

### The Receptive Field of F.M. Dostoevsky in the Artistic Consciousness of The Twentieth Century

**Petruxina N. M.**

Doctor of Philology, Professor

Uzbekistan, Tashkent

[tatashap@mail.ru](mailto:tatashap@mail.ru)

#### Article Information

**Received:** March 13, 2023

**Accepted:** April 22, 2023

**Published:** May 06, 2023

**Keywords:** *F. M. Dostoevsky, European and Uzbek literary systems, M. Bakhtin*

**Abstract.** A comprehensive study of the specifics of the development of the world artistic consciousness of the 20th century, especially its axiological and ideological components, is impossible without taking into account the impact of the work of F. Dostoevsky, who stepped over national borders in his “cultural” significance. The tradition of intertextual and receptive reading of Dostoevsky is in many ways becoming the basis for the construction of modern methods of artistic and interdisciplinary research.

In modern philological studies of the specifics of the development of the world literary process of the twentieth century and the levels of value influence of classical Russian literature on it, scientists note the continuous interest in the work of F. M. Dostoevsky, which today manifests itself to a greater extent in the context of interpretive meanings, and not only, and not so much specifically literary: “It is obvious that the desire to re-read and interpret Dostoevsky is a way for the era to understand itself, a way not only for artistic, but also for general philosophical, ideological reflection” (6: 3).

For Russian literature, for example, the work of F. Dostoevsky becomes a kind of ideological center, in the perspective of which an absolutely new qualitatively new ethical-aesthetic literary and cultural paradigm of the twentieth century is being formed.

Considering the receptive field of modern Russian literature, S.E. Trunin emphasizes that “turning to the classics stimulates the development of new models of thinking. Great attention to the cultural and literary heritage is determined by a number of factors: firstly, the classics act as one of the constants in the ongoing reassessment of values; secondly, thanks to such a reassessment, new forms of thinking are developed; thirdly, turning to the classics helps to better understand modernity and its certain phenomena, and sometimes there is a dispute with those ideas that have not passed the test of time” (7).

In the prism of new meanings of the receptive “reading” of world literature of the 20th century in the context of F. Dostoevsky's work, the entire history of world literature begins to be perceived in a completely different way. Images, ideas, plots created by F.M. Dostoevsky are so

ambiguous in the possibilities of their interpretation that, while maintaining a pronounced “Russianness”, they acquire a supranational quality. It is precisely this perceptual feature that explains Dostoevsky's striking “findability” in any national literary system.

So, within the framework of this scientific study, we will try to determine the system of multi-level correlations of Dostoevsky's creativity, his artistic philosophy with Russian, Western European and Uzbek literary systems of the twentieth century.

The most significant for the world literary process of the twentieth century are such code discoveries of Dostoevsky's work as the principle of carnivalization, the space-time model of the text, designated by M. Bakhtin as the “chronotope”, the “threshold” of being and consciousness of the individual, the subjective organization of the novel space, which marked a new type of novel thinking with “equivalent artistic voices-consciousnesses” (M. Bakhtin), psychological and religious-philosophical substantiation of “cathartic” as an evolutionary component in the development of personality, definition of “demonic” as a form of ontological existence.

These aspects determine the relevance of F. Dostoevsky's work for the world literary process of the 20th century, which conceptualized in its space not only individual phenomena, but also the entire Dostoevsky tradition in the system of intertextual “dialogue” with the classics.

Considering the directional components of the creative heritage of F. M. Dostoevsky, literary critics unequivocally conceptualize critical realism, although recently it has been customary to talk about the presence of some baroque, or even existential tendencies as directionally signified. The genesis of the formation and development of the Russian realistic tradition over the course of two centuries - the 19th and 20th centuries - is undoubtedly associated with the name of Dostoevsky, who acts as a kind of mediator (guide) between both epochal realistic paradigms.

On the one hand, Dostoevsky absorbed and developed the traditions of classical critical realism in his work, on the other hand, he became the ideological and aesthetic basis for his “dispersal” (when the work of a great writer, without losing its independent artistic significance, dissolves in the subsequent literary process. Often this is fraught with the fact that the writer, as if dissolving in the world literary process, has an all-encompassing effect on its development) in Russian literature of the twentieth century and thus ensured the existence of a realistic “continuity fund”, which, according to V. Khalizev, is the most important condition for literary evolution: “There are always types of emotional mood in literary work (sublime, tragic, laughter, etc.), moral and philosophical problems (good and evil, truth and beauty), “eternal themes” associated with mythopoetic meanings, and, finally, an arsenal of art forms that find their use anytime and anywhere. The constants of world literature designated by us, i.e. *topoi* (they are also called common places - from the Latin *Locicomunes*) constitute the fund of continuity, without which the literary process would be impossible” (9: 357).

