by Dostoevsky as well as European and, influenced by them, Russian scholars of that period (18th and 19th centuries) the Turkish prophet; Islam was seen not as a world religion but the religion of the Turks; to convert to Islam meant to become a Turk (Crew, **op. cit.**, p. 37). Todorova (**op.cit.**, p. 162) repeats the labeling writing that everything Ottomans was considered synonymous with Islamic or Turkish (and to a lesser extent Arabic and Persian). Batunsky (**op.cit.**, p. 29) and Crew (**Ibid.**) mention a Russian translation of the Qur'an based on a mid-seventeenth-century French edition titled The Al-Koran on Muhammad, or the Turkish Creed.

deeds toward humanity which also confirms argument on Dostoevsky's concern for universal harmony. Moreover, reference to this sort of variety puts forward Dostoevsky's tendency to multi-voiced dialogic structure. For Raskolnikov, Janus-faced and split cultured self, these men were, on the one hand, "without exception criminals, [...] guilty of terrible carnage", and, on the other hand, they were also "benefactors and leaders of humanity".⁸⁸ On the one hand, they were leaders who must have promised their people to contribute to universal order, on the other hand, they caused death and destruction. These images of the external other are used to juxtapose them with Raskolnikov's personality in order to find differences or similarities. Hence, Dostoevsky uses images of the other in order to define the self.

In another episode which talks about what Russian people are like, there are some references or implications to Europeans in general. For example, Luzhin, as a man from the provinces, notes that Petersburg youth has "clearer views, more criticism and practicality" that recalls the European youth.⁸⁹ Razumikhin, as a representative of such youth, does not agree that there is practicality.⁹⁰ In his opinion, it happened because Russians had been weaned from labor for two hundred years with the help of which practicality is acquired. Regarding the dispute between Luzhin and Razumikhin taking place by Raskolnikov's bed, Syromyatnikov observes in this scene the clash between ideologies of the Slavophiles (Razumikhin) and the Westernizers (Luzhin).⁹¹ Moreover, Razumikhin's judgments about the Russian people who, in contrast to other nations make sense; they are used to "having everything ready-made, to walking on crutches, to having our food chewed for us".⁹² Yet, Razumikhin also believes that Russians have the potential to change the situation thanks to their desire for good and honesty.⁹³

⁸⁸ Dostoevsky, **Crime and Punishment**, Trans. by Constance Garnett, w.place, Planet PDF, p. 466, (Online) www.planetpdf.com, September 2, 2018.

⁸⁹ **Ibid.**, p. 271

⁹⁰ **Ibid.**

⁹¹ Syromyatnikov, **op. cit.**, p. 29.

⁹² **Ibid.**, p. 276.

⁹³ **Ibid.**, p. 271.

It is not only Razumikhin who discusses negative traits of a general Russian character. Other characters do it too but their aim is to eradicate them, not to condemn. Besides, such negative features are always combined with the positive. For example, “my friends are drunk, yet they are all honest”; “though we do talk a lot of trash, and I do, too, yet we shall talk our way to the truth”.⁹⁴ Therefore, Russian people do not deny their own vices, but try to recognize and eradicate them because they believe in being on the right path. It comes to show a difference with the conceptualization through binary oppositions by which Western thought works. To Dostoevsky such a reservoir of opposites is one of the most important features of the Russian character, which distinguishes it from other nations, particularly European. Dostoevsky reveals the feature in many of his works. In **Crime and Punishment** Raskolnikov, for example, behaved “as though he were alternating between two characters”: “morose, gloomy, proud and haughty” but “of noble nature and a kind heart”.⁹⁵ Sonya’s occupation was “shame and degradation” which existed in her “side by side with other, opposite, holy feelings”.⁹⁶ Dostoevsky asserts through the words of Svidrigaylov that it happens because of broadness⁹⁷ (**shirota**) of Russians’ ideas; they are “broad like their land”.⁹⁸ A Russian character can combine good and bad thanks to this trait, but if a person is deprived of his genius, then it is a misfortune. This is another feature which distinguishes Europeans from Russians. And in Raskolnikov these two opposite characters fight with each other, and he fights with them. Dilemma inside him rages to find out whether he is a louse, trembling creature or a man who has the right.⁹⁹ He will cope with it if only he manages to manifest genius. But what is the essence of the genius for the Russian man? At the end of the novel, Raskolnikov recovers from his spiritual illness; he is resurrected by Sonya’s love for him and his for her. Taking the gospel that Sonya gave him, he realizes, maybe manifesting genius, that now her beliefs will become his, her feelings - his. Therefore, the genius for Dostoevsky can be

⁹⁴ **Ibid.**, p. 366.

⁹⁵ **Ibid.**, p. 386.

⁹⁶ **Ibid.**, p. 576.

⁹⁷ The term **broadness** is also translated as **wideness** which mean **comprehensiveness** and **openness**.

⁹⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 867.

⁹⁹ **Ibid.**, p. 742.

revealed through love and faith. T.S. Eliot's diagnosis of dissociation of sensibility for Western culture and art can be remembered here and contrasted.¹⁰⁰ In other words, Dostoevsky is convinced that a person can achieve genius only if he can love God and another being, which particularly Russian people are most capable of, all thanks to their broadness. Dostoevsky seems to believe that since Europeans are not as **broad** as Russians, their genius is only enough for themselves, whereas the Russian can show his genius so as to save not only himself, but others as well - a trait that points at Dostoevsky's quest for universal brotherhood and harmony. Notably, in Dostoevsky's view, a person of any ethnicity is Russian if he or she is Orthodox Christian. Consequently, if to generalize, the mission of the savior of mankind can be carried out by someone who is Orthodox Christian and is capable of sincere love for the fellow creature - such is the formula of national Russian identity according to Dostoevsky. While some readers are right to question whether such formula accords with the notions of **vsechelovek** (universal man) and pan humanism, it is important to keep in mind that because for Dostoevsky the best ever and the only embodiment of these notions was Jesus Christ, universal peace and harmony can be achieved only if people follow his teachings.

Furthermore, in katorga in Siberia Raskolnikov meets the social and religious other. Before being sent there Porfiry Petrovich, the head of the Investigation Department, warns Raskolnikov that real Russian peasants from the depths of the country are strangers/foreigners for modern cultivated men.¹⁰¹ Moreover, he separates an intelligent man and a simple peasant into two different sorts, including himself and Raskolnikov within the first sort. When Raskolnikov lives in prison he confirms the idea saying that there is a "terrible impossible gulf that lay between him and all the rest".¹⁰² However, the gulf might not be something that isolates him, an intelligent man, from all the rest, the majority of whom are simple peasants on the basis of the social status difference but rather

¹⁰⁰ Viorica Patea, "T. S. Eliot, Dante and the Poetics of a 'Unified Sensibility'", **T. S. Eliot, Dante and the Idea of Europe**, Ed. by Paul Douglass, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011, p. 17.

¹⁰¹ **Ibid.**, p. 605.

¹⁰² **Ibid.**, p. 957.

on the basis of faith. All the rest are “a different species” for him because he is a non-believer but they believe in God, and he is aware of it. A similar division concerning faith will be focused on in analysis of **The Possessed**.

After the issue of the external and internal other, to the religious other we will assign the Muslim Kirghiz living in Asia. When Raskolnikov is in prison, he sees a dream sick on a hospital bed. This dream is about a plague that spreads all over the world infecting every single man with microbes (**trikhiny**), which make people possessed. However, there are a few chosen people who recover in order to found a new life. After awaking from this dream Raskolnikov feels physically and spiritually resurrected and healed. First of all, it is necessary to understand the origin of a “terrible new strange plague” that comes “to Europe from the depths of Asia”.¹⁰³ To begin with, it is necessary to clarify that this passage does not talk about people from Asia, but only a plague, microbes which attack everyone. In Belov’s understanding the microbes (**trikhiny**) symbolize atheism, selfishness and pride and come from “the muddy streams of Western European philosophy”.¹⁰⁴ The proposition raises questions since Dostoevsky’s plague comes not from Europe but from Asia. From a neutral point of view, Dostoevsky’s choice of Asia may be based on a natural phenomenon. Since the climate in the depths of Asia is mostly hot and humid, most infections begin to spread from there. Consequently, the image of Asia does not contain any orientalist concepts, it is used only as the place where the plague starts. In addition, there is no cultural, ethnic, or geographical depiction of people who would found, as Dostoevsky puts it, “a new race and a new life”, all we know is that they are “a pure chosen people”.¹⁰⁵ The text says that these few men will be the only survivors in the whole world whose destiny is “to renew and purify the earth”.¹⁰⁶

Another image of the religious other is the Kirgiz steppe, Kirgiz people and nomadic tents Dostoevsky introduces in the epilogue of **Crime and Punishment**. In an interesting observation of Seitov, by the end of the novel Raskolnikov turns away from

¹⁰³ **Ibid.**, p. 960.

¹⁰⁴ Introduction by Belov in Syromyatnikov, **op. cit.**, p. 8.

¹⁰⁵ Dostoevsky, **Crime and Punishment**, p. 960.

¹⁰⁶ **Ibid.**

materialistic European civilization of Napoleon towards patriarchal Asia, which is imagined by Raskolnikov as “a different, unknown, free, ‘spontaneous’ world that has not yet experienced the corrupting influence of the European civilization”.¹⁰⁷ Now when Raskolnikov is resurrected, European atheism, materialism and rationalism become alien for his Russian soul, and Asian sincerity, spontaneity and broadness are accepted by his heart as his own.¹⁰⁸ This is how Dostoevsky describes the view Raskolnikov sees after recovering:

From the high bank a broad landscape opened before him, the sound of singing floated faintly audible from the other bank. In the vast steppe, bathed in sunshine, he could just see, like black specks, the nomads’ tents. There was freedom, there other men were living, utterly unlike those here; there time itself seemed to stand still, as though the age of Abraham and his flocks had not passed.¹⁰⁹

The phrases like “a broad landscape”, “the sound of singing floated faintly audible from the other bank”, and “vast steppe” stress spontaneity and broadness. The nomads he sees there are different from his compatriots because they are associated by Raskolnikov with the age of Abraham, supposedly the era of universal unity and freedom, pure from European atheistic ideologies.¹¹⁰ In short, through the use of the religious other, Dostoevsky aims at emphasizing similarity of the Russian self with Asian mentality and its difference from the European.

In conclusion, relying on the novels **The Gambler** and **Crime and Punishment**, we have analyzed how the writer used images of the other in building self-awareness of the main characters Alexey Ivanovich and Rodion Rakolnikov. Together with discussing the internal other, we focused on the role of the external other in its relation with the Russian national self. While two types of the internal other, social and religious, are used to associate with the Russian self, the external other was represented as opposing Russian mentality because of its tendency to individualism and atheism instead of communal society united by the mission of saving mankind with sincere love for God and another person of any faith and origin.

¹⁰⁷ Seitov, **op. cit.**, p. 79.

¹⁰⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 87.

¹⁰⁹ Dostoevsky, **Crime and Punishment**, p. 963.

¹¹⁰ Seitov, **op. cit.**, p. 78.

3.3. Dichotomy of the Self and the Other in *The Possessed*

Dostoevsky's next greatest novel *The Possessed* is another work that describes real events happened in Dostoevsky's time. It is read by many in ideological and poetic connection with *Crime and Punishment*.¹¹¹ The microbes (*trikhiny*) Raskolnikov sees in his dream infect inhabitants of a small town in *The Possessed*. While it is true that Dostoevsky alludes to the West as the source of the disease, he also suggests that its root is in tendency of human nature to accumulate "all the sores, all the foul contagions, all the impurities, all the devils great and small" when it disassociates itself from God.¹¹² In his letter to Maikov Dostoevsky explains that the main question raised in the novel is the existence of God.¹¹³ Thus, together with other types, this part focuses on opposition of the religious self and the non-religious (secular) other in their boundary with the Absolute.¹¹⁴

Before passing to the analysis of the self/other nexus, some words are to be said about the title of the novel. Its original name *Besy* is translated as **demons**, **devils**, or **possessed** and implies someone who "spreads anti-Christian and anti-human ideas, seducing weak people with thoughts of impunity and permissiveness".¹¹⁵ (my trans.) Kuznetsova notices that Dostoevsky, instead of using the Greek derivatives *djaval* or *demon* also used in Russian, prefers the indigenous Russian word *besy*.¹¹⁶ In her opinion Dostoevsky aims by such choice to point at the origin of demonic powers within Russian national culture.

¹¹¹ For more information go to Syromyatnikov, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

¹¹² Dostoevsky, *The Possessed*, Trans. By Constance Garnett, w.place, Global Grey, 2014, p. 678, (Online) www.globalgrey.co.uk, December 14, 2018.

¹¹³ Dostoevsky, *Pisma* 150, p. 456.

¹¹⁴ For more information consult Felde, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

¹¹⁵ Syromyatnikov, *op. cit.*, p. 449.

¹¹⁶ Kuznetsova, *op. cit.*, p. 289.

