From the Editor

Esteemed Colleagues, Dear Readers,

We are pleased to inform you that from December 20, 2022, *Dostoevsky and World Culture. Philological journal* is listed among the journals recognized by the Higher Attestation Commission for the following specialties:

5.9.1. Russian Literature and Literature of the Peoples of the Russian Federation
5.9.2. World Literature (Philological Studies)
5.9.3. Theory of Literature (Philological Studies)

We are looking forward to your articles. We remind you that the journal has a section entitled *Dostoevsky: His Readings*, in which we publish hermeneutic studies on authors important to Dostoevsky (Dante, Goethe, Shakespeare, Hugo, Dickens, Pushkin, etc.) not focused on direct connections with Dostoevsky’s texts.

From February 28 to March 2, 2023, the Research Centre “Dostoevsky and World Culture” IWL RAS together with the Commission for the Study of Fyodor Dostoevsky’s Artistic Heritage at the Academic Council “History of World Culture” RAS organized the 2nd International Online Conference “Crime and Punishment: Current State of Research” dedicated to the novel *Crime and Punishment*, while from April 19 to 21, 2023, in Staraya Russa was held the 25th edition of the International Readings “Dostoevsky’s Works in the Perception of 21st-Century Readers,” jointly organized by the “Fyodor Dostoevsky’s Museums in Staraya Russa” (a branch of the Novgorod Museum-Reserve) and the Centre. Summaries of both conferences are published in this issue.

On October 2–3, 2023, the Centre is planning an International Online Conference titled “The Book in the Book.” The conference, dedicated to the theoretical problem of the presence of books as both directly mentioned texts and tangible objects of the plot in written works of world literature and culture, is part of the project funded by the Russian Science Foundation (RSF) “The Role and the Image of Books in F.M. Dosto-

Next year we are planning two conferences, one dedicated to *Crime and Punishment* (late February – early March, online) and the other to *The Idiot* (April, Staraya Russa). We remind all the participants of our former conferences on *Crime and Punishment* that in 2024 our Centre is finalizing the work on the new volume for the series *Dostoevsky’s Works: Current State of Research* dedicated to the novel. We are looking forward to your articles based on the papers you presented. Since *Crime and Punishment* is part of all educational programs in Russia and sometimes even abroad, in addition to the themes that are typical for the series and cover all the fields of academic research on the novel, the conferences and the volume will also focus on its presence in textbooks and manuals, different methodological approaches to it, etc. We look forward to your requests for participation in conferences intended for 2024 and in the planned publication. We especially invite teachers and educators who have something to say about the value, usefulness, and applicability (or vice versa) of textbooks and manuals concerning the novel and those who can share their own insights and observations about how the novel is perceived by today’s students and pupils.

I would like to stress the fact that for our conferences we accept applications to join as listeners and participants to the discussion, and that we include such participants in the program, as we highly value their presence in the work of the conference.

The years 2021–2023 were marked by the publication of a great number of books about Dostoevsky and his work. We are ready and willing to provide space for the publication of insightful reviews of books and anthologies published in the last three years. We are also open to the publication of extensive summaries of past conferences.

An article by Caterina Corbella in the section *Hermeneutics. Slow Reading* opens the present issue of the journal. This piece of research can be described as squared hermeneutics: a hermeneutic analysis of hermeneutic research on Dostoevsky’s work, namely *Crime and Punishment*, by two Catholic theologians, Divo Barsotti and Romano Guardini. The article shows that Catholic theologians noticed and accepted the key role of Sonya Marmeladova in Dostoevsky’s novel, which according to Soviet
critics was univocally structured around the figure of Raskol’nikov. It should be noted that the Orthodox churchmen who wrote about the novel did not see Sonya as a figure that reveals the deepest meanings of the novel and the paths that the author suggests to the reader (her image is for me the one of a figurehead at the bow of a spiritual ship); they could not see her as the “Orthodox image of holiness” that impressed Catholic theologians for her vitality, grandiosity, the impossibility to subordinate her to rational categories, her being unattainable by theoretical and logical thinking. Barsotti wrote that “in Sonya more than in the works of many Russian theologians the Wisdom that guides man through his life reveals herself.”

The second article in the same section by Nina Ishchenko is dedicated to the analysis of the dialogues between Porfiry Petrovich and Raskol’nikov in *Crime and Punishment* through the prism of Plato’s dialogues, according to a method of analysis of Plato’s works that I call philological, i.e. a method that pays attention to the full context of the dialogues and not only to the statements of the participants. The evincive comparison of Porfiry Petrovich and Socrates in this article deserves attention from readers and researchers.

