

© 2022. Лу Яо
Сучжоуский Университет
г. Сучжоу, Китай

Ф. М. Достоевский и братья Аксаковы в контексте общественно-литературной борьбы и сотрудничества

Аннотация: В 1840-х гг. Ф. М. Достоевский прославился в литературных кругах благодаря своей повести «Бедные люди», но подвергся широкой критике со стороны славянофилов в лице братьев Аксаковых за свой творческий подход и политическую идеологию. В 1860-х гг. жаркие споры между «Временем» и «Денем» подтвердили идеологические разногласия Достоевского со славянофилами. В 1880-х гг., как показывает автор статьи, намечается сближение позиции Достоевского, его художественных идей и взглядов братьев Аксаковых, что особенно хорошо ощутимо по речи Достоевского на Пушкинском празднике. В статье осмысляются основные мировоззренческие расхождения и точки соприкосновения между почвенничеством и славянофильством, прослеживаются непростые отношения Достоевского с братьями Аксаковыми, которые длились более 40 лет. Отмечается, что многочисленные несогласия в убеждениях указанных современников касались вопроса о творческом стиле, назначении литературы и идейных течениях. Достоевский верил в славянофильскую мысль, но был более прогрессивен, он развил и углубил идеалы фундаментализма второй половины XIX в.

Ключевые слова: Ф. М. Достоевский, К. С. Аксаков, И. С. Аксаков, идеология, славянофилы, почвенничество, творческий метод.

Информация об авторе: Лу Яо, доктор филологических наук, Сучжоуский Университет, ул. Шизи № 1, район Гусу, 215006 г. Сучжоу, провинция Цзянсу, Китай.

E-mail: emailluyao@126.com

Дата поступления статьи в редакцию: 09.08.2022

Дата одобрения статьи рецензентами: 22.10.2022

Дата публикации статьи: 25.12.2022

Для цитирования: Лу Яо. Ф. М. Достоевский и братья Аксаковы в контексте общественно-литературной борьбы и сотрудничества // Два века русской классики. 2022. Т. 4, № 4. С. 54–71. <https://doi.org/10.22455/2686-7494-2022-4-4-54-71>



This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)

Dva veka russkoi klassiki,
vol. 4, no. 4, 2022, pp. 54–71. ISSN 2686-7494
Two centuries of the Russian classics,
vol. 4, no. 4, 2022, pp. 54–71. ISSN 2686-7494

Research Article

© 2022. Lu Yao
Suzhou University
Suzhou, China

F. M. Dostoevsky and the Aksakov Brothers in the Context of Social and Literary Struggle and Cooperation

Abstract: In the 1840s F. M. Dostoevsky became famous in literary circles thanks to his story *Poor Folk*, but was widely criticized by the Slavophiles, namely by the Aksakov brothers for his creative approach and political ideology. In the 1860s heated disputes between *Vremnya* and *Den'* confirmed Dostoevsky's ideological disagreements with the Slavophiles. In the 1880s, as the author of the article shows, begins a convergence of Dostoevsky's position, his artistic ideas and the views of the Aksakov brothers, which is especially noticeable in Dostoevsky's speech at the Pushkin holiday. The article comprehends the main ideological differences and points of contact between *pochvennichestvo* and Slavophilism, traces the difficult relationship between Dostoevsky and the Aksakov brothers, which lasted more than 40 years. Numerous disagreements in the beliefs of these contemporaries concerned the issue of creative style, the purpose of literature and ideological currents. Dostoevsky believed in Slavophile thought, but was more progressive; he developed and deepened the ideals of fundamentalism in the second half of the 19th century.

Keywords: F. M. Dostoevsky, K. S. Aksakov, I. S. Aksakov, ideology, Slavophiles, *pochvennichestvo*, creative method.

Information about the author: Lu Yao, PhD in Philology, Suzhou University, Shizi St. 1, Gusu District, 215006 Suzhou, Jiangsu province, China.

E-mail: emailluyao@126.com

Received: August 09, 2022

Approved after reviewing: October 22, 2022

Published: December 25, 2022

For citation: Yao, Lu. "F. M. Dostoevsky and the Aksakov Brothers in the Context of Social and Literary Struggle and Cooperation." *Dva veka russkoi klassiki*, vol. 4, no. 4, 2022, pp. 54–71. (In English) <https://doi.org/10.22455/2686-7494-2022-4-4-54-71>

With the increasing influence of Russian literary studies, the wave of conservative thought in Russia has also influenced the study of Russian literature in China. Recently, Chinese scholars have also gradually begun to study Russian authors of conservatism. Some of the conservative thinkers and critics already familiar in Russia, such as N. N. Strakhov, M. N. Katkov, K. S. Aksakov, and I. S. Aksakov, were introduced to Chinese scholars. In the middle of thinkers, the Brothers Aksakov have only recently become an attractive theme for study, although they have been familiar to Russian scholars for a long time.

The Brothers Aksakov are seen as representative of Slavophilism and contemporaries of Dostoevsky, with whom Chinese scholars are most familiar. Chinese scholars seem to have overlooked both the close and hostile relations between the Brothers Aksakov and Dostoevsky. They studied the brothers as part of the Slavophiles, paying no attention to their different characters or their unique activities.