3.3.1. The European Other vs. the Russian National Self from the Possessed Westernizers' Perspective

The first type to start with is the European other. On the one hand, it is depicted in negative light to stress Europe as a dying civilization.¹¹⁷ On the other hand, the self is juxtaposed with the European other to ridicule the vices of the Russian people such as Russian wildness, lack of education and feeling of inferiority. Stepan Trofimovich, a Westernizer and a liberal, claims, for example, that all blame is on “Russian indolence, our degrading impotence to produce ideas, our revolting parasitism in the rank of nations”.¹¹⁸ Comparing so-called attributes of European industriousness to Russian indolence he concludes that “the Russians ought to be extirpated for the good of humanity, like noxious parasites”.¹¹⁹ In another episode he, on the contrary, hopes that if Russians take an example from Europe, namely from the Germans, and if they begin to work, they will probably learn and have an opinion and engender a nationality.¹²⁰

Another possessed Westernizer Karmazinov supposedly expresses the Western idea in its entirety. This person is driven only by selfishness, vanity and complete lack of faith - the features that distinguish, according to Dostoevsky, a Western man.¹²¹ Moreover, he prefers living in Europe because in his opinion it is “a realm of stone” whereas “Holy Russia is a country of wood, of poverty... and of danger, the country of ambitious beggars in its upper classes, while the immense majority live in poky little huts.”¹²² Karmazinov also claims that because “everything [in Russia] is doomed and awaiting the end. Russia as she is has no future”.¹²³ As a solution Karmazinov suggests immigrating to Europe and “become a German”.¹²⁴ In the image of Karmazinov Dostoevsky embodies a typical

¹¹⁷ Dostoevsky, **The Possessed**, p. 26.

¹¹⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 215.

¹¹⁹ **Ibid.**

¹²⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 28.

¹²¹ Syromyatnikov, **op. cit.**, p. 193.

¹²² **Ibid.**, p. 379.

¹²³ **Ibid.**, p. 380.

¹²⁴ **Ibid.**

Russian European like characters of **The Gambler** who exchange their true national identity for a fake European mask.

3.3.2. Dichotomy of the Religious Self and the Non-Religious Other

If to look at the self/other interaction from a different angle where the self is Russian narod and the other constitutes those who do not believe in existence of God, it turns out that the essence of the self is Orthodoxy, or faith in Russian people as the body of Christ. The character most close to nationalist Slavophiles in **The Possessed**, Shatov claims that the narod can exist only when it finds “its own god, and the faith in Him as the only true one”.¹²⁵ For him, identity of the whole nation is a god, and this god cannot be common to several nationalities, but only the particular one for one nation. He assures that in case a god becomes common, then he will die, and the people themselves will die with him. A people cannot be without religion, which he understands as a specific concept of evil and good for a nation. According to Stavrogin, Shatov fanatically reduces God “to the simple attribute of nationality” with which Shatov does not agree and corrects Stavrogin saying that he raises the people to God and excludes all other gods bereft of reconciliation.¹²⁶ The basic fatality of Shatov, in our opinion, lies in the fact that “by his god” he hopes to “conquer and drive out of the world all other gods” and, as the leader of humanity, resurrect and “save all the rest by its truth”.¹²⁷ He warns that if the narod does not believe in such mission, “it would at once sink into being ethnographical material, and not a great people”.¹²⁸ For him, only Russian narod can be like this and only it can play the leading role, since only it is a God-bearing people. Berdyaev admits that Dostoevsky denounces Shatov and sees in him an idolater for his conviction that the Russian narod is made by god and that this god exists only for the Russian nation.¹²⁹ Despite the fact that Shatov expresses some of Dostoevsky’s beliefs¹³⁰, Shatov’s death implies that such

¹²⁵ **Ibid.**, p. 255.

¹²⁶ **Ibid.**, p. 256.

¹²⁷ **Ibid.**

¹²⁸ **Ibid.**

¹²⁹ Berdyaev, **Russkya Ideya**, p. 245.

¹³⁰ **Ibid.**, p.244.

religious nationalism will not lead any nation to brighter future but only to a fatal end, as in the case of Shatov. Another fault of this character Dostoevsky points at is monologism of his beliefs and ideas. While Stavrogin tries to understand his inner self through dialogical interaction, in Bakhtin's sense, with people different from him, Shatov does not see necessity in dialogue with another consciousness in search of the self. He wrongly thinks that he has found the self.

Coşkun Karataş offers a different perspective on the religious/non-religious nexus we can benefit from. She argues that according to Dostoevsky people alienate from each other mainly because of their alienation from religion, in other words, if a person stops believing in God, he loses connection with other people as well.¹³¹ In this light, as Stavrogin's atheism makes a spiritual monster from him and leads him to committing a suicide, so Shatov's reduction of God "to the simple attribute of nationality" and his chauvinism results in his murder. If both of them truly believed in God, they would not suffer alienation and might have had less fatal life.

To sum up, almost all main characters of **The Possessed** are whether killed or committed suicide like those swine in the epigraph which "ran violently down a steep place into the lake" because the devils entered into them. Stepan Trofimovich before his death realizes that his son Petrusha, his compatriots and he himself at the head of them "shall cast [them]selves down, possessed and raving, from the rocks into the sea, and we shall all be drowned - and a good thing too, for that is all we are fit for. [But] the sick man will be healed and 'will sit at the feet of Jesus', and all will look upon him with astonishment ...".¹³² Notably, the only thing that unites Stepan Trofimovich with the other possessed is atheism. Dostoevsky implies here that they cannot be healed because they do not believe in Jesus, whereas Russian narod, the sick man, will recover from all the sores and impurities because they accept to sit at the feet of Jesus. Thus, through such dichotomy of the religious self personified in the Russian narod and the non-religious

¹³¹ Coşkun Karataş, **op. cit.**, p. 400.

¹³² **Ibid.**, p. 678.

other represented by the Russian intelligentsia, Dostoevsky aimed to depict destructiveness of atheism and the healing power of the Orthodox faith.

3.4. From the Cultured Self/Social Other Nexus to Obshechelovechnost in *The Adolescent*

The Adolescent is the fourth of the five major novels written by Dostoevsky in Russia in 1875. Dostoevsky writes that “disintegration is the principal visible idea of the novel”.¹³³ Initially Dostoevsky planned to name the novel **Disorder** because he wanted “to demonstrate that we have now general disorder, disorder everywhere and wherever you go, in society, in business, in guiding ideas (of which, for that very reason, there aren't any), in convictions (which, for the same reason, we don't have), in the disintegration of the family unit.”¹³⁴ While Russian moral chaos was the main preoccupation in all Dostoevsky's great novels, his goal in this novel was to look into the family unit as the source of the chaos, disorder and degradation of the whole nation. The translator of *The Adolescent* Richard Pevear describes the novel as the next-to-last step in “an ascending movement from ‘underground’ towards the cold, clear light at the end of *The Brothers Karamazov*”.¹³⁵

3.4.1. Versilov as a Representative of the Cultured Self and his Relation to the Social Other

Despite the fact the novel is called after an adolescent Arkady Dolgoruky in a form of a first-person confessional memoir by the title character, the major figure is his biological father Andrey Petrovich Versilov, “a once wealthy aristocrat now down on his luck and a philosophical seeker after truth.”¹³⁶ Scholars in unison describe Versilov as a complex and original figure mainly due to his split personality and duality. For example,

¹³³ Cited in the Translators' Notes to *The Adolescent*, p. 11.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

¹³⁶ Frank, *op. cit.*, p. 708.

in Mochulsky's opinion "everything shifts, wavers, and doubles in his consciousness; ideas are ambiguous, truths - relative, faith - unbelief" in him throughout the novel.¹³⁷ To Seitov, Versilov's bifurcation is the result of his inability to resolve some issues for himself.¹³⁸ Frank thinks that the major thing that tears him apart is his inability to believe in God.¹³⁹ In Pevear's view, this inability must be caused by general disorder in both Russian and European societies.¹⁴⁰ Particularly for the present work the figure of Versilov is interesting because he represents the Westernized Russian intelligentsia which starts to address the narod in their search for new answers about the meaning of life. In other words, his search of the national self goes through encounter between the cultured self and its social other.

Another reason why we focus on Versilov is his being a bearer of the developing idea of **vsechlovechnost** (all-unity, pan-humanity). If Raskolnikov, looking at the Kirgiz steppe, only shows first signs of it, Versilov is the character who on his own experience of serving humanity realizes that the real universal service can start only with unification of intelligentsia, the bearer of knowledge and modern science, and narod, the keeper of true faith and tradition. Even though Nikolay Chirkov calls Versilov "new artistic embodiment of the universal man [chelovek-univers]"¹⁴¹, the idea Dostoevsky bears in mind since his years of the katorga, we prefer to distinguish Versilov with the label he adopts himself as **obshechlovek** (cosmopolitan) rather than **vsechlovek** (universal man) due to his split personality and duality. However, the fact that Versilov is on the right path in his search of truth allows to regard him as Dostoevsky's next-to-last figure who is ascending from complete loss of identity towards **vsechlovechnost** (pan-humanity) and universal brotherhood as the key characteristic of the Russian national identity.

To exemplify how Dostoevsky imagines the Russian nation, it is enough to analyze Versilov's ideas on the cultured self/social other nexus. To start, Versilov as a typical

¹³⁷ Cited in Introduction to Translators' Notes in Dostoevsky, **The Adolescent**, p. 12.

¹³⁸ Seitov, **op. cit.**, p. 93.

¹³⁹ Frank, **op. cit.**, p. 709.

¹⁴⁰ Pevear, Introduction to **The Adolescent**, p. 11.

¹⁴¹ Nikolay Chirkov, **O Stile Dostoyevskogo**, Moscow, Nauka, 1967, p. 213.

aristocrat proud of his noble origin contrasts the upper classes with the narod: “We, that is, the beautiful people, are opposed to the common folk”.¹⁴²

The most basic images of interest to us are presented through Versilov, a representative of an ancient noble family, proud of his belonging to the upper classes. Through the dichotomy **we-they** Versilov characterizes the narod and nobility. One of the key representatives of the narod in the novel is Makar¹⁴³ Dolgorukiy, whose image Versilov uses to construct the image of the Russian commoners:

In general, when they [commoners] don't say anything, it's worst of all, and he [Makar] was a gloomy character, and, I [Versilov] confess, not only did I not trust him, when I summoned him to my study, but I was even terribly afraid: there are characters in that milieu, and terribly many of them, who contain in themselves, so to speak, the incarnation of unrespectability, and that is something one fears more than a beating.¹⁴⁴

However, such stereotypical attitude to a commoner changes in the process of direct interaction with Makar. Versilov admits that it is a fortune for him to realize that he is mistaken and that “this Makar Ivanovich was something quite different”.¹⁴⁵ With the help of this social other Versilov not only rebuilds his vision of the narod but he also sees in Makar’s eyes the reflection of himself and identifies some qualities of the upper classes he has not noticed before. For instance, when he juxtaposes the nobility with the narod, he concludes that

They [narod] somehow know how to do it, and there's something here that we [nobility] don't understand, and generally they know better than we how to manage their own affairs. They can go on living in their own way in situations that are most unnatural for them, and remain completely themselves in situations that are most not their own. We can't do that.¹⁴⁶

By the same token, through Versilov’s insights Dostoevsky highlights that in order to establish the Russian nation strong and united, the upper classes have to turn to the narod because only it possesses

¹⁴² Dostoevsky, **The Adolescent**, p. 100.

¹⁴³ Makar is a vernacular form of the Greek ecclesiastical name Makarios meaning ‘blessed’. Dostoevsky’s choice of the name for this representative of the narod is relevant metaphorically to his idea of the Russian people as God-bearing nation.

¹⁴⁴ **Ibid.**

¹⁴⁵ **Ibid.**, p. 101.

¹⁴⁶ **Ibid.**, p. 99.

great, vital force and historical breadth both morally and politically. And above all - deference, that modest deference, precisely the deference that is necessary for the highest equality, moreover, without which, in my opinion, one cannot attain to superiority. Precisely here, through the lack of the least arrogance, one attains to the highest respectability, and there appears a person who undoubtedly respects himself, and precisely whatever the situation he finds himself in, and whatever his destiny happens to be. This ability to respect oneself in one's own situation - is extremely rare in the world, at least as rare as a true sense of one's own dignity.¹⁴⁷

Furthermore, Versilov preaches that it is essential for the brighter future of the nation to abolish the class division and start to distinguish people according to their deeds of "honor, science, and valor".¹⁴⁸ He believes that "in this way the estate turns by itself into what is merely a gathering of the best people, in the literal and true sense, and not in the former sense of a privileged caste. In this new or, better, renewed form, the estate might hold out."¹⁴⁹ These words of his clearly advocate that anybody with honor and valor can become a member of the realm of the best people. On the other hand, he continues to be proud of his nobility supporting it with an assertion that the high cultural type is taken from the highest cultural stratum of the Russian people.¹⁵⁰ Once more it becomes obvious that Versilov has a split personality and continues searching for the true self.