M. Bakhtin, emphasizing the importance of identifying the genesis of a literary phenomenon at the level of the “tradition-modernity” paradigm, emphasizes that “a work has its roots in the distant past. Great works of literature have been prepared for centuries, but in the epoch of their creation only the ripe fruits of a long and complex process of maturation are removed” (2: 331).

However, Bakhtin logically focuses the methodological point for studying the processes of the genetic development of tradition with the “modernity” paradigm, denoting the identification of an evolutionarily significant state of a literary phenomenon as the goal of literature as a developing system: “Modernity retains all its enormous and in many respects decisive importance. Scientific analysis can only proceed from it and ... must always check with it, but it

is impossible to clamp it (a literary work) in this era: its fullness is revealed only in great time” (2: 331).

Developing the thought of Bakhtin, the researcher Belaya N.V. notes that “traditions (both general cultural and actually literary) invariably influence the work of writers, constituting an essential and almost dominant aspect of its genesis. At the same time, individual facets of the continuity fund are refracted in the works themselves, directly or indirectly. These are, firstly, verbal and artistic means that have been used before, as well as fragments of previous texts; secondly, worldviews, concepts, ideas that already exist both in non-artistic reality and in literature; thirdly, they are life analogues of verbal and artistic forms” (3).

However, one should also take into account the factor of the “indirect” influence of tradition on the development of certain literary phenomena, that is, indirectly through the work of the writer-concentrator. F. Dostoevsky in many ways transforms the traditional critical realism inherited from previous Russian realists and at the same time launches the mechanism of “traditional change” (D. Likhachev) for subsequent stages of development. D. S. Likhachev notes that such an evolutionary strategy can become the basis of “traditional forms in unexpected positions.”

A vivid example of this can be the paradoxical manifestation of Dostoevsky's realistic concepts in the work of Russian modernists of the early twentieth century (in particular; D. Merezhkovsky, A. Bely, L. Andreev, D. Andreev) and Russian postmodernists of the second half of the twentieth century (for example: S. Sokolova, A. Bitov, D. Galkovsky, V. Erofeev and others).

In the Russian literature of the 19th century, with its realistic attitude to the construction of the traditional world model “inner man-reality”, it is the problem of determining the psychoexistence of a personality in relation to its invariant artistic model and real life prototypes that are hypothetically present in life that is most acutely posed. This relationship is most clearly correlated with the heroes of F. Dostoevsky - on the one hand, they are amazingly conditional and phantasmagoric, and on the other, they are life-like and real.

So F. Dostoevsky subjects the critical realism of the previous stage to “traditional changes” and brings into an absolutely new semantic layer the fundamental worldview criterion of realism “the work reflects reality in the whole sum of contradictions”. F. Dostoevsky actually identifies the hero as an “independent reality” and imposes on him the formula of “reflection of the reality of “man in man” in the whole sum of contradictions.”

This is how a realistic mimetic accent is transformed – a person becomes not only a reflection of reality, but also, in turn, an object of reflection of internal contradictions as forms of manifestation of “independent contradictory being”. Such transformations in Dostoevsky's realistic worldview, in our opinion, have already allowed critics of the 20th century to identify existential motives and tendencies in the writer's artistic system, due to the formula “I-in-being” / “being-in-me”. Hypothetically, in Dostoevsky, it could sound like this - “I-in-reality” / “reality-in-me”.

The psychological complexity and ambiguity in the artistic interpretation of F. M. Dostoevsky's “man in man” is largely hidden in the deep multidimensionality of the “inner world” of his characters, which is determined by the author's ambiguity in understanding the meaning of man and his being. Realist Dostoevsky understands “being” both as a form of “reality” and as a manifestation of human consciousness, that is, its “inner world”, and in fact becomes a concept synthesizing classical realism and existential constants of artistry.