I. S. Aksakov was probably the first person of the Slavophiles to focus on Dostoevsky. In a letter to his family in 1845 I. S. Aksakov reported on the latest developments of several St. Petersburg writers and mentioned Dostoevsky with irony: “Grigoriev is also friendly with Otechestvennye Zapiski. In the latter, they have found a new star, a kind of Dostoevsky, who was placed almost above Gogol, the Gogol of many Slavophiles’ hearts!!!” [Aksakov I. 1888: 313]. K. S. Aksakov maintained a similar attitude towards Dostoevsky. The Brothers Aksakov disapproved and even feuded with this new star of St. Petersburg.

K. S. Aksakov’s Critique of Early Dostoevsky’s Writing

The American scholar Joseph Frank commented on Dostoevsky’s debut novel like this: “No début in Russian literature has been described more vividly than that of Dostoevsky, and few, in truth, created so widespread and sensational a stir” [Joseph Frank 1976: 137]. However, Frank did not specify

that the critics and the magazine publishers in St. Petersburg cheered Dostoevsky. They are members of the naturalist, which praised the novel *Poor Folk*. Belinsky praised Dostoevsky as a new genius and his novel was a new attempt at social fiction: “He (Dostoevsky. — L. Y.) had succeeded in producing the work that Belinsky had been waiting for” [Joseph Frank 1976: 139]. On 5 February 1846, in a letter to Zhukovsky, the critic and publisher P. A. Pletnev described the situation that *Poor Folk* shook the literary world of St. Petersburg: “Our Nekrasovites (those who published articles in Nekrasov’s magazine) are crazy about it and said that now both Gogol and others are dead” [Pletnev: 570]. Another novelist, L. W. Brant, even thought that Dostoevsky’s artistic talent surpassed that of Gogol and Lermontov: “They said, a new author has appeared, like Gogol, and his story, which seems to have more merit than Gogol’s novels and being printed in a St. Petersburg almanac. It will be interesting to see!” [Dmitriev: 157].

In contrast to the St. Petersburg literary scene, the Slavophiles in Moscow were more restrictive. A. S. Khomyakov claimed that the tragedy of Devushkin, the protagonist of *Poor Folk*, was rooted in contempt for the masses and women. The criticism of K. S. Aksakov was even harsher for the following reasons.

Firstly, K. S. Aksakov disapproved of the naturalists. It was clearly unacceptable to him that the St Petersburg literary scene appreciated naturalism, and regarded Dostoevsky and his *Poor Folk* as the best representatives of the natural school. Secondly, Dostoevsky uses the mouth of Devushkin in his novel to dissent from Gogol’s *The Overcoat*, and even to critique Gogol: “they, those scumbags, no matter what you write!” [Dostoevsky 1: 68]. Thirdly, the high esteem of Dostoevsky in the St. Petersburg literary scene, like “better than Gogol,” made the Slavophiles loathe Dostoevsky. The approval of “better than Gogol” hurt the Slavophiles, because of the standards of the writers produced by the Slavophiles. In the hierarchic system of writers constructed by the Slavophiles, Gogol ranks first, followed by S. T. Aksakov and N. S. Sokhanskaya, the reasons were as follows: the Slavophiles regarded Gogol’s *Dead Souls* as a return to Orthodox ideals and harmonious patriarchy, while N. S. Sokhanskaya’s work reflected a positive, healthy picture of national life. In a letter to N. S. Sokhanskaya I. S. Aksakov wrote: “Your novel was named ‘the Russian Story’, and no other writer, not Grigorovich, not even Turgenyev, has ever been awarded by us” [Fetisenco: 235]. Nekrasov, Turgenyev and even Pushkin belonged to Westerners, which was too con-

cerned with the dark side of life. These authors were criticized by the Slavophiles for their extensive use of naturalistic creative methods.

After reading *Poor Folk*, K. S. Aksakov attacked Dostoevsky mercilessly, based on concepts of orthodoxy and the positive and the negative. He claimed that Dostoevsky borrowed the best portrayal of Civil Servant and petty people from Gogol when he created the two main characters, Devushkin and Varenka in *Poor Folk*, a failed copy of Gogol's creative motivation and character. According to traditional Slavophile theory, the creation should be "a combination of national consciousness and the truth of Orthodoxy" [Zenkovsky: 66]. Orthodoxy is the foundation of Gogol's writing, and the Slavophiles saw it as the basis of Russian Narodnost'. The creation was intended to reflect both the Orthodox faith and the Narodnost': "Russian Narodnost' is impossible outside of Orthodoxy; that Orthodoxy is that spiritual historical element, under the influence of which Russian Narodnost' was formed and developed. All attempts to isolate Orthodoxy from the Russian Narodnost', so to say, to throw out bases and create some new political Russian Narodnost' from dehumanized material" [Aksakov I. 2002: 748]. All of them are part of the Russian people's souls. The Orthodox spirit added great importance to Gogol's writing and formed the spiritual world of the Russian people. *Dead Souls* is the embodiment of Russian Narodnost'. The absence of the Orthodox in *Poor Folk* prevents the true expression of Narodnost'. K. S. Aksakov thought, that *Poor Folk* is a parody, similar in style, but does not convey Gogol's spirit, nor reflects the unique Russian Narodnost'.

