



Western Washington University
Western CEDAR

WWU Honors Program Senior Projects

WWU Graduate and Undergraduate Scholarship

Spring 1994

The Struggle for Spiritual Supremacy: Dostoevsky's Philosophy or History and Eschatology

Andrew Wender
Western Washington University

Follow this and additional works at: https://cedar.wwu.edu/wwu_honors



Part of the [History Commons](#), and the [Philosophy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wender, Andrew, "The Struggle for Spiritual Supremacy: Dostoevsky's Philosophy or History and Eschatology" (1994). *WWU Honors Program Senior Projects*. 339.
https://cedar.wwu.edu/wwu_honors/339

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the WWU Graduate and Undergraduate Scholarship at Western CEDAR. It has been accepted for inclusion in WWU Honors Program Senior Projects by an authorized administrator of Western CEDAR. For more information, please contact westerncedar@wwu.edu.

**The Struggle for Spiritual Supremacy:
Dostoevsky's Philosophy of History and Eschatology**

**Andrew Wender
Presented to Prof. George Mariz and Prof. Susan Costanzo
Project Advisers**

**Honors 490 - Senior Project
June 6, 1994**



Honors Program

HONORS THESIS

In presenting this Honors Paper in partial requirements for a bachelor's degree at Western Washington University, I agree that the Library shall make its copies freely available for inspection. I further agree that extensive copying of this thesis is allowable only for scholarly purposes. It is understood that any publication of this thesis for commercial purposes or for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature _____

Date _____


7/26/94

Table of Contents

Page

I.	Introduction	2
II.	Historical Context And Intellectual Development of Dostoevsky's Philosophy of History	9
III.	Dostoevsky's Philosophy of History: Sacred History	22
IV.	Dostoevsky's Philosophy of History: Earthly History	37
V.	Dostoevsky's Philosophy of History: Eschatology and Concluding Remarks	45
	Endnotes	59
	Works Consulted	

The salvation of Russia comes from the people...An unbelieving reformer will never do anything in Russia, even if he is sincere in heart and a genius. Remember that! The people will meet the atheist and overcome him, and Russia will be one and orthodox.¹

I. Introduction

Upon taking stock of the world around him, the keen twentieth century observer attains a heightened awareness of the dynamism of history; of the continual interplay among the differing strands of human faith and ideology, which give rise to the omnipresent swirls and eddies of social, political and philosophical ideas and structures. In the midst of this ceaseless flux, it is difficult to avert one's gaze from Russia and her traditional European and Asiatic spheres of influence, regions of strategic import and ideological and spiritual efflorescence, where recent events emblemize the grand complex scheme of historical change.

As a being potentially of broad curiosity and intellectual horizons, man often is concerned with understanding the past precedents, contemporary ramifications and future implications of the historical trends and events which he discerns. The thought and writings of Russian author and religious philosopher Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky manifest these concerns at their most fundamental levels. Dostoevsky was deeply steeped in the study of the then-current state and historical role of his contemporary nineteenth century Russian society. He perceived a Russia, which, through the distinct spiritual, cultural, nationalistic, mystical and metaphysical characteristics of its civilization, would play a pivotal part in driving universal history.

Might Dostoevsky's words provide a window of light shedding understanding upon the unsettled situation in today's Russia? Are his thoughts on the destiny of Russia and her people, his analysis of their historical future as well as their past, a possible means by which

one may come to a more comprehensive reading of the nature of Russian civilization and its place in European and global affairs? These are merely two immediately pertinent issues among the multitude of issues which may become comprehensible from a consideration of Dostoevsky's philosophy of history and eschatology.

Dostoevsky's conceptualizations of the historical progression and fate of Russia, Europe, man, and indeed, of the world and cosmos in its entirety, form vital component parts of his religio-philosophical thought and overall world view. Emerging from the pages of his novels and the innermost reaches of his diaries, letters and personal notebooks, are words redolent of an extraordinarily spiritual and cerebral man whose image of history was inextricably bound up with to his love of the Russian Orthodox Christian faith, his country, and the Russian people. He concerns himself with history on a series of widely varying levels, from the specific political events of his day, to the grand apocalyptic and eschatological implications of Christian Scripture and Russian Orthodox theology. For Dostoevsky, history as a broad theoretical concept, and history as a series of narrative events and ideas, were part of the same thematic construct.

It was largely for his vision of a divinely ordained universal history with Russia at its earthly core, that a prophetic designation was ascribed to Dostoevsky by many of those who found themselves in sympathy with at least some of his espousals. An often repeated story regarding Dostoevsky relates the heartfelt response of an audience which heard at first hand his 1880 address in honor of Aleksander Pushkin, a dramatic and riveting piece of oratory which is frequently cast as the crowning, culminative event in Dostoevsky's life. Emotional cries of "you are our saint, you are our prophet," rang out from the ranks of the literary

aficionados, who had just heard the speaker position the legacy of the beloved poet Pushkin at the core of his conception of Russia's destiny:

Everywhere in Pushkin is heard faith in the Russian character, faith in its spiritual power, and if there is faith, consequently there is also hope, great hope for the Russian man...Yes, the Russian's destiny is incontestably all-European and world-wide. To become a real Russian, to become fully a Russian, perhaps, means only to become brother of all men...[Russia was called to] utter the ultimate word of great common harmony, of the brotherly definitive accord of all races following Christ's evangelical law!²

Nicholas Berdyaev and Nicolas Zernov are among the many writers who have joined the aforementioned audience in deciphering a prophetic strain to Dostoevsky's religious and historical message. Their reactions, along with the perceptions of authors with similar concerns, will be considered side by side with Dostoevsky's own words, in an examination of those elements in Dostoevsky's thought which have prompted such weighty attributions.³

In studying it, no aspect of Dostoevsky's vast schema of religio-philosophical thought may be divested of his devotion to the doctrine of Russian Orthodox Christianity, of his fundamental love for Russian culture, nor of his fervent conviction which affirmed the essential spiritual worth of the Russian people and "soil."⁴ For Dostoevsky, the truest earthly realization of the Christian ideals of communion and brotherhood were to be found through the Russian community and its collective faith in Russian Orthodox Christianity. Yet, concurrently, Dostoevsky thought also of Russia as an integral part of the European community; moreover, he viewed his country as the spiritual and strategic protector of the Slavs and many other Christian peoples whose homelands abutted upon Muslim territory.

It is the tension between Dostoevsky's unwavering allegiance to Russia and the Russian Orthodox faith on the one hand, and his ambivalent attitudes toward the outside

world on the other, which give rise to crucial strands running through his philosophy of history. Dostoevsky viewed much of the non-Russian world with hostility and disdain. His often biting perceptions of modern world politics, religion and culture, particularly of Western Europe, contribute to fundamental elements of his thought. In Dostoevsky's estimation, post-Enlightenment Europe was beset by a spiritual and political malaise which threatened to envelop its historical future with dire consequences. As shall be evidenced herein, his often vitriolic criticisms of, and apocalyptic predictions for, the West are practically axiomatic to Dostoevsky's philosophy of history. Yet, despite his oft-voiced accusations that modern European culture cast a pernicious influence over Russia and was generally hostile to her, Dostoevsky maintained a seemingly contradictory appreciation and affection for the non-Russian world. Perhaps in the words of Ivan Karamazov, of The Brothers Karamazov, there exists an element of Dostoevsky's own reflections on the many days which he had willingly spent outside his homeland, albeit in the midst of a "degenerate" society: "I want to travel in Europe, Alyosha, I shall set off from here. And yet I know that I am going to a graveyard, but it's a most precious graveyard, that's what it is!"⁵

For Dostoevsky, Europe's prevailing sentiments toward Russia--"she despises us, whether secretly or openly; she considers us an inferior race"-- could not negate the fact that Russia, too, was a part of Europe, indeed, ultimately its most important part.⁶ It becomes apparent that there is no more important point of Dostoevsky's philosophy of history than the mission of universal salvation which he ascribes to Russia. It is Russia who will point the way along the correct historical path for Europe as well as for the rest of the world; despite their earthly wrongs, all men, in keeping with the pure spirit of Christ's teachings,

might hope to achieve the salvation which is to be sparked by the faith of the Russian people.

In analyzing Dostoevsky's philosophy of history, one must consider the apparent dichotomies which he depicts as separating Russia from the non-Russian world, and East from West, against the larger backdrop of his universal concerns. While his general disillusionment with the peoples, politics and beliefs of modernity led him to launch a visceral attack on much of the nineteenth century world, the more overarching theme in Dostoevsky's philosophy of history is that which seeks to reconcile the disparate elements of a world in crisis to the hopeful promise of their ultimate fate within the grand divine cosmic scheme.

Themes regarding the relationship of East to West have been situated at the heart of Russian history for centuries. This has been manifested clearly in the events of the twentieth century, as it was at the time of Peter the Great's reforms in the early 1700's. In Dostoevsky's thought, the particular religious, ethnic and nationalistic characteristics which differentiate Western European civilization from that of Eastern Europe are afforded an acute significance, which resonates throughout his philosophy of history.

At the crux of Dostoevsky's dialogue on Russia and the non-Russian world, and the relationship between them, exists his contrasting feelings toward the differing Christian denominations which are represented in his writings. His spiritual immersion in Russian Orthodoxy was, as has been previously indicated, matched by his strong distaste for the institutions and doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. Dostoevsky envisioned a West which was gripped by a general malaise of the soul and spiritual corruption; the state of

European upheaval and degradation which he perceived was the unfortunate consequence of a Church which had strayed from the true precepts of Christianity, allowing the general atmosphere to be pervaded by pernicious social, political, and philosophical ideas and entities, as well as by convoluted manifestations of religious faith and practice. Dostoevsky was troubled by this Western European sickness of the spirit, and by the taint which its influence had left on several echelons of Russian culture and society. It became apparent to him that the mission of regeneration of a troubled continent, indeed, of a troubled world, lay to the guardians of the East; i.e., Russia, her people, and their religious faith.

Dostoevsky glowered upon those varied peoples and institutions, religious or otherwise, which, in his estimation, were all accomplices in the moral and spiritual putrefaction of the nineteenth century world. Roman Catholicism, as indicated above, was cast in a particularly unflattering light within his world view; Muslims, Jews, French, Turks, Nihilists and Socialists, were among the other faiths, nationalities and social and philosophical movements which were calumniated in Dostoevsky's critique of the nineteenth century world at large. His philosophy of history may appear to some as a misanthropic diatribe against all those who were not Russians, Slavs, or adherents to Russian Orthodoxy. However, Dostoevsky's viewpoint was the vision of a devout, if restless, Christian spirit, whose love for mankind was exemplified by his wish for the universal proliferation of religious devotion, spiritual communion and faith in salvation. He hypothesized an earthly and sacred history, in which Russia, through her place in the Christian cosmic scheme, might play a pivotal role in the regeneration of a troubled world.

What is sought herein, then, is a description of Dostoevsky's philosophy of history

(including his theory of apocalyptic eschatology), judged as a fundamental element of his mature religio-philosophical thought in which it is embedded. His philosophy of history will be addressed in terms of its transcendental as well as earthly elements, and in terms of the place which he ascribes each to Russia and to the non-Russian world, within the framework of his reading of universal historical progression, as lived out by man, and ordained by God.

The tenor of Dostoevsky's philosophy of history may be detected from a number of different texts which he authored. Figuring centrally in this analysis will be several novels, The Brothers Karamazov, (particularly the passage entitled "The Legend of the Grand Inquisitor" which is contained therein), The Idiot and The Devils (The Possessed). Among Dostoevsky's other writings, his serialized work, Diary of a Writer, will be referred to most often. Selections from Fyodor Dostoevsky: Complete Letters, The Notebooks, and The Unpublished Dostoevsky will also receive appropriate consideration.⁷ Texts have been selected for their evidence of direct concern with Russian and world history, eschatology, juxtapositions of Russian thought and society with that of the West, and the delineation of a coherent religious world view. The structure of Dostoevsky's writing is uniquely multilayered and polyphonic; the complex nature of the texts invites a hermeneutic analysis, which seeks an integral construction of their meaning and significance through the dialogues, and characterizations of Dostoevsky's personae. His works contain a series of vibrant and impassioned ideas which excite, provoke the inner thoughts of, and frequently startle, the reader.

It becomes vividly apparent that for Dostoevsky, history was more than simply "dynamic," or "alive"; the ideas and flow of history evoked the deepest matters of life, faith

and the spirit. Conceptualizations of the fullness of the Russian national and religious spirit, of messianism, and of the inextricable ties between a transcendent religious order and earthly life were not vague notions to him; they were as real as the birds which soared in the sky above. Whether there exists any validity to the "prophetic" stance often attached to Dostoevsky by many of his contemporaries, Berdyaev, Zernov, and others, for example, is an issue for those who study his philosophy of history to ponder. One should not embark on an analysis of significance of the Dostyevskian historical scheme without an initial awareness of the phraseology of the novelist himself, in order ultimately to consider whether his words are indeed prophetic of the course of recent, present and future events:

The salvation of Russia comes from the people...An unbelieving reformer will never do anything in Russia, even if he is sincere in heart and a genius. Remember that! The people will meet the atheist and overcome him, and Russia will be one and orthodox.⁸

II. Historical Context And Intellectual Development of Dostoevsky's Philosophy of History

In its most essential elements, Dostoevsky's philosophy of history and eschatology was the formulation of his mature thought. Those specific writings which are to be the primary basis for consideration herein were composed not earlier than the late 1860s, and for the most part, were the result of Dostoevsky's work throughout the 1870s, culminating in the "Pushkin" speech shortly before his death in 1881. A mind of such fertility as Dostoevsky's, however, is engaged in a constant rumination upon a lifetime of experiences observations, and intellectual developments; that element of his thought which is considered herein, may be elucidated by an attempt to seat it within the midst of those factors which contributed to its cultivation. No philosophical construct may be examined in an artificially imposed

historical vacuum, with little concern for the caprices and continuities of history which help impart to a structure of thought the form and significance of its specific characteristics; this holds all the more truth with reference to a thinker with the dynamic complexities of Dostoevsky. The framing of his philosophy of history within a broader intellectual and historical picture, is essential; it requires a brief treatment of those issues which served to mold his personal thought, and it also necessitates a consideration of Dostoevsky's place within the context of nineteenth century Russian intellectual history.