3.4.2. Construction of Obshechelovek from the Russian National Self/European Other Perspective

The second reference to the self/other nexus in **The Adolescent** is built around the European other. Versilov in his attitude to it is as Janus-faced as he is with the social other. Seitov perceptively states that two worldviews, the European and the Eastern, are struggling in the mind of the protagonist throughout the entire work; Versilov is split between European atheism, individualism and desire for material possessions and Eastern religiosity, high morality, soulfulness and sentimentality.¹⁵¹ Mochulsky interprets it as two loves, one is for anything Western and another for everything that opposes it, i.e.

¹⁴⁷ **Ibid.**, p. 102.

¹⁴⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 160.

¹⁴⁹ **Ibid.**

¹⁵⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 325.

¹⁵¹ Seitov, **op. cit.**, p. 96.

Eastern.¹⁵² To demonstrate how Dostoevsky uses the European other to identify points of its convergence and divergence with the Russian self we will refer to Versilov's monologue his son Arkady listens to in amazement.

On the one hand, worldviews of the Russians like Versilov and Europeans converge upon "the treasures of their [Europeans'] science and art, their whole history".¹⁵³ He feels himself a Russian as much as he is European because Europe is "as precious as Russia; for him, every stone in her is dear and beloved. Europe was just as much our fatherland as Russia"; what is more, "for almost a hundred years, Russia has lived decidedly not for herself, but for Europe alone".¹⁵⁴ On the other hand, he realizes differences between the Russians and Europeans. There was a period when he left Russia, his family and friends to wander in Europe and preach against atheism Europeans proclaimed.¹⁵⁵ He explains to his son that he wept for them because it is impossible for a human being to live without God as the Westerners intended to. It is exactly this yearning for the idea of necessity to believe in God that makes him "a man of a different type" and different from indigenous European culture.¹⁵⁶

Another point of divergence of the Russian type from the Western is linked to Versilov's noble origin. He argues that "the Russian type of nobility has never resembled the European" because it managed to "remain a higher estate as the guardian of honor, light, science, and the higher idea"¹⁵⁷ which Europe, he asserts, has lost when it "proclaimed atheism"¹⁵⁸ and allowed egoism to replace the former binding idea¹⁵⁹. In Versilov's opinion, after losing the higher idea, the Europeans approached its last day in the earthly paradise. In his imagination the higher idea is "in France [to be] a Frenchman, with a German [to be] a German, with an ancient Greek a Greek, and by that very fact [to be] most Russian", in other words, to be "capable of becoming most Russian precisely

¹⁵² Cited in Introduction to Translators' Notes in Dostoevsky, **The Adolescent**, p. 12.

¹⁵³ **Ibid.**

¹⁵⁴ **Ibid.**

¹⁵⁵ **Ibid.**, p. 327.

¹⁵⁶ **Ibid.**

¹⁵⁷ Dostoevsky, **The Adolescent**, p. 160.

¹⁵⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 327.

¹⁵⁹ **Ibid.**, p.160.

only when [being] most European”.¹⁶⁰ He is convinced that this ability is Russians’ “most essential national distinction from all the rest”, an ability that Europeans failed to gain “because they’re still all too German and all too French, and they haven’t finished their work in those roles”.¹⁶¹

On the whole, Dostoevsky uses the image of the social other to indicate that the cultured self cannot survive unless it overcomes the border which separates them. The only way to construct a strong national identity, according to Dostoevsky, is to reunite with *narod* and strive for honor, science, and valor as one national body. Regarding the European other, the writer uses it to introduce **obshechelovechnost** as a peculiar trait of the Russian national character. To explain what he means he refers to the Frenchman, Englishman or the German who agree to serve mankind on condition that each of them remains a Frenchman, Englishman or the German, respectively, whereas the Russian agrees to serve without any condition because only a Russian managed to develop a high cultural type - “the type of universal suffering for all” in addition to a high thought of “the all-reconciliation of ideas”.¹⁶² Pointing at such alteration of the Russian self from the European other, Dostoevsky challenges his readers to reconsider their vision of the Russian self as **obshechelovek** (cosmopolitan), which is only a stage of development of the Russian self before reaching **vsechelovechnost** (pan-humanity) depicted in **The Brothers Karamazov** through Alesha Karamazov.

¹⁶⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 325.

¹⁶¹ **Ibid.**

¹⁶² **Ibid.**

3.5. The Russian National Self as the Bearer of Universal Brotherhood in *The Brothers Karamazov*

“Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit.”

John 12:24¹⁶³

Dostoevsky wrote his last novel *The Brother Karamazov* consisting of twelve books, almost six hundred pages long in a comparatively short period of time. Keeping in mind his parallel work on *The Dairy of a Writer*, he finished the novel in a short period of time. One of the explanations could be a proposition of Georgy Fridlender that “many ideas, characters, episodes of the novel were either prepared by the writer’s previous works, or appeared in his creative imagination long before starting *The Brothers Karamazov*”.¹⁶⁴ (my trans.) Syromyatnikov assumes in this regard that in the novel Dostoevsky’s unrealized ideas of such novels as *Atheism*, *Childhood*, *The Life of a Great Sinner* and thoughts that found expression in his journalism and epistolary merged together.¹⁶⁵ Moreover, such themes as the past, present and future of Western Europe and Russia, which had always been central for Dostoevsky’s oeuvre, found symbolic expression in three generations in *The Brothers Karamazov*.¹⁶⁶ Valentina Vetlovskaya reminds a claim said long before that the theme of the past, present and future of Russia and, through it, of mankind is summarized in the epigraph of the novel.¹⁶⁷ Kasatkina associates a **corn of wheat** mentioned in it with a personality, an **I**, a self, who stays alone or dies spiritually if this **I** puts borders to separate itself from the rest. But when the self merges with the world, as a corn of wheat does with the soil, and stops protecting and defending his individual borders, his life will be more fruitful.¹⁶⁸ The scholar states that

¹⁶³ Cited by Dostoevsky in *The Brothers Karamazov*, Trans. by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, w.place, Vintage Classics, 1992, p. xv.

¹⁶⁴ Georgy Fridlender, *Kommentariy, Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy F. M. Dostoyevskogo v 30 Tomakh*, Vol.15, Leningrad, Nauka, 1976, p. 399.

¹⁶⁵ Syromyatnikov, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

¹⁶⁶ Fridlender, *op. cit.*, p. 452.

¹⁶⁷ Valentina Vetlovskaya, *Roman F. M. Dostoyevskogo “Bratya Karamazovy”*, Pushkinskiy Dom, St. Petersburg, 2007, p. 249.

¹⁶⁸ Tatyana Kasatkina, *Svyashchennoye v Povsednevnom: Dvusostavniy Obraz v Proizvedeniyakh F.M. Dostoyevskogo*, Moscow, Imly Ran, 2015, p. 345.

this is what **The Brothers Karamazov** is about. The title itself implies that a family of the Karamazovs is at the center of discussion. Despite the father's sinfulness, his two elder sons' debauchery and selfishness, and general immorality of other characters connected with the Karamazovs, the brotherly love of the youngest son Alesha unites them all into one organism. Besides, Bakhtin compares the title with a microcosm, because in his view it comprises a multiplicity of tones and styles, each element of which functions via a thoroughgoing dialogization.¹⁶⁹ In addition, the novel is the best example of Bakhtin's polyphony - polyphony of many different voices whose target is to meet at the same destination which is, in Dostoevsky vision, next to Jesus's feet.

Another similar point of view is shared by Seitov who underlines the concept of brotherhood given in the title. The scholar comes to the conclusion relying on Vetlovskaya who states that the category of **brotherhood** plays the key role because everybody in the novel is connected with each other.¹⁷⁰ According to Seitov, the national psychology is reflected in the images of the brothers Karamazov.¹⁷¹ If to keep in mind that for Dostoevsky national is inseparable from universal, the images depicted in the novel can be applied to other nations' psychology. Therefore, **The Brothers Karamazov** can be read as microcosm of not only Russia but the whole mankind as well.

It is known that **The Brothers Karamazov** is the last work of Dostoevsky. Hence characterization of the self/other nexus in this novel becomes his final touch on the topic. To exemplify how Dostoevsky's images of both the self and the other construct national and universal identities, several types of the self/other nexus will be under consideration. In this novel Dostoevsky stresses again that in order to recover from the internal split and achieve national integrity, the initial step must be a dialogical interaction between the cultured self and the social other, who should see in each other nothing but another equal self. When national split is recovered and integrity is achieved, the next step is universal brotherhood which can become real, Dostoevsky argues, if each of us becomes **a corn of wheat, vsechelovek**.

¹⁶⁹ Bakhtin, **Dostoevsky's Polyphonic Novel**, p. 250.

¹⁷⁰ Vetlovskaya, **op. cit.**, p. 138.

¹⁷¹ Seitov, **op. cit.**, p. 103.

3.5.1. The Cultured Self/Social Other Nexus as a Step toward National Integrity

The first self/other nexus to look into in **The Brothers Karamazov** is relationship between the cultured self and its social other. Characters from the upper classes, the cultured self, contribute to tell about the narod, the social other, both from positive and negative sides. For example, Liza's mother, a noble woman, as if trying to convince herself rather than the listener in loving the narod, characterizes it as "our splendid Russian people, so simple in their greatness".¹⁷² On the contrary, Fyodor Pavlovich, the father, is sure that "the Russian peasant, generally speaking, needs thrashing" because they are swindlers, unworthy of pity by the upper classes.¹⁷³ Remarkably, the images of Russia, peasants and their vices are intertwined. Fyodor Pavlovich cannot decide whether he hates Russia or its vices like swinishness and filthiness which he ascribes only to the peasants.¹⁷⁴ However, it is him who is the most perverse and spiritually filthy among all is actually him. It allows to conclude that Fyodor Pavlovich sees himself in opposition to the narod and Russia, which is the other for him because he distances and separates himself from commoners.

Fyodor Pavlovich's illegitimate son¹⁷⁵ Pavel Smerdyakov who sees himself as an educated man distances himself from the narod in the similar way. In his conversation with a lady he rhetorically asks her: "Can a Russian peasant be said to feel, in comparison with an educated man? He can't be said to have feeling at all, in his ignorance. [...] I hate all Russia".¹⁷⁶ In reality Smerdyakov seems to hate everyone and everything that reminds him of his origin: he hates his mother for giving birth to him, he hates his surname, his father, whom he eventually kills, his step-brothers, the servant Grigory who brought him

¹⁷² Dostoevsky, **The Brothers Karamazov**, w.place, Planet PDF, 2004, p. 100, (Online) www.planetpdf.com/, March , 2018.

¹⁷³ **Ibid.**, p. 270.

¹⁷⁴ **Ibid.**

¹⁷⁵ It is not stated clearly that Smerdyakov is Fyodor Pavlovich's son, however, it is implied by the writer throughout the novel.

¹⁷⁶ **Ibid.**, p. 460.

up, poverty of Russia whose people are stupid in his opinion.¹⁷⁷ He distances himself so much that he decides to commit, first, homicide and then suicide, two greatest sins ever. Interestingly, the whole novel is built about Smerdyakov's murder of his master and father Fyodor Pavlovich, another great sinner. Kasatkina clarifies that if the rule of Paradise is when personalities merge with each other to be one organism, the rule of Hell is when a person distances and separates himself from members of the rest of society and looks at them as the insignificant other.¹⁷⁸ For this reason, unless the self and other overcome borders that divide them, they cannot achieve either inner peace or build national integrity. Instead of building an earthly Paradise and living in peace and harmony, they choose living in Hell.

3.5.2. The Religious Self vs. the Non-Religious Other

Another perspective of the self/other nexus is relationship between believers and non-believers from points of view of Father Zossima, a monk who influenced and guided Alyosha throughout the novel. As a former representative of the upper classes, Father Zossima depicts the self/other nexus from a broader perspective; his attitude to people of all classes is less prejudiced and more caring. To him every single person, be that Fyodor Pavlovich or his servant Smerdyakov or anybody living in a faraway country is a bearer of a grain of faith in his heart. The only criteria according to which he contrasts one with another is faith in God. In this case, from Zossima's perspective there is no upper classes or lower, therefore, no cultured self and his social other; there are believers and atheists. He teaches that when believers, i.e. the religious self, meet atheists, the non-religious other, and overcomes it, then everybody will unite into a single Russia.¹⁷⁹

Also, he is convinced that the religious self is hidden in the humbleness of the Russian peasant. Even though he accepts that "the peasants are corrupted and cannot renounce their filthy sin, [...] [they] still believe in righteousness, have faith in God and

¹⁷⁷ **Ibid.**

¹⁷⁸ Kasatkina, "Roman Bratya Karamazovy kak Vyskazyvaniye Vsego", 01:14:00.