K. S. Aksakov then borrowed the positive and negative elements to evaluate Dostoevsky's writing. According to the critic, genuine artworks contain a positive element, bringing light and comfort to the reader: "The profound, reconciling beauty of the artwork has embraced and meanwhile brought new life, a new beginning to your soul, brighter and purer, more cheerful in your heart" [Aksakov K. S., Aksakov I. S.: 185]. Thus, K. S. Aksakov claimed that *Poor Folk* is not a real literary masterpiece because of its naturalistic and realistic portrayal, which makes a heavy impression on the readership. For K. S. Aksakov, *Poor Folk* is a negative parody. The history of literature has proved that K. S. Aksakov's evaluation is clearly prejudiced. But the question he raised is also worth pondering: should literature emphasize denunciation and criticism? From this point of view, Gorky's works *About Karamazovshchina* (1913) and *More About Karamazovshchina* (1913) could be an answer to this question. If *Poor Folk* exposed the "lack" of Dostoevsky's creative ta-

lent so that K. S. Aksakov concluded that Dostoevsky had not shown any artistic talent in his novels. The appearance of *The Double* then undoubtedly increased K. S. Aksakov's dissatisfaction with Dostoevsky: "Then Mr. Dostoevsky has imitated Gogol's methods, his external movements, his outward looks, not knowing the truth, that Gogol's perfect creations were due to his different life... In it (i. e., *The Double*. — L. Y.) Mr. Dostoevsky constantly imitates Gogol, often to the extent of copying rather than borrowing" [Aksakov K. S., Aksakov I. S.: 189]. Much of Aksakov's scathing criticism of Dostoevsky is related to the naturalistic method.

In *Poor Folk* and *The Double*, Dostoevsky showed a realistic picture of extremely harsh life in St Petersburg, which made K. S. Aksakov uncomfortable. K. S. Aksakov did not regard accuracy as the highest criterion of art, he said: "Yes, if accuracy was an artistic virtue, the best artist would be a Daguerreotype or a stenographer" [Aksakov K. S., Aksakov I. S.: 229]. At the same time, Dostoevsky's philanthropic tendency in *Poor Folk* also displeased K. S. Aksakov. The Slavophile critic and Professor S. P. Shevyrev of Moscow University commented that: "The philanthropic tendency of the novel is more visible than the artistic" [Shevyrev: 225]. The powerful philanthropic tendency in Dostoevsky's writing awakens sympathy for the poor, but sympathy is a negative emotion that brings the reader not pleasure and peace, but pain. Moreover, the philanthropic tendency makes *Poor Folk* a tendentious novel; that cannot be called true art. Thus, according to K. S. Aksakov, Dostoevsky borrowed only the external form of Gogol's writing, but not its essence. The style of *Poor Folk* is gloomy and grey, and its achievements are limited.

Thus, K. S. Aksakov's criticism of Dostoevsky, while consistent with his Slavophile ideology, is clearly prejudiced. K. S. Aksakov merely remarks on the lack of orthodox elements in Dostoevsky's early writing and his naturalistic methods, but does not feel the humanistic spirit that forms the basis of the writer's creation. *Poor Folk* embodies Dostoevsky's humanist spirit; the author creates a perspective "that looks at the world from above, not below" [Joseph Frank 1976: 144]. A new perspective was formed by Dostoevsky's main innovation over Gogol. As opposed to Gogol, who portrayed many characteristic petty people but satirically mocked them, Dostoevsky was always sympathetic towards the petty people, ready to return to them and look at the world from their point of view. At all times Dostoevsky treated each of his characters with pity, turning the reader's attention to the poor, trying

to show the struggle between the divinity of man and the harshness of the environment using naturalistic methods, but there is no such compassion for the world in Gogol's writing.

Although Dostoevsky's early writings were under the general criticism of the Brothers Aksakov, many Slavophile concepts, such as the *Obshchina* influenced Dostoevsky from the 1840s. After the publication of *Mistress*, Dostoevsky's ideas gradually moved closer to Slavophilism. D. A. Kunilitsky believes, "It was the tragic-poetic portrayal of people's life undertaken by Dostoevsky in *Mistress* that was radically different from the sketches and negativity of the natural school..." [Kunilitsky 2013: 40]. It is in this novel that Dostoevsky changed his style from a negative portrayal of Russian society to a poetic depiction of Russian real life, attempting to show an idyllic, refreshing virtue against the unhappy social reality. Dostoevsky not only saw tragedy in reality but also found a positive element in it. Certain changes in style, of course, do not mean that Dostoevsky fully embraced Slavophile thought, because "the antiquated aspects of Slavophilism, its nostalgia for a mythical before-Petrine period, he simply dismisses as lamentations over the lost boyar privileges of the nobility, now living off the vanished glory and clinging to a few faded titles" [Joseph Frank 1986: 195]. Furthermore, attitudes towards literature and the intelligentsia defined great differences between Dostoevsky and the Slavophiles. Therefore, after his return from exile in Siberia, Dostoevsky intended to create a new trend — fundamentalism. Together with Apollo Grigoriev, he announced the creation of the newspaper *Vremya*, which was to replace Westernism and Slavophilism and put Russia on the "Third Way".