In many ways, the development and texture of Dostoevsky's thought may be viewed as emblematic of a motif which recurs throughout modern Russian history, i.e., the seemingly omnipresent and often frictional interplay of the ideas of East and West. Dostoevsky's deep intellect, religious devotion and social conscience emerged from an early age; they were the defining elements of a man who steeped himself in varied strands of European thought as well as in the study of current events, in an attempt to grapple with the fluid social, political and intellectual milieu which defined nineteenth century Russia. Dostoevsky lived in the midst of a society which he perceived as being gripped by ever deepening contentiousness, strife and class alienation, particularly between proponents and opponents of the continuing Westernization of Russia, and among members of the vastly separate socio-economic strata of Russian society. Driven by a deep affection for his homeland and its people, Dostoevsky was led first to the thought of Western Europe, and ultimately back to the spirit of Eastern Europe, in his lifelong quest for and cultivation of, the faith and ideas which he hoped to see uplift and unify Russia, and contribute to the progression of her universally bound historical destiny.

Born in 1821, Dostoevsky experienced a childhood which had a particularly acute effect on the formation of his thought and intellectual concerns. The son of a doctor at the Hospital for Poor People in Moscow, his early years were shaped by an extremely strict and financially modest middle-class upbringing. Fyodor's exposure to the pain ridden and indigent, together with his contacts with the peasants near his family's small piece of property in Tula province, instilled in him a deep compassion for those on the bottom rung of Russian society, which would permeate the ideas of his maturity.⁹ Soulful and mystically inclined from his earliest years, Dostoevsky engaged himself in endless reading, particularly of Russian classics; his adoration for Pushkin caused him to be deeply affected when "a national tragedy," the death of the great poet in a duel, occurred in 1837.¹⁰ Perhaps the most fundamental molding element of Dostoevsky's childhood, however, was his immersion in the Russian Orthodox faith. Joseph Frank deftly contrasts Dostoevsky's religious upbringing with the assertion of nineteenth century Russian cultural historian Alexander Herzen that, "nowhere does religion play so modest a role in education as in Russia.":

Herzen was, of course, talking about the education of the children of the landed or service aristocracy, whose parents had been raised for several generations on the culture of the French Enlightenment and for whom Voltaire had been a kind of patron saint. By the beginning of the nineteenth century, such parents had long since ceased to be concerned about Orthodox Christianity...Only against such a background can one appreciate the full force of Dostoevsky's quiet words: 'I came from a pious Russian family...In our family, we knew the Gospel almost from the cradle'...the children were all taught to read by their mother from a well-known eighteenth century religious primer...Coarse lithographs accompanying the text depicted various episodes from the Scriptures-the creation of the world, Adam and Eve in Paradise, the Flood,...etc.The very first impressions that awakened the consciousness of the child were those embodying the teachings of the Christian faith; and the world thereafter for Dostoevsky would always remain transfigured by the glow of this supernatural illumination.¹¹

This gulf in spiritual awareness between Dostoevsky and the influential classes, was of course, not lost on him, as it ultimately exemplifies the crisis of faith which he came to recognize in the nineteenth century world.

Shortly after the traumatic deaths of both their mother and Pushkin, which occurred at roughly the same time in 1837, Dostoevsky and his older brother Mikhail enrolled at the Military Engineering School in St. Petersburg. The six years during which Fyodor attended this Academy contained a series of significant developments in his outlook, among them the apparent murder of his father by serfs in 1839. This somewhat shadowy, yet significant incident in the Dostoyevskian life story has been accorded an unprecedented intensity of research in recent years; Stephen K. Carter has asserted in his 1991 book, The Political and Social Thought of F.M. Dostoyevsky, the fascinating and quite plausible argument that, by calling attention to the plight of the serfs, the murder reinforced Dostoevsky's emerging detestation for the institution of serfdom, and was a major catalyst to his personal radicalization which was to occur in the 1840's.¹²

The early 1840's brought the full efflorescence of Dostoevsky's fascination with Romantic and German Idealistic philosophy, interests which had been budding for several years; he was deeply affected by his reading of the work of men such as Hegel and Goethe. More and more, however, Dostoevsky's thirst for thought which was relevant to the social condition of Russia led him to the philosophy of the French social Romantics. The writing of Balzac was a "revelation" to him, and Victor Hugo was the object of a youthful Dostoevsky's "worship".¹³ Through a commiseration with the expression of social Romanticism, Dostoevsky began to formulate his ideas of a materialistic Europe which was

veering toward moral bankruptcy. As he became increasingly involved in the study of Romantic and social philosophy, he began experiencing the stresses and strains which were inevitable within his personal framework of thought; Dostoevsky was essentially attempting to reconcile the transcendent elements of traditional Christianity, and metaphysics, with an ever heightening social awareness of the day to day suffering of man.

As Dostoevsky became progressively more captivated by Western philosophy and social thought through the 1840's, he became an integral figure among the young progressives who were instrumental in the intellectual development of Russia during this period. As will surely appear ironic to the student of the mature Dostoevsky, the writer's gaze at this point was assuredly fixed on the thought of the West. A self-described proponent of "European liberalism" during the 1840's, Dostoevsky's ideology might be described at this point as reconcilable with those whom Bruce K. Ward terms "the Russian Westernizers."¹⁴

It is a difficult task to achieve a completely satisfactory characterization of many of the major "movements" in Russian intellectual history. Varying analysts inevitably have differing ideas of what is inclusive within a designation such as "Westernizer," or of whom may be categorized, for instance, as a "Slavophile;" both of these categorizations, in fact, come into play in some manner within the context of Dostoevsky's thought and place in Russian intellectual life. For our purposes, suffice it to say that the young Dostoevsky was at first joined with other Westernizers largely by their common interest in the thought of Hegel and the Western Romanticists. By his early twenties, Dostoevsky was deeply concerned not only with social ills within Russia, but also with her relationship to the West,

and thus, in a seminal way, with her historical destiny. Like many other young intellectuals who saw in the thought of the West an applicability to Russia, Dostoevsky became influenced by Vissarion Belinsky, a dynamic literary critic who addressed Western socialism as "the final and best fruit of Western civilization [which might] take up its new abode in a youthful, energetic Russia."¹⁵

Dostoevsky became steeped in the French utopian socialism of George Sand, Saint-Simon and Fourier. Through this philosophy, he and the other Westernizers sought to reconcile their transcendently focused thought with the earthly quest for "freedom, equality and brotherhood."¹⁶ Although the passionate Dostoevsky involved himself deeply in these intellectual pursuits, there existed from an early stage inchoate fissures within the Russian Westernizers, which would ultimately manifest themselves in Dostoevsky's later distaste for the philosophy of the West. While in the 1840's he was perhaps less involved with the strict tenets of Russian Orthodoxy than at any other point in his life, and while he did find that he could satisfy his religiosity by envisioning socialism as a sort of "practical Christianity," Dostoevsky found nevertheless that the emerging atheist humanism and devotion to positivistic science which was exhibited by Belinsky and some of the other Westernizers left an uneasy gnawing in his soul.

Upon graduating from the Academy in 1843 with the stirrings of an ideologue, Dostoevsky abandoned military service and thrust himself into writing. With Poor Folk, published in 1846, he was lauded by Belinsky as a "new Gogol,"¹⁷ as a brilliant writer whose tale of poverty, inner turmoil and social identity was an artistic creation of social and political import.¹⁸ Belinsky's effusive, and, as some have suggested, excessive praise, vaulted

Dostoevsky into the ranks of prominent Westernizing intellectuals. In 1847, Dostoevsky became associated with the Petrashevsky Circle, a group of St. Petersburg socialists (many of them atheists, a fact which no doubt disturbed him) who congregated to discuss politics and social issues.¹⁹ With his liberal and radical connections, Dostoevsky made himself an enemy of the government of Nicholas I, whose policy of "Official Nationality" cast the Westernizers as a threat to the imperial doctrine of "Orthodoxy, autocracy and nationality."²⁰ The irony is immense; for the mature Dostoevsky would perhaps have more in common with the attitudes of an iron-fisted czar, than he would have with the attitudes of his former persona, a young man who associated with radicals and atheists. The political upheavals which swept across Europe in 1848 struck fear into the heart of Tsar Nicholas. For Dostoevsky and his associates, this atmosphere of turmoil brought crisis. On April 23, 1849, the members of the Petrashevsky circle were rounded up and arrested; Dostoevsky was accused of "participation in criminal designs, the circulation of a private letter full of insolent expressions against the Orthodox Church and the Supreme Authority, and an attempt to spread literature against the Government by means of a domestic lithography," and was sentenced to death.²¹

Dostoevsky's arrest and imprisonment marked his first steps down a new road. It would prove to be a serpentine route toward despair, confusion and faith, which would point him, however, toward his loftiest themes. Led in front of a firing squad in December, 1849, he was reprieved by imperial decree at the last moment, and sentenced instead to hard labor which was to commence in the hellish cold of a Siberian winter.²² Dostoevsky's four years in prison possessed for him the qualities of epiphany. The Years of Ordeal: 1850-1859,

the second volume in Frank's previously cited biographical work, recounts in unparalleled detail the suffering, pain and misery which Dostoevsky witnessed and encountered as his health deteriorated rapidly; particularly notable is the fact that it was during his time in Siberia that Dostoevsky's acute and life-long struggle with epilepsy developed.²³ He was allowed one book, a copy of the New Testament. Immersed in an atmosphere of anguish, Dostoevsky grasped this volume and "began to rediscover Christ."²⁴ Religion became the cornerstone of existence for him; with a burgeoning belief fed largely by despair, Dostoevsky began wrestling with the issues which would consume his thoughts for the rest of his life—God, man's fate, the intertwined nature of faith and suffering.

Dostoevsky's turn back to Christianity was joined by his embrace of things Russian: the Russian man, the Russian soul, the Russian spirit. Dostoevsky was deeply affected by his contact with hardened convicts, the murderers and violent criminals with whom he spent his time. Witnessing their devotion to Russian Orthodoxy in the face of hardship, it was during these years that Dostoevsky's love and reverence for the faith, essential nature and inner fiber of the Russian were formed. In his prison experiences, one can see the seeds of Dostoevsky's conception of the "Russian Idea." To him there existed a quality in the Russian spirit which lit the way for hope of salvation and regeneration of the troubled state of both man and Russia, with a more vivid glow than could emanate from Western-imported "Utopian Socialism."

Released from prison in early 1854 at age 32, Dostoevsky was kept in exile at Semipalatinsk, in Siberia, for several years as a private in the army. With more freedom, he read voraciously, requesting of his brother that he send him works ranging from Kant and

Hegel to the Koran and contemporary Russian literature. Toward the end of his period of exile, Dostoevsky married Maria Dmitrievna Isaeva, whom he met in Semipalatinsk, and was granted the right to publish small serialized works.²⁵ In December of 1859, he was released from exile and returned to St. Petersburg, reentering a world of rapid and acute social and political upheaval, and as he came to perceive, a world which was marked by its great spiritual crisis.²⁶

Dostoevsky, as well as the political and intellectual milieu which he now encountered, had undergone significant, indeed monumental change, during his decade in Siberia. The 1855 death of Nicholas I and Russia's crushing defeat in the Crimean War ushered in the era of the reforming and modernizing Alexander I, marked by the Tsar's emancipation of the serfs in 1861. The Russian Westernizers whom Dostoevsky now saw were not at all the Westernizers of his youth; Romantic idealism and emerging progressivism had been exchanged for a fully formed radical ethos, with a materialistic agenda which Dostoevsky found antithetical to his new reliance on faith and spirituality. For Dostoevsky, it was now useless to consider social and political change within a secular context alone. It was also useless to import solely Western philosophical notions without considering the potent tonic of regeneration which he believed to exist within the spirit of the common Russian man.

The period of Dostoevsky's return also saw the continuation of the bitter intellectual struggle between the Russian Westernizers and the aforementioned Slavophiles. The Slavophiles had thrived from 1840-1860, in particular; they were strongly opposed to the intermingling of Russia with the West, feeling that Russian Orthodoxy and the Russian national spirit contained all that was necessary for her historical path. Dmitrij Tschizewskij

synthesizes some fundamental tenets of "classical" Slavophilism; he states:

- 1) Russia has its own unique spirit and ought to go its own historical way-one quite different from that of the West;
- 2) The unique character of Russia was imprinted upon it in "old Russia" (for some this meant Russia before Peter the Great, i.e. before the eighteenth century; for others it meant Russia before Ivan the Terrible, i.e., before the sixteenth century). developments after Peter constitute deviations from Russia's unique path;
- 3) One of the essential elements of Russia's unique character is...Orthodoxy...²⁷

With their many polemics directed against the Catholic Church and the corrupting influences of Western civilization as a whole, the Slavophiles contributed to an air of bitter enmity between the major camps of the Russian intellectual community for several decades. It may seem as if the Slavophiles actually had considerable philosophical similarities to the mature Dostoevsky; and it is true that he perceived the common ground between them. That which separated them however, was crucial: Dostoevsky's philosophy is characterized by its overarching universalizing nature, with its espousal of a Russian-led unification of all men in Christian brotherhood; whereas the Slavophiles focused on the idea of an inherently superior, yet inwardly turning Russia, one which sought a separate path from that of the outside world. Furthermore, one might suggest that the post-exile Dostoevsky, who was "a Slavophile insofar as Slavophilism affirmed the truth of Christianity and the Russian people as bearers of this truth," shared more common ground with the "classical" Slavophiles than with their counterparts who directed the movement after 1860. At the point of Dostoevsky's reentry onto the Russian intellectual scene, the Slavophiles had been drained of their most able blood, with the "more shallow disciples" turning the thought of their forerunners "into

a tiresome litany expressing an impotent yearning for the pre-Petrine past and a self-righteous indignation at everything new in the present. Slavophilism had degenerated into a futile conservatism of the Moscow gentry, and was no longer equal to the struggle with its Westernist opponents."²⁸

Thus, on Dostoevsky's return to St. Petersburg, he was faced with a deeply divided Russian intellectual community. A general simplification, while not of course wholly accurate, affords some idea of the polarized viewpoints which existed. The Western-leaning left often sought irreligious and positivistic answers to questions of society and history, elements of its ideology moving through the stages of radicalism while approaching nihilism, whereas an East-leaning right focused on "a retrospective utopia."²⁹ Dostoevsky chose not to adhere to either side, but rather, to embark on a philosophical path which called for the reconciliation of the Slavophile-Westernizer split beneath the umbrella of the essential unity and universality of the Russian national and spiritual mission:

[in the Russian character] there appears a highly synthesizing capacity for pan-conciliation and pan-humanism. A Russian sympathizes with everything human, disregarding the differences of nationality, blood and background...He has an instinct for pan-humanism... It is almost terrifying how free the Russian is in spirit, how strong is his will...And who knows, foreign gentleman, whether it may not perhaps be Russia that is predestined to wait until after you have reached your end and, meanwhile to absorb your ideas, take over your ideals, reconcile your thoughts, elevate them to a new universal significance, and then, in spirit and free from all irrelevant, class, and 'soil' interests, enter into a new, broad, and as yet historically unknown activity...with which it will carry you all away.³⁰

As the 1860s opened with tumult and uncertainty, the essential chapters of Dostoevsky's religio-philosophical thought began to open. Together with his brother Mikhail, and their associates Nikolay Strakhov and Apollon Grigoryev, Dostoevsky in the early 1860s became the chief spokesman for the *pochvennichestvo*, or the "native soil movement." These

pochvenniki, or "men of the soil," held that the life-giving spirit of the Russian soil, and of the common people who were attached to it, will be the basis for the 'new world' which is to emanate from Russian Orthodoxy and nationality.³¹ The native soil movement contained social, religious, political, cultural and historical applications, basing a conception of Russian nationality and destiny upon a "theory of spiritual types" which was rooted in Russian Orthodoxy.³² As viewed by Dostoevsky and the pochvenniki, the native soil movement was a message of Russian messianism; Russia was destined to synthesize and unite the cultural achievements of all Europe, "utter[ing] the new word" which was to become the basis for all European culture, and for a universal Christian culture.³³ In 1861, the men inaugurated Vremya, or "Time," the journal of their movement.³⁴ Its prospectus read, in part:

We have at last persuaded ourselves that we too are a separate nationality, independent and original in the highest degree, and that our task is to create for ourselves an indigenous form native *to our own soil*... We foresee that... the Russian idea may well be a synthesis of all the ideas that have developed in Europe.³⁵

With his involvement in the native soil movement, Dostoevsky's conception of history began to gain a coherent articulation. The progression of the 1860s brought a few further advances in his intellectual development, which manifested themselves in our period of focus, the years from the late 1860s to early 1880s which formed the apogee of his thought. In 1861 and 1862, Dostoevsky serialized in Vremya a work grounded in his recollections of prison entitled The House of the Dead. In part, it shows the commencement of Dostoevsky's forceful polemic against the radical Westernizers; Frank contends that the story's penetrating involvement with concerns such as freedom, morality, psychology and the spirit stabbed at those "material determinists" and proponents of "rational egoism" who would deny the viability of such unquantifiable human characteristics.³⁶ The realization of Dostoevsky's

long-awaited opportunity to travel in Europe proved to fan the flames of his rapidly-emerging anti-Westernizer (as well as simply anti-Western) animus. To use Denis Dirscherl's apt term, Dostoevsky was "appalled" by the greed, materialism and social inequities which he witnessed in Western Europe.³⁷ Written in 1863, Winter Notes on Summer Impressions recounted the rot and corruption which he perceived in France, Britain and Germany.

Notes From Underground was Dostoevsky's most impassioned attack to date against the radicals when it appeared in 1864. Utilizing his personal writings, as well as the new pochvennichestvo journal, Epokha, or "Epoch", as literary vehicles, Dostoevsky felt compelled to counter the espousals of Nikolai Chernyshevsky, a champion of revolutionary socialism and author of the famed leftist novel What Is To Be Done? Affected by the flow of current events as well as by the ferment of his own thoughts, Dostoevsky's ideological antipathy towards the mind and spirit of the West deepened; personal circumstances led him to undertake further travels to Western Europe which left him with a heightened sense of disillusionment, and he experienced a noted and bitter feud with Russian novelist Ivan Turgenev, who became to Dostoevsky "a mere personification of all that was despicable and ugly in Europe."³⁸ To Dostoevsky, the world of the 1860s suffered from an overabundance of decay, decadence and disbelief; he saw these characteristics exemplified in the socialists, "nihilists," the "atheists" and largely, in the non-Russian world as a whole.

We will not herein consider Crime and Punishment, that novel which for so many readers conjures up the principal image of Dostoevsky, yet which, in terms of the chronologically organized influences upon his philosophy of history, lies just prior to the articulation of his central themes. It was after the completion of this book, in the dawn of

the late 1860s, that his thought shows a deep concern, indeed, an obsession, with the fate of a world in crisis. It is largely from this point forth, that Dostoevsky casts within his writings his conception of a universal historical path along which Russia would be led to her destined role as a herald of Christian salvation. By this point in his intellectual and spiritual development, Dostoevsky was no longer able to consider secular or worldly concepts as entities which could stand on their own. There could be no effective social or political reform without an abiding awareness of religion; there could be no meaningful ordering of life without consideration of faith and the soul; and there could be no valid historical continuum which did not involve the Russian spirit, the Russian faith in Orthodoxy and Christ. To Dostoevsky, the Russian spirit and Christ were inseparable. It is with their guiding hand that the destiny of man and the world will take shape; and it is to Dostoevsky's conception of this destiny that we now turn, through an examination of the elements of his philosophy of history and eschatology.

III. Dostoevsky's Philosophy of History: Sacred History

Underlying the study of Dostoevsky's philosophical thought, is the sheer complexity of their premises and themes, which present a daunting intellectual task to those who strive clearly to delineate the lines of his thought. One might argue, however, that this complexity, while often frustrating to the analyst, ultimately enhances his understanding of Dostoevsky's philosophy and intellectual development by manifesting the interconnectedness of the novelist's voluminous and varied subject matter and concerns. Such is the situation particularly that arises from an examination of his philosophy of history; the cerebral

dexterity which are necessitated by the move to divide the vast scope of Dostoevsky's ideas into manageable, distinct categories, are mitigated somewhat by the discovery of unifying strands which appear to connect the elements of his philosophy of history.

That which I suggest herein is the consideration of the tripartite structure which may be discerned within Dostoevsky's philosophy of history, namely: his schema of history as sacred, and inextricably tied to the divine; his views on the earthly manifestations of sacred history, especially the role of Russia and her relationship to the non-Russian world, most notably the West; and his notion of eschatology. The three divisions of this structure may be envisioned as constituting a set of Russian boxes, each one seated in a larger one: sacred history, as orchestrated by God and experienced by man, is the all-encompassing outer box which contains and controls earthly history; sacred and earthly history thus are tied together as they move toward the apogee of time, the apocalypse. At the core of the schema of concentric boxes is Dostoevsky's notion of eschatology, which represents the ultimate culmination of sacred and earthly history together, resulting in the timeless eternal existence which shall succeed them. Within this series of concentric boxes, the Russian people, national "spirit" and Orthodoxy assume a pivotal role as the beacon, behind which the rest of the world shall follow. Over the course of the journey to spiritual regeneration, there is interconnectedness, Dostoevsky perceives, between earthly and transcendent history, which render the two inseparable. The essence of his philosophy of history is rooted in the belief that, man's actions may contribute to the fixing of his role within the guiding plan of the theocentric cosmos in which he exists.

As has been evidenced by means of a panoptic review of the multitude of intellectual

currents which touched Dostoevsky, his mental and spiritual development entailed a long and protracted inner struggle aimed at defining the unified vision in which he might find true belief. From the perspective of his mature years, his occasional writings will appear, on the one hand, as polemics railing against the waters of rationalist and humanist philosophy in which he had waded in his earlier years. Yet, they also convey the potent dialectic between belief and disbelief, that agonizing road which, in Dostoevsky's view, he and all others, but the saints, must wander in order to arrive at true religious faith.³⁹

Even though he lives in a universe in which there exists true Christianity, and the absolute love and purity which it embodies, man must wrestle with his own free will in order to approach an unquestioning belief in this sublime reality. The road to faith is exceedingly hard, and the free will with which man has been endowed, forces him to endure great suffering, and march through the "Furnace of Doubt" in order to grasp a glimpse of that which is true.⁴⁰ At the heart of Dostoevsky's thought is the knowledge that all believers must suffer and wrestle with the most penetrating, disturbing questions in order to believe. While this struggle is an inevitable part of the time which man spends on earth, the inner dialectic, together with a lifetime of hardships, ultimately point to the truth, i.e., that God, Christ and the opportunity for salvation *do* exist, and they offer the great promise of a magnificent, beautiful, and loving Kingdom of Heaven which will succeed the transient world. Dostoevsky believed this, and he was certain that the pious Russian man, the adherent to Orthodoxy, believed this, as well. The definite existence of, and eternal love offered by, God and Christ, as well as the theological supremacy of the Russian Orthodox faith, which allows man to recognize these truths, came to form the most essential strands of Dostoevsky's view

of world history.

Dostoevsky's philosophy of history departs from the backdrop of this religious belief, which became rooted at the very center of his soul. Overshadowing all earthly history, there exists a transcendent, sacred history, with Christ at its core. In an ultimate sense, the two have a symbiotic relationship, for man's free will dictates that his actions shall play a role in the determination of his fate.

A true mystic in the tradition of the Eastern Church, Dostoevsky did not always show a clearly ordered and delineated vision of the elements of this symbiosis between transcendent and earthly history.⁴¹ His perception was unlike that of Dante's meticulous depiction of heaven, hell and purgatory; it was unlike the seventeenth century deists' image of a "clockmaker" deity who presided over a world endowed with a divine rationality. Dostoevsky, rather, viewed the cosmos in terms of the mystery and nebulousness which he saw represented in its essence. Faith and the divine were not entities which invited quantification, but rather entities which invited meditation upon the qualities of their form, significance and power. Indeed, as was alluded to in previous discussion of his view of Western thought, and as shall be expanded upon further, Dostoevsky saw in the general modern ethos and particularly in modern conceptions of Christian faith and theology, a hyperrationality which was ultimately destructive to morals, the soul and the spirit.

At its most fundamental level, then, Dostoevsky's philosophy of history rests on a conception of the universe as viewed within the context of Russian Orthodox theology. A discussion of the particular elements of this theology itself would open up a vast and complex subject which falls outside the scope of this paper, but which is well treated by

sources such as Vladimir Lossky's previously cited The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church.⁴² As regards Dostoevsky's particular adaptation of Russian Orthodox theology, suffice it to say for the immediate present that he saw Christianity in its purest form to be embodied in the doctrinal tenets of the denomination. For Dostoevsky, Christianity, existed in the East in its full blossomed spirit, unsullied by an overwhelming and ultimately corrupting earthly bureaucracy characteristic of Rome. More elaboration upon the critical dichotomy which Dostoevsky drew between Orthodoxy and Catholicism shall be forthcoming. It is essential to perceive at this juncture, however, the strength with which Dostoevsky embraced the spirit and character of Russian Orthodoxy; it was that which he viewed as the bastion of pure mysticism and the mission of a universal Christian community, "the religion of freedom and love, the definitive triumph of Christ's eternal gospel."⁴³

V.V Zenkovsky has made the astute observation that "Dostoevsky was the first[Russian thinker] to convert all the problems of the human spirit into religious problems."⁴⁴ Zenkovsky's remark is broad in its implications. Dostoevsky sought to reflect the sublimity of Christianity and its role in history in its rightful glory and light. The road to the Kingdom of Heaven, however, is an arduous one. Critical elements of Dostoevsky's philosophy of history are found not merely in an unravelling of scriptural prophecies, although these do play a part. He sees as pivotal the earthly turmoil among men and within men, the struggle for souls, hearts, minds and spirits between "those engaged in trying to realize the kingdom of God in the world and those trying to establish the kingdom of Man to the exclusion of God, between the followers of the God-man [i.e. Christ, my addition] and the followers of the Man-God..."⁴⁵

As a being whose spirit was filled by God with freedom, man has the choice to believe or not to believe, to follow the righteous path or an aberrant one. Dostoevsky's philosophy of history is a scheme in which men frequently take actions which are antagonistic to each other, to their own souls, and to the true Christian order. The historical path which is drawn by these actions and their consequences is juxtaposed with the path drawn by a pure, divine and Orthodox order. Both are elements of sacred history and will ultimately merge into one thread, but their progression is affected by the perpetual struggle between darkness and light, between evil and good, between the self destructive side of the human spirit which hurtles toward debasement, and that side which seeks to uplift itself through faith, humility and fellowship with the community of believers.

In The Brothers Karamazov and in The Idiot, Dostoevsky's conception of the sacredness in history finds its fullest expression. In both novels, a world view springing from a spiritual immersion in pure Russian Orthodoxy is presented as the counterpoise to a world view rooted in impiety, materialism and perversion of the true Christian faith. The dialectic between the forces of belief and disbelief is played out, resulting in the depiction of a theocentric historical scheme, in which the spiritual potency and apocalyptic vision of Russian Orthodoxy is made manifest. This dialectic is the fundamental current which runs through Dostoevsky's depiction of sacred history; it is also, in keeping with the mystical tone of his piety, one of the less concrete elements within Dostoevsky's philosophy of history. It becomes apparent that the nebulous, transcendent tone which frequently permeates Dostoevsky's stylistic treatment of the union between history and the divine is intended. As his writings imply, it is the forces of sacrilege whose essence is implied by the rational and

mechanistic mentality indicative not only of the modern age, but of the structure of the Catholic Church, as well. As seen by Dostoevsky, the forces of good and spiritual piety are not of the earthly and materialistic realm, but belong to a higher plane of divinity which is approached only by the Russian Orthodox faith and its lack of temporal concerns.

"The Legend of the Grand Inquisitor," and a subsequent, related section within The Brothers Karamazov entitled "The Russian Monk" are Dostoevsky's most powerful expressions of that struggle between the faithful and the faithless which lies at the crux of universal history as sacred. Ivan Karamazov, a brilliant, atheistic and nihilistic radical, relates to his younger brother, Alyosha, a pious junior member of an Orthodox religious order who exhibits far less worldliness than his brother, the tale of the "Grand Inquisitor." The tale is an apocryphal story in which Christ returns in the flesh to Seville in the midst of the Spanish Inquisition, to find that the fathers of the Church community loathe him for the threat His message poses to their earthly power, and wish to burn him at the stake as a heretic. The Inquisitor admonishes Christ with indignation for His having endowed upon men a divine gift of free will which they are utterly ill-equipped to handle. It is the feeling of the Inquisitor and other officials of the Church community, that they can do the most good for the masses of ignorant men by orchestrating their corporeal and spiritual lives through the wielding of absolute earthly power. The Inquisitor's wish is to guide man through the social and political authority of church structure, while denying to him the most essential divinely intended element of his existence-the power to make the conscious choice to accept or reject the miracle of faith and salvation.⁴⁶

In assuming a role based not on their divinely bestowed gift of spiritual intercession,

but on their earthly power, the Grand Inquisitor and like members of the clergy appear to have completely inverted and corrupted God's universal plan. The Grand Inquisitor states:

With us everyone will be happy, and they will no longer rebel or destroy each other, as in your freedom, everywhere. Oh, we shall convince them that they will only become free when they resign their freedom to us, and submit to us...They themselves will be convinced that we are right, for they will remember to what horrors of slavery and confusion your freedom led them. Freedom, free reason and science will lead them into such a maze, and confront them with such miracles and insoluble mysteries, that some of them, unruly and ferocious, will exterminate themselves; others, unruly but feeble, will exterminate each other; and the remaining third, feeble and wretched, will crawl to our feet and cry out to us: 'Yes, you were right, you alone possess his mystery, and we are coming back to you-save us from ourselves.'⁴⁷

As I interpret "The Legend of the Grand Inquisitor," that earthly scheme which the Grand Inquisitor envisions is the very state of existence against which the believer and the true Christian community must struggle during the course of history. The Inquisitor and his ilk have been blinded by earthly pride; they themselves hold a vision of Christianity, sacred history and ultimate apocalyptic revelation which is the antithesis of the true vision of the faithful. The Inquisitor continues:

The most tormenting secrets of their conscience-all, all they will bring to us, and we will decide all things, and they will joyfully believe our decision, because it will deliver them from their great care and their present terrible torments of personal and free decision. And everyone will be happy, all the millions of creatures, except for the hundred thousand of those who govern them. For only we, we who keep the mystery, only we shall be unhappy. There will be thousands of millions of happy babes, and a hundred thousand sufferers who have taken upon themselves the curse of the knowledge of good and evil. Peacefully they will die, peacefully they will expire in your name, and beyond the grave they will find only death. But we will keep the secret, and for their own happiness we will entice them with a heavenly and eternal reward. For even if there were anything in the next world, it would not, of course, be for such as they...⁴⁸

While its themes, including attacks on the full range of "godless and materialist

socialism," are of far broader scope than solely an attack on Western Christianity, it is reasonable to suggest that "The Legend of the Grand Inquisitor" is in part, a harsh polemic against the Roman Catholic church.⁴⁹ Shortly after hearing the tale, Alyosha gives the impassioned response: "It's a far cry from the Orthodox idea...It's Rome, and not even the whole of Rome, that isn't true-they're the worst of Catholicism, the Inquisitors, the Jesuits...! Dostoevsky's deep disillusionment with the mind and the ethos of the West was largely embodied in his philosophical distaste for Catholic doctrine, an important theme in his philosophy of history which shall be explored at several additional junctures. In Dostoevsky's thought, the Roman Catholic Church's entanglement with political and other worldly affairs gave it a temporal focus, serving to distract it from the true spiritual mission of Christianity. Emanating from this excessive concern with the worldly trappings of power structure and administration, was a church which "imprisoned Christ and replaced him with authority, papacy, and the Jesuits." ⁵⁰

In The Idiot, also, the crisis of faith is presented as well; Christian belief is faced with the chaotic, materialistic and atheistic ethos of modernity, in a struggle to stay away from the dark abyss of apostasy. The protagonist, Prince Myshkin, is presented as the clumsy and misunderstood figure of pure Christian faith, fighting to retain his spiritual equilibrium in the midst of an Age which cannot understand him. Prince Myshkin is embroiled in tumult within his own soul, seeking to retain a grip on belief when the hour is darkest. In the novel, Myshkin is deeply affected by Hans Holbein's 1521 painting, *Christ in the Tomb*:

The picture shows Christ, just taken down from the cross. I believe artists usually depict Christ, whether on the cross or taken down from it, as still retaining a trace of extraordinary beauty in the face; they seek to preserve this beauty in him, even during the most terrible agonies There was no hint of beauty in Rogozhin's picture;

it is an out-and-out depiction of the body of a man who has endured endless torments even before the crucifixion-wounds, torture, beatings from the guards, blows from the populace when he was carrying the cross and fell beneath it, and finally the agony of the cross...In the picture, the face is terribly mangled by blows, swollen, with terrible, swollen, bloody bruises, the eyes open and unfocused; the whites wide open, gleaming with a kind of deathly, glazed lustre. But it's odd; as you look at this corpse of a tortured man a most curious question comes to mind: if a corpse like that...was seen by all his disciples, his future chief apostles, and seen by the women who followed him and stood by the cross, by all in fact who believed in and worshipped him, how could they have believed, looking at such a corpse, that the martyr would rise again? The compulsion would be to think that if death was so dreadful, and nature's laws so powerful, how could they possibly be overcome?...Looking at that picture, one has the impression of nature as some enormous, implacable, dumb beast, or more precisely...the guise of a vast modern machine which has pointlessly seized, dismembered and devoured, in its blind and insensible fashion, a great and priceless being, a being worth all of nature and all her laws, worth the entire earth...The picture is, as it were, the medium through which this notion of some dark, insolent, senselessly infinite force to which everything is subordinated is unwittingly conveyed. The people who surrounded the dead man...must have felt a terrible anguish and confusion on that evening, which had shattered all their hopes and almost their entire belief at one fell blow...⁵¹

Great, indeed, is the spiritual hardship which must be endured to arrive at and retain true belief, particularly within a cultural and intellectual milieu in which men are robbed of the essential freedom of their souls. The faithful must persist, however; they must struggle against the spiritual debasement of others of their own Age, and they must struggle against their own inner doubts. With such an effort of faith, Dostoevsky felt that men could realize the purest love of God and Christ, regardless of the opposing forces.

For Dostoevsky, then, there was a false and beckoning road which threatened to divert man from the true path of sacred history; this was the road of nonbelievers, of apostates and corrupters of the faith, and of doubters who sowed doubt in others. The model and guide for those who wish to tread on God's true path, however, is Father Zossima, the Russian Orthodox monk, whose presence and espousals within The Brothers Karamazov

exemplify the spiritually pure mission with which the Eastern Church counterbalances the errant ways of the West:

...among monks so many are humble and meek, thirsting for solitude and fervent prayer in peace. People point less often to these monks, and even pass them over in silence, and how surprised they would be if I were to say that from these meek ones, thirsting for solitary prayer, will perhaps come once again the salvation of the Russian land! For truly they are made ready in peace 'for the day and the hour, and the month and the year.' Meanwhile, in their solitude they keep the image of Christ fair and undistorted, in the purity of God's truth, from the time of the ancient fathers, apostles and martyrs, and when the need arises they will reveal it to the wavering truth of the world. This is a great thought. This star will shine forth from the East."⁵²

Upon being told by the Grand Inquisitor, "...if anyone has ever deserved our stake, it is you. Tomorrow I shall burn you.," Christ responded with nothing but silence and a kiss of love. It was with this as an example that Father Zossima instructed his flock on that which they should aspire to:

Love all of God's creation, both the whole of it and every grain of sand. Love every leaf, every ray of God's light. Love animals, love plants, love each thing. If you love each thing, you will perceive the mystery of God in things. Once you have perceived it, you will begin tirelessly to perceive more and more of it every day. And you will come at last to love the whole world with an entire, universal love...My young brother asked forgiveness of the birds: It seems senseless, yet it is right, for all is like an ocean, all flows and connects; touch it in one place and it echoes at the other side of the world...Tormented by universal love, you, too, would then start praying to the birds, as if in a sort of ecstasy, and entreat them to forgive your sin. Cherish this ecstasy...⁵³

To Dostoevsky, the common Russian faithful were "Christbearers;" they embodied a depth of spirit which was capable of such great piety and universal vision.⁵⁴ The Russian people also understood, as represented by Christ, and as manifested in light of their arduous national history, that suffering was an integral part of attaining salvation. Father Zossima preached:

...if everyone abandons you and drives you out by force, then, when you are left alone, fall down on the earth and kiss and water it with your tears, and the earth will bring forth fruit from your tears, even though no one has seen or heard you in your solitude. Have faith to the end, even if it should happen that all on earth are corrupted and you alone remain faithful: make your offering even so, and praise God, you who are the only one left.⁵⁵

The earthly manifestation of sacred history involves the battle for hegemony over man between those who are represented by the Grand Inquisitor, and those who are represented by Father Zossima. The linear framework of Dostoevsky's philosophy of history carries the struggle for souls towards its apocalyptic apogee. Inasmuch as all of history somehow falls within the sphere of the divine, it becomes apparent that Judgement Day will reflect the outcome of earthly events.

Within the ambit of sacred history, it is necessary to consider in greater depth the dichotomous relationship which Dostoevsky drew between Catholic and Orthodox Christianity within his philosophy. To what extent can we detect Dostoevsky's own perceptions in the frenzied words of Prince Myshkin?:

Roman Catholicism is even more than atheism itself. In my opinion! Yes, that's my opinion! Atheism only preaches a negation, but Catholicism goes further: it preaches a distorted Christ, a Christ calumniated and defamed by themselves, the opposite of Christ! It preaches the Antichrist...Roman Catholicism cannot hold its position without universal political supremacy...to my thinking Roman Catholicism is not even a religion, but simply the continuation of the Western Roman Empire, and everything in it is subordinated to that idea, faith to begin with. The Pope seized the earth, an earthly throne, and grasped the sword; everything has gone on in the same way since, only they have added to the sword lying, fraud, deceit, fanaticism, superstition, villainy. They have trifled with the most holy, truthful, sincere, fervent feelings of the people; they have bartered it all, all for money, for base earthly power. And isn't that the teaching of Antichrist? How could atheism fail to come from them? Atheism has sprung from Roman Catholicism itself...it is begotten by their lying and their spiritual impotence!...Out over there, in Europe, a terrible mass of the people themselves are beginning to lose their faith...⁵⁶

Although Myshkin's diatribe has a wild-eyed tone, it is not far-fetched to assert that the bases for his viewpoints are very similar to Dostoevsky's. It must be kept in mind that Catholicism often appeared to Dostoevsky as an imprecise entity, essentially as a chief element of the "Western corruption" against which he inveighed with such fervor. Even Berdyaev, who had great sympathy for many of Dostoevsky's viewpoints, cautions that "Dostoevsky had an extremely inadequate and entirely exterior knowledge of Catholicism."⁵⁷ Geoffrey C. Kabat makes the assertion that "Dostoevsky regards the Catholics as the most dangerous destabilizing party in Europe...[together with socialism, it is] predicated on the rejection of Christ, on atheism, and on the organization of society for narrow political purposes..."⁵⁸

How did Dostoevsky come to such a harsh determination regarding Catholicism? He felt that the Roman Church, as opposed to Eastern Orthodox Christianity, had been contaminated with an impure taint which was traceable to the early reaches of its history:

[in the days of the early formation of Christianity] Christian communes-churches-arose, following which a new, hitherto unheard-of nation began to form itself-all brotherly, all humanitarian in the form of an Oecumenical [sic] Church. But it was subjected to persecution; its ideal was moulded underground, while on the earth's surface a huge edifice, an enormous ant-hill, was being erected-the ancient Roman Empire...A collision of two diametrically opposed ideas occurred: the man-God encountered the God-man, Apollo of Belvedere encountered Christ. A compromise took place: the Empire embraced Christianity, while the Church accepted the Roman law and the Roman state. A small part of the Church retired into the wilderness and continued there its original work: Christian communes again came into existence, and later monasteries...the remaining overwhelming portion of the Church subsequently split into two parts. In the Western part the state, at length, subdued the Church altogether. Papacy arose-a continuation of the ancient Roman Empire in a new incarnation. In the Eastern half, however, the state was conquered and destroyed by the sword of Mohammed, and there remained only Christ detached from the state. That state which embraced and again raised Christ has endured such dreadful secular sufferings from its enemies, the Tartars, want of order, serfdom, Europe and Europeanism-is still enduring so much suffering-that actually no real social formula

in the spirit of love and Christian self-improvement has yet been elaborated in it...our people are only Christ-bearers and they place their entire hope in Him alone...this comprises the idea of their whole future.⁵⁹

In Dostoevsky's eyes, the Roman Catholic church assumed the mantle of earthly rule which had been held by imperial Rome. In so doing, the Western Church committed the grievous sin of wedding itself to the principle that spiritual purity was contingent upon temporal authority. Like the pagan empire which preceded it, the Roman Catholic Church attempted to yoke men together into a universal community which existed under the banner of an earthly edifice. For Dostoevsky, no universal community could possess legitimacy if it was subjugated by men who claimed to represent divine authority, yet who established and perpetuated their power along material lines. The worldly emphasis of a system such as Catholicism, in which the "political organization of society must precede the achievement of brotherhood and justice," led its followers to pursue the goal of a community in which an idyllic temporal situation was attainable; hence the connection to socialism, with its pursuit of an earthly, secular, social ideal.⁶⁰ To the mature Dostoevsky, such ideas were anathema; they seemed to veer dangerously close to an acceptance of an historical progression, which occurred exclusively within time, and to the exclusion of the divine.

In Dostoevsky's estimation, Russian Orthodoxy permitted the cultivation of faith to flourish independent of the affairs of state, thereby allowing an untrammelled pursuit of universal regeneration based on transcendent principles. It was his contention that the organization of life and society, rather than being orchestrated along the lines of implicitly secular, coercive and politically manipulative methods of social engineering which he saw embodied in Western government, must be achieved in accordance with the Orthodox ideal of *sobornost*, or "mutual free association in the presence of Christ."⁶¹ On these counts, it

is important to realize that Dostoevsky saw in Russian Orthodoxy, specifically, the purest embodiment of the teachings of the Eastern Church. He was aware of the intertwined nature of church and state which had prevailed during the era of the Byzantine Empire and its "Caesaropapist" emperors; he therefore attempted to keep separate in his own mind the tenets of Orthodoxy, from the historical past of the administrative body of the Eastern Church, per se. He felt that the history of the Byzantine church had been too tightly bound with issues of politics and various "national antagonisms"; the church had at various times experienced entanglements with the Islamic Empire as well as with "subject peoples" such as Greeks, Bulgars, and Serbs. Therefore, when Dostoevsky implies that "the Orthodox doctrine has been preserved since olden times inviolate and in its brightest purity," he attributes this to the pure and holy efforts of the monastic community, in particular, rather than to the works of administrative ecclesiastical functionaries. Hence, there was a critical place in Dostoevsky's historical scheme for men of the Russian Orthodox monastic tradition such as Father Zossima, and his young disciple, Alyosha Karamazov.⁶²

Thomas Masaryk makes the point that Dostoevsky "hoped for his own kind of 'Catholicism' and that is why he had to turn against the Roman variety."⁶³ This issue, of course, lies at the crux of Dostoevsky's philosophy of history. His wholly enveloping love of Russia led him to espouse the universal exportation of the spirituality of his homeland, on bases which would perhaps not always hold up to comprehensive scrutiny on the grounds of particular theological and historical issues. Dostoevsky saw in the Russian Orthodox faith the very essence of the selfless ideal of Christian love:

'The great Eastern eagle, shining with his two wings on the peaks of Christianity, soared over the world.' He seeks no conquest or acquisition, no

expansion of his borders; but the liberation of the oppressed and the downtrodden, giving them new life for their benefit and that of mankind...dear is the peaceful victory of the great Christian spirit preserved in the East.⁶⁴

As exemplified in its purest form by Father Zossima, and as practiced by the common Russian, the spirit of Russian Orthodoxy is the vehicle by which the scheme of sacred history shall be carried out among men:

Isn't there in Orthodoxy alone both the truth and the salvation of the Russian people, and-in the forthcoming centuries-of mankind as a whole? Hasn't there been preserved in Orthodoxy alone, in all its purity, the Divine image of Christ? And, perhaps, the most momentous preordained destiny of the Russian people, within the destinies of mankind at large, consists in the preservation in their midst of the Divine image of Christ, in all its purity, and, when the time comes, in the revelation of this image to the world which has lost its way!⁶⁵

Through its purity and precepts, Russian Orthodoxy will lead men through earthly travails to ultimate universal communion at the end of time, and to the realization of the Kingdom of Heaven.

IV. Earthly History

By shifting the present focus to those of Dostoevsky's prophecies which pertain to earthly history; i.e., to particular trends in nationalism, politics, strategy and social movements, one is essentially examining the manner in which temporal events advance the progress of humanity toward the goal of a theocentric universal community. In his unpublished papers from as far back as the mid 1860s, Dostoevsky formulated a framework for a three part division of historical progression, in which "patriarchy was the primitive condition. Civilization is the middle, the transitional [and] Christianity-the third and final degree of man,...at this point development stops, the ideal is attained..."⁶⁶ In those of his

later writings which constitute the focus of this study, Dostoevsky expanded upon the fate of man as it was manifested in the second and third stages of this scheme. In this manner, he illustrated that the decaying state of European civilization would undergo a revitalization which was to be spearheaded through the divine inspiration, and the guidance, of Russia and her people.

In Dostoevsky's mind, the central issues of earthly history stemmed from the need to minister to the moral and spiritual sickness of the modern world. This malaise, of course, had religious roots: "in the West Christ has been lost (through the fault of Catholicism), and because of that the West is declining, exclusively because of that."⁶⁷ Dostoevsky held that the ideas, practices and dogmas of Catholicism were the basis for Western European culture (thus, the spiritual misguidance of Catholicism threatened Russia by way of the Russian Westernizers' eager absorption of Western influences ideas); therefore, the contemporary moral, social and political ills against which Dostoevsky directed his polemics were essentially byproducts of a corruption of the true Christian Idea.

The Devils, perhaps more than any other of Dostoevsky's novels catalogued the symptoms of a spiritually sick age. Radical socialism, positivistic science, atheism, and ultimately, nihilism, were all manifestations of the long developing scourge which loomed as a cloud shadowing the spiritual integrity of both Russia and the entire world community: "That's exactly like our Russia. These devils who go out of the sick man and enter into the swine-these are all the sores, all the infections, all the impurities, all the devils and imps that have accumulated in our great and dear invalid, our Russia, over the course of centuries..."⁶⁸

Its pages dripping with angst, tumult and piercing stabs at the radical agenda and persona, Dostoevsky utilizes his tale of revolutionaries in Russia to make it clear that all social and political movements which attempt to subsist on secular lifeblood are doomed to failure. Yes, Russia will undergo improvement and regeneration, but not by the means nor for the ends which the radicals espouse:

...not one people has yet ordered its life in accordance with the principles of science and reason...Socialism is by its very nature bound to be atheistic because it has proclaimed from the very first that it is an atheistic institution and that it intends to organize itself exclusively on the principles of science and reason. Reason and science have always, today and from the very beginning of time, played a secondary and a subordinate part; and so they will to the end of time. Peoples are formed and moved by quite a different force, a force that dominates and exercises its authority over them, the origin of which, however, is unknown and inexplicable. That force is the force of an unquenchable desire to go on to the end and, at the same time, to deny the existence of an end. It is the force of an incessant and persistent affirmation of its existence and a denial of death. It is the spirit of life, as the Scripture says, "rivers of living water," the running dry of which is threatened in Revelation...The purpose of the whole evolution of a nation, in every people and at every period of its existence, is solely the pursuit of God, their God, their very own God, and faith in Him as the only one. God is the synthetic personality of the whole people, taken from its beginning to its end...⁶⁹

They are the words of Shatov, a character in The Devils, but they could be the words of Dostoevsky himself. Shatov continues:

A truly great people can never reconcile itself to playing second fiddle in the affairs of humanity, not even to playing an important part, but always and exclusively the chief part. If it loses that faith, it is no longer a nation. But there is only one truth, and therefore there is only one nation among all the nations that can have the true God, even though other nations may have their own particular great gods. And the only "god-bearing" people is the Russian people...⁷⁰

The foregoing statement expresses, in esse, the earthly face of Dostoevsky's philosophy of history. It combines nationalism and the religious faith of the Russian people into one cohesive concept, resulting in the notion of a nation and a place with a divine

national mission. Russia will overcome the nonbelievers within her own borders; she will reveal the truth also to those abroad. The faith of the Russian people and the purity of Russian Orthodoxy will bring about a religious regeneration; and it shall be paralleled by the rising to preeminence of Russia as the leader among nations, and as the only geostrategic superpower with a valid moral imperative. It was Dostoevsky's hope that the leadership of Russia would prompt man to cast off the golden calf of post-Enlightenment Western science, and to embrace Christian ideals in its stead. Russian leadership as hegemon of Europe, and indeed, of the world as a whole, was necessary for this to occur.

As has been stressed throughout these pages, Dostoevsky sought in his philosophy of history to achieve a union of the particulars of social, political and foreign affairs, with the more abstract realms of faith, the spirit and destiny. He gave expression to an existent Russian national mission or "Idea," to a linking of the spiritual calling of the Russian religion and people; together with a forecasting of the imminent supremacy of the Russian nation. By situating a Russia, which he viewed as a vigorous national, as well as a spiritual entity at the core of this scheme, his pronouncements took on a tone which many listeners, particularly non-Russians, might understandably receive with considerable foreboding.

By stressing Russian global hegemony as a means by which the nineteenth century crisis of civilization might be alleviated, Dostoevsky entered into the arena of strategic considerations, as well as into issues pertaining to political, ethnic and religious tensions. Hans Kohn asserts that Dostoevsky's conception of "Nationalist Messianism" is an idea which extends Russian imperialism to so great an extent that it actually parallels Stalinist thought; Geoffrey Kabat speaks of the extreme xenophobia which characterizes Dostoevsky's world

view, while others allude to his rabid chauvinism.⁷¹

It is imperative to remember that Dostoevsky himself, like those who analyze his thought, are frequently speaking from the context of an intellectual milieu in which strategic and ideological competition among nation states is a topic of central concern. This does not mitigate the fact, however, that Dostoevsky risks attenuating critical religio-philosophical elements of his philosophy of history by becoming embroiled in superficial and hyperbole-laden treatment of complex geostrategic and political issues. By treating these concerns in a manner which betrays his lack of true understanding and facility with world affairs, he risks being accused of ignoring and violating the profound differences between transcendent and temporal authority in a manner approximating that of which he accuses the Catholic Church.

It is in Dostoevsky's Diary of a Writer that matters pertaining to the Russian role in earthly history are treated to their fullest extent. In analyzing the Diaries, it is necessary to consider Dostoevsky's jingoistic tone as an important part of the equation in recognizing the position of unparalleled significance which Russia and her national destiny were to be ascribed in Dostoevsky's philosophy of history: "The Great Russian only now begins to live; he is just arising to utter his new word-and, perhaps, to the whole world. In my judgment, Moscow--this center of the Great Russians--is destined to live long, and let's pray God that it be so. Moscow, thus far, has not been the third Rome; and the prophecy that "there shall be no fourth Rome" must be fulfilled. Nor can the world do without a Rome..."⁷² Dostoevsky illustrates with this pronouncement that he conceives of Moscow as the third Rome, thus providing the critical point from which the Russian national mission of pan-

human salvation may depart. The first Rome was corrupted by its own paganism and by the transferral of ungodliness to the Western Church and Empire. The second Rome, Constantinople, emerged as the home of the true Christian faith, yet it too fell to unbelievers; conquests first by the hand of Western Crusaders, and then by the hand of Turks, left the city without a righteous guardian.

In Dostoevsky's view, Moscow was to be the final successor to the Byzantine Empire. The conquest of Constantinople by Russia thus emerged as a key factor, if man was to be rescued from the clutches of apostasy:

Constantinople must be *ours*, conquered by *us*, Russians, from the Turks, and remain ours forever. She must belong to us alone...Precisely now the new phase of Russia's existence begins. Constantinople is the center of the Eastern world, while Russia is its spiritual center and its head...Russia, possessing Constantinople, would be guarding the freedom of all Slavs and of *all Eastern* peoples without drawing a line between them and the Slavs. During all these centuries the Mohammadan rule over all these peoples has been not a unifying but an oppressive force; under that rule they did not even dare to move, which means that they have not lived like human beings at all. However, with the abolition of the Mohammadan rule, there might ensue among these peoples, who would suddenly leap out from under the yoke to freedom, awful chaos...Temporarily Russia would serve as a unifying force precisely by reason of the fact that she would firmly establish herself in Constantinople. Russia would save them from one another and would guard the freedom of the entire East and its future order.⁷³

This key passage, from an 1877 essay entitled in part, "Constantinople Must Be Ours," not only is a call for the Russian occupation of Constantinople, but alludes to specific elements of the "future order" which shall be ushered in by this conquest. Dostoevsky was enraptured by current events and politics, and believed that they held great significance within a broad metahistorical context. Throughout the 1870s, the frequently turbulent situation in the Balkans was of particular concern to him; hostilities between Slavs and Muslims in the region were viewed by Dostoevsky as emblematic of the ongoing struggle for

spiritual and strategic influence which was faced by Russia together with her ethnic and religious brethren. He viewed the Russian historical mission as being closely linked to the well-being of the Slavs, who, as ethnic relatives and fellow adherents to Orthodoxy, were entitled to share in Russia's holy destiny in the role of a protected smaller brother:

...that assimilation of the Slavs under the rule of Russia, signifies and comprises a spiritual union of all those who believe that our great Russia, at the head of the united Slavs, will utter to the world, to the whole of European mankind and to civilization, her new, sane and as yet unheard-of word. That word will be uttered for the good and genuine unification of mankind as a whole in a new, brotherly, universal union whose inception is derived from the spirit of the great Russian people who have suffered so long, who during so many centuries have been doomed to silence, but who have always possessed great powers for clarifying and settling many bitter and fatal misunderstandings of Western European civilization.⁷⁴

For Dostoevsky, it was in keeping with the imminence of historical destiny that Russia must "come to the assistance of the [Slavs] against the Turks," the "oppressors of Christianity" who formed "a savage, disgusting Mohammadan horde, the sworn enemy of civilization." It is not without irony, one notes, that Dostoevsky's intention in expressing such deeply nescient vitriol was to "arouse comforting thoughts...[in the] firm belief that Russia exists for the sole purpose of serving Christ and promoting ecumenic Orthodoxy *as a whole*."⁷⁵

In looking to southern Europe and the Near East, Dostoevsky saw a clouded "Eastern Question," a collection of Christians whose disparate ethnic and national interests demanded great efforts at cohesiveness in the face of that which he viewed as the Islamic menace. Simultaneously, to the west, the course of Russian and world history was being impacted by a European situation on the verge of cataclysmic disarray. From the "Catholic Conspiracy,"⁷⁶ to the impotent governments and ruling interests of France, England and Germany, Dostoevsky details in the Diaries those empty political machinations which he

viewed merely as contributing factors to the inevitable:

...even now the dreadful fact is revealed-the fact that this is the last word of civilization. This last word has been uttered and revealed; now it is known, and it is the result of the whole development of eighteen centuries-of the whole humanization of humanity. All Europe, at least her leading representatives-those same men and nations who vociferated against slavery; who abolished Negro trade; who destroyed their domestic despotism; who proclaimed the rights of men; who created science and astounded the world with its power; who animated and captivated the human soul with art and its sacred ideals; who kindled enthusiasm and faith in the hearts of men by promising them in the very near future justice and truth-these same peoples and nations...are turning their backs on millions of...Christians, men, their own brethren...⁷⁷

Dostoevsky issued this statement in 1876, in specific reference to the lack of European support which was shown for Christians who were fighting against Turks in the Balkans. Taken in the context of the entire scope of Dostoevsky's thought, however, the words may be understood as a broad indictment of European civilization. For Dostoevsky, the whole-scale degeneration of the Western spirit has caused Europe to turn its back on Christianity as a whole, and has rendered the former powers of the continent unable to continue their role of leadership. The mantle will, therefore, pass to a new and enduring power:

Russia will prove stronger than any nation in Europe. This will come to pass because all great powers in Europe will be destroyed, for the simple reason that they will be worn out...there will remain on the Continent but one colossus-Russia.⁷⁸

Clearly, Dostoevsky saw the second, or "civilization" stage of history, as he referred to it in his unpublished papers, as a previously grand edifice of Western European construction which was now no longer viable. Russia, with her patient, devout people, pious spirit, raw power, is the only earthly entity capable of guiding man out from the ruins of the ephemeral to the light of the eternal.

What are we to make of Dostoevsky's vision of earthly history? Undeniably, it is a

weak aspect of his thought. An abstract thinker by nature, Dostoevsky gave rise to fundamental inconsistencies when he attempted to reconcile his pondering of divine mysteries with day to day affairs. His claims for Russian political and strategic hegemony were rooted in the soul, reflecting a deep understanding of the importance of the unquantifiable inner fire and spirit which ultimately guides man; yet, his predictions took too little serious account of the exigencies of contemporary issues, both domestic and abroad. Dostoevsky's thought suffered from a lack of true depth in critical fields such as the history of religion and theology; many of his assumptions regarding the course of future events were grounded in an inadequate or skewed perception of that which had preceded his own time. For Dostoevsky, the pan-human mission of salvation formed the essence of Russian existence, and it was inevitable that each step along her historical path would point toward that goal. In his estimation, it necessarily followed that the paths of Muslim, Roman Catholic and Jew, of French, English or German, were aberrant ones. It was a fact of cosmic existence that temporal history was woven by endless series of such aberrations from the true path. Ultimately, it was only with the end of time that the Russian Idea was to be realized in its fullest efflorescence.

V. Eschatology and Concluding Remarks

Dostoevsky's religious and philosophical meditations evince a conceptual concern with apocalyptic matters which runs so deep, that eschatology emerges as the focal point of his philosophy of history. This intellectual leitmotif drove him to formulate a view of eschatology, which conceives of it as the culmination and apogee of his philosophy of

history. Dostoevsky's vision of the Apocalypse draws significantly on concepts from the New Testament Book of Revelations, and its imagery of a tumultuous end to earthly time.

On the one hand, Dostoevsky's conception of eschatology would appear to be the great unifier of his religious and historical philosophy, for it provides the denouement to the ongoing struggle throughout historical time between those who would seek the man-God, and those others who would seek the God-man. At the conclusion of this struggle, the eternal Kingdom of Heaven will incorporate the cosmos, with Christ reigning upon the throne. Yet, again, on the other hand, Dostoevsky's theory of eschatology underscores certain fundamental incongruities within his philosophy of history. These relate largely to issues adumbrated in the previous two sections, wherein Dostoevsky's thoughts regarding temporal history were treated. It will be recalled that Dostoevsky's thought rings much truer and with more clarity when it concerns issues of transcendental faith and the spirit. Once he becomes immersed in the particulars of earthly history, he risks ensnaring his philosophy in a web of contradictions. This danger is pointed up when one tries to reconcile Dostoevsky's general view of the apocalypse, i.e., the collapse of earthly time within an environment of fury, with his general view of the Russian "mission."

It is unnecessary to examine fully here the inconsistencies within Dostoevsky's conception of the Russian mission; it is useful to reiterate, however, that the premises of political as well as spiritual superiority upon which this idea rested, appear paradoxically similar to the supposed doctrinal shortcomings of Catholicism, against which he railed. In comparing Dostoevsky's conception of Russia's destiny, against the image of a world which he depicts as beyond hope within his apocalyptic scheme, one ultimately is left unsure as to

what the role he conceives for Russia actually entails. If earthly time is on the brink of apocalypse, then what could be the possible use of a Russian earthly mission? Is Russia supposed to stave off the apocalypse, initiate the apocalypse, or simply guide the way to the end of time and commencement of an eternal heavenly existence? And what of his vitriolic espousals? Do these point more toward a universalizing mission of salvation, or toward the provocation of a cataclysmic conflict; or are these two things contingent upon one another? The answers to these questions are unclear. Is an apocalyptic war to occur, with Russia emerging as earthly victor just as time closes? Again, one is left guessing.

Gary Saul Morson's enlightening The Boundaries of Genre discusses The Diary of a Writer in terms of its call for a "Russian utopia built on European ruins," which phrase is not an inaccurate assessment of that which Dostoevsky proposes therein.⁷⁹ Does this imply Dostoevsky's belief, as Morson suggests, that, "as promised in the Revelation to St. John...[the] battle will be followed by the millennium-which, for him, means a worldwide utopia headed by Russia and based on the Russian Orthodox faith?"⁸⁰ If this is so, it would seem to imply a sacrilegious conflation of earthly entity with divine scheme, which, with or without Russia, one would think that Dostoevsky would find abhorrent. In essence, the point is this: coming on the heels of Dostoevsky's view of sacred and earthly history, his notion of eschatology presents problems for the reader and student of his work that Dostoevsky himself never fully worked out. Particularly troublesome are the vague lines which Dostoevsky draws between those events which occur in the temporal sphere, i.e., that which takes place before the close of time; and those events which occur in the transcendent sphere, i.e., subsequent to, and independent of the passage of time. This, perhaps, was

simply the nature of the man--he was a vast, noncompartmentalized thinker, who was content to ignore specific details if they could not be fully reconciled with his fundamental themes.

It is necessary for the time being, then, to put aside the accumulation of intellectual baggage and take a brief look at the elements of his apocalyptic eschatology, as Dostoevsky depicted them. C.M. Woodhouse makes the claim that in analyzing prophecy, one must differentiate actual prediction from the apocalyptic "manner" of writers such as Isaiah, St. John the Divine and Blake.⁸¹ Dostoevsky, it seems, would find such a distinction anathema, for while some predictions may not come to pass, there was for him an immutable thread connecting the possibility of actual events with the sacred context in which they occur. This is evidenced repeatedly within his philosophy of history and eschatology, for he saw concrete trends and events within the unravelling of time, which pointed toward an impending, inescapable and divinely ordained end.

Dostoevsky's meditations on eschatology had evolved over the period of time upon which we are focusing, i.e., from the late 1860s to the late 1870s and early 1880s. In form and content, The Brothers Karamazov, represents the pinnacle of Dostoevsky's religious philosophy and philosophy of history, the apogee at which several different strands within his thought converged. The novel, particularly "The Legend of the Grand Inquisitor," articulates his apocalyptic eschatological theory in terms of universal abstract principles, which appear to have superseded some of the more specific concerns regarding Russia and Europe which were particularly critical in some of his previous works.

Earlier, in The Idiot Dostoevsky had concluded on the frenzied words of Lizaveta

Prokofievna Yepanchin: "And all this, and all this abroad, and all this Europe of yours, it's all just an illusion, and all of us abroad are nothing but an illusion...mark my words, you'll see!"⁸² Such is the emotional current which runs throughout the novel; it is permeated with apocalyptic images of a modern world which lacks all moral fiber and substance, and as such, is teetering on the edge of destruction. The innocent figure of Prince Myshkin provides a glimmer of hope, but on the whole, the atmosphere is largely grim, a stark, terrifying depiction of a world in its death throes. There exists here little of the mitigating image of a vastly conceived post-apocalyptic realm of salvation, which would come to figure so prominently in the later development of Dostoevsky's philosophy of history. In The Idiot, one sees the cold, dark shadow of the end; at this point, Dostoevsky seems to suggest that it is up to the acts of Christian faith to carry man beyond this point.

Allusions to, and excerpts from, the Book of Revelation form what is perhaps the pivotal motif within The Idiot. Lebedev, a central character who frequently appears in conjunction with such imagery, likens the state of mankind to the apocalyptic milieu which is described in Revelation 6:5-6; in his analysis of The Idiot, Robert Hollander suggests that this passage stands out as an accurate "epigraph" to the novel:

We are in the time of the third horse, the black one, and of the rider with the balance in his hand, for everything in our age is weighed in the balance and settled by agreement, and people are only seeking their rights: 'a measure of wheat for a penny, three measures of barley for a penny,' and with all this they still want to keep a free spirit, a pure heart, a healthy body and all the rest of God's gifts. But they won't keep them by demanding their rights alone, and there will follow the pale horse, and he whose name is death, and after him comes Hell...⁸³

At a later juncture, Lebedev takes up the issue of "the star called Wormwood," [Revelations 8:11] and proceeds to deliver a tirade in which he applies the pertinence of the Apocalypse

to the nineteenth century conditions of Russia and the West.⁸⁴

In chapter upon chapter, the theme looms in the background: from Russian language name references to the "foul and hateful birds" of Revelation 18:2, to the appearance of merchants whose presence recalls the moneyed men who wept over the doom of Babylon in Revelation 18:11, to the dream-based appearance of a gruesome "creature from hell" whose image recalls the "scorpions" of Revelation 9:10.⁸⁵ Hollander goes on to point out a particularly salient instance in which a knife is placed between the pages of a copy of Solovyev's history of Russia, purportedly to symbolize the presence of the Antichrist in the present and future. Further evidence is provided in the climactic scene of The Idiot, in which the antagonist, Rogozhin, murders Nastasya, a girl whose character is marked by the dichotomous inner struggle between good and evil. In this fateful occurrence, the forces of darkness and the Antichrist gain the upper hand over the forces of good in their struggle for the temporal world.⁸⁶

From ideas which he formulated in notes, which were published as The Notebooks for The Possessed, Dostoevsky moves toward the depiction of a more direct involvement of Russia with events surrounding the Apocalypse. Whereas The Idiot had concerned itself primarily with the world's disintegration, The Notebooks deal also with issues which seem to occur subsequent to the fall of the earthly era, at least as we know it. The inevitable confusion which arises from Dostoevsky's ascribing of a place for Russia in the apocalyptic scheme recurs in this instance. Dostoevsky's plans called for the central character Stavrogin to suggest that:

We have reached the last stage of our submission to Europe, to civilization, to the curse of Peter's reform. Intellectual irresponsibility-(socialism, communism,

baseness)-but we shall eventually grasp this not only with our vigorous vitality...but also with our intellect; we shall smash those European fetters which have been clinging to us for so long, and they will break like cobwebs; and we shall realize, finally, that the world, the terrestrial globe, the Earth has never *seen such* a gigantic idea as the one which is now taking shape here, in the East, and moving to take up the place of the European masses...to regenerate the world. Europe will [either] flow into our waters as a living stream...and the part of it which is dead and doomed to die will serve as ethnographic material for us. We are bringing the world the only thing we can give it, which is however, the only thing it needs: Orthodoxy, the true and glorious, eternal creed of Christ and...a full moral regeneration in his name. We are bringing the world the first paradise of the millennium.-And from amongst us, there will appear Elias and Enoch, who will give battle to the Antichrist, i.e., the spirit of the West which will become incarnate in the West. Hurray to the future.⁸⁷

To begin with, one of course needs to consider the extent to which Stavrogin may be read as an echo of Dostoevsky. While each specific word should not be taken as if it was meant to be "spoken" by Dostoevsky himself, the language clearly conveys fundamental elements of his world view. The passage is one which points back to the ambiguities which occur, when Dostoevsky attributes to Russia a place in the Apocalyptic scheme. At this point, Dostoevsky has concluded, as he did in The Idiot, that "civilization" (particularly the West and those who adopt its mores) is on the brink of cataclysmic destruction. Here, however, he espouses a theme of hope which focuses upon Russia, with the belief that Russia is capable of taking a hand in victory in the final earthly struggle between Christ and Antichrist. What remains unclear in this pronouncement is whether Russia is to spearhead a push for universal salvation which *occurs directly before and during the end of time*; or whether Russia is to take a role which actually involves her in the ushering in of eternity, thus ascribing to the nation a significance which clearly transcends temporal time. Dostoevsky makes manifest his strict adherence to a biblical conception of eschatology, but becomes exceedingly vague when trying to illustrate man's role within this divine framework.

From 1870, when the preceding notes for The Devils (The Possessed) were composed, through the middle and late 1870s, Dostoevsky formulated a more comprehensive notion of that which the Apocalypse held in store for man. Throughout 1876 and 1877, he voiced ominous warnings in The Diaries which were reminiscent of the tone of The Idiot:

Everybody is in a state of waiting; everybody is alarmed; some kind of a nightmare hangs over everybody; everybody has bad dreams. But who or what that *piccola bestia* [i.e., tarantula]⁸⁸ is, what causes such confusion, is impossible to determine because of the condition of general madness: everyone conceives it in his own way, and no one understands the other. And yet it seems that all have already been stung. The sting immediately causes most extraordinary fits: in Europe, one might think, people cease to understand each other, just as at the time of the Tower of Babylon...⁸⁹

Dostoevsky envisioned an impending doom for Europe which was right around the corner: "If not we, then our children will see how England will end. Now for everyone in the world 'the time is at hand.'"⁹⁰ The omnipresent state of flux which he saw embodied in the nineteenth century world was a portent:

...from hour to hour Europe is changing from what...she was only six months ago--so that one cannot even vouch three months ahead for her further immutability. The point is that we are on the eve of the greatest and most violent events and revolutions in Europe... Yes, immense cataclysms are awaiting Europe, perturbations which the human mind refuses to believe, conceiving their realization as something fantastic...⁹¹

An anecdote related by Morson cites a frantic Dostoevsky as claiming to an associate, "The antichrist is coming to us! He is coming! And the end of the world is near--nearer than they think!"⁹² Once this end arrives, Dostoevsky proclaimed, mankind will finally be ready to receive "something eternal, millennarian, for that which has been preparing itself in the world since the very beginning of civilization."⁹³ At that point, the path to salvation will be opened, leading the world to a "utopia" founded on "the brotherhood of man,...the

universal reconciliation of peoples,...the principles of universal service to mankind, and at last, in the very renewal of men on the true principles of Christ."⁹⁴ This path will be lighted, "the 'new word' spoken," by Russia, which will sit at the head of a universal order of united Orthodoxy:

...an end is coming to former things, to the long, drawn-out former times, and that a step is being taken toward something already completely new, something which splits the past in two, and renews and resurrects it for a new life, and...this step is being taken by Russia!⁹⁵

In September, 1877, Dostoevsky went so far as to compose an essay entitled "Who's Knocking at the Door? Who Will Enter? Inescapable Fate," which suggested four concrete trends which were to herald the impending apocalypse. His prophecy stated:

...let us once more await the events, and we shall then see where the more correct road is. And just as a matter of record, I shall attempt...to indicate the points and landmarks of this road which is already becoming visible to everybody, and which, willy-nilly, we shall all have to follow...

1) The road begins at Rome and leads from Rome, from the Vatican, where...[it was] mapped long ago...in the very near future *dying papal Catholicism* will unquestionably fight against the whole world...

2) ...this fatal struggle is already shaping itself...France has been chosen and designated for the dreadful battle, and the battle will take place...[it is] *inevitable and not far distant*...

3) The moment the battle begins it will be converted into an all-European battle. The Eastern problem and the Eastern war, by force of destiny, will merge with the all-European conflict...

4) (And let it be called the most conjectural and fantastic of all my predictions-I concede this in advance.) I am convinced that the war will end in favor of the East...Russia has nothing to fear...today somebody is knocking at the door; some new man with a new word seeks to open the door and enter...⁹⁶

From such language, one sees the strong element of national messianism which existed in Dostoevsky's conception of eschatology. His many bold prognostications, however, have not

yet been actualized, leading one to look anew at the more abstract themes of The Brothers Karamazov, in order to gain a perspective on a religious and philosophical depth more profound than that which was evinced in some pages of The Diaries.

At the core of The Brothers Karamazov exists the dichotomy between faith and atheism, between the freedom granted by God to believe, and the freedom granted by God to rebel. The focal dialectic of existence rests in man's argumentation upon these sets of divine metaphysical elements. The Grand Inquisitor asks far less of man than do Christ and Father Zossima. In the context of the earthly realm, the Inquisitor's promises of bread, structured worship, and an ordered life are quite persuasive; thus, he is eminently capable of attaining earthly power, not exclusively through coercion, but with the willing assent of the people. Christ and Father Zossima are far less likely to attain this measure of earthly influence, for the road which they ask man to tread is long and steep; it involves faith, hardship, and a willingness to relinquish the moral and spiritual hubris born of temporal existence.

As the embodiment of the antichrist, the Grand Inquisitor can and will attain rulership of the world. He has accepted the temptation of earthly dominion, and thus has been established as the enemy who will face the forces of God in the final apocalyptic battle. Those who follow the truth are unable to loosen the Inquisitor's grasp on power so long as the temporal realm exists, and they, in the manner of Christ who forgave with a kiss, must come to terms with that fact. Like Christ, Father Zossima and thus, by extrapolation, the Russian people, know that the true "kingdom is not of this world."⁹⁷ The believers are content to wait patiently their hour, at which time they will wrest control of the cosmos away

from the Grand Inquisitor and his ilk.

For Dostoevsky, the society of the Grand Inquisitor represented the world milieu of the nineteenth century. Built on falsehood, deceit and disbelief, its fall was imminent. When this aberrant society finally went up in flames, those who retained the true word of Christ, i.e., the word of Russian Orthodoxy, would step in to lead the way from destruction to eternal life. Was Russia, the nation, to fight the armies representing the antichrist at the final apocalyptic battle? One must turn to Dostoevsky's other writings to determine if he did, in fact, have a precise answer to this question. This much, however, becomes apparent, when taken from the pages of The Brothers Karamazov and "The Legend of the Grand Inquisitor:" when the antichrist and his followers have their supposed benevolence uncovered, and their atheism is revealed, the faithful will be there to fill the void and serve as spiritual intercessors to the Kingdom of Heaven. Whether the faithful will appear in the form of the Russian nation, or as some other entity, is a more specific, and less certain question. What appears certain, however, is the fundamental premise on which Dostoevsky's theory of eschatology, and ultimately, his entire philosophy of history are seated: The divine, eternal realm is the ultimate pinnacle of existence; it is the goal toward which all time and history march. All that which occurs in the earthly sphere is merely a manifestation of the arduous, yet eminently rewarding spiritual struggle required of those who gaze up at the light, knowing that while their place in this world is unenduring, their faith is timeless.

While Dostoevsky made manifest his vision of the final word of history, man can by no means yet issue the final word on Dostoevsky. It would be possible, and perhaps quite fruitful, to engage in a discourse on the merits and shortcomings of his philosophy and the

manner in which he conveyed it; and perhaps to recognize his schema of historical thought as a vast and inspired intellectual framework, if for all that, as one which possessed a multitude of deep biases and conceptual flaws. Dostoevsky, quite simply, was not a worldly man; he was more facile in dealing with the mystical rather than the rational; and the grandiose but nebulous idea often carried for him greater authority than the tightly reasoned and concrete concept. It is perhaps characteristic of such a man, that his jeremiads and prophecies drew more upon his upwelling of the spirit, faith and emotion, than upon wholly accurate assessments of the particular political and strategic exigencies of the day. Is it possible to suggest that Dostoevsky's philosophy of history is, therefore, too removed from real, tangible global situations, to suggest many "prophecies" of merit to a world approaching the twenty-first century? On the contrary--I suggest that a consideration of the present state of flux within Russia might very well dictate that a focused gaze be fixed back upon Dostoevsky, and upon the truths which he conceived of as the foundation of history.

Were Dostoevsky to view Russia of the 1990's, he might perceive that his homeland is presently bedeviled by ills which, in their forms, effects, and etiologies, are not dissimilar from those crises of culture and ethos which he invoked in his philosophy of history. He would most likely decry a clear twentieth century pattern, by which much of the agenda for political policy, social organization, and establishment of values and mores within Russia has been based upon the mass-man ideology of the West. For Dostoevsky, poverty, crime, social alienation, emptiness of the spirit and a downtrodden Russian economy are not matters which can be addressed by arguing the relative merits of freemarket capitalism or economic socialism; nor are these issues which will disappear silently under the veil of

Western-style liberal democracy. In actuality, Dostoevsky might argue, Russia suffers today largely because of the West; from the residual stain of Marxist-inspired atheism, to the corrupting allure of Western materialism, to the pernicious influence of the superficial self-aggrandizement which the West's non-communitarian individualists hold dear.

In point of fact, Dostoevsky, were he alive today, might once again contend that the spell of Western culture has brought the world to the brink of apocalypse; yet, merely disproving his prophecy of an imminent end would not negate the value of that which he has to say. The ultimate relevance of Dostoevsky's philosophy of history for Russia and the world rests, perhaps, not on its particular predictions, but on its premises and overall thrust. The way of the modern West, Dostoevsky suggests, is certainly not the appropriate historical path for Russia, and it most likely is not the correct path for mankind as a whole. From his viewpoint, it seems that emulation of the West will lead Russia only to disaster, to an inadequate imitation of Europe and away from the beauty and depth of Russia's own true nature. The answers to Russia's woes, and consequently, the regeneration of her greatness as a nation, must come from within the Russian mind, spirit and soul.

Finally, Russia must not only follow her own calling, rather than the dictates of the West, but she must base this calling upon the foundation of her national spirit and character--Orthodoxy. There can be no fundamentally secular solution for Russia or for mankind as a whole, Dostoevsky argued; this would remain as true for the present era as it was for previous centuries.

Whether the requirement for religious faith necessitates the outright theocratic state, or merely a milieu in which belief is encouraged, is perhaps an issue for future generations

to determine explicitly. If Russia can, however, illustrate by example the viability of faith as a productive driving force in the modern world, then she will be succeeding in her historical mission, and will vindicate the most essential element of Dostoevsky's philosophy of history, the central role of God.

Endnotes

1. Quotation from: Fyodor Dostoevsky. *The Brothers Karamazov*. Translated in Fyodor Dostoevsky. *The Grand Inquisitor with related chapters from The Brothers Karamazov*. Constance Garnett, translator. Charles B. Guignon, editor and introduction. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1993, ix-x.
2. Konstantin Mochulsky. *Dostoevsky: His Life and Work*. Michael A. Minihan, translator. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1967, 640-41.
3. Nicholas Berdayev. *Dostoevsky*. Donald Attwater, translator. New York: New American Library, 1974., and Nicolas Zernov. *Three Russian Prophets: Khomiakov, Dostoevsky, Soloviev*. Gulf Breeze, Florida: Academic International, 1973., are crucial sources for the study of these themes.
4. Dostoevsky's involvement in the *pochvennichestvo*, or the "native soil movement," was an instrumental factor in the development of his thought. As shall be touched upon in more detail shortly, the "native soil movement" attributed potent powers of spiritual regeneration to the common Russian people and to the soil which they cultivated. A good source for study of the *pochvennichestvo* is Wayne Dowler. *Dostoevsky, Grigor'ev, and Native Soil conservatism*. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1982.
5. Denis Dirscherl. *Dostoevsky and the Catholic Church*. Chicago: Loyola Univ. Press, 1986, 83, 92.
6. F.M Dostoevsky. *The Diary of a Writer: Vol. II*. Boris Brasol, translator. New York: Octagon, 1973, 1047. (Jan. 1881: Chap. II, Sec. 3.)
7. For excerpts which are quoted directly from these texts, references and abbreviations for subsequent notations are as follows:
 - Fyodor Dostoevsky. *The Brothers Karamazov*. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, translators. New York: Vintage, 1990. Hereafter noted as *BK*.
 - Fedor Dostoevsky. *The Idiot*. Alan Myers, translator. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992. Hereafter noted as *ID*.
 - Fyodor Dostoyevsky. *The Devils (The Possessed)*. David Magarshack, translator. London: Penguin, 1971. Hereafter noted as *DEV*.
 - F.M. Dostoevsky. *The Diary of a Writer, Vols. I and II*. Boris Brasol, translator. New York: Octagon, 1973. Hereafter noted as *DW*.
 - Fyodor Dostoevsky. *Complete Letters*. David A. Lowe, editor and translator. Ann Arbor: Ardis, (Vol. I, 1988; Vol. II, 1989; Vol. III, 1990; Vol. IV, 1991; Vol. V, 1991.) Hereafter noted as *LET*.
 - Fyodor Dostoevsky. *The Notebooks for The Idiot*. Katharine Strelsky, translator; Edward Wasiolek, editor. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 1967.
 - Fyodor Dostoevsky. *The Notebooks for The Possessed*. Victor Terras, translator; Edward Wasiolek, editor. Chicago: Univ Chicago Press, 1968.
 - Fyodor Dostoevsky. *The Notebooks for the Brothers Karamazov*. Edward Wasiolek, editor and translator. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 1971. Hereafter noted as *NTBKS*.
 - Carl Proffer, general editor. *The Unpublished Dostoevsky: Diaries and Notebooks (1860-1881)*. Ann Arbor: Ardis, (Vol. I, 1973; Vol. II, 1975; Vol. III, 1975.) Hereafter noted as *UNPUBL*.
8. Fyodor Dostoevsky. *The Brothers Karamazov*. Quoted in Constance Garnett, editor., Charles B. Guignon, editor. *The Grand Inquisitor with related chapters from The Brothers Karamazov*., op. cit., ix-x.

9. Richard Hare. *Portraits of Russian Personalities Between Reform and Revolution*. London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1959, 108-09.
10. Leonid Grossman. *Dostoevsky: A Biography*. Mary Mackler, translator. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1975, 25.; Avrahm Yarmolinsky. *Dostoevsky: Works and Days*. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1971, 19.
11. Frank's comprehensive and meticulously compiled multi-volume series constitutes what is perhaps the best available biography of Dostoevsky. The volume cited here is Joseph Frank. *Dostoevsky: The Seeds of Revolt: 1821-1849*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1976, 42-43. Other available volumes include: Joseph Frank. *Dostoevsky: The Years of Ordeal: 1850-1859*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1983.; and Joseph Frank. *Dostoevsky: The Stir of Liberation: 1860-1865*. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1986.
12. Stephen K. Carter. *The Political and Social Thought of F.M. Dostoevsky*. New York: Garland, 1991, 216.
13. J. Frank. *Dostoevsky: The Seeds of Revolt: 1821-1849*, op. cit., 102-13.
14. Bruce Ward. *Dostoyevsky's Critique of The West: The Quest for the Earthly Paradise*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier Univ. Press, 1986, 15-34.
15. B. Ward. op. cit., 23.
16. B. Ward, op. cit., 23.
17. Nicholas Gogol (1809-1852) has been considered one of the greatest Russian writers of prose. Filled with satire and elements of the "psychological," his work was well received by opponents of the imperial regime for its realistic portrayal of the common man's existence in Russia. (Nicholas V. Riasanovsky. *A History of Russia: fifth edition*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1993, 358-9.
18. Ernest J. Simmons. *Dostoevski: The Making of a Novelist*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1940, 21.; William J. Leatherbarrow. *Fedor Dostoevsky*. Boston: Twayne, 1981, 37.
19. Robert Belknap. "Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky," 102-108 in Victor Terras, editor. *Handbook of Russian Literature*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1985, 103.
20. N. Riasanovsky, op. cit., 324.
21. D. Dirscherl, op. cit., 48-9.
22. Ronald Hingley. *Dostoyevsky: His Life and Work*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978, 70-71.
23. J. Frank. *Dostoevsky: The Years of Ordeal: 1850-59*, op. cit., passim.
24. D. Dirscherl, op. cit., 51.
25. Maria Dmitrievna, who was frequently ill, died in 1864. In 1867, Dostoevsky was remarried, this time to a young stenographer, Anna Grigorevna Snitkina, who was working for him. Anna Grigorevna is frequently credited with providing Dostoevsky with an emotional stability which permitted him to realize the significant achievements of his later years. (W. J. Leatherbarrow, op. cit., 26-27).
26. W. J. Leatherbarrow, op. cit., 23-24.

27. Dmitrij Tschizewski. *Russian Intellectual History*. John C. Osborne, translator. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1978, 190.
28. B. Ward, op. cit., 33-34.
29. Marc Raeff. *Russian Intellectual History: An Anthology*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966, 288.
30. V. V. Zenkovskii. *Russian Thinkers and Europe*. Galia S. Bodde, translator. Ann Arbor: American Council of Learned Societies, 1953, 160.
31. V.V. Zenkovsky. *A History of Russian Philosophy: Vol. I*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1953, 405.
32. W. Dowler, op. cit., 183.
33. D. Tschizewskij, op. cit., 219., V. V. Zenkovskii. *Russian Thinkers and Europe.*, op. cit., 158.
34. S. K. Carter, op. cit., 221.
35. D. Dirscherl, op. cit., 56.
36. J. Frank. *Dostoevsky: The Stir of Liberation: 1860-1865.*, op. cit., 232.
37. D. Dirscherl, op. cit., 80.
38. S. K. Carter, op. cit., 217-22., D. Dirscherl, op. cit., 130.
39. Arthur Trace's illuminating study, *Furnace of Doubt: Dostoevsky and 'The Brothers Karamazov.'* Peru, Illinois: Sherwood Sugden, 1988, 170 and passim., views the development of Dostoevsky's works and thought (particularly *The Brothers Karamazov*), in terms of the role which his inner spiritual struggles and ruminations on religious belief played.
40. Again, I borrow a thought from A. Trace, op. cit., this time, specifically an element of his title, i.e., *Furnace of Doubt*.
41. Vladimir Lossky. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*. Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1976., is a good source for studying the mystical themes which characterize much of the teaching of Orthodox Christianity. Such a source would also allow one to embark on what might be a fascinating exercise; i.e., a comparison of Dostoevsky's religious philosophy with the canonical doctrines of Orthodoxy, in order to see if perhaps there existed any discrepancies between the thought of the highly creative Russian, and the official precepts of the faith which he embraced.
42. V. Lossky, op. cit., passim.
43. N. Berdyaev, op. cit., 225.
44. V. V. Zenkovsky. *A History of Russian Philosophy: Vol. I.*, op. cit., 432.
45. Frederick C. Copleston. *Russian Religious Philosophy: Selected Aspects*. Kent, England: Search press, 1988, 40.
46. F. Dostoevsky. *BK.*, op. cit., 258.

47. F. Dostoevsky. *BK*, op. cit., 258-59.

48. F. Dostoevsky. *BK*, op. cit., 259.

49. N. Berdyaev, op. cit., 200.

50. D. Dirscherl, op. cit., 125.

51. F. Dostoevsky. *ID.*, op. cit., 430-31.

52. F. Dostoevsky. *BK*, op. cit., 313. Note also the allusion within this passage to Revelation 9:15: "So the four angels were released, who had been held ready for the hour, the day, the month, and the year..." Biblical references, particularly from the Book of Revelation, are critical in recognizing Dostoevsky's emphasis on the Apocalypse; which, as shall be expanded upon in more detail later, is a focal element of his philosophy of history.

53. F. Dostoevsky. *BK*, op. cit., 319-20.

54. Victor Terras. *A Karamazov Companion: Commentary on the Genesis, Language, and Style of Dostoevsky's Novel*. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1981, 71.

55. F. Dostoevsky. *BK*, op. cit., 321.

56. F. Dostoevsky. *The Idiot*. Quoted in D. Dirscherl, op. cit., 100.

57. N. Berdyaev, op. cit., 200.

58. Geoffrey C. Kabat. *Ideology and Imagination: The Image of Society in Dostoevsky*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1978, 24.

59. F. Dostoevsky. *DW: Vol. II.*, op. cit., 1005. (Aug. 1880: Chap. 3, Sec. 3)

60. G. Kabat, op. cit., 23.

61. A. Boyce Gibson. *The Religion of Dostoevsky*. London: SCM Press, 1973, 201. *Sobornost* refers to a spiritually grounded ideology of community organization which Dostoevsky saw as an effective alternative to the harmful emphasis on the individual, or "self," which was present in Western society. Gibson provides a lucid explanation: "...the problem is the 'self.' Everything was conspiring to raise it: the individualism of the rising bourgeoisie, the self-consciousness induced by psychological introspection, the backwash of a romanticism which had beaten in vain against the seawalls of progress and success. The 'self' was getting out of proportion. It could be met either by suppression from without or dedication from within...*sobornost*...provided a social answer. It was reinforced by recent memories of peasants' communes...a collectivity not enforced but growing from ageless custom, in which the place of the individual is not to get on at others' expense but to engage in activities which everyone regards as part of his own...In the presence of God, mediated by his church, the self is deflated to normal proportions, its independence is softened into communion without loss of dignity, and its aggressiveness is harnessed to the wills of all. Not collectivity, in the end, but communion; not, therefore, a political recipe, but a pooling of spiritual resources..."(Gibson 201-02).

62. B. Ward, op. cit., 173-74.

63. Thomas Garrigue Masaryk. *The Spirit of Russia: Vol. III*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1967, 46.
64. F. Dostoevsky. *DW: Vol. II.*, op. cit., 781-83. (Jul.-Aug. 1877, Chap. II, Sec. 2).
65. F. Dostoevsky. *DW: Vol. I.*, op. cit., 63. (1873, Sec. 7)
66. F. Dostoevsky. *UNPUBL: Vol. I.*, op. cit., 98. (Notebook IV - 1864-1865)
67. F. Dostoevsky. *LET: Vol. III.*, op. cit., 360. (Letter 428; May 1871, to Nikolay Strakhov)
68. F. Dostoevsky. *The Devils*. Quoted in Malcolm V. Jones. *Dostoyevsky: The Novel of Discord*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1976, 132.
69. F. Dostoevsky. *DEV.*, op. cit., 256.
70. F. Dostoevsky. *DEV.*, op. cit., 258.
71. Hans Kohn. "Dostoyevsky and Danilevsky: Nationalist Messianism," 500-515 in Ernest J. Simmons, editor. *Continuity and Change In Russian and Soviet Thought*. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1955, passim.; G. Kabat, op. cit., 51. Kohn's remarks are particularly noteworthy in that they compare Dostoevsky to an ideological context which he most likely would have loathed, i.e., Marxism as embodied in the Communist and doctrinally atheist Soviet Union. Perhaps the more apt comparison might involve likening Dostoevsky's political views to fascism, in general; an ideology which bears relevance not only to the history of the Cold War era USSR, but to the present day political climate in Russia, as well.
72. F. Dostoevsky. *DW: Vol. I.*, op. cit., 315. (May 1876; Chap. I, Sec. 2)
73. F. Dostoevsky. *DW: Vol. II.*, op. cit., 904-05. (Oct. 1877; Chap. III, Sec. 1)
74. F. Dostoevsky. *DW: Vol. II.*, op. cit., 780. (Jul.-Aug. 1877; Chap. II, Sec. 2)
75. F. Dostoevsky. *DW: Vol. I.*, op. cit., 377, 555. (Jul.-Aug. 1876; Chap. I, Sec. 3; Dec. 1876; Chap. II, Sec. 3)
76. F. Dostoevsky. *DW: Vol. II.*, op. cit., 821. (Sep. 1877; Chap. I, Sec. 3)
77. F. Dostoevsky. *DW: Vol. I.*, op. cit., 376. (Jul.-Aug. 1876; Chap. I, Sec. 3)
78. F. Dostoevsky. *DW: Vol. I.*, op. cit., 339. (May 1876; Chap. II, Sec. 3)
79. Gary Saul Morson. *The Boundaries of Genre: Dostoevsky's Diary of a Writer and the Traditions of Literary Utopia*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1981, 33-34.
80. G. S. Morson, op. cit., 33.
81. C. M. Woodhouse. *Dostoiievsky*. New York: Haskell House, 1974, 91.
82. F. Dostoevsky. *ID.*, op. cit., 652.
83. F. Dostoevsky. *The Idiot*. Quoted in Robert Hollander. "The Apocalyptic Framework of Dostoevsky's *The Idiot*," 123-139 in *Mosaic*, vol. 7, no. 2, Winter 1974, 130.; W. J. Leatherbarrow, op. cit., 101.

84. *The New Testament, Psalms, and Proverbs: The New King James Version*. Nashville: Gideons, 1985, 452.
85. W. J. Leatherbarrow, op. cit., 102-03.; Erik Krag. *Dostoevsky: The Literary Artist*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1976, 154.
86. R. Hollander, op. cit., 137-38.
87. F. Dostoevsky. *NTBKS From The Possessed*, op. cit., 225-26.
88. G. S. Morson, op. cit., 33. Morson informs the reader of this term's translated meaning.
89. F. Dostoevsky. *DW: Vol. I.*, op. cit., 429. (Sep. 1876; Chap. I; Sec. 1)
90. G. S. Morson, op. cit., 34. This passage is an allusion to Revelation 1:3: "Blessed is he who reads and those who hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written in it; for the time is near. (*New Testament*, op. cit., 442.)
91. F. Dostoevsky. *DW: Vol. II.*, op. cit., 908. (Nov. 1877; Chap. III, Sec. 2)
92. G. S. Morson, op. cit., 37-38.
93. G. S. Morson, op. cit., 35.
94. F. Dostoevsky. *DW: Vol. I.* (Jun. 1876; Sec. II, Chap. 4) Quoted in G. S. Morson, op. cit., 34.
95. F. Dostoevsky. *DW: Vol. II.* (Apr. 1877; Chap. I, Sec. 1) Quoted in G. S. Morson, op. cit., 35.
96. F. Dostoevsky. *DW: Vol. II.*, op. cit., 832-835. (Sept. 1877; Chap. I, Sec. 5) It should be noted here, in particular reference to phrase 2) within this passage, that Dostoevsky frequently associated France with the embodiment of what he saw as a Catholic-instigated socialism which was a pervasive ill within nineteenth-century Europe.
97. Ellis Sandoz. *Political Apocalypse: A Study of Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1971, 161. Sandoz alludes here to John 18:36, which states: "Jesus answered, 'My kingdom is not of this world. If My kingdom were of this world, My servants would fight, so that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now My kingdom is not from here.'" (*The New Testament*, op. cit., 208)

Works Consulted

Primary Sources

F.M Dostoievsky. The Diary of a Writer: Vol. II. Boris Brasol, translator. New York: Octagon, 1973.

Dostoevsky, Fyodor. The Brothers Karamazov. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky, translators. New York: Vintage, 1990.

_____. The Brothers Karamazov. Translated in Fyodor Dostoevsky. The Grand Inquisitor with related chapters from The Brothers Karamazov. Constance Garnett, translator. Charles B. Guignon, editor and introduction. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1993.

_____. The Idiot. Alan Myers, translator. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992.

_____. The Devils (The Possessed). David Magarshack, translator. London: Penguin, 1971.

_____. The Diary of a Writer, Vols. I and II. Boris Brasol, translator. New York: Octagon, 1973.

_____. Complete Letters. David A. Lowe, editor and translator. Ann Arbor: Ardis, (Vol. I, 1988; Vol. II, 1989; Vol. III, 1990; Vol. IV, 1991; Vol. V, 1991.)

_____. The Notebooks for The Idiot. Katharine Strelsky, translator; Edward Wasiolek, editor. Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 1967.

_____. The Notebooks for The Possessed. Victor Terras, translator; Edward Wasiolek, editor. Chicago: Univ Chicago Press, 1968.

_____. The Notebooks for the Brothers Karamazov. Edward Wasiolek, editor and translator. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1971.

Proffer, Carl, general editor. The Unpublished Dostoevsky: Diaries and Notebooks (1860-1881). Ann Arbor: Ardis, (Vol. I, 1973; Vol. II, 1975; Vol. III, 1975.)

Secondary Sources

The New Testament, Psalms, and Proverbs: The New King James Version. Nashville: Gideons, 1985

- Andrew, Joe. Russian Writers and Society in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century. Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1982.
- Belknap, Robert. "Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky," 102-108 in Victor Terras, editor. Handbook of Russian Literature. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1985.
- Berdyayev, Nicholas. Dostoievsky. Donald Attwater, translator. New York: New American Library, 1974.
- Berquist, Goodwin F., Coleman, William E. and Golden, James L., eds. The Rhetoric of Western Thought: 5th edition. Dubuque: Kendall Hunt, 1992.
- Billington, James H. The Icon and the Axe: An Interpretive History of Russian Culture. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1967.
- Carter, Stephen K. The Political and Social Thought of F.M. Dostoevsky. New York: Garland, 1991.
- Copleston, Frederick C. Russian Religious Philosophy: Selected Aspects. Kent, England: Search press, 1988.
- Dirscherl, Denis. Dostoevsky and the Catholic Church. Chicago: Loyola Univ. Press, 1986.
- Dowler, Wayne. Dostoevsky, Grigor'ev, and Native Soil Conservatism. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1982.
- Frank, Joseph. Dostoevsky: The Seeds of Revolt: 1821-1849. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1976
- _____. Dostoevsky: The Years of Ordeal: 1850-1859. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1983.
- _____. Dostoevsky: The Stir of Liberation: 1860-1865. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1986.
- Garnett, Constance, translator, Charles B. Guignon, editor and introduction. The Grand Inquisitor with related chapters from The Brothers Karamazov. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1993.
- Gibson, A. Boyce. The Religion of Dostoevsky. London: SCM Press, 1973.
- Grossman, Leonid . Dostoevsky: A Biography. Mary Mackler, translator. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1975.
- Hare, Richard. Portraits of Russian Personalities Between Reform and Revolution. London:

Oxford Univ. Press, 1959.

Hingley, Ronald. Dostoyevsky: His Life and Work. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978.

Hollander, Robert. "The Apocalyptic Framework of Dostoevsky's *The Idiot*," 123-139 in Mosaic, vol. 7, no. 2, Winter 1974.

Howe, Irving. "Dostoevsky: The Politics of Salvation," 53-70 in Rene Wellek, ed. Dostoevsky: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Kabat, Geoffrey C. Ideology and Imagination: The Image of Society in Dostoevsky. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1978.

Kohn Hans. "Dostoyevsky and Danilevsky: Nationalist Messianism," 500-515 in Ernest J. Simmons, editor. Continuity and Change In Russian and Soviet Thought. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1955.

Krag, Erik . Dostoevsky: The Literary Artist. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1976.

Leatherbarrow, William J. Fedor Dostoevsky. Boston: Twayne, 1981.

_____. Fedor Dostoevsky: A Reference Guide. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co., 1990.

Lossky, Vladimir. The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church. Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1976.

Masaryk, Thomas Garrigue. The Spirit of Russia: Vol. III. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1967.

Miller, Robin Feuer. Dostoevsky and the Idiot: Author, Narrator, and Reader. Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1981.

Mochulsky, Konstantin. Dostoevsky: His Life and Work. Michael A. Minihan, translator. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1967.

Morson, Gary Saul. The Boundaries of Genre: Dostoevsky's Diary of a Writer and the Traditions of Literary Utopia. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1981.

Panichas, George A. The Burden of Vision: Dostoevsky's Spiritual Art. Chicago: Gateway, 1985.

Peace, Richard. Dostoyevsky: An Examination of the Major Novels. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1971.

- Raeff, Marc. Russian Intellectual History: An Anthology. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966.
- Riasanovsky, Nicholas V. A History of Russia: fifth edition. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1993.
- Richardson, David Bonner. Berdyayev's Philosophy of History: An Existentialist Theory of Social Creativity and Eschatology. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1968.
- Sandoz, Ellis. Political Apocalypse: A Study of Dostoevsky's Grand Inquisitor. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1971.
- Simmons, Ernest J. Dostoevski: The Making of a Novelist. New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1940.
- Terras, Victor. A Karamazov Companion: Commentary on the Genesis, Language, and Style of Dostoevsky's Novel. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1981.
- Trace, Arthur. Furnace of Doubt: Dostoevsky and 'The Brothers Karamazov.' Peru, Illinois: Sherwood Sugden, 1988.
- Tschizewski, Dmitrij. Russian Intellectual History. John C. Osborne, translator. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1978.
- Ward, Bruce. Dostoyevsky's Critique of The West: The Oust for the Earthly Paradise. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier Univ. Press, 1986.
- Woodhouse, C. M. Dostoievsky. New York: Haskell House, 1974.
- Yarmolinsky, Avrahm. Dostoevsky: Works and Days. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1971.
- Zenkovskii, V. V. Russian Thinkers and Europe. Galia S. Bodde, translator. Ann Arbor: American Council of Learned Societies, 1953.
- Zenkovsky, V.V. A History of Russian Philosophy: Vol. I. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1953.
- Zernov, Nicolas. Three Russian Prophets: Khomiakov, Dostoevsky, Soloviev. Gulf Breeze, Florida: Academic International, 1973.