The problem of determinism, which is central to the Russian realism of the 19th century, is conditioned by the behavior and consciousness of the characters - be it an idea, cultural codes or the social "microenvironment" surrounding a person - by various circumstances, in the works of Dostoevsky it corresponds to the representation of the characters in their artistic unconditionality. Man is transcendent in his spiritual essence and is what he is, and no determining factors explain or add anything to him. The center of the artistic world is not so much the personality in its relations with society, environment, era, cultural tradition, but the status of the personality, its qualities in value-based moral potencies.

If we talk about direct direct correlations between Dostoevsky and Russian realists (L. Tolstoy, A. Chekhov, M. Gorky, I. Bunin) in the context of directional and worldview reception, then in each particular case, absolutely individual forms of "dispersal" are revealed.

Thus, for example, criticism actualizes the opinion that in the work of A. Chekhov, Dostoevsky's intertext is manifested in a more complex system than direct quotation: "It is not only a matter of the similarity of individual excerpts and quotations, sometimes striking. Chekhov, it must be assumed, just counted on the obviousness of repetitions - "in the hope that the reader and viewer will be attentive and that they will not need a sign ..." (A.S. Suvorin, December 30, 1888).

In the future, frank repetitions and style calls will disappear, but the tradition will continue. The memoirs of Misail Poloznev, "the man with the hammer", the statistics of "Gooseberry", Belikov from "The Man in the Case", and, finally, the very possibility of living in a case are, undoubtedly, fantastic creations of Russian life; there is no point in arguing which is more terrible - Dostoevsky's "abyss" or the hidden, slow horror of life in Chekhov's city N.

The realistic tradition of the work of A. P. Chekhov and F. M. Dostoevsky, linking the constants of realistic aesthetics and the existentially significant tendency to consider "reality-in-me", makes a significant contribution to the artistic development of the problem, predetermining one of the most important areas of artistic knowledge of Man in the literary world. process throughout the 20th century.

F. Dostoevsky had a strong artistic influence on the development of M. Bulgakov's work. However, it would be fundamentally wrong to say that Bulgakov's work was formed under the influence of Dostoevsky. They are brought together and separated on different sides of the artistic word by the same problem - the problem of the limit. Bulgakov in many respects has in common with Dostoevsky the desire to comprehend and depict the line - between worlds, between good and evil, faith and unbelief, reasonable and madness. And in his search for an artistic expression of the limit, Bulgakov many times refers to the work of Dostoevsky.

In modern criticism, it has already become customary to mention that two books by Dostoevsky, *The Idiot* and *Demons*, lay on Bulgakov's desk. In addition, M. Bulgakov knew exactly and correctly perceived these two novels not as separate works, but as a dilogy. Bulgakov perceived the dilogy in the context of precisely the problem of the limit, because the artistic and worldview concept of Dostoevsky's dilogy was based on the idea that in order to understand the meaning of life and to find personal balance, a person needs to experience as much happiness as unhappiness.

Bulgakov, in the system of his philosophical understanding of Dostoevsky, singled out a number of value-axiological universal constants, which later formed the central concept sphere of the novel "The Master and Margarita" - "faith/unbelief", "rebellion/humility", "good/evil",

"temptation/repentance". " - reduced to the figurative-metaphorical triad "God - Man - Satan", which determines the key personological scheme of the novel.

One of the most complex textual structures in the works of F. Dostoevsky and M. Bulgakov is undoubtedly the spatio-temporal level, which in both writers performs not only the function of artistic organization of the place and time of action, but also becomes an idea in itself. Dostoevsky, and Bulgakov, with all the difference in their author's modeling, acquire a certain typological relationship, which we define as the "physics" of the fourth dimension.

This new quality of the artistic chronotope is characterized not only by the merging of space and time into a single image (according to M. Bakhtin's theory), but also by the expansion of the sphere of habitual everyday understanding - the space of life and the time of life. In both Dostoevsky and Bulgakov, space and time become voluminous (four-dimensional) and have the ability to both collapse into one point and expand to all-being.

The unlimited possibility of interpreting meanings in the works of Dostoevsky and Bulgakov is also achieved due to the special quality of the chronotope, which completely determines not only the "stylistic and compositional drawing", but also the entire textual space of the writers' works. M. Bakhtin defined this quality of "higher realism" in Dostoevsky as "the main subject of depicting a person on the verge of the last decision, at the moment of crisis and unfinished – and unpredictable – turn of his soul" (1: 71).