The Literary Debate Between Dostoevsky and I. S. Aksakov

From 1861, Dostoevsky engaged in a full-scale polemic with various ideologies of the Russian literary scene to promote the ideas of fundamentalism. The Slavophile newspaper *Den'*, created at the same time, naturally came into Dostoevsky's vision. To clarify his disagreement with Slavophile ideas, Dostoevsky twice expressed his views on articles by I. S. Aksakov, the editor-in-chief of *Den'*.

In the first issue of *Den'* I. S. Aksakov published an article entitled *Return to the Nation's Life through Self-Consciousness*, in which he tried to prove that the present Russian literature (mostly created by Westernism writers) was a deception of the nation and full of lies. The false literature was not

only distant from the nation, but also contained Westernism theories and ideologies while ignoring the plight of the Russian people: “...lies in literature, suffering from diseases and indifferent to national sorrows” [Aksakov I. 2008: 170]. For I. S. Aksakov, this literature with its naturalistic perspective is a scathing condemnation of the character of the people. It exaggerates the darker sides of national life, promotes decadent Westernism ideas, portrays depraved characters and becomes a lie in literature because of its excessive condemnation. The culprits of the literary lie were Westernism intellectuals who played with fanciful Westernism political theories, viciously ridiculing and censuring their own nation. “The lie is in the censure of our Narodnost’, not by fervent love, but due to wickedness, instinctively hostile to all the sanctity of honor and duty” [Aksakov I. S. 2008: 170]

Differently from Slavophilism, Westernism sought to expose social reality, focus on sensitive themes and express its political ideas through literary works to awaken revolutionary sentiments in the people. Thus, Westernism often emphasized tendency in literature, while Slavophiles resolutely rejected tendency. In literature, Slavophiles wanted to see idyllic village life, harmonious patriarchal families and pious Orthodox believers, rather than violence and revolution. The Slavophiles emphasized that “Russian literature has eternal value in fully expressing the spirit of Russian national culture. The significance of national literature lies in its being a reliable reflection of national life and the spirit of the people” [Ji Mingju: 145]. The naturalistic methods overused by the Westerners succeeded in provoking the revolt. This result contradicted the Slavophiles’ moderate improvement. The Slavophiles therefore constantly monitored the Westernism literary tendencies and tried to replace them with a positive element. He was displeased with I. S. Aksakov’s total rejection of the literature of the Natural School and the Westernism intellectuals, and he promptly published two articles, “The Last Literary Phenomena of Den’” and “Two Camps of Theorists on Den’ and Some Other Things” in order to contradict I. S. Aksakov.

Dostoevsky differed greatly from I. S. Aksakov in his attitude to the Natural School. Dostoevsky always had a realist view of art and literature, both in his literary work and in his literary criticism. He believed that ideals of art and realistic aesthetics always corresponded to each other: “And the main thing is that art is always in the highest degree true to reality — its deviations are transient; it is not only always true to reality, but it cannot be false to contemporary reality” [Dostoevsky 18: 101]. Dostoevsky claimed that Rus-

sian literature not only did not deceive the nation, but also shouldered the burden of exposing lies and self-defeating lies. The Slavophiles, on the other hand, mistook reality for a lie and regarded the legends of the before-Petrine period as reality. Dostoevsky's attitude to literature was more tolerant and he expressed an ideological view of realism, condemning the Slavophile method of creativity and criticism. It is possible to say Dostoevsky's understanding of reality was higher than the Brothers Aksakov's. However, Dostoevsky seems to have seen the two brothers' dissatisfaction with literature, not understanding the positive role of the Slavophiles in the revival of national culture and the transmission of positive ideals in literature, which reflects a certain prejudice in Dostoevsky's polemical thought.

Dostoevsky also refutes the opinion of I. S. Aksakov that literature is full of lies and hypocrisy. Dostoevsky accused this view of being extreme: "If there is a lie, if there has been one, then our literature, over the decades, has almost entirely denied this lie, not admitted" [Dostoevsky 19: 60]. According to Dostoevsky, there was no malignant condemnation of the national character in literature. I. S. Aksakov's rejection of condemnation in literature reflects that "Slavophile critics are unwilling to understand modern literature" [Kunilitsky 2013: 84]. N. N. Strakhov, also a critic of fundamentalism, explains the inevitability of self-condemnation in his journalistic essay *The Poverty of Our Literature*: "Self-satisfied and self-praise are unbearable for us, on the contrary, it is a pleasant pastime for us to punish ourselves in every possible way, to give ourselves no mercy, to apply to ourselves the highest demands" [Strakhov 1984: 45]. The present literary trend in Russia, according to Dostoevsky, is the self-condemnation of the nation by writers. Dostoevsky considered the literature of condemnation to be noble literature, and this kind of literature can only be heart-shaking if it condemns the present condition of society. Finally, Dostoevsky and I. S. Aksakov had different attitudes towards the intellectuals. According to I. S. Aksakov: the Westernism intellectuals were Russian troublemakers and creators of literary lies. Dostoevsky partly agreed with him, using the image of Nechaev in *Demons* to satirize the Westerners and their disconnection from the mainstream: "Dostoevsky's charge to the Westerners of the *Demons* lies above all in their detachment from the mainstream of their own nation. A generation that lost its cultural roots, religious traditions and the moral character of its homeland has finally bred demons which harm the nation" [Liu Wenfei: 303]. However, he believed that I. S. Aksakov's attacks on Westernism intellectuals are based on a stubborn attitude rather than on a