¹⁷⁹ **Ibid.**, p. 698.

weep tears of devotion”.¹⁸⁰ In other words, even a corrupted and filthy peasant can be saved as long as he believes in truth and does not reject God unlike an atheist. In addition, Father Zossima, trusting what he has seen himself, characterizes Russian peasants as “not servile, and even after two centuries of serfdom they are free in manner and bearing, yet without insolence, and not revengeful and not envious”.¹⁸¹ If we suppose to apply the same qualities to characterize the Russian Europeans, especially those Russians living abroad Dostoevsky depicts in **The Gambler**, we will see that they are not applicable. For Zossima, in contrast to the narod, the educated and cultured Russians lost their spiritual dignity, and, therefore, are not free, either “in manner or bearing”; they are “revengeful and envious”.¹⁸² As for the vision of the Russian intelligentsia by the narod, the latter respect the former for being “rich and noble, [...] clever and talented” unlike himself but does not find in it a reason to be the alienated other because both are humans; and as long as they have their dignity they are equals. Father Zossima believes that the solution for both sides is brotherhood, amalgamation of the self and other into one single image of Jesus Christ. He insists that the moment “the master and servant” exchange “a loving kiss with softened hearts”, the border will disappear and both will feel “a human bond between themselves”.¹⁸³ And when it happens, the Russian people will be able to “shine forth like a precious diamond to the whole world”.¹⁸⁴

The next example to demonstrate that the criterion of national identity is not the social status of a person but rather traditional faith is Kate’s bow with her forehead to the floor. It is known that one of the Russians’ most traditional ways of greeting someone or express gratitude was a low bow that initially comes from earthly bows when praying to God. In this way, the Orthodox way of worshipping God became the national characteristic of the Russian people. Dmitri Karamazov was amazed when Katya bowed to the ground like a real Russian because he thought that a Europeanized boarding school student like

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 649.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 650.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 653.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 651.

her would never bow in this way.¹⁸⁵ In Dostoevsky's text a Russian is not someone who is Russian by birth, but the one who believes in the Orthodox God and follows traditions.

To finalize the idea that the criterion for determining the self is not nationality of a person or his social status, but rather his faith and moralistic stance is the episode of dispute between Fyodor Pavlovich and his sons about whether a person who has faith as little as a mustard seed can order a mountain to move into the sea and it will move without delay.¹⁸⁶ When all of them, the great sinner Fyodor Petrovich Karamazov, lackey and anathema Smerdyakov, atheist Ivan Karamazov, his younger brother and Father Zossima's novitiate Alyosha Karamazov and their pious and devoted servant Grigory agree on existence of one or two men in the world who can move mountains, the father Fyodor Petrovich concludes that in this idea "you have the Russian all over," and that this is "a purely Russian characteristic" with what both Ivan and Alyosha agree.¹⁸⁷ Dostoevsky here emphasizes the fact that whoever a person is, a peasant or an educated man, lackey Smerdyakov or terribly perverted father, belief even in one entity or a grain of faith in the heart shows that they are Russian, too. Thus, the Russian national self according to Dostoevsky is any person who has more or less faith in God, even little; and it is this faith what helps to stand against the non-religious other. He believed that absence of faith leads people of any ethnicity in the Russian nation to degradation and identity crisis.

3.5.3. Use of the External Other in Search of the National Self

After the social and non-religious others, the European other, as in previous works, occupies an important place in the definition of the self. Very often the self is influenced by the European other and depends on it. For example, Ivan asserts that "all the axioms of the Russian boy and Russian professors are derived from European hypotheses".¹⁸⁸ Ivan's

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 230.

¹⁸⁶ "Because you have so little faith," He answered. "For truly I tell you, if you have faith the size of a mustard seed, you can say to this mountain, 'Move from here to there,' and it will move. Nothing will be impossible for you", **New American Standard Bible**, Matthew 17:20-21, w.date, (Online) <https://www.bible.com/bible/compare/MAT.17.20-21>, March 12, 2019.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 266.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 481.

dream is to go to Europe, even if it is for him “a graveyard, but the most precious”; “precious are the dead that lie there”.¹⁸⁹ He admires their “passionate faith in their work, their truth, their struggle and their science” which he cannot find in Russia.¹⁹⁰ Nevertheless, he also believes that this “first strength of one’s youth” will be inherited by Russians on condition they follow the path of “cultivated and humane Europeans”.¹⁹¹

As a rule, references are made to the Germans, French, and Englishmen, although they are often used in a general sense as **the folks there, they, Europeans, and other peoples**. These images also serve the purpose of understanding the self. Moreover, from different characters, we have several options of the self through the European other. Rakitin understands that he is a foreigner for a “rather courteous than open” Frenchman.¹⁹² Smerdyakov concludes that Russians are a very stupid nation compared to a smart French nation, who could have made “a good thing if they had conquered” Russia and annexed it.¹⁹³ For the English, Russians are a barbarian people in need of education.¹⁹⁴ The Germans characterize “a Russian schoolboy ... with no knowledge and unbounded conceit”.¹⁹⁵ To this characterization Alyosha’s friend Kolya Krasotkin, a boy of young age, reacts in a typically Russian way. On the one hand, he agrees with this “criticism made by a German” saying that he is perfectly right, on the other hand, he wishes that the German had seen the good side too.¹⁹⁶ This Russian boy, in spite of admitting that such conceit should be corrected, still thinks that such trait of character allows “an independent spirit [...], boldness of thought and conviction” to develop “almost from childhood”.¹⁹⁷ Without it, he suggests, one may gain “the spirit of these sausage makers, groveling before authority”, meaning the Germans.¹⁹⁸ Another statement of Kolya Krasotkin that “the Germans must be choked” despite their achievements in sciences complements the

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 472.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 495.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, p. 127.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, p. 460.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1525.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1163.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

negative image of the Germans Dostoevsky draws in other works, but it is a single one here. We claim that the purpose of this image is not to stereotype the Germans but, through it, to convince the Russian Westernizers that negative traits of the Russian self are trivial and correctable.

The last image to mention is America. Though it is not exactly European, it is Western and we will discuss it within the frame of the European other. If in **Crime and Punishment** America is identified with suicide, here - with a hard labor prison which is more hated by Dmitri Karamazov than Siberia. To him, people in America, with exception of Redskins, are not of his soul.¹⁹⁹ He hates them not because they are worse than him, on the contrary, he accepts that “they may be better” and “may be wonderful at machinery” but simply because America is not his own soil and there is no Russian God there.²⁰⁰ In addition, Ivan’s association of Europe with a precious graveyard and Dmitri’s association of America with a wonderfully equipped hard labor prison imply that Dostoevsky refers to negative as well as positive images in order to illustrate that the West is alien for the Russian soul in spite of its advantages.

Proceeding from the speeches of the prosecutor Ippolit Kirillovitch and Dmitri’s lawyer Fedyukovich made at the court, there are two different images of the self constructed through its relations with other nations, supposedly European. The prosecutor associates the Russian people with “a fatal troika which dashes on in her headlong flight perhaps to destruction”²⁰¹; the lawyer - with “the stately chariot of Russia which will move calmly and majestically to its goal”²⁰². The prosecutor disagrees with a great writer (Nikolay Gogol) that “all peoples of the world stand aside respectfully to make way for the recklessly galloping troika to pass”.²⁰³ In his opinion, other nations stand aside rather “from horror, perhaps from disgust” but not from respect.²⁰⁴ He warns that one day, when “their [Europeans’] growing hatred heaps up”, they might “form a firm wall” in attempt

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 1606.

²⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

²⁰¹ *Ibid.*, p. 1520.

²⁰² *Ibid.*, p. 1575.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, p. 1463.

²⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1520.

to confront “the frenzied rush of our lawlessness, for the sake of their own safety, enlightenment and civilization”.²⁰⁵ In short, the prosecutor positions safety of the external other against lawlessness of the Russian self, their enlightenment against Russian darkness, in order to emphasize Russia’s vices and, by doing so, convince the court that such Russians like Dmitri Karamazov lead everyone to destruction and should be stopped. As an alternative to this perspective, the lawyer Fedyukovich draws more positive image of the self by also contrasting it with the external other. For him, “the spirit and the meaning” is a Russian characteristic, whereas “retribution and the letter of the law” defines other nations.²⁰⁶ Unlike the prosecutor he calls for “salvation and the reformation of the lost” as one of the peculiarities of Russian justice.²⁰⁷ Thus, through these two visions of the self constructed in relation to the external other, it is for the jury (and readers) to decide whether Dmitri Karamazov and other Russians like him embody **a frenzied troika** or **a stately chariot**.

Besides, by comparing and contrasting the images of the self and other, Dostoevsky wants to lead us to the conclusion that all people are alike, especially in evil. Smerdyakov asserts that the Russians and “the folks there” (Europeans) are “just alike in their vice” and that the only difference between the two is material possession and their attitude to it.²⁰⁸ While “the scoundrel [in Europe] wears polished boots”, the Russian one “grovels in filth and sees no harm in it”.²⁰⁹ In another episode Ivan Karamazov refers to atrocities of the Turks, French, and Russians which he attributes to many people, regardless of their origin, education or breeding. It does not matter that he introduces a negative image of the external other, he refers to “specimens from home” that are even worse.²¹⁰ He does not compare them to make one better than another, he, having united them into one humanity, analyzes the person and comes to the conclusion that in every man lies a hidden demon - “the demon of rage, [...] lustful heat at the screams of the

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1521.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 1575.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 461.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 490.

tortured victim, [...] lawlessness” feeds not on ethnic, cultural or physical peculiarities of the man but “vice, gout, kidney disease, and so on” peculiar to any human being on earth.

3.5.4. The Orthodox Self vs. the Religious Other

The next type of the other is the religious other. In **The Brothers Karamazov** images of this type of the internal other are fewer than images of the external other but those used are typical for Dostoevsky’s previous works. These are Asians, Tatars, and Turks. However, reference to religion is made in the case of Asians and Tatars, but not Turks. In Smerdyakov’s speech about a soldier who has not agreed to renounce Christianity and convert to Islam and then been tortured for this to death by “the enemies of the Christian race”, “the pagan Mohammedan faith” is opposed to Orthodox Christianity.²¹¹ On account of this incident Smerdyakov tries to convince his listeners that the moment a Christian renounces Christianity he “becomes exactly like a heathen”.²¹² As an example of the heathen he refers to a Tatar whom God should not punish because this “unclean heathen came into the world from heathen parents”.²¹³ It is necessary to ponder on the translation nuances here. In original text the word **poganiy** is used. The word has several meanings such as **filthy**, **unclean**, and **heathen**. We argue that Dostoevsky used the word in its last meaning, i.e. **heathen**, **non-believer** or **infidel**, but not in the meaning of **unclean** and **filthy**, though very often the word **heathen** is associated with someone filthy and unclean rather than non-believer. Yet, filthiness often implies spiritual rather than physical condition of uncleanness. If to analyze the English translation, it can be seen that the Russian word **poganiy** is translated into English in three different ways: **pagan** (pagan Mohammedan faith), **an unclean heathen**, and **heathen** (heathen parents). It is a question why the translator added the adjective **unclean** if the word **heathen** already implies uncleanness, not physical but spiritual. In another context, the English word **heathen** is also used for the Russian word **inoyazychnik**, which means **someone who**

²¹¹ **Ibid.**, p. 267.

²¹² **Ibid.**, p. 263.

²¹³ **Ibid.**, p. 264.

speaks a different language or **yazychnik**, which means **pagan, heathen, and infidel**. Thus, the words **pagan** or **heathen** with emphasis on someone's faith are more suitable in this context. We assume that the word **unclean** in the present context has a typically orientalist color in it and is not appropriate in the English translation. Dostoevsky uses a Tatar as an example of a heathen/pagan not in connection to his ethnicity but to his faith. Moreover, a Russian also becomes a heathen/pagan the moment he stops believing in the Christian Orthodox God. Therefore, if Orthodox Christianity for Dostoevsky is a criterion for establishing the Russian national self, anyone of the non-Orthodox faith is the religious other, whether he is Russian or Tatar, Asian or European.

As for the Turks, they are mentioned only as foreigners in the context of bestial cruelty to many people and are juxtaposed by Ivan Karamazov with Europeans' love of burning heretics and Russians' love of torturing children. However, in another passage, the image of the Turks who "nailed their prisoners by the ears to the fences" is used to contrapose it to the image of the Russian, for whom "nailing ears is unthinkable [... because they are] after all, Europeans".²¹⁴ The lines can be interpreted that nailing ears is too barbaric for civilized people like Russians. At the same time, next to barbarism of the Turks Dostoevsky introduces examples of Frenchmen's absurdity "to cut off a man's head, because he has become our brother", and Russian specialty to get "satisfaction of inflicting pain" on animals and children.²¹⁵ Overall, the negative images of the religious other personified in Tatars, Asians and Turks do not differ from negative images of the European other and the Russian self because Dostoevsky looked into the human behavior and psychology in general.

3.5.5. Four Features of the Cultured Self

Another factor to be weighed in appreciation of the self/other relation for identity construction is several types of the cultured self. Ippolit Kirillovich, the prosecutor states that in the Karamazovs there are "certain fundamental features of the educated class of to-

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 489-490.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 493.

day.”²¹⁶ The cultured self is represented by four brothers whose features are to become constituents of Russian national identity; the brothers’ dialogical interaction among themselves and external and internal others give it the shape as Dostoevsky imagined it. Moreover, Dostoevsky’s discussion of several types of the self and other point at multifacedness of the Russian people and polyphony of this work.

The first feature is represented by the illegible son of Fyodor Pavlovich, Pavel Smerdyakov, who is at the same time, Fyodor Pavlovich’s lackey, a qualified “soup-maker”²¹⁷ and the real murderer. When he compares himself to Dmitri Karamazov he says to Alyosha that “Dmitri Fyodorovitch is lower than any lackey in his behavior, in his mind, and in his poverty [while he] could open a cafe restaurant in Petrovka, in Moscow, for [his] cookery is something special, and there’s no one in Moscow, except the foreigners, whose cookery is anything special”.²¹⁸ Yet, Dostoevsky depicts him as a lackey of weak intellect who looks and behaves like a foreigner, hates Russia and those whom he envied all his life.²¹⁹ Smerdyakov is convinced that Russian nation is a stupid nation and wishes it had been conquered by a smarter one.²²⁰ Alyosha says that the faith Smerdyakov is “not the Russian faith at all”.²²¹ During the last days of his life he is “thrown off his balance by philosophical ideas”²²² of Ivan Karamazov, “one of those modern young men of brilliant education and vigorous intellect, who has lost all faith in everything”²²³. In Ivan Dostoevsky portrays the second feature of the cultured self, a typical Europeanized member of the Russian upper classes we discussed in **The Gambler** and **The Possessed**.

The third feature is given in the youngest son and the main character of the novel Alyosha Karamazov, a devout and modest youth who “clings to the ideas of the people”.²²⁴ The prosecutor warns that such a nature may degenerate either into “gloomy mysticism

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 1464.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 461.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 460.

²²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 266.

²²² *Ibid.*, p. 1488.

²²³ *Ibid.*, p. 1466.

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1468.

[or] blind chauvinism, [...] two elements which are even a greater menace to Russia than the premature decay, due to misunderstanding and gratuitous adoption of European ideas”²²⁵ we see in Ivan. There is a moment when Alyosha almost allows “the gloomy mysticism” to overcome his love for God and make him go astray. It happens when Father Zossima begins to stink two days after his death while many of his lovers and followers including Alyosha have been expecting him to work miracles.²²⁶ When Alyosha sees this he gets disappointed by the fact that his beloved Zossima becomes a laugh stock for his enemies. This disappointment made him suffer and angry so much that even his “face is quite changed [...] There’s none of [his] famous mildness to be seen in it”.²²⁷ Dostoevsky himself admitted that Alyosha could even become a revolutionist, which actually happened to many Russians in 1917. Also, if Ivan represents the intellectual side of the educated self, Alyosha substantiates the spiritual one.

Finally, speaking of the eldest brother Dmitri, the prosecutor sees in him “our mother Russia, the very scent and sound of her [...] because] he is spontaneous, he is a marvelous mingling of good and evil” and he is as broad as Russia itself.²²⁸ Seitov in this regard proposes that many of the features inherent in the Russian people are presented in Dmitri.²²⁹ In his opinion, such features of Dmitri as broadness and spontaneity are inherited from the nomadic Asian nature; heartiness and religiosity are characteristic for genuine Russians. For example, the features of broadness and spontaneity can be seen in the episode when Katya, a noble and educated young lady comes to Dmitri’s place to take promised by him money in order to pay for her father’s debts.²³⁰ The moment he sees her, proud and arrogant, he decides “to play her the nastiest swinish cad’s trick”, instead, he gives her the promised money, “made her a deep bow. A most respectful, a most impressive bow”, and lets her go.²³¹ Ever since that bow Katya is convinced that “the

²²⁵ **Loc. cit**

²²⁶ **Ibid.**, p. 703.

²²⁷ **Ibid.**

²²⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 1469.

²²⁹ Seitov, **op. cit.**, p. 114.

²³⁰ **Ibid.**, p. 229.

²³¹ **Ibid.**, p. 230.

simplehearted Mitya, who even then adored her, was laughing at her and despising her”.²³²

Dmitri’s heartiness and religiosity can be illustrated through his dream he sees while being under arrest for suspicion of murdering his father. In his dream

he was driving somewhere in the steppes, [...]. And as they drove in, there were peasant women drawn up along the road, a lot of women, a whole row, all thin and wan, [...]. And in her arms was a little baby crying. And her breasts seemed so dried up that there was not a drop of milk in them. And the child cried and cried, and held out its little bare arms, with its little fists blue from cold. And he felt that a passion of pity, such as he had never known before, was rising in his heart, that he wanted to cry, that he wanted to do something for them all, so that the babe should weep no more, so that the dark-faced, dried-up mother should not weep, that no one should shed tears again from that moment, and he wanted to do it at once, at once, regardless of all obstacles, with all the recklessness of the Karamazovs.²³³

To sum up, to depict the process of search of the national self through interaction with the other and multifacedness of the Russian people Dostoevsky introduces various features embodied in four brothers Karamazov. The first is absence of love of fatherland, envy and hostile servility of Smerdyakov; the second is intelligence but atheism in Ivan; third is devotion, spirituality and religiosity of Alyosha; and finally broadness and spontaneity of Dmitri. From another perspective, these features are juxtaposed with each other by Dostoevsky again to emphasize broadness and Janus-faced nature of the Russian character, which we regard as one of the key characteristic of the Russian self represented in the novels under consideration. So Ivan’s vigorous intellect and loss of faith is juxtaposed with Alesha’s spirituality and soulfulness; Smerdyakov’s servility and enmity is contrasted with Dmitri’s rampage, passion and patriotism.

3.5.6. Alesha Karamazov as a Symbol of Universal Brotherhood and Vsechelovek

²³² *Ibid.*, p. 1455.

²³³ *Ibid.*, p. 1062.

In the previous subchapter we focused on Janus-nature, multivoicedness and multifacedness of the cultured self which matter for defining the Russian national self. Here, we are to argue that for Dostoevsky these features of the Russian self allow it to become a brother to all and a bearer of universal harmony and peace. For instance, Rakitin states that without this unnatural mixture of genuine nobility with genuine baseness he identifies in all brothers Karamazov the existence of the Russian nature is incomplete.²³⁴ Moreover, this mixture makes Russians so broad that they can “include everything and put up with everything”.²³⁵ In Rakitin’s similar view, to be Russian means to be two extremes and “capable of combining the most incongruous contradictions”: to be Janus-faced. As a result, through images of the brothers Dostoevsky suggests that due to this capability of “the greatest heights and of the greatest depths”²³⁶, the Russian people become so broad/comprehensive that they can accommodate any state the man can experience. The broadness of the Russian people is associated by Kasatkina with a bowl (**chasha**) ready to give other nations infinite space for self-realization, not a dome (**kupol**) over the nations which limits their growth.²³⁷ The image of Alesha Karamazov serves as the best example of the bowl because he opens his heart to everyone and manages to unite everyone around himself. For example, in the case of the schoolboys whom he gathers around himself and unites by a promise not to forget what they have experienced together:

A sudden impulse seemed to come into his soul. With a serious and earnest expression he looked from one to another of the bright, pleasant faces of Ilusha’s schoolfellows, and suddenly said to them:
 ‘Boys, I should like to say one word to you, here at this place.’
 The boys stood round him and at once bent attentive and expectant eyes upon him.
 [...]
 ‘Well, let us go! And now we go hand in hand.’
 ‘And always so, all our lives hand in hand!’²³⁸

Moreover, despite the difference between the brothers, who might also represent mankind in general, they get together around Alesha who is a symbol of universal brotherhood. He

²³⁴ Dostoevsky, **The Brothers Karamazov**, p. 1472.

²³⁵ **Ibid.**, p. 1473.

²³⁶ **Ibid.**, p. 1472.

²³⁷ Kasatkina, **Svyashchennoye v Povsednevnom: Dvusostavniy Obraz v Proizvedeniyakh F.M. Dostoyevskogo**, p. 481.

²³⁸ **Ibid.**, p. 1625.

is unique due to his ability to “accept and acknowledge, excuse and appreciate any dissimilarity” just as the Russian nation can accept any idea of other nations.²³⁹ The most important trait that Dostoevsky ascribes to him is unconditioned love for everybody and everything just as his teacher Father Zossima preaches:

Love a man even in his sin, for that is the semblance of Divine Love and is the highest love on earth. Love all God’s creation, the whole and every grain of sand in it. Love every leaf, every ray of God’s light. Love the animals, love the plants, love everything. If you love everything, you will perceive the divine mystery in things. Once you perceive it, you will begin to comprehend it better every day. And you will come at last to love the whole world with an all-embracing love.²⁴⁰

Despite Dostoevsky’s duality and dilemmas which never left him until his death, the thoughts and ideas he expressed in the novels we discussed in this chapter allow to conclude that the writer imagined the Russian national self as a brother to all men with a heart filled with all-embracing love for all without exception, **vsechelovek**, and the bearer of universal harmony, peace and brotherhood. The epigraph Dostoevsky chose for the novel also summarizes his vision of the national and universal identity: just like a corn of wheat constitutes an ear of wheat, and billions of these ears of wheat grow on the mother earth under the same sun, so should each person, be he the self or the other, believer or non-believer, Orthodox or not constitute a strong nation, based on its authentic tradition and religion²⁴¹, and nations should live in peace and harmony as one organism feeding from the same earth and living under the same sun, and finally, die to bring forth much fruit.

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 479.

²⁴⁰ Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov*, p. 657.

²⁴¹ From a broader perspective atheism is also a faith/belief, even an agnostic relies on a belief. The non-religious people have their own personal faith in various aspects, constituents, experiences in life and in human potential.

CONCLUSION

The historical material addressed in Chapter I has been used to explore Russia's perception of the self and clarify the relationship between the self and the other which is necessary as a framework to apply to the novels under consideration and demonstrate how Dostoevsky uses the other in search for the self. After looking into events taken place within three periods of Russian history starting from the foundation of the Kievan Rus and conversion of the Slavic tribes to Christianity, to the reforms of Peter the Great and national split of the nineteenth century, we have come to several conclusions.

The first time the rulers of the heterogeneous society of the Kievan Rus found it necessary to establish Russianness was growth of the Tatar-Mongols in power and constant threat from the steppe. Accepting the Byzantine version of Christianity Russian nation-builders of that period defined the self in opposition to the Catholic West and Islamic East in whom they mainly recognized infidels and potential oppressors. Having chosen the mission of Moscow as the Third Rome and gaining independence from the Tatar-Mongols, the self was associated with Orthodoxy and constructed against the religious other personified in anyone of the non-Orthodox faith.

The vision of the self dramatically changes when Peter the Great opens the window on Europe. During his reign Russia's relationship with Europe and Asia was reorientalized. With reforms of Westernization and modernization of the newly established Russian Empire by Peter the Great, the Russian people were divided into classes. The upper classes were forced to put on a Western mask and refashioned themselves in the European manner, whereas the lower classes remained where they were before. Such class division led to the split of the nation into the cultured self and the social other. Moreover, with Russia's growth in power and expansion to the East, Russians had a closer intercourse with various peoples of Siberia, the Caucasus, and empires in Asia such as the Ottoman Empire and Persia. The religious other personified in representatives of these nations served to define the Russian self. However, when Russia established itself as another great power and became a threat for the West, Westerners started to associate

Russia with the barbaric East rather than a member of the European family. Russian nation-builders spent the last years of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries in attempt to convince the West that they share the same identity. One of the ways they applied was to establish a border division between the center and periphery to demonstrate how the Russian self differed from its religious other. Another way to prove the West that Russians were as civilized as Europeans went through contrasting the educated upper classes with the barbaric narod which inevitably led to the split of the Russian nation into Us (the upper classes) and Them (the narod), the cultured self and the social other.

Finally, the Napoleonic invasion on Russia, the Crimean war and the Russo-Turkish war in the Balkans became the last drops for Russians to realize that they possessed a unique identity, neither European nor Asian. Nevertheless, before this realization was shared by majority of the Russian intelligentsia, there were two prevailing visions of Russianness by Westernizers and Slavophiles. Their debate over the direction Russia should turn to deteriorated duality of the Russian self deepening the national split. A good deal of ink has been spilled over the question of national identity crisis by the end of the nineteenth century. Despite reaching some consensus between the Westernizers and Slavophiles on difference of the Russian character from the European, the two imagined the future for Russia in opposite directions: Westernizers believed that it was essential for Russia to eradicate whatever Asian and Eastern left in its body and build a socialistic state according to European standards; the Slavophiles argued that Russia needed to rebuild what was destroyed by Westernization reforms of Peter the Great and search for the Russian self in the East. While the first took European achievements in education and science as the goal Russians should strive for and referred to the religious other like Asians, the Ottomans and other Eastern nations to oppose the Russian cultured self, the Slavophiles, on the contrary, saw in Europe the dominant other and believed that Russians have more in common with the religious other rather than with the European. As a result, closer to the end of the nineteenth century both Westernizers and Slavophiles found a cause to reunite over the idea of Russia as a provider of universal brotherhood. There was

a moment when a big part of Russian society got inspired by the thought that no other nation but Russia with its Janus-faced nature and broadness was capable of incorporating with the other, be it external or internal, peacefully, absorbing its culture and transforming into the Russian national self. The person who expressed this idea in the most powerful way at his historical Pushkin speech was Fyodor Dostoevsky.

Chapter II covers Dostoevsky's life and oeuvre. The writer dies at the age of sixty as a famous publicist and novelist. The future of Russia after his death did not happen as Dostoevsky dreamed but as he warned. He predicted most of the calamities of the twentieth century and his ideas continue to appeal to modern mankind. His gift to understand the human soul together with experiences he gained throughout his difficult life allowed him to create masterpieces that appeal to various people of all generations. It seems he knows that the human heart is full of goodness as well as evil. He also knows that we can multiply goodness and eradicate evil in our hearts with the help of another person. Due to his enormous power of imagination he managed to create numerous voices and consciousnesses to present his readers a rainbow of images in order to choose the one that can help to us resolve our inner struggles and imagine other people's worldview. One of his main tactics was dialogical interaction with another consciousness and multivoicedness (polyphony) needed to understand the self. Bakhtin particularly diagnosed that quality of his authorship. Dostoevsky applied it not only to his characters but he practiced it in his relation with other people. The first crucial moment in his life was when he met the other in the Siberian *katorga*. Despite the border between him, a representative of the educated upper class, and other convicts from the *narod*, his ability to see a human in the other, no matter how bad or how different he is, allowed him to solve the mystery of the human personality. Moreover, meeting the social and religious others in the *katorga* gave him an opportunity to realize that while Russian *narod* managed to preserve their national authenticity, the gentry, wearing the European mask for a century, lost its national identity. Eight years in Siberia allowed him not only to become a psychologist but a national activist who propagated unification of the upper classes with

the narod in order to recover from social split, religious schism and stop the spread of nihilism and liberalism until his last days.

If Siberia provided Dostoevsky with experience of meeting the internal other, his trips to Europe and four-year forced stay there made it possible to meet the external other, which became another key image in constructing the national self. The writer used the European other mainly to address the Westernizers who idealized Europe and compared the Western endeavor for freedom and love for education and science to barbarism and darkness of the Russian narod. To point at the wrongness of such view of the West Dostoevsky frequently depicted America as a prison and Europe as a dying civilization infected with atheism and materialism in relation to young and pure, and ready to suffer for the other's well-being, God-bearing Russian people. Yet, despite Dostoevsky's frequent attacks on the Europeans for their individualism and selfishness, he adored Europe in which he saw the second fatherland and dreamed of Russia's spiritual unification and sincere friendship with Europe. With regard to Europe's superior attitude to Russia as an uncivilized and uncultured nation of slaves, Dostoevsky suggested turning to Asia to show that Russia could be a master too. He also argued that Russians are not only Europeans but Asians as well. He saw in this Janus-faced nature of Russia, and in its duality not a split of national self but ability of the Russian people to embrace the other not as an object but another subject, another self.

Another external other he used in the search of the self is the Ottoman Turk. Unlike the internal and the European others, he never actually met the Ottomans; all he learnt about them and Islam was from European and Russian sources. They were imagined by Dostoevsky as the common other similar to the Tatar-Mongols who threatened the integrity of the state and well-being of Orthodox Christians. The image of the Turkish other, negative as a rule, was also used by Dostoevsky to encourage the Russian crusade in the Balkans and create the image of the Russian savior of the Slavic brethren from Ottoman oppression

By the end of his life, he seems have defined what the Russian national self should be like - it should be like Pushkin who could reincarnate in himself an alien nationality,

could comprehend the soul of different peoples, acknowledge and reconcile differences, eliminate contradictions without any racial discrimination and unite them all in brotherly love. No matter how utopian this may sound, it was his vision of the Russian national self, and not only Russian. Once, when he was only eighteen years old he wrote in his letter to his brother that “Man is a mystery: if you spend your entire life trying to puzzle it out, then do not say that you have wasted your time. I occupy myself with this mystery because I want to be a man”.¹ All his life was spent in attempt to solve the mystery of the human heart. Now, when we read his works we see that he did not waste a day in it. In this sense Dostoevsky seems to have succeeded in becoming a man because through his writing he teaches mankind that our ultimate goal is to love one another and see a brother in each other.

In Chapter III, through the analysis of Dostoevsky’s use of the self/other nexus in search of national identity on explicit examples from his six novels, we have come to the following conclusions. Firstly, depicted in **The House of the Dead** convicts of various origins, religion and culture symbolize a microscopic model of the Russian nation. Through the image of Goryanchikov during his life in katorga Dostoevsky demonstrates that for national identity to be constructed a person must first build his self-awareness which is possible only in dialogical interaction between the self and the other. For this a person must be able to see in other people who are socially, politically, ideologically or religiously different from him, not an inferior other but another equal self; he must wish to learn from them and share his knowledge, respect them for what they are, and be capable of embracing the human species in spite of their sins and evil thoughts. Although the novel was written in the first half of Dostoevsky’s life, Goryanchikov can be considered as the prototype of Dostoevsky’s **vsechelovek** and universal brotherhood he would gradually develop until he creates Alyosha Karamazov in his last novel.

But before **The Brothers Karamazov**, we discussed his earlier novels such as **The Gambler** and **Crime and Punishment**. Though Dostoevsky introduces the social and

¹ Dostoevsky, Pisma 10, Received by Mikhail Dostoevsky, Petersburg, August 15, 1839, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, p. 21, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/354.htm, January 21, 2018.

religious types of the other in relation with whom two alienated Russian Europeans, Alexey Ivanovitch and Raskolnikov come to their self-awareness, the main focus is made on the external other, particularly the European one. The writer refers to the Russian self/European other dichotomy to draw readers' attention to the essential difference between the two. Concerning the example of Raskolnikov's spiritual crisis caused by atheistic ideologies copied from the West and based on individualism and materialism, the writer suggests that the Russian soul cannot survive without serving other people for the sake of God and loving humanity like Jesus Christ did.

In the next novel **The Possessed** we focused on the European other vs. the Russian national self from the perspective of the possessed Westernizers and dichotomy of the religious self and the non-religious type of the other in order to analyze Dostoevsky's vision of the Russian self. The biblical story of a possessed man who gets healed by Jesus given as an epigraph to the novel summarizes how Dostoevsky looked at the national crisis of the nineteenth century and what would follow. While he associates the Russian narod with the sick man who can recover only by means of faith in God, he also identifies liberalism of Stepan Trofimovich, chauvinism of Shatov, atheism of Stavrogin and some more **-isms** of other characters with demons who entered the body of the Russian nation and made it possessed by these ideologies. Among other messages of the novel, the most essential in our opinion is Dostoevsky's idea of the Russian nation as the God-bearing people.

Examples taken from **The Adolescent** served to examine Dostoevsky's another key concept he used to define the national self - **obshechelovek**, the closest English equivalent of which is **cosmopolitan**. Through thoughts of the main character Versilov on the social other Dostoevsky demonstrates that in order to become a better person and build a healthy nation, first of all, the upper classes of Russia have to reunite with the narod and strive for honor, science, and valor as one national body. Secondly, using the European other and contrasting it to the Russian self, Dostoevsky introduces Versilov as a representative of the Russian high cultural type who is different from Europeans by his ability of universal suffering for all and all-reconciliation of ideas. These two

characteristics become the major ones of **obshechelovek**. However, Versilov is not yet the type of the Russian self Dostoevsky dreamt of due to his religious weakness and therefore - duality. It is Alyosha Karamazov, the youngest brother in the Karamazov family, who manages to reunite with his brothers in spite of all tragedies.

The last important novel of Dostoevsky for this research is **The Brothers Karamazov**. If **The House of the Dead** is considered as a prelude to Dostoevsky's vision of the Russian national self, so **The Brothers Karamazov** is his final and the most effective word. Each brother in the Karamazov family symbolizes a type of the Russians, each of whom struggles with various problems. Smerdyakov hates everything Russian and is bitter about being an illegitimate child. In Dmitri broadness, debauchery and spontaneity together with heartiness and religiosity are prevalent. Belief in lawfulness of egoism, disbelief in God and immorality of Ivan are problematic. Nevertheless, Alyosha's sincere faith in God and all-embracing love for his brothers and all people around him give hope to those who are desperate. Alyosha embodies Dostoevsky's vision of the Russian national self which is **vsechelovek** who is not only capable of universal suffering for all and all-reconciliation of ideas but also is a true Christian signed with the image of God, proud of his nationality and looks at the other, both internal and external, with brotherly love.

The most important conclusion our analysis of the self /other perspective leads to is that the other for Dostoevsky is never an alien, a separated and distanced personality but an extension of the self, another self. He uses various images of the self and other to offer readers his view of a person's journey in search of himself through interaction with another because, as Bakhtin says, "the most important acts constituting self-consciousness are determined by a relationship toward another consciousness (toward a *tbou*). Separation, dissociation, and enclosure within the self as the main reason for the loss of one's self."² Based on autobiographical events Dostoevsky's first novel after katorga **The House of the Dead** offers us Dostoevsky's vision of the Russian self which he constructed out of his own experience. The novels that followed it combine the writer's thoughts and

² Bakhtin, **Dostoevsky's Polyphonic Novel**, p. 287.

experience he gained before and after the katorga. Alexey Ivanovich, Raskolnikov, Stavrogin, Shatov, Stepan Trofimovich Verhovensky, Versilov, Ivan and Dmitri Karamazov etc. are the images he took from real life to demonstrate the act of constituting self-consciousness of members of the contemporary Russian society in their state of separation, dissociation, and enclosure within the self which causes identity loss. On the other hand, the writer also stresses that it can happen to any human and assures that the way out is hidden in another consciousness in relation toward which the self is determined.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andreeva, Elena: **Russia and Iran in The Great Game: Travelogues and Orientalism**, Oxon, Routledge, 2007.
- Alekseyev, Pavel V: “Musulmanskij Vostok v Poetike F.M. Dostoyevskogo”, **Vestnik Omskogo Universiteta**, No.4, 2013, pp. 298-301.
- Antipov, Georgiy, et al: **Tekst Kak Yavleniye Kultury**, Novosibirsk, Nauka, 1989.
- Auezov, M. O: “F. M. Dostoevskii i Chokan Valikhanov,” **Druzhba Narodov** 3, w.place, 1956.
- Augustyn, Adam et al., Ed. by: “Lycurgus”, **Encyclopaedia Britannica**, w.date, (Online) <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Lycurgus-Spartan-lawgiver>, July 4, 2018.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail: **Problemy Poetiki Dostoevskogo**, Kiev, Next, 1994.
- : **Dostoevsky's Polyphonic Novel**, Ed. and Trans. by Caryl Emerson, *Theory and History of Literature*, Vol.8, University of Minnesota Press, London, 1984.
- : “Avtor i Geroy v Esteticheskoy Deyatel'nosti”, **Estetika Slovesnosnogo Tvorchestva**, Moscow, Iskustvo, 1979.
- : **The Dialogic Imagination**, Ed. by Fichael Holquist, Trans.by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, Austin and London, University of Texas Press, 1981.
- : **Speech Genres and Other Late Essays**, Trans.by Vern W. McGee, Texas, University of Texas Press, 1986.
- Bakulina, Svetlana: **Tolerantnost: ot Istorii Ponyatiya k Sovremennym Sotsiokulturnym Smyslam**, Omsk, Omsk State Pedagogical University, 2010.
- Bartold, Vasiliy V: **Sochinenia, Raboty po Istorii Vostokovedeniya**, Vol.9, Moscow, Nauka, 1977.

- : “Istoriya Izucheniya Vostoka v Yevrope i Rossii”, **Lectures**, Vol.8, 2nd ed., Leningrad, Leningrad Institute of Study of Living Eastern Languages, 1925.
- Baskakov, Nikolay: **Russkie Familiyi Turuskogo Proiskhozhdeniia**, Moscow, Nauka, 1979.
- Bassin, Mark. **Imperial Visions. Nationalist Imagination and Geographical Expansion in The Russian Far East, 1840–1865**, UK, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Batunsky, Mark. **Rossiia i Islam**, Vol.2, Moscow, Progress-Traditsiya, w.date.
- : “Islam and Russian Mediaeval Culture”, **Die Welt Des Islams**, Vol.26, No.1/4, 1986, pp. 1–27.
- Belington, James H: **Russia in Search of Itself**, Washington, DC., Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2004.
- Belinskii, V. G: **Polnoe Sobraniye Sochineniy**, Moscow, Akademiya Nauk USSR, Vol.5, 1954.
- Belov, Sergey: **Vokrug Dostoyevskogo: Statyi, Nakhodki i Vstrechi Za Tridtsat Pyat Let**, St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg University, 2001.
- Berdyayev, Nikolay: **Russkaya Ideya**, St.-Peterburg, Izdatelskiy Dom, Azbuka-Kkassika, 2008.
- : **Mirosozertsanie Doctoevckogo**, Pgaha,Ymca-Press, 1923, (Online) www.vehi.net/berdyayev/dostoevsky/index.html, August 12, 2018.
- Bhabha, Homi: **The Other Question In Literature**, London, Methuen, Politics and Theory, 1986.
- : **The Location of Culture**, London, Routledge, 1994.
- Blinova, Olesya: “Personalnaya Identichnost v Kontekste Otnosheniya ‘YA-Drugoy’”, PhD dissertation, Chelyabinsk, University of Chelyabinsk, 2009.

- Cadoux, Theodore John: “Solon”, **Encyclopaedia Britannica**, w.date, (Online) <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Lycurgus-Spartan-lawgiver>, July 4, 2018.
- Cassirer, Ernst: “Filosofiya Simvolicheskikh Form”, **Mifologicheskoye Myshleniye**, Vol.2, Moscow, 2001.
- Chaadayev, Peter: **Letter Seven**, Necropolis, February 16, 1829, (Online) www.librebook.me/filosoficheskie_pisma__sbornik/vol2/7, June 3, 2018.
- Chirkov, Nikolay: **O Stile Dostoyevskogo**, Moscow, Nauka, 1967.
- Coşkun Karataş, Nazan: “Rus Düşüncesi Bağlamında F. M. Dostoyevski’de Yabancılaşma Olgusu”, PhD dissertation, Istanbul, Istanbul University, 2018.
- Crews, Robert D. **For Prophet and Tsar: Islam and Empire in Russia and Central Asia**, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Dal, Vladimir: “Inoy”, **Tolkoviy Slovar Zhivogo Velikorussskogo Yazyka**, Vol.1, pp. x-y, (Online) <http://www.slovorod.ru/dic-dal/dal-ik>, November 14, 2018.
- : “Chuzhoy”, **Slovorod.ru, Tolkoviy Slovar Zhivogo Velikorussskogo Yazyka**, Vol.1, pp. x-y, (Online) <http://www.slovorod.ru/dic-dal/>, November 14, 2018.
- Dickinson, Sara: “Russia’s First “Orient”: Characterizing the Crimea in 1787”, **Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History**, Vol.3, No.1 (2002), pp. 3-25. Slavica Publisher. DOI: 10.1353/kri.2002.0005.
- Dobrolyubov, Nikolay A: “Perviy Godi Ysarstvovaniya Petra Velikogo”, **Sobraniye sochineniy**, Vol.2, St. Petersburg, 1862.
- Dolinin, A. S: “Istoriya Sozdaniya Romana Podrostok”, v **Tvorcheskoy Laboratorii Dostoevskogo**, Leningrad, Sovetskiy Pisatel, 1947.
- Dostoevsky, Fyodor: **The House of the Dead and Poor Folk**, Trans. by Constance Garnett, New York, Barnes & Noble Classics, 2004.

- : **The Gambler**, Trans. by Jessie Coulson, Penguin Group, England, 1966.
- : **Crime and Punishment**, Trans. by Constance Garnett, w.place, Planet PDF. www.planetpdf.com, September 2, 2018.
- : **The Possessed**, Trans. By Constance Garnett, w.place, Global Grey, 2014. www.globalgrey.co.uk, December 14, 2018.
- : **The Adolescent**, Trans. by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, w.place, Vintage, w.date.
- : **The Brothers Karamazov**, w.place, Planet PDF, 2004, (Online) www.planetpdf.com, January 20, 2016.
- : **The Brothers Karamazov**, Trans. by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, w.place, Vintage Classics, 1992.
- : **Dnevnik Pisatela**, Moscow, Knizhniy Klub 36.6, 2011.
- : **The Diary of a Writer**, Trans. by Boris Brasol, New York, George Braziller, 1919.
- : “Zimniye Zametki o Letnikh Vpechatleniyakh”, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Leningrad, Nauka, 1989, Vol.4, pp. 388-451, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol4/23.htm, December 1, 2018.
- : “Na Yevropeyskiye Sobytiya v 1854 Godu”, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.10, pp. 349-341, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol10/02annex/03poetry/01poetry/65.htm, December 19, 2018.
- : “Obyavleniye o Podpiske na Zhurnal ‘Vremya’ na 1861 God”, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Leningrad, Nauka, 1993, Vol.11, pp. 5-11, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/tocvol11.htm, December 1, 2018.
- : “Dva Lagerya Teoretikov”, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.11, St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1993, pp. 219-240.

- : Pisma 10, Received by Mikhail Dostoevsky, Petersburg, August 15, 1839. **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.15, St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1993, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/354.htm, January 21, 2018.
- : Pisma 37, Received by Mikhail Dostoevsky, Petropavlovskaya krepost, December 22, 1849, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.15, Petersburg, Nauka, 1996, (Online) <https://rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/381.htm>, January 3, 2019.
- : Pisma 38, Received by Mikhail Dostoevsky, Omsk, January 30 - Feb. 22, 1854. **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.15, St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1993, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/382.htm, January 21, 2019.
- : Pisma 39, Received by N. D. Fonvizina, Omsk, February 20, 1854, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.15, St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1993, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/383.htm, January 30, 2018.
- : Pisma 46, Received by A. N. Maikov, Semipalatinsk, January 18, 1856, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.15, St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1993, (Online) <https://rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/390.htm>, January 1, 2018.
- : Pisma 54, Received by Chokhan Valikhanov, Semipalatinsk, December 14, 1856, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.15, St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1993, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/398.htm, January 29, 2019.
- : Pisma 76, Received by I. S. Turgenev, Peterburg, June 17-19, 1863. **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.15, St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1993, (Online)

www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/420.htm, January 29, 2019.

-----: Pisma 78, Received by N. N. Strakhov, Rome, September 18(30), 1863. **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.15, St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1993, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/422.htm, January 29, 2018.

-----: Pisma 91, Received by A. Ye. Wrangel, Petersburg, March 31 – April 14, 1865, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.15, St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1993, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/435.htm, November 29, 2018.

-----: Pisma 98, Received by M. N. Katkov, Wiesbaden, September 10-15, 1865. **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.15, St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1993, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/442.htm, November 29, 2018.

-----: Pisma 130, Received by A. N. Maikov, Veve, June 22, 1868, **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.15, St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1993, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/474.htm, November 19, 2018.

-----: Pisma 150, Received by A. N. Maikov, Dresden, October 9 (21), 1870. **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.15, St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1993, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/494.htm, October 19, 2018.

-----: Pisma 221, Received by Ye. F. Yunge, Peterburgh, April 11, 1880. **Sobraniye Sochineniy v 15 Tomah**, Vol.15, St. Petersburg, Nauka, 1993, (Online) www.rvb.ru/dostoevski/01text/vol15/01text/565.htm, January 21, 2019.

- Duffy, Helena: “The East as a Career: Russia, The Occident And The Orient In Andreï Makine’s Once Upon The River Love”, **Orientalism / Occidentalism: Languages Of Cultures Vs. Languages Of Description**, Ed. by Steiner, Moscow, Sovpadeniye, 2012.
- Engels, Frederick: “The Turkish Question”, w.date, (Online) www.marxengels.public-archive.net/en/ME0719en.html, August 10, 2017.
- Etkind, Aleksandr: **Vnutrennaya Kolonizatsiya. Imperskiy Opyt Rossiya**, Trans. by V. Makarov, Moscow, Novoye Literaturnoye Obozreniye, 2013.
- Frank, Joseph: **Dostoevsky: A Writer in His Time**, Ed. by M. Petrusiewicz, New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Felde, Viktoriya: “Oppozitsiya ‘Svoy – Chuzhoy’ V Kulture”, PhD Dissertation, Omsk, 2015.
- Fridlender, Georgiy: Kommentariy, **Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy F. M. Dostoyevskogo v 30 Tomakh**, Vol.15, Leningrad, Nauka, 1976.
- Fanon, Frantz: **Black Skin, White Masks**, Trans. by Charles Lam Markmann, United Kingdom, Pluto Press, 1986.
- Gadzhiev, K: “Razmyshleniya o Politicheskoy Kharaktere Sovremennoy Rossii”, **MEiMO**, No.2, Moscow, 1996.
- Galtseva, Rinata, Irina Rodnyanskaya: “O Lichnosti Dostoyevskogo”, **K Portretam Russkikh Misliteley**, Moscow, Petroglif, 2012.
- Gibian, George: “The Quest for Russian National Identity in Soviet Culture Today”, **The Search for Self-Definition in Russian Literature**, Ed. by Ewa M. Thompson, Vol.27, Houston, John Benjamins Publishing Company Amsterdam, 1991.
- Godechot, Jacques: “Napoleon I”, **Encyclopaedia Britannica**, w.date, (Online) <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Lycurgus-Spartan-lawgiver>, July 4, 2018.

- Gorshkov, Aleksey S: “Inakovost” i Genderniye Variatsii Mnozhestvennoy Identichnosti, **Identichnost Kak Predmet Politicheskogo Analiza: Sb. St. Po Itogam Vseros. Nauch.-Teor. Konf.**, Moscow, Imemo Ran, 2011.
- Gritsanov, Alexandr: “Drugoy”, **Noveyshiyy Filosofskiy Slovar**, Minsk, V. M. Skakun, 1998.
- Grossman, P: **Zhizn i Trudy: F. M. Dostoevskiy**, Moscow, 1935.
- Halperin, Charles J: **The Tatar Yoke: The Image of the Mongols in Medieval Russia**, Bloomington, Indiana University, 2009.
- Hall, Stuart: **Questions of Cultural Identity**, Ed. by S Hall and P. Du Gay, London, Sage Publications, 1996.
- : **Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices**, London, Sage / Open University, 1997.
- : “The Spectacle of the Other”, **Representation: Cultural Representations And Signifying Practices**, Ed. by Stuart Hall, London, Sage Publications, 1997.
- Hegel, G. W. F: **Phenomenology of Spirit**, New York, Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Hope, John P., “Manifestations of Russian Literary Orientalism”, PhD Dissertation, The University of Michigan, US, 2003.
- Ilyin, Ilya: “Chto Sulit Miru Raschleneniye Rossii”, **Iz Istorii Russkoy Gumanisticheskoy Mysli**, Moscow, Prosvesheniye, 1999.
- Irvine, Martin: **A Student’s Guide**, Georgetown University, w.date, (Online) www.faculty.georgetown.edu/irvinem/theory/Bakhtin-MainTheory, December 10, 2019.
- Kandemir, Hüseyin. “Dostoyevski Düşüncesinde Türk-İslam Olgusu Ve Osmanlı Rus Savaşı Çerçevesinde Doğu Sorunu”, **Avrasya Uluslararası Araştırmalar Dergisi**, Vol.4, No.8, January, 2016.

- Karamzin, Nikolay M: **Istoriya Gosudarstva Rossiyskogo**, Vol.5, Ch.3, w.page, (Online) www.azbyka.ru/otechnik/Nikolaj_Karamzin/istorija-gosudarstva-rossijskogo/, May 1, 2018.
- Kasatkina, Tatyana: **Svyashchennoye v Povsednevnom: Dvusostavniy Obraz v Proizvedeniyakh F.M. Dostoyevskogo**, Moscow, Imly Ran, 2015.
- : “Roman Bratya Karamazovy kak Vyskazyvaniye Vsego”, **YouTube**, uploaded by Zhivoye Obsheniye, May 4, 2018, (Online) www.youtube.com/watch?v=s-xd6rHqPuY&t=4452s, May 1, 2018.
- Khalidi, Tarif: “Jesus through Muslim Eyes”, September 3, 2009, (Online) www.bbc.co.uk, July 11, 2019.
- Kirichek, Yuliya A: “Diskurs “Drugogo”: ot Filosofskikh Traditsiy k Teorii Identichnosti”, **Nauchniy Yezhegodnik Instituta Filosofii i Prava Uralskogo Otdeleniya Rossiyskoy Akademii Nauk**, Vol.13, No.4, 2013, pp. 42-53.
- Kleespies, Ingrid: “Caught at the Border: Travel, Nomadism, and Russian National Identity in Karamzin’s ‘Letters of a Russian Traveler and Dostoevsky’s ‘Winter Notes on Summer Impressions’”, **The Slavic and East European Journal**, Vol.50, No.2, 2006, pp. 231–251, (Online) www.jstor.org/stable/20459249, March 19, 2017.
- Knight, Nathaniel: “Grigor’ev in Orenburg, 1851-1862: Russian Orientalism in the Service of Empire?”, **Slavic Review**, Vol.59, No.1, 2000, pp. 77-100.
- Konev, Aleksey: “Inorodtsy” Rossiyskoy Imperii: K Istorii Vozniknoveniya Ponyatiya, **Istoricheskiye Nauki: Teoriya i Praktika Obshchetvennogo Razvitiya**, 2014, No.13, pp. 117-120.
- Kopelev Lev Z: “Chuzhiye”, **Chelovek v Istorii**, Moscow, Odissey, 1994.

- Kovalev, Oleg: “Problema Drugogo v Tvorchestve F.M. Dostoyevskogo: Narratologicheskii Aspekt”, **Izvestiya Altayskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta**, No.2, 2012.
- Kuznetsova, Irina: “The Possessed: The Demonic and Demonized East and West in Thomas Mann’s Der Zauberberg and Dostoevsky’s Demons”, **The German Quarterly**, American Association of Teachers of German, University of Virginia, Summer, 2012, pp. 275-284.
- Layton, Susan: **Russian Literature and Empire: The Conquest of the Caucasus from Pushkin to Tolstoy**, Cambridge and New York, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Leontyev, Konstantin N: **Zapiski Otshelnika**, Moscow, Direkt-Media, 2014.
- Lesevitskiy, Aleksey V: “Yevraziyskiye Sententsii v “Dnevnikhe Pisatelya” F. M. Dostoyevskogo” **Kulturologiya i Iskusstvovedeniye Voprosy Teorii i Praktiki**, Tambov, Gramota, 2015, No.5 (55), pp. 107-110.
- Levinas, Emmanuel: **The Levinas Reader**, Ed. by Sean Hand, Oxford, Blackwell, 1989.
- Lysenko, Victoria: “Poznaniye Chuzhogo Kak Sposob Samopoznaniya: Zapad, India, Rossiya”, **Voprosy Filosofii**, Moscow, No.11, November, 2009, pp. 61-77.
- Lotman, Yuriy: **Statyi po Semiotike i Topologii Kultury**, Vol.1, Tallin, Aleksandra, 1992.
- Makhlin, V. L: **Bakhtinskiy Sbornik**, Ed. by Yaziki Slovanskoy Kulturi, Vol.5, Moscow, 2004.
- Maksimova, S. G., et al: “Obraz ‘Drugogo’ Kak Strukturniy Komponent Natsionalnoy Identichnosti: Konstruktivistskaya Paradigma”, **Filosofiya, Sotsiologiya i Kulturologiya**, Barnaul, Altai State University, w.date, pp. 242-252. DOI: 10.14258/izvasu (2014) 2.2-48.

- Marshall, Alex: **The Russian General Staff and Asia, 1860-1917**, Routledge, Oxon, 2006.
- Matthew: “Because you have so little faith,” He answered. “For truly I tell you, if you have faith the size of a mustard seed, you can say to this mountain, ‘Move from here to there,’ and it will move. Nothing will be impossible for you”, **New American Standard Bible**, Matthew 17:20-21, w.date, (Online) <https://www.bible.com/bible/compare/MAT.17.20-21>, March 12, 2019.
- Monas, Sidney: “Self’ and ‘Other’ in Russian Literature”, **The Search for Self-Definition in Russian Literature**, Ed. by Ewa M. Thompson, Vol.27, Houston, John Benjamins Publishing Company Amsterdam, 1991.
- Neumann, Iver: **Uses of The Other: “The East” in European Identity Formation**, University Of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 1999.
- Olçay, Türkan: **Rus Edebiyatında Doğalcı Okul**, İstanbul, İ.Ü Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 2003.
- Ostrowski, Donald: **Muscovy and the Mongols. Cross-cultural Influences on the Steppe Frontier, 1304-1589**, UK, Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Otroshenko, Vladislav: **Taynaya Istoriya Tvoreniy: Kniga Esse-novell**, Moscow, Kulturnaya Revolyutsiya, 2005.
- Paksoy, H. B: **Alpamysh: Central Asian Identity Under Russian Rule**, w.place, Association for the Advancement of Central Asian Research, 1989.
- Repina, Lorina P: “Natsionalniy Kharakter i Obraz Drugogo”, **Dialog So Vremenem**, No.39, 2012, pp. 9-19.
- Romanova, Anna, et al: **Chuzhoy i Kulturnaya Bezopasnost**, Moscow, Rosspen, 2013.
- Patea, Viorica: “T. S. Eliot, Dante and the Poetics of a ‘Unified Sensibility’”, **T. S. Eliot, Dante and the Idea of Europe**, Ed. by Paul Douglass, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011.

- Perlina, Nina: “Vico’s Concept of Knowledge as an Underpinning of Dostoevsky’s Aesthetic Historicism”, **The Slavic and East European Journal**, Vol.45, No.2, 2001, pp. 323-342, (Online) www.jstor.org/stable/3086332, March 19, 2017.
- Porshnev, Boris F: **Sotsialnaya Psikhologiya i Istoriya**, Moscow, 1979.
- Proskuryakova, N.A: **Bolshaya Rossiyskaya Entsiklopediya**, w.date (Online) www.bigenc.ru/domestic_history/text/3249696, November 14, 2018.
- Rosenshield, Gary: “Religious Portraiture in Dostoevsky’s ‘Notes from the House of the Dead’: Representing the Abrahamic Faiths”, **The Slavic and East European Journal**, Vol.50, No.4, Winter, 2006, pp. 581-606, (Online) www.jstor.org/stable/20459366, February 12, 2018.
- Said, Edward: **Orientalism**, London, Penguin Books, 1978.
- Sarbash, Lyudmila: “Polietnokonfessionalnaya Rossiya V “Zapiskakh iz Mertvogo Doma” F.M. Dostoyevskogo”, **Vestnik Chuvashskogo Universiteta**, Cheboksary, 2012, No.4, pp. 307-313, (Online) www.cyberleninka.ru/article/n/polietnokonfessionalnaya-rossiya-v-zapiskah-iz-mertvogo-doma-f-m-dostoyevskogo, April 3, 2018.
- Schimmelpenninck van der Oye, David: **Russian Orientalism: Asia in the Russian Mind from Peter the Great to the Emigration**, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2010.
- Seitov, Marat: “Predyevraziystvo F.M. Dostoyevskogo: Istoki i Khudozhestvennoye Voploshcheniye”, PhD dissertation, Magnitogorsk State University, Magnitogorsk, 2010.
- Semenenko, Irina: “The Quest for Identity: Russian Public Opinion on Europe and the European Union and the National Identity Agenda”, **Perspectives on European Politics and Society**, Routledge, Vol.14, No.1, 2013, pp. 102–122. DOI: [org/10.1080/15705854.2012.732396](https://doi.org/10.1080/15705854.2012.732396).

- Shipilov, Andrey: **“Svoi”, “Chuzhie” i “Drugie”**, Progress-Traditsia, Moscow, 2008.
- : **Oppozitsiya “My - Oni” v Sotsio-Kulturnom Razvitii**, Vol.1, Voronezh, Tsentralno-Chernozemnoye Knizhnoye Izdatelstvo, 2004.
- Shteinberg, Aaron: **Sistema Svobodi F.M. Dostoyevskogo**, Berlin, Skythen, 1923.
- Shternberg, L.: **“Inorodtsy. Obshchiy Obzor”, Formy Nacionalnogo Dvizheniya v Sovremennykh Gosudarstvakh. Avstro-Vengriya, Rossiya, Germaniya**, Ed. by A.I. Kastelianskiy, St. Petersburg, Obshchestvennaya Polza, 1910, pp. 529-574.
- Shlapentokh, Dmitry: **“Russian Nationalism and Soviet Intellectuals under Gorbachev”, The Search for Self-Definition in Russian Literature**, Ed. by Ewa M. Thompson, Vol.27, Houston, John Benjamins Publishing Company Amsterdam, 1991.
- Simpson, John, Jennifer Speake: **“Scratch a Russian and you find a Tartar”, Oxford Dictionary of Proverb**, 5th ed., Oxford University Press, 2009, (Online) Ed. by: www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/, May 23, 2018.
- Strelkova, Irina: **Valikhanov**, Molodaya Gvardiya, Moscow, 1983.
- Syromyatnikov, Boris: **Poetika Russkoy Idei v “Velikom Pyatiknizhii” F. M. Dostoyevskogo**, St.Petersburgh, Mamatov, 2014.
- Taki, Viktor: **Tsar and Sultan: Russian Encounters with the Ottoman Empire**, London, New York, I.B. Tauris &C. Ltd, 2016.
- Tatishchev, Vasiliy: **Leksiyon Rossiyskoy Istoricheskoy, Geographicheskoy, Politicheskoy i Grazhdanskoy**, St. Petersburg, 1793, (Online) <https://www.prilib.ru/item/425836>, September 14, 2018.
- Taylor, Charles, et al: **Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition**, Ed. by Amy Gutmann, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Tishkov, Valeriy: **“Natsionalnaya Identichnost i Dukhovno-Kulturnyye Tsennosti Rossiyskogo Naroda”, Izbrannyye Lektsii Universiteta**, St-

- Petersburgh, St. Petersburg University of Humanities, Vol.105, 2010.
- : **Rossiyskiy Narod: Istoriya i Smysl Natsionalnogo Samosoznaniya**, Moscow, Nauka, 2013.
- : **Etnologiya i Politika**, Moscow, 2001.
- Tlostanova, Madina: **A Janus Faced Empire: Notes on the Russian Empire in Modernity, Written from the Border**, Moscow, 2003, (Online) www.researchgate.net/publication/273947828, June 12, 2017.
- : "Life in Samarkand: Caucasus and Central Asia vis-à-vis Russia, the West, and Islam", **Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge** 5, No.1, 2006, pp. 105-116.
- Todorova, Maria: **Imagining the Balkans**, New York, Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Tolz, Vera: **Inventing the Nation: Russia**, London, Arnold, 2001.
- Riasanovsky, Nicholas V: **A History of Russia**, 6th Ed, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Roberts, Graham H: **Other Voices: Three Centuries of Cultural Dialogue between Russia and Western Europe**, Cambridge Scholars Publishing, UK, 2011.
- Vinogradov, Viktor: "Chuzhoy", **Istoriya Slova**, (Online) <https://azbyka.ru/otechnik/Spravochniki/istoriya-slova/>, November 14, 2018.
- Vetlovskaya, Valentina: **Roman F. M. Dostoyevskogo "Bratya Karamazovy"**, St.Peterburg, Pushkinskiy Dom, 2007.
- Volgin, Igor: **Posledniy God Dostoyevskogo**, Moskva, Izdatelstvo AST, 2017.
- : "Spets Kurs: Igrok", **YouTube**, uploaded by Academia, Kultura channel, (Online) <https://youtu.be/yviC9QPkRBc>, October 15, 2018.

- Vovchenko, Denis: "Gendering irredentism? Self and other in Russian Pan-Orthodoxy and Pan-Slavism", **Ethnic and Racial Studies**, Vol.34, No.2, February 2011, pp. 248-274.
- Vucinich, Wayne: **Russia and Asia: on the Influence of Russia on the Asian Peoples**, Stanford, Hoover Institution Press, 1972.
- Walicki, Andrzej: **The Slavophile Controversy: History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-century Russian Thought**, London, Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Yakovlev, Leo: **Dostoyevskiy: Prizraki, Fobii, Khimery (Zametki Chitatelya)**, Harkov, Karavella, 2006.
- Yemelianova, Galina: **Russia and Islam: A Historical Survey**, New York, Palgrave, 2002.
- Yevlampiyev, Igor: "Lichnost kak Absolyut. Metafizicheskiye Eksperimenty Dostoyevskogo", **Antropologiya Dostoyevskogo** 3, (Online) <http://dostoevskiy-lit.ru/dostoevskiy/kritika/evlampiev-antropologiya-dostoevskogo/evlampiev-lichnost-kak-absolyut-metafizicheskie-eksperimenty.htm>, October 8, 2018.
- Zakharov, Vladimir: "Filosofskaya Mysl: Retseptsiya i Interpretatsiya Rossiyskiy Oriyentalizm v Interpretatsii Lermontova i Saída", **Filosofskiye Nauki**, w.place, No.3, 2015.
- : "Khudozhestvennaya Antropologiya Dostoyevskogo", **Zhurnalniy Klub Intelros "Problemy Istoricheskoy Poetiki"**, No.11, 2013, pp. 150-164, (Online) www.intelros.ru/readroom/problemy-istoricheskoy-poetiki/vyp-11-2013/29739-hudozhestvennaya-antropologiya-dostoevskogo.html, June 2, 2018.
- Zarova, Elena D: "Obraz 'Drugogo' v Stanovlenii Tsivilizatsionnoy Identichnosti", PhD Dissertation, Saratov, 2009.
- Zaznayev, Oleg: "Kanadskaya Natsionalnaya Identichnost: Problemy Formirovaniya", **Zapiski Kazanskogo Universiteta: Gumanitarniye Nauki**, Vol.154, No.1, 2012.

CV

Irina Balık was born in Semipalatinsk city, Kazakhstan in 1978. After finishing her lyceum, she started her bachelor degree at the Faculty of Foreign Languages, at East-Kazakhstan State University sponsored with a city municipality scholarship. As a result of five years education she produced a thesis titled “Black English”. Since the graduation she had been teaching the English Language at Bolashak State Schools in various cities of Kazakhstan. During these years she participated some regional contests for teachers of English where she won the first, second and third places. She was also awarded some certificates from Ministry of Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan for preparing students for Project competitions.

She started her Master Degree at the Faculty of Philology, Suleyman Demirel University in Almaty, Kazakhstan in 2008. After the defense of her Master thesis titled “Teaching English Grammar through Comics” she completed the studies in 2010 and moved to Turkey the same year. She had been teaching Academic English at Antalya Bilim University since 2013 until 2016. There she also worked at the Erasmus office as a responsible person for Exchange Programs.

In 2013 she started her PhD program at the Department of Comparative Literature. After completing the curriculum she started to work on her dissertation under supervision of Dr. Ferah Incesu and Prof. Dr. Türkan Olcay in Istanbul University. July 2019 after defending her dissertation titled “Dostoevsky’s Use of the Other in Search of the Self” she completed the doctorate.