Paradoxically, M. Heidegger, who was fond of reading Dostoevsky throughout the entire period of the 1910s - 1920s of the 20th century, endows "existential space" with the same quality: space is homogeneous, does not stand out in any of the conceivable points, is equivalent in all directions, but sensually unperceivable disintegration" (8: 313). The equivalence of the "threshold" of the realist Dostoevsky and the "disconnection" of the existentialist Heidegger is determined in the system of spatial being of "man within man" (Dostoevsky's term).

It is not by chance that V. V. Zamanskaya notes that "the feeling of the crisis of life, the ability to see your hero "beyond the last line" of being was reflected in the brilliant prose of Dostoevsky, whose artistic experience is closest to the type of consciousness of the twentieth century and becomes a powerful factor in the existentialization of literature, not only Russian but also European" (5: 57).

World philosophical thought, explaining the specifics of Russian religious existentialism, focuses on the problem of "meaning loss", which is one of the fundamental ones in the work of F.M. Dostoevsky. Intuitively felt by the writer, terrible feelings of boredom and satiety, represented in the novel space by a whole series of actions of the characters, become evidence of the destructive beginning of the human personality, requiring more and more new means to dissipate it.

The heroes cannot fill the bottomless emptiness of their souls with anything: neither with debauchery, nor with attempts to find their own kind, nor with temptation. So boredom, as a derivative of the category "loss of meaning" becomes a fundamental factor in comprehending the metaphysical essence of heroes and determines the problem of understanding freedom, the problem of his life choice. The death of such heroes as Svidrigailov, Stavrogin, Smerdyakov is not absurd, not meaningless, it is the complete end of their metaphysical existence.

The painful experience of skeptical despair and spiritual emptiness results in an unconscious feeling of guilt by the characters, which is the leverage for suicide/murder. In this context, the category of guilt becomes an internal dominant that makes it possible to analyze the heroes' awareness of their own guilt and is the first step towards redemption, towards the coming

catharsis, with the onset of which the human soul must find harmony, peace, peace and purification. And this is the fundamental difference between Dostoevsky the realist, who brings his heroes out of the "threshold" space into the "world with God" from the existential disintegration of the "world without God."

For Dostoevsky, despair is significant by gaining faith through a cathartic understanding of oneself and being, for Western European existentialists, despair is going beyond the "limits" of being and significantly gaining freedom.

"For Camus and many of his contemporaries, the problem of individual freedom was central. In solving it, they followed an essentially non-social path, chosen by those who, not accepting the reality of their time, sought personal freedom and came to an anarchist revolt against any social existence. Among the distant forerunners of this hopefully metaphysical rebellion are Schopenhauer, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche.

It is their books, along with Dostoevsky - the way the West learned it, that Camus, a student at the University of Algiers, is studying. Metaphysical problems, which, as Camus believed, nourish modern sensibility, the rebellion of Ivan, Kirillov, Stavrogin against God and his creation - that's what he then perceives as the main thing in the work of the Russian writer. Favorite literary heroes of Camus - Kirillov and Ivan - teach him the lesson of "royal freedom" ... "(4: 83).

The literature of each nation enters the world literary process primarily with symbolic names that determine the most evolutionarily significant stages in the formation of a national artistic system - names that focus in their creative consciousness not only genetic, contact, typological relationships, but also transformational constants that mutually enrich both their national field, and the world.

Considering the development of the Uzbek literary process of the 20th century in the context of the problem of the formation, development and transformation of the Uzbek novel space, we naturally stopped at the novel concept of M. Bakhtin, deployed by him in the system of the novel space of F. Dostoevsky.

It is rather difficult to talk about the direct influence of the novel concept of F. Dostoevsky on the formation and development of Uzbek novelistics, since the stage of the emergence of the Uzbek novel is associated with the period of the early twentieth century, when the development of the Russian novel was accompanied by a number of processes of destruction of the classical novel tradition (to which most critics include the novel Dostoevsky) caused by the renewal of the classical canons of realism (the school of Znaniev realism of the early twentieth century) and the emergence of the type of modernist novel.

However, those key principles that M. Bakhtin formed in the concept of the novel on the basis of an analysis of the artistic system of F. Dostoevsky can provide direct basic material for researching trends and constants in the development of the Uzbek novel of the 20th century. The basis for the development of the novelistic artistic system in the Uzbek literature of the 20th century is undoubtedly the novel by A. Kadyri "Past Days", which, according to all Uzbek literary criticism, "was an event not only in the history of Uzbek literature, but also in the history of the artistic worldview of the peoples of Central Asia and Kazakhstan".

The correlation of the novelistic artistic system (in the complex of formal and meaningful features) of F. Dostoevsky and A. Kadyri is felt to a greater extent precisely in the context of the key features of the realistic "polyphonic novel" defined by M. Bakhtin: 1) "a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses..." (1: 6); 2) "it is built not as a whole of

one consciousness that has objectively accepted other consciousnesses into itself, but as a whole of the interaction of several consciousnesses, none of which has completely become the object of another ...<... > ... everything in it is built in such a way as to make a dialogic confrontation hopeless" (1: 20-22); 3) the main feature becomes "not becoming, but coexistence and interaction" (1: 33); 4) "between all the elements of the novel structure there are dialogical relations, that is, they are counterpunched" (1: 49).

It should be emphasized that the realistic and social character of artistic psychology, which coincides with Dostoevsky and Kadyri, determines the principle of realistic novelistic narration. However, the structure of the "compositional dialogue" among writers is somewhat differentiated. For Dostoevsky, the system of "independent and unmerged consciousnesses" of the heroes is usually inscribed in the context of the social, existential and everyday plan, Kadyri defines the plot-compositional dialogic space in the context of the historical and social reality and the personal life of his heroes.

The expansion of the internal "private" space of the personal life of the characters due to the compositional expansion of the historical background enhances the feeling of the realism of the narration and determines the main plot-forming conflict of the novel on many levels. If in most of Dostoevsky's novels ideas, as a rule, socially conditioned ideas become such a background context for the personal conflict of "the minds of heroes", then for the artistic system of Kadyri, the contextual filling of the personal conflict background with socio-historical determination, correlated with the real everyday specifics of the history of Turkestan in the middle XIX century.

However, in relation to the novels of Dostoevsky and Kadyri, the statement of M. Bakhtin (entering into an analytical dispute with the concept of B. M. Engelhardt about the essence of the "idea-ideology" constants in relation to Dostoevsky's "ideological novel") that "the idea as the subject of the image occupies a huge place in the work of Dostoevsky, but she is not the heroine of his novels. His hero was a man, and in the end he portrayed not an idea in a man, but, in his own words, "a man in a man."

The idea was for him either a touchstone for testing a person in a person, or a form of its discovery, or, finally, and this is the main thing, that "medium", that environment in which human consciousness is revealed in its deepest essence" (1: 38 -39).

The variability of comprehension of the "mystery of man" in the works of F. M. Dostoevsky suggests not only the ambiguity of reading his works, but also the broad aspect in choosing the conceptual principle for constructing new systems for comprehending the writer's philosophical views and his historical and literary path.

Determination and systematization of the levels of influence of Dostoevsky's creativity on the formation of the world literary process will make it possible to form in modern literary criticism a methodology for systematic research on the principle of "writer - literary process", as well as to theorize a number of historical and literary categories on the problem of determining the logic of the development of the world literary process.

## LITERATURE

1. Bakhtin M. M. Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics. - M., 1979.
2. Bakhtin M.M. Aesthetics of verbal creativity. - M., 1979.
3. Belaya N.V. Tradition and innovation as the most important components of literary creativity. // art history. - No. 2. - 2007. - CyberLeninka Scientific Library:

<http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/traditsiya-i-novatorstvo-kak-vazhneyshie-sostavlyayuschie-literaturnogo-tvorchestva#ixzz3EKvR92Vx>

4. Dostoevsky in foreign literatures - L. : Nauka, 1978.
5. Zamanskaya VV Existential tradition in Russian literature of the XX century. Dialogues on the borders of centuries. – M.: Flinta; Science, 2002.
6. Lvova I. V. F. M. Dostoevsky and the American novel of the 1940-1960s. - Abstract. diss. for the competition ... .. doctor of philology. Sciences. - Veliky Novgorod, 2010.
7. Trunin S.E. Dostoevsky's reception in Russian prose at the turn of the 20th and 20th centuries. – Moscow, 2008.
8. Heidegger Marty. Time and being. - M.: Respublika, 1993.
9. Khalizev V.E. Theory of Literature. - M., 1999.