clearly conscious of the limitations of Westernism. Researcher Wan Haisong of the Institute of Foreign Languages of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences agrees with this view, “the new generation of Slavophiles, led by I. S. Aksakov, after more or less careful research, but in their theoretical development has made few significant intellectual advances, and their perspective is still limited to the framework established by the older Slavophiles” [Wan Haisong: 105]. Dostoevsky observed that both Slavophiles and Westerners were obsessed with their own ideas and blindly hostile to the other’s theory. Therefore, he resolved to love and pity all intellectuals, urging them to return to the mainstream and unite at the feet of Christ.

As scholar Y. I. Zakiev said, “He (Dostoevsky. — L. Y.) did not hate the intellectuals, he only wanted to re-educate them in a nationalistic way” [Zakiev: 53]. A return to the mainstream was identified by Dostoevsky as the only possible way. Dostoevsky was not alone in striving for a return to the mainstream. N. N. Strakhov also called for reconciliation with the Westernism intellectuals: “I have known this world for a long time, since 1845, when I went to university. Petersburg people with their mind as well as their heart and seminary spirit, which gave us Chernyshevsky, Antonovich, Dobrolyubov, Blagosvetlov, Eliseyev, etc., the main preachers of Westernism. — I know all of them intimately, I have seen their development, I have followed the literary movement, I have ventured into this arena myself, etc.” [Strakhov 2003: 606]. The fundamentalist’s appeal for reconciliation was relevant to the social needs of the time. After more than 40 years of disagreement and polemics, Slavophiles and Westerners were deeply exhausted, and the terror of the Narodniks had brought Russian society to a stalemate. In this oppressive atmosphere, Dostoevsky believed that the intellectuals needed to return to the mainstream and choose reconciliation.

Dostoevsky continued to call for reconciliation until the 1880s. The Pushkin Speech in 1880 elevated Dostoevsky to the pinnacle of fame, and he made a strong appeal at the celebration for the reconciliation of Slavophiles and Westerners, for the reconciliation of all mankind. As V. V. Zenkovsky said: “Dostoevsky struggled passionately against modern ‘seclusion’ and ‘isolation’ and called for ‘human commonality’, for genuine brotherhood, for overcoming national egoisms, all his life he dreamed of reconciling all peoples” [Zenkovsky: 227]. Dostoevsky regarded Slavophilism and Westernism intellectuals with the same fraternal and humanistic spirit with which he had always regarded the entire nation and humanity.

The Literary Collaboration Between Dostoevsky and I. S. Aksakov

Pushkin's celebration in 1880 was a cultural sensation in Russia, bringing together leading writers, playwrights, publishers, critics, journalists, scientists, actors, artists and musicians; Conservatives, Slavophiles, fundamentalists, Westerners and Narodniks. M. N. Katkov, I. S. Aksakov, N. N. Strakhov, I. S. Turgenev and G. I. Uspensky were present. The celebration was called by I. S. Aksakov: "a true event in the historical development of Russian society. — A great act of our people's self-consciousness, a new era, a turning point for our younger generations..." [Aksakov I. 1891: 91]. The influence of the celebration was felt far into the future: Pushkin's allure and the participation of many stellar writers were only superficial factors; the ideological struggle between Conservatives and Westerners, Slavophiles and Westerners, is the real reason why the celebration has such an impact. The Russian writer V. O. Mikhnevich, who was present, said: "It was not at all about Turgenev and Dostoevsky or their readings, not even about Pushkin, but about the idea which they all became an expression to the public and about those unspoken, but clearly — more clearly than ever — felt intellectual's aspirations which were in the atmosphere of Pushkin's celebrations and formed the living soul of the event that we lived through" [Levitt: 9]. Thus, Pushkin's celebration was not only a ceremony to unveil a sculpture of Pushkin but also an ideological arena for intellectuals of different trends.

The winner of this struggle, Dostoevsky, shone with his infectious speech and won the palm award. In his speech Dostoevsky endowed Pushkin with the value of all mankind and sought to make all Russian people, Slavophiles and Westerners, unite as a community of destiny at the feet of Christ. Dostoevsky, satisfied with the effect of his speech, wrote in a letter to his wife: "A cloud was encircling the horizon, and here the word of Dostoevsky, like the sun rises, dispelled everything, illuminated everything. From this time comes brotherhood and there will be no perplexity" [Dostoevsky 1988: 184–185]. Dostoevsky's triumph is recognized, G. I. Ouspensky, I. S. Aksakov and N. N. Strakhov give the same answer. As N. N. Strakhov recalled: "I. S. Aksakov had to speak to the public afterwards... But instead of starting his speech he suddenly announced from the pulpit that he would not speak. 'I cannot speak,' he said, 'after Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoyevsky's speech; everything I have written is only a weak variation on some of the themes of this genius speech" [Strakhov 1990: 513–514].