A thoroughly detailed and fascinating article by Nikolay Podosokorsky opens the section *Poetics. Context*. The research is dedicated to the image of the sun (fundamental for *Crime and Punishment*) in the light of its constant presence in the myth of Napoleon and more generally in the myth of the ruler. The summon by Porfiry Petrovich: “Become a sun, and everyone will see you. The sun should be a sun, first of all,” which has already been noticed and analyzed as a reference to Christ, is displayed here in the light of its other component: being the sun in the eyes of his subjects and appearing as the sun in the works of different artists was a deliberate idea of Napoleon and of the ones who forged his political cult. However, the famous and well-known by Dostoevsky “Sun of Austerlitz,” foundation of the “solar” cult of the emperor, is consistently not mentioned by the author and by his hero-Napoleonist in the novel *Crime and Punishment* (although a reader who is aware of the cultural context of the novel like Merezhkovsky fills the gap immediately, as Podosokorsky points out). I suggest that the importance of the author’s omission is related to Dostoevsky’s unwillingness to create a bi-directional image.

I would like to note something very important for the comprehension of the meaning of the novel: the opposite relations with destiny of a genius (among others, Napoleon), who reads in “simple physical phe-
nomena” that the others do not understand words addressed to him by the Providence, and of Raskol’nikov, who tries to gain greatness *in spite of* his destiny, because for some reason he thinks he should “renounce life altogether” and “suffocate everything in himself.”

The second article of the section, written by Olga Dekhanova, immerses the reader in vivid images through the analysis of the drinking reform of 1863 and clearly illustrates that what seemed naturalistic details in Dostoevsky’s works very unlikely could have been real at the time when *Crime and Punishment* takes place. An artistic detail (such as the name of a drinking establishment and its setting) is considered by the researcher in the context of the legal system reformed on various levels during 1860s, and it is revealed as not complying with its provisions. We can see once again that the detail for Dostoevsky is a multi-dimensional *word* that must be understood at the deepest level, and not just a piece of reality placed in the text in order to fix the same reality in a work of art.

The following article by Aleksandr Krinitsyn is dedicated to the presence of Friedrich Schiller in the novel *Crime and Punishment*. Schiller was a most important author for Dostoevsky, and in this novel his presence is not linked to his works (as it happens in *The Brothers Karamazov*) but with his surname, which becomes a symbol of certain human qualities and a particular personal structure. At the same time, every mention of Schiller in the novel contains a specific reference that was clear for Dostoevsky, but rarely it is for his modern reader. This link is explained by the author of the article.

This time the section *Dostoevsky in the 20th-21st Centuries* displays very different pieces of research, and this heterogeneity only faintly reflects the presence of Dostoevsky in the times that followed him. The first piece of research is dedicated to Dostoevsky’s involvement in the formation of 20th-century literature, the latter to studies on Dostoevsky’s work in English-speaking scholarship in the 20th and 21st centuries; between them, an article where the author, Irina Borisovna, is concerned with the reconstruction of the real parameters of Bakhtin’s moral philosophy, the most famous and so far most influential scholar of Dostoevsky’s work in the 20th century. This reconstruction is of great importance for the study of Dostoevsky because it partly corrects the distorted perspective of Bakhtin’s book on Dostoevsky in the mind of the readers. I would like to remind Bakhtin’s own words in a discussion with Sergey Bocharov, widely known in fairly narrow circles: “— Mikhail Mikhailovich (...) what is wrong with your book on Dostoevsky? — Come on, is that any way
to write it? I mean, I took the form away from the main point there. I couldn’t talk directly about the main issues. — What are, M.M., the main issues? — Philosophical issues, the one that tormented Dostoevsky all his life: the existence of God. I had to swing back and forth all the time. I had to hold my own hand. Just as you start thinking, you must stop. Back and forth (M.M. repeated it several times during the conversation). Even the church was negotiated (M.M. is speaking here of that passage in the first chapter of his ‘Dostoevsky’ when he argues with Boris Engel’gardt, who, following Hegel, in the article ‘Dostoevsky’s Ideological Novel’ interpreted the writer’s world as a dialectical becoming of the one spirit. However, ‘the image of the one becoming spirit is intrinