Fyodor Dostoevsky: The Genesis of Genius

Key Word/ Descriptors: Fyodor Dostoevsky, Literature, Christianity, Nihilism, Orthodoxy, 19th Century Philosophy

Abstract:

Fyodor Michailovich Dostoevsky was a 19th century Russian author whose literary contributions have been some of the most influential in history. Despite being predominantly a writer of fiction, one cannot deny the influence that he had over the fields of philosophy, psychology, and theology. This article does not aim to provide an in-depth analysis of all of Dostoevsky's ideas and their biographical roots. Rather, to provide the reader with the cultural and biographical influences for the cornerstones of his worldview, facilitating interpretation and reflection on his ideas. By discussing the genesis of his anthropological framework, his views on the nature of man, his fear of nihilism, and finally the solution which he found in Christ, readers would be able to better appreciate the works of Dostoevsky and understand, with more clarity, the reasons for why he held certain positions.

Article:

Introduction:

Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky (1821-1881) was an ex-convict, political activist, writer, and above all, a Christian. A writer of the 19th century, his works continue to inspire and challenge readers today, with his questions on God, nihilism, the essence of humanity, and more being ever so applicable in our times. Despite his Christianity, Dostoevsky was a self-described "child of this age, a child of unfaith and scepticism."[1] The label as a "child of this age" is apt. Dostoevsky's uniqueness is undeniable, however, his novelty is best understood through how he either affirmed or rejected the ideas of his time. Therefore, a thorough examination of the ideological landscape and the biographical moments in Dostoevsky's life is vital for readers to further understand the meaning of his works.

This paper is written with the goal to present the biographical and conceptual backdrop behind Dostoevsky's works. Due to the breadth of his writings, I do not attempt to provide a complete analysis of his works.[2] Rather, I will structure my analysis on four cornerstones of his worldview. First, I will begin by examining the roots of his anthropocentrism. Then, I will analyse the development of his views on the nature of man. By understanding the nature of man, I would turn to his unique presentation of nihilism. Finally, I will present Dostoevsky's Christian journey and the inspirations behind his conception of Christ. I will provide commentary from two perspectives. The "biographical"—the events and relationships which influenced his ideas; and the "conceptual"—the ideas which influenced him or the ideas which he criticised.

Dostoevsky's Anthropocentrism:

Dostoevsky's anthropocentrism can be defined as the prioritisation of humankind, and specifically the human individual, as the first mode of analysis. Under anthropocentrism, there is nothing more important than how ideas impact the nature of man. Dostoevsky's

[1] Dostoevsky, Letter to N.D. Fonvisin, March 1854.

[2] Such a task has been carried out brilliantly by Joseph Frank's five volume biography.

anthropocentrism, which remained consistent throughout his life, was expressed in two perspectives. Firstly, from a social perspective, he was a progressive, deeply concerned with the well-being of the lower class and the oppressed. Despite distancing himself from the Russian radicalism of his youth, his emphasis on the moral virtue of the Russian peasantry maintained until his *Diary* in 1881 where he recognises similar aims between him and the radicals. Secondly, his anthropocentrism also impacted his methodology, his analysis focusing on the practical implications on mankind over discussions of abstract philosophy.[3] The desire for practical analysis is best seen in the words of Father Zosima who, refusing to settle with quietism, tells Alyosha to leave the monastery, a representation of abstract ideas, and to enter the world, to "not be afraid of human sin, [rather to] love man in his sin."[4]

A period worthy of analysis for his anthropocentrism is his affiliation with the Petrashevsky circle, a group of literary critics who, under influence of Fourier, promoted materialism and utopian socialism.[5] Dostoevsky's affiliation with Petrashevsky coincided with his relations with Vissaron Belinsky, an influential literary critic, who introduced Left Hegelian works, in particular D.F. Strauss' and L. Feuerbach's, to progressive Russian circles.[6] Strauss' work *The Life of Jesus* argued for the mythopoetic foundations of Christian Scriptures, and Feuerbach's *The Essence of Christianity* argued that all theology ought to have an anthropological basis.[7] Strauss and Feuerbach were not opposed to the Christian values of love and social care, rather they aimed to maintain Christian values whilst removing their supernatural, presumed mythological presuppositions, a materialistic stance which fit in neatly with Petrashevsky's and Belinsky's philosophy. The influence of the two Left Hegelians, especially Feuerbach, must be properly recognised when reading Dostoevsky. With the Kantian recognition of the insufficiency of *a priori* reasoning in theological knowledge, Dostoevsky follows a Feuerbachian framework to begin with anthropology, an *a posteriori* discipline through which truth can be measured by its impacts on humans. The preference for an anthropological basis over the theoretical is represented in a letter to his brother where he writes that "nature, the soul, love, and God, one recognises through the heart and not through reason."[8] Therefore, while Dostoevsky may not have adhered fully to Petrashevsky's Left Hegelian atheism,[9] one can see that his early affiliation with progressive intelligentsia introduced him to the anthropological views of Feuerbach which impacted his anthropocentric methodology.

Dostoevsky's anthropocentrism was strengthened during his time in Siberia which he described in *The House of the Dead*. Through this work, Dostoevsky aimed to establish a

---

[3] Berdyaev 2009, 24.
[4] Dostoevsky 2003, 412.
[5] Troyan 1946, 368.
[6] Malnick 1949, 369-373.; See also Dostoevsky's articles in 1873 in his *Diary of a Writer* where he attributes Belinsky with his conversion to Socialism and atheism. Though one should also note his treatment of Belinsky as a symbol of Russian progressive life rather than as an individual. (Dostoevsky, Letter to Strachov, May 1871)
[7] Feuerbach 2008, xii.
[8] Dostoevsky, Letter to M. Dostoevsky, October 1838.
[9] Dostoevsky 2010, 139.

psychological analysis of the inmates and encourage sympathy for the lower classes of society.[10] Initially, his experience with other inmates was negative due to their violence towards each other.[11] However, his attitude transformed due to a conversion experience where he recalled a childhood memory of a peasant showing him kindness in his youth leading to a rekindling of a faith in mankind, especially the Russian people, and a recognition of a redeemable element of humankind despite its harsh exteriors.[12] The rekindling of faith in humanity, especially for the outcasts of society, would have thus further influenced Dostoevsky's care for mankind and the significance that he gave to the impacts which ideas would have had on humans.

Dostoevsky's anthropocentrism can be appreciated through what Bakhtin identified as "polyphony" in Dostoevsky's novels. To Bakhtin, a polyphonic novel was one in which a plurality of individual voices and ideas interact with each other, each holding their own weight, independent of the author's own ideas.[13] Central to the idea of polyphony is the proposition that humans could be capable of individually representing coherent and systematic ideas without reliance on a further system for explanation. Such a proposition has connections to Turgenev's article *Hamlet and Don Quixote* in which Turgenev argues that man either posits an ideal as beyond human nature or within it.[14] By placing the individual in relation to the idea that they represent, Turgenev provides the conceptual groundwork for Dostoevsky to develop the presuppositions for his polyphonic genre. Furthermore, one can turn to Dostoevsky's commitment to journalism as a further demonstration of how he attempted to bridge "eternal ideas" and their ephemeral embodiments in people.[15] Unlike the Petrashevsky circle who attempted to force the individual into a broader system,[16] journalism dictates a personalist approach which starts with the individual and claims that truth is revealed not through an investigation of abstract systems, but rather a relationship with the individuals of analysis. Truth as presented through the human individual is not only helpful in the development of a polyphonic novel, but also revealing in understanding Dostoevsky's anthropocentrism.

Dostoevsky and the Nature of Man:

I will now examine the influences behind Dostoevsky's presentation of the nature of man. To do so, I will analyse both the ideas that Dostoevsky was inspired by and those which he vehemently rejected. By placing Dostoevsky's views in the context of these ideas, one would be able to further appreciate the importance that Dostoevsky placed on mankind and why he fought strongly to defend what he viewed as essentially human.

---

[10] Frank 1986, 198. This is to be seen alongside his admiration for Victor Hugo's work *Les Miserables* and his socio-ethical concerns.

[11] Frank 2010, 200-207.

[12] Frank 1983, 117-123.

[13] Bakhtin 1984, 6.

[14] Turgenev 1930, 11.

[15] Frank 1986, 51.

[16] Troyan 1946, 374. This is a recurring argument of Russian radicals. For example, see Chernyshevsky 1965.

Dostoevsky's views on the nature of man are best presented through a comparison with Chernyshevsky. In *The Anthropological Principle in Philosophy*, Chernyshevsky argues that humans are thoroughly material and act based on hedonic utilitarian motives.[17] Dostoevsky was at odds with Chernyshevsky's socialism and utilitarian ethics. Their disagreement is best seen through their opposing reactions to the "Crystal Palace" in London. Where Chernyshevsky saw a vision of utopia,[18] Dostoevsky saw a symbol of modern materialism.[19] The disagreement between the two led to the conceptual inspirations for Dostoevsky's *Notes from Underground*, in which the underground man parodies Chernyshevsky's ideas of human rationality and utilitarian ethics. To Dostoevsky, humans suffer from irrational and contradictory desires. Even if one was given a utopia, man's desire for freedom and the unexpected would lead humans to destroy said utopia, demonstrating the absurdity of utopian formulations and building on the need for individual analysis established above.[20]

Another contribution of Dostoevsky was his presentation of mankind as dialectical in nature. For Dostoevsky, there are two major dialectics surrounding the nature of man, the dialectic of freedom and the dialectic of good and evil. I will begin by analysing the former by briefly returning to his time in Siberia, which made Dostoevsky realise the strength of man's desire for freedom. In *The House of the Dead*, Dostoevsky binds the concept of individuality with personal autonomy and expression. He writes the worst punishment was not physical torture, but rather a monotonous task like "[pouring] water from one vessel into another and back" which crushes one's individuality.[21] Similarly, the authorities turning a blind eye to personal possessions was interpreted by Dostoevsky as a representation of man's need for autonomy expressed through personal possessions, without which one would go insane.[22] What was insidious about these punishments was not only that they were "socialist" in nature,[23] but that they deprived an individual of ownership over their own actions and therefore crushed the individual. However, Dostoevsky recognised that freedom is not totally positive, but also comes with its burden, establishing a dialectical relationship between the necessity of freedom and its dangers. This dialectic culminates in "The Grand Inquisitor" where Christ is accused of cruelty for having given man freedom knowing the suffering that it causes—a suffering which an ordinary man cannot bear.[24] In response to the suffering resulting from freedom, the Grand Inquisitor, by providing "miracle, mystery, and authority" in exchange for blind obedience, crushes human freedom to preserve what he believed was their overall "well-being".[25] The conflict presented between the Grand Inquisitor and Christ only further solidified Dostoevsky's views of man's role in relation to freedom.

---

[17] Chernyshevsky 1965, 29, 49.
[18] In Chernyshevsky's work *What is to be Done?* he symbolises human reason with the Crystal Palace in London.
[19] Frank 1986, 238-239. This is seen from how he titles his chapter about London as "Baal" in *Winter Notes*.
[20] Dostoevsky 1994, 33.
[21] Dostoevsky 2004a, 17.
[22] Frank 2010, 218.
[23] For example, personal possession is accredited as the root of social problems.
[24] Dostoevsky 2003, 328.; Polka 1991, 261-262.; Guardini 1952, 60.
[25] Dostoevsky 2003, 332-336.

The dialectic of good and evil is likewise valuable when understanding Dostoevsky's views on the individualistic nature of man and how each person has to bear their own responsibility. In Dostoevsky's novels, every character is forced to decide between good and evil, two powerful and real forces.[26] This dialectic can be understood through Dostoevsky's religious influences. Ksana Blank suggests that the story of St. Andrew of Crete, where a murderous boy becomes a Saint, could have influenced Dostoevsky's belief that anyone, regardless of how far they have sinned, could still choose God and be redeemed.[27] Furthermore, Frank recognises the influence that Saint Tikhon Zadonsky had on Dostoevsky. To Tikhon, wrestling with evil is vital in ascertaining the Christian revelation.[28] The influence of Tikhon is further supported by Caryl Emerson who writes that a distinctive feature of Dostoevsky's works is the extent at which Dostoevsky presents the depravity of man, illustrating how it is through moral struggle that revelation is achieved.[29] By placing humans between good and evil, one discovers the individualism which lies at the heart of Dostoevsky's philosophy. To Dostoevsky, just as in Christianity, each human must bear the responsibility and consequences of their actions and cannot place the blame on anyone or anything else.

Dostoevsky's presentation of the nature of man was vastly different from the materialistic outlook of his contemporaries in radical Russian intelligentsia. Unlike in utopian socialism where private property and freedom are abolished in exchange for hedonistic maximisation, Dostoevsky viewed individual expression and personal moral responsibility as essential elements of human nature.

Dangers of Nihilism:

Just as utopian socialism was viewed by Dostoevsky as a threat to humanity, Dostoevsky also viewed nihilism as a major threat and wrote significantly about it in his works. To Dostoevsky, nihilism can be expressed in a variety of ways. It is not only expressed as a quietist resignation due to the lack of higher values (Hippolite), but is also inclusive of atheistic humanism (Kirillov) and Napoleonic types (Raskolnikov). The topic of nihilism is worthy of discussion as it contextualises Dostoevsky's often quoted phrase "without immortality there is no virtue,"[30] and is one of Dostoevsky's most influential contributions to philosophy. The development of Dostoevsky's nihilism is best understood through an analysis of his biographical and conceptual exposure.

I will begin by turning to the literary influences behind Dostoevsky's characterisation of nihilism, which would clarify its Napoleonic form.[31] A source for inspiration is Turgenev's novel *Fathers and Children*. Turgenev wrote the main character, Bazarov, to be an

---

[26] Brazier 2016, 5-9.
[27] Blank 2010, 40-51.
[28] Frank 1995, 376-377.
[29] Emerson 2011, 215-222.
[30] Dostoevsky 2003, 95.
[31] One should note the similarities between Dostoevsky's nihilism (in its Napoleonic form) and Nietzshce's later characterisation of the *ubermensch*.

embodiment of the radical nihilists. Suffering from "Satanic pride," Bazarov acted on a self-affirmation of his own values regardless of external norms. Some radicals were critical of the work, and particularly Turgenev's presentation of Bazarov, viewing it as a caricature of the new generation and Dobrolyubov in particular.[32] However, Pisarev, a young radical, defended Turgenev's Bazarov as a brilliant expression of the individualism and self-will which the young radicals strove towards.[33] Pisarev's interpretation of Bazarov inspired or at least lined up with Dostoevsky's interpretation, seen from his categorisation of Raskolnikov who, in the spirit of Bazarov, wrestles with the idea of overcoming a moral law in an attempt to become an extraordinary person. Apart from Turgenev, one could find other influences to the Napoleonic type in world literature. One notable writer is Balzac whose writings, as noted by Grossman in his analysis of Dostoevsky's "Pushkin Speech," had a lasting impression on Dostoevsky and served as one of his primary philosophical inspirations.[34] Grossman points out the similarities between *Crime and Punishment* and Balzac's *Le Pere Goriot* in which Rastignac asks his friend Bianchon whether he would be responsible for the death of a decrepit Chinese if he would get a million francs.[35] The ideological kinship that Rastignac and Raskolnikov share are remarkable; they both challenge, from a utilitarian perspective, the right for a hypothetical superior or extraordinary man to use crime to achieve their higher visions. The Napoleonic type is also present in Pushkin's *The Queen of Spades*. The hero of Pushkin's short story, Hermann, described with "the profile of Napoleon and the soul of Mephistopheles,"[36] killed a countess to gain a secret formula for gambling success. The reference to Napoleon is also found in Pushkin's *Evgeny Onegin* where a verse reads "we all now pose as Napoleons…for us are the instruments of one."[37] Therefore, one can see that the Napoleon archetype, a self-affirmation over moral laws, has a well-established precedence in the literature that Dostoevsky admired, but also in the works of his contemporaries, demonstrating the literary context behind Dostoevsky's nihilism.

From a biographical landscape, Dostoevsky's early exposure and understanding of nihilism can be attributed to Nikolay Speshnev, a radical who attended Petrashevsky Fridays in 1848.[38] Based on utilitarian ethics of self-interest, Speshnev was not opposed to resorting to violence and a revolutionary seizure of power to bring around communism.[39] The link between atheism, communism, and utilitarian ethics embodied by Speshnev strongly affected Dostoevsky's characterisation of nihilism as inclusive of Napoleonic types, as seen in his categorisation of Nikolay Stravogin (of which Speshnev was an inspiration). Dostoevsky's

---

[32] Frank 1986, 163-165. Regardless of whether Turgenev was ridiculing the new generation, the work was dedicated to the memory of Belinsky who was greatly influential of this new generation.
[33] Ibid., 174.
[34] Grossman 1973, 23. It is worthwhile to refer to Grossman's words in full "It is remarkable that [Dostoevsky] turns specifically to Balzac to reinforce one of the basic tenets of his philosophy… the impossibility of building one's happiness as an individual or even the general good on the suffering of another person, even if it be an insignificant creature."
[35] Ibid., 33-40. The connections between Balzac and Dostoevsky is also noted in Frank 1995, 73..
[36] Pushkin 1956-1962, 5:252. As cited in Frank 1995, 74.
[37] Pushkin 1956-1962, 6:343. As cited in Frank 1995, 74.
[38] Frank 2010, 145-146.
[39] Frank 1976, 260.

early formulations of nihilism were only strengthened through his experience with Orlov, a convict in Siberia. Orlov was described as having murdered old people and children in cold blood, not suffering from guilt or regret over his actions. Interaction with someone who can act without moral ramifications would only have further developed Dostoevsky's perception of nihilism. A final illuminating event is the attempted murder of Tsar Alexander II in 1866 by the self-proclaimed "Pure Russian" Dmitry Karakozov. Karakozov was a part of a small radical group led by Nikolay Ishutin who were inspired by the revolutionary ideas of the 1860s and willing to carry out self-sacrifice and violence to achieve their aims. In his 1866 correspondence with Katkov, Dostoevsky not only demonstrates his identification of socialism with nihilism, but also the growing threat that nihilist (socialist) ideas had on the minds of the Russian youth.[40] The attempted assassination of the Tsar, a symbol of Russia, by what could be classified as nihilistic groups would only have further fomented in Dostoevsky's mind the threat that nihilism represented.

As seen in Dostoevsky's influences, his presentation of nihilism cannot be equivocated with an image of *ressentiment* and resignation. Rather, Dostoevsky also presents nihilism as a self-affirmation over moral considerations. Nihilism, especially in its Napoleonic form, is parodied by some of Dostoevsky's greatest characters. Kirillov, in a recognition of atheism, recognises that man has now become God, and by doing so is faced with boundless freedom, a condition which he cannot accept and is expressed in suicide.[41] Nikolay Stavrogin and Raskolnikov, despite their Napoleonic aspirations, end up wrestling with guilt.[42] Ivan Karamazov, despite his proud rejection of God's ticket, ultimately bears the cost of his conscience, feeling partially responsible for Smerdyakov's patricide. Therefore, the theme of nihilism is prevalent throughout the work of Dostoevsky and was a challenge which was at the forefront of his philosophy.

An Antidote in Christianity:

To Dostoevsky, man's value only exists if God exists. If God does not exist, then the value of man also does not.[43] Therefore, in metaphysical and moral terms, Dostoevsky viewed Christianity as the only solution to nihilism which maintained man's freedom and responsibility. I will now examine the development of his Christian faith and the sources which influenced his conception of Christ.

Dostoevsky's exposure to the Christian message began from a young age. His parents were devout Christians, integrating religion into every aspect of Dostoevsky and his brother's upbringing. He was taught to read by his mother from *One Hundred and Four Sacred Stories from the Old and New Testament* which contained key Biblical stories like the Book of Job, the creation account, the Flood, and more. An early exposure to Christianity helped embed Christian values into the mind of a young Dostoevsky, such that even during his self-

[40] Frank 1995, 50-53.
[41] Ramsey 1956, 93.
[42] Dostoevsky 2011, 735-787; Dostoevsky 2006
[43] See Berdyaev 2009, 195.

proclaimed "atheist" days, one must read his atheism under qualification. Dostoevsky did not agree with the thought of influential socialists, viewing them as untenable theories, only giving them credit insomuch as they were undergirded by worthwhile moral sentiments (which were Christian in essence). Likewise, Dostoevsky's disagreements with Left Hegelian atheism was noted by Frank as an area of disagreement between Dostoevsky and the other radicals of his time, like Petrashevsky and Belinsky.[44] Finally, Dostoevsky's comments to Speshnev that "we shall be with Christ" prior to their mock execution places further doubt on the nature of his atheistic worldview at that time.[45] Therefore, even behind his supposed atheism was a maintenance of a strong Christian ethic.

After Dostoevsky's return to Christianity, the importance of Christian ethics only became more intense, as seen in his letter to N. Fonvisin in which he writes "there is nothing lovelier, deeper, more sympathetic, more rational, more manly, and more perfect than the Saviour…If anyone could prove to me that Christ is outside the truth, and if the truth really did exclude Christ, I should prefer to stay with Christ and not with truth."[46] The importance of Christ in this letter demonstrates Dostoevsky's distaste for radical materialists who tried to replace Christ, the God-man, with the man-God, and shows that he viewed Christ as the only lens through which all things can be understood. The reality of Christ as an antidote to nihilism and immorality is further reinforced in his letter to a mother where he instructs the mother to teach her child the Gospel and to believe in God, as she would find nothing better elsewhere.[47] Therefore, the importance of Christianity maintained significance through his life and was vital in allowing him to overcome the challenge of nihilism.[48]

Understanding Dostoevsky's influences for his presentation of Christ is best done through an analysis of the inspirations behind *The Idiot* which was written to present a Christlike "perfect and noble man."[49] While there are numerous literary influences behind Myshkin, I will focus on two sources, Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables* and Miguel de Cervantes' *Don Quixote*. To Dostoevsky, Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables* was a work which perfectly encapsulated the rising up of the lowly.[50] By writing about the unfortunate in France, Hugo directed sympathy for those who were often overlooked and outcast by society, echoing what Dostoevsky viewed as Christ's care towards sinners. While Dostoevsky disagreed with Hugo's social Christianity, the aforementioned virtues would have influenced the care and compassion that Myshkin would show towards Nastasya and Marie. However, what would become an even greater influence to Dostoevsky was Cervantes' Don Quixote, the most mentioned literary figure in his *Diary*. Returning to Turgenev's *Hamlet and Don Quixote*, Turgenev described Don Quixote as the archetype of having faith in a higher truth.[51] In