Such an ending is surprising, since I. S. Aksakov expressed his strong dislike for Dostoevsky and his *Vremya* in a letter to N. S. Sokhanskaya in the 1860s, during the polemics between *Den'* and *Vremya*: “This journal is a Slavophile in the most desperate way and berates us at every opportunity, saying that Slavophilism is obsolete and wants to create a theory about Russian *Narodnost'* — without faith and morality!” [Kunilitsky 2015: 88]. After the Pushkin memorial day, I. S. Aksakov recalled Dostoevsky’s speech: “He read it, read it masterly, such an excellent, original speech, which captures the question of *Narodnost'* even wider and deeper than my speech, not in the form of a logical exposition, but in vivid, realistic images, with the skill of a novelist, and the impression was truly amazing” [Aksakov I. 1891: 96]. Dostoevsky was surprised at the change in the attitude of this ex-enemy: “Aksakov came in and announced that he would not read his speech, because everything had been said and everything had been resolved by the great word of our genius — Dostoevsky” [Dostoevsky 1988: 185]. In fact, that I. S. Aksakov thought so highly of Dostoevsky and reconciled with him was directly connected with I. S. Turgenev and the Westernism he represented.

N. N. Strakhov commented on I. S. Turgenev’s role in this celebration: “It was now felt that the majority had chosen Turgenev as the signal on which all the accumulated enthusiasm could be poured out” [Strakhov 1984: 170]. The majority means a large number of intellectuals and students of Westernism. The purpose of Turgenev’s attendance was, according to Dostoevsky, to deprive Pushkin of the title of the national poet: “for the hostile party (Turgenev, Kovalevsky and almost the entire university) resolutely wants to belittle Pushkin as the exponent of Russian *Narodnost'* by denying *Narodnost'* itself” [Dostoevsky 1988: 169]. At that time I. S. Aksakov was not only the leader of Slavophiles, but also the defender of *Narodnost'*: “Opponent of them (Westerners. — *L. Y.*), from our side, is only Ivan Sergeevich Aksakov (Yuryev and others of no importance), but Ivan Aksakov is both obsolete and bored in Moscow” [Dostoevsky 30: 169]. Thus, to protect Pushkin’s reputation and *Narodnost'*, Dostoevsky hoped to unite with I. S. Aksakov against the Westernist slander of Pushkin.

I. S. Aksakov did not disappoint Dostoevsky. After Dostoevsky’s speech, I. S. Aksakov gave his lecture, despite his repeated refusal. At the beginning of his speech, I. S. Aksakov called Pushkin the first love of the Russian people. In his opinion, the first awakening of the Russian people occurred after reading Pushkin’s poetry, the *Narodnost'* in the poetry awakened the

self-consciousness of the slumbering Russian, and therefore Pushkin was a firm exponent of Russian Narodnost'. Although in Aksakov's early years, like the older Slavophiles, accepted the idea of praising Gogol and devaluing Pushkin, with the changes of the 1860s he gradually realized Pushkin's importance and accepted his status as a national poet. Dostoevsky's appreciation of Pushkin was even higher. He considered Pushkin to be the first who formed such an artistic image of Russian beauty: "This ability is entirely Russian and national, and Pushkin only shares it with all our people" [Dostoevsky 30: 131]. It was Pushkin who found the beauty of Russia from the ideas of the Russian people and showed the sensitive and perceptive character of the Russian. From Dostoevsky's point of view, Pushkin's most important talent is not the expression of the Narodnost' or the profound revelation of the beauty hidden in the hearts of the Russian people, but his empathy for all humanity. Dostoevsky saw in Pushkin's poetics common humanity. Pushkin was not only a Russian poet, but a poet of all mankind because of his ability to sympathize with other peoples in the world: "I just say that of all peoples, the Russians, with their hearts and talents, are probably the most adept at uniting all of humanity and being in solidarity with all of them" [Dostoevsky 30: 131].

I. S. Aksakov emphasized the connection of Pushkin's writing with the nation and Narodnost', while Dostoevsky stressed the issue of literature and religion, Narodnost' and universal humanity in his speech. Although each litterateur had a different focus, both sides had the same starting point — to protect Pushkin's reputation.

I. S. Turgenev drove out the Conservative representative M. N. Katkov before the start of the celebration to secure victory. But I. S. Turgenev did not anticipate the accession of Dostoevsky and I. S. Aksakov. As a typical moderate Westerner, I. S. Turgenev was prepared to admit Pushkin's linguistic talents, but refuse to admit the title of Pushkin's national poet and the Narodnost' in Pushkin's poetry: "In art, poetry and literature, only a weak nation, immature or still in a state of subjugation or oppression, would come up with the slogan of Narodnost'... Thank God, Russia is not in such a position ..." [Turgenev: 215]. I. S. Turgenev doubted whether Pushkin was a national poet: "In a word... But can we properly call Pushkin a national poet in the sense of worldwide significance (the two expressions often match), the way we call Shakespeare, Goethe, and Homer? Pushkin apparently did not succeed in reaching it" [Turgenev: 217]. I. S. Turgenev's

rejection of Pushkin's title of national poet and the concept of Narodnost' was due to his own reasons. Based on Westerner's conception, Narodnost' contradicts common humanity. In order to actively integrate into Western European society, Russian Narodnost' had to be eliminated. For this reason, the denial of Narodnost' in Pushkin's writing was of particular importance to the Westerners. This act of I. S. Turgenev was clearly disapproved of by Dostoevsky and I. S. Aksakov. Believing that I. S. Turgenev had offended Pushkin, I. S. Aksakov refused to speak after I. S. Turgenev. Dostoevsky mentioned: "Today, due to clique, Ivan Aksakov refused to read his speech after Turgenev (in which he humiliated Pushkin by taking away from him the title of the national poet) during the morning reading of his speeches" [Dostoevsky 30: 182]. Although the process was turbulent, in the end, Slavophiles won: "Dostoevsky's success allowed Aksakov to describe the Pushkin celebration as a 'triumph' of the Russian trend" [Kunilitsky 2013: 133]. I. S. Aksakov exclaimed after the memorial day: "All in all, the celebration of our trend, represented by Dostoevsky, was perfect, while the speeches of the others could all be regarded as the nonsense ramblings of the 1840s" [Aksakov I. S. 1891: 97]. Dostoevsky's victory renewed the glory not only for himself but also for the Slavophiles. Amidst a climate of Westernism and Narodnik's ideology as well as Conservative dependence on the government to suppress intellectuals, Slavophiles once again returned to the public eye and breathed new air into the climate of opinion. N. N. Strakhov evaluated the end of the celebration: "Slavophiles should have recognized our poet as a great expresser of the Russian spirit, and Westerners, although praising Pushkin, have to confess that they had not seen all his worth" [Strakhov 1984: 176].

For the fundamentalists, the truth of Russia is not on the side of the Slavophiles alone, or the side of the Westerners. To achieve truth, it is necessary to reconcile both sides, as well as the whole nation, all of humanity. It was Dostoevsky's Orthodox fraternal ideas and his relentless pursuit of humanism that brought him the palm award.

Conclusion

The tortuous relationship between Dostoevsky and the Brothers Aksakov lasted for more than 40 years. It is easy to notice that creative style and ideological trends were a constant source of disagreement between them. In the early years, Dostoevsky chose naturalism, trying to reflect the plight of the

nation and arouse the concern of all classes, while the romanticist K. S. Aksakov could not accept such a straightforward denunciation and opposed it; twenty years later, Dostoevsky chose to advocate Westernism literature with a condemnatory tendency, which was again rejected by I. S. Aksakov; it was not until the 1880s that I. S. Aksakov gradually broke away from the profoundly Slavophile influence and made his own theoretical progress, coming to terms with Dostoevsky's artistic ideas. The Brothers Aksakov chose to reject the Naturalists because of their Slavophile ideology; for them, the nobility of national life and the greatness of the national spirit could not be tainted. Dostoevsky also believed in Slavophile thought, but he was more progressive. In the Russian national mainstream, Dostoevsky developed and deepened the ideals of Fundamentalism in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Список литературы

Источники

Аксаков К. С., Аксаков И. С. Литературная критика. М.: Современник, 1981. 384 с.

Аксаков И. С. Иван Сергеевич Аксаков в его письмах. М.: Тип. М. Г. Волчанинова, 1888. Ч. 1. 466 с.

Аксаков И. С. Отчего так нелегко живется в России. М.: РОССПЭН, 2002. 1008 с.

Аксаков И. С. Наше знамя — русская народность. М.: Ин-т русской цивилизации, 2008. 640 с.

Аксаков И. С. Письмо И. С. Аксакова о Московских праздниках по поводу открытия памятника Пушкину // Русский архив. 1891. № 5. С. 90–99.

Достоевский Ф. М. Полн. собр. соч.: в 30 т. Л.: Наука, 1972–1990.

Л. Н. Толстой и Н. Н. Страхов. Полн. собр. переписки: в 2 т. М.: Гос. музей Л. Н. Толстого, Группа славянских исследований при Оттавском университете, 2003. Т. 2. 1080 с.

Плетнев П. А. Сочинения и переписка: в 3 т. СПб.: Тип. Имп. Акад. наук, 1885. Т. 3. XII. 746 с.

Страхов Н. Н. Литературная критика. М.: Современник, 1984. 432 с.

Страхов Н. Н. Воспоминания о Федоре Михайловиче Достоевском // Ф. М. Достоевский в воспоминаниях современников. М.: Худож. лит., 1990. С. 513–514.

Тургенев И. С. Собр. соч.: в 12 т. М.: Худож. лит., 1956. Т. 11. 572 с.

Шевырев С. П. Об отечественной словесности. М.: Высшая школа, 2004. 304 с.

Исследования

Дмитриев А. П. К оценке «Бедных людей» и «Двойника» Ф. М. Достоевского в семье Аксаковых (по переписке В. С. Аксаковой и М. Г. Карташевской) // Два века русской классики. 2020. Т. 2, № 1. С. 154–167. <https://doi.org/10.22455/2686-7494-2020-2-1-154-167>

Закиев Ю. И. Славянофилы и Ф. М. Достоевский // Аксаковские чтения: духовное и литературное наследие семьи Аксаковых. Уфа: Изд-во Башкирского ин-та развития образования, 2001. С. 51–53.

Зеньковский В. В. Русские мыслители и Европа: Критика Европейской культуры у русских мыслителей. Париж, YMCA-PRESS, 1955. 283 с.

Кунильцкий Д. А. Достоевский и братья Аксаковы: спор о русской литературе. Петрозаводск: Изд-во ПетрГУ, 2013. 152 с.

Кунильцкий Д. А. Славянофилы и «Время»: к истории запрещения журнала // Вестник Череповецкого государственного университета. 2015. № 6. С. 87–90.

Левитт Маркус Ч. Литература и политика: пушкинский праздник 1880 года. СПб.: Академический проект, 1994. 263 с.

Фетисенко О. Л. «Истина-живая сила»: братья Аксаковы и Кохановская (Н. С. Соханская) в 1860 г. // Христианское чтение. 2017. № 3. С. 232–252.

Frank Joseph. Dostoevsky. The Seeds of Revolt (1821–1849). Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1976. 401 p.

Frank Joseph. Dostoevsky. The Stir of Liberation (1860–1865). Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1986. 395 p.

Ji Mingju. Slavophilistic Literary Theory and Cultural Criticism. Beijing: China Society Press, 2015. 251 p.

Liu Wenfei. The Slavophiles' Position in Dostoevsky's Demons. Chinese and Foreign Culture and Literature, 12th series. Sichuan: Sichuan University Press, 2005. P. 288–305.

Wan Haisong. Discussion of the Fundamentalism as the “Third Way”: Focusing on Fyodor Dostoevsky // Russian East European and Central Asian Studies. 2018. № 3. P. 94–107.

References

Dmitriev, A. P. “K otsenke ‘Bednykh liudei’ i ‘Dvoinka’ F. M. Dostoevskogo v sem’e Aksakovykh (po perepiske V. S. Aksakovi i M. G. Kartashevskoi)” [“On the Assessment of ‘Poor People’ and ‘Double’ by F. M. Dostoevsky in the Aksakov Family (According to V. S. Aksakova and M. G. Kartashevskaya)”]. *Dva veka russkoi klassiki*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2020, pp. 154–167. <https://doi.org/10.22455/2686-7494-2020-2-1-154-167> (In Russ.)

Zakiev, Iu. I. “Slavianofily i F. M. Dostoevskii” [“Slavophiles and F. M. Dostoevsky”]. *Aksakovskie chteniia: dukhovnoe i literaturnoe nasledie sem’i Aksakovykh [Aksakov Readings: the Spiritual and Literary Heritage of the Aksakov Family]*. Ufa, Bashkir Institute for the Development of Education Publ., 2001, pp. 51–53. (In Russ.)

Zen’kovskii, V. V. *Russkie mysliteli i Evropa: Kritika Evropeiskoi kul’tury u russkikh myslitelei [Russian Thinkers and Europe: Criticism of European Culture among Russian Thinkers]*. Paris, YMCA-PRESS Publ., 1955. 283 p. (In Russ.)

Kunil’tskii, D. A. *Dostoevskii i bra’ia Aksakovy: spor o russkoi literature [Dostoevsky and the Aksakov Brothers: a Dispute about Russian Literature]*. Petrizavodsk, Petrozavodsk State University Publ., 2013. 152 p. (In Russ.)

Kunil’tskii, D. A. “Slavianofily i ‘Vremia’: k istorii zapreshcheniia zhurnala” [“Slavophiles and ‘Vremya’: on the History of the Magazine’s Prohibition”]. *Vestnik Cherepovetskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, no. 6, 2015, pp. 87–90. (In Russ.)

Levitt, Markus Ch. *Literatura i politika: pushkinskii prazdnik 1880 goda [Literature and Politics: Pushkin’s Holiday in 1880]*. St. Petersburg, Akademicheskii proekt Publ., 1994. 263 p. (In Russ.)

Fetisenko, O. L. “‘Istina-zhivaia sila’: bra’ia Aksakovy i Kokhanovskaia (N. S. Sokhanskaia) v 1860 g.” [“‘Truth is a Living Force’: Brothers Aksakov and Kokhanovskaya (N. S. Sokhanskaya) in 1860”]. *Khristianskoe chtenie*, no. 3, 2017, pp. 232–252. (In Russ.)

Frank, Joseph. *Dostoevsky. The Seeds of Revolt (1821–1849)*. Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1976. 401 p. (In English)

Frank, Joseph. *Dostoevsky. The Stir of Liberation (1860–1865)*. Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1986. 395 p. (In English)

Ji, Mingju. *Slavophilistic Literary Theory and Cultural criticism*. Beijing, China Society Press, 2015. 251 p. (In English)

Liu, Wenfei. “The Slavophiles’ Position in Dostoevsky’s Demons.” *Chinese and foreign culture and literature, 12th series*. Sichuan, Sichuan University Press, 2005, pp. 288–305. (In English)

Wan, Haisong. “Discussion of the Fundamentalism as the ‘Third Way’: Focusing on Fyodor Dostoevsky.” *Russian East European and Central Asian Studies*, no. 3, 2018, pp. 94–107. (In English)