[44] Frank 2010, 139.
[45] Ibid., 179.
[46] Dostoevsky, Letter to N.D. Fonvisin, March 1854.
[47] Dostoevsky, Letter to a Mother, March 1878.
[48] I will not touch upon his struggle with the problem of evil, which although plays a key role in his key works, most notably *The Brothers Karamazov*, exceeds the scope of this paper.
[49] Dostoevsky, Letter to S. Alexandrovna, January 1868.
[50] Frank 1986, 198.
[51] Turgenev 1930, 12.

contrast to the egoism of Dostoevsky's nihilists, who are archetypally connected to Turgenev's categorisation of Hamlet, Don Quixote was selfless and self-sacrificial. To Cervantes, Don Quixote was driven by the thought of a suffering world in his absence, motivating him to enter into the world to solve the injustices that he experienced.[52] Due to Don Quixote's active care for the world and a naive desire for beauty and goodness, Dostoevsky categorised Don Quixote as the most perfect of the noble figures in Christian literature.[53] One could, like Gratchev, challenge whether Dostoevsky viewed Christ as sharing the ridiculousness and comicality of Don Quixote.[54] However, Yen has argued that ridiculousness need not have a negative connotation, but rather is a representation of other-worldliness which Dostoevsky valued.[55]

Therefore, one can see that Dostoevsky's presentation of Christ was strongly influenced by his own Christian journey and literary sources like *Don Quixote* and *Les Misérables*. Christ did not only represent a distant historical character with little to no modern application, but was a moral exemplar whose values and teachings were directly applicable to the edification of the human individual. In Christ, Dostoevsky saw the only solution to nihilism, and viewed one's response to Christ as the most important decision that one can make.

Conclusion:

Dostoevsky was a Christian writer. Not only from the fact that he was a Christian who wrestled with Christian themes, but that his works were Christian in their essence. Jesus proclaimed that man was not made for the law, rather that the law was made for man,[56] Dostoevsky also challenged the abstract in favour of the practical. No idea could be judged apart from its impacts on humans. Just as Christianity confronts humankind with the gravity of their sin, Dostoevsky was not afraid to penetrate the depths of human depravity and the growing challenge of nihilism. However, just as Christianity is a bearer of good news despite its darkness, Dostoevsky does not leave his readers without hope, but rather points them directly to the light of Christ. From the analysis of the genesis and influences of Dostoevsky's main ideas, one is able to further appreciate the struggles and challenges which transformed Dostoevsky into the thinker that he was.

[52] Cervantes 2015, 34.
[53] Dostoevsky, Letter to S. Alexandrovna, January 1868.
[54] Gratchev 2015, 141.
[55] Yen 2023, 135-138.
[56] Mark 2:27

Works Cited:

Bakhtin, M. M. 1984. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Translated by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Berdyaev, Nicolas. 2009. *Dostoievsky: An Interpretation*. Translated by Donald Attwater, London: Semantron Press.

Blank, Ksana. 2010. *Dostoevsky's Dialectics and the Problem of Sin*. Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

Brazier, P. H, and Rae, Murray. 2016. *Dostoevsky.* Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers.

Chernyshevsky, Nicholas, "The Anthropological Principle in Philosophy" in *Russian Philosophy.* Vol. 2., edited by 29-60. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1965.

De Cervantes, Miguel. 2015. *Don Quixote*. Barcelona: Real Academia Espanola. (my translation)

Dostoevsky, Fyodor. Letter to Micheal Dostoevsky. 31 Oct. 1838. From Letters of Fyodor Michailovitch Dostoevsky to his Family and Friends.

———. Letter to N. D. Fonvisin. Mar. 1854. From Letters of Fyodor Michailovitch Dostoevsky to his Family and Friends.

———. Letter to Nikolay Nikolayevitch Strachov. 18 May. 1871 From Letters of Fyodor Michailovitch Dostoevsky to his Family and Friends.

———. Letter to a Mother (unnamed). 27 Mar. 1878 From Letters of Fyodor Michailovitch Dostoevsky to his Family and Friends.

——— 1919. *The Diary of a Writer*. Translated by Boris Brasol, New York: George Braziller.

———. 1985. *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions*. Translated by Kyril FitzLyon London: Quartet.

———. 1994. *Notes from Underground.* Translated by Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, London: Vintage Books.

———. 2003. *The Brothers Karamazov.* Translated by David Mcduff, London: Penguin Books Ltd.

———. 2004a *The House of the Dead*. Translated by Constance Garnett, New York: Dover Publications Inc..

———. 2004b. *The Idiot*. Translated by David Mcduff, London: Penguin Books Ltd.

———. 2006. *Crime and Punishment*. Translated by Sidney Monas, New York: Signet Classics.

———. 2011. *Demons*. Edited by Ronald Meyer. Translated by Robert A. Maguire, London: Penguin Books Ltd.

Emerson, Caryl. 2011. "TOLSTOY AND DOSTOEVSKY ON EVIL-DOING." In *All the Same The Words Don't Go Away: Essays on Authors, Heroes, Aesthetics, and Stage Adaptations from the Russian Tradition*, 215–22. Academic Studies Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt21h4wh9.13.

Feuerbach, Ludwig Andreas. 2008. *The Essence of Christianity*. Translated by George Eliot, Newburyport: Dover Publications.

Frank, Joseph. 1976. *Dostoevsky: The Seeds of Revolt 1821-1849*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 1983. *Dostoevsky: The Years of Ordeal 1850-1859*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 1986. *Dostoevsky: The Stir of Liberation, 1860-1865*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 1995. *Dostoevsky: The Miraculous Years 1865-1871*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 2002. *Dostoevsky: The Mantle of Prophet 1871-1881*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 2010. *Dostoevsky: A Writer in His Time*. Edited by Mary Petrusewicz, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Gratchev, Slav N. 2015. "Prince Myshkin as a Tragic Interpretation of Don Quixote." Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America, vol. 35, no. 1, 137-51.

Grossman, Leonid. *Balzac and Dostoevsky.* Translated by Lena Karpov. Michigan: Ardis, 1973.

Guardini, Romano, and Sally S. Cunneen. 1952. "THE LEGEND OF THE GRAND INQUISITOR." *CrossCurrents* 3, no. 1: 58–86. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24455664.

Malnick, Bertha. 1949. "V. G. Belinsky." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 27, no. 69: 363–80. http://www.jstor.org/stable/4204043.

Polka, Brayton. 1991. "PSYCHOLOGY AND THEOLOGY IN 'THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV' 'EVERYTHING IS PERMITTED' AND THE TWO FICTIONS OF CONTRADICTION AND PARADOX." *Literature and Theology* 5, no. 3: 253–76. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23924534.

Pushkin, A.S. *Sobranie Sochineii*, ed. D.D. Blagoi et al., 10 vols. (Moscow, 1956-1962). As cited in Frank, *The Miraculous Years*, 74.

Ramsey, Paul. 1956. "No Morality without Immortality: Dostoevski and the Meaning of Atheism." *The Journal of Religion* 36, no. 2: 90–108. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1199955.

Strauss, David Friedrich. 1973. *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*. Translated by George Eliot, London: SCM Press.

Troyan, N. 1946. "The Philosophical Opinions of the Petrashevsky Circle." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 6, no. 3: 363–80. https://doi.org/10.2307/2102692.

Turgenev, Ivan Sergeevich. 1917. *Fathers and Children*. Translated by Constance Garnet. New York: P F Collier & Sons; Project Gutenberg, December 21, 2009.

———. 1930. *Hamlet and Don Quixote: An Essay*. Translated by Robert Nichols. London: Hendersons.

Yen, Joshua J. W. 2023. “Interpreting Prince Myshkin: The Idiot” *An Unexpected Journal*, vol. 6, no. 4. 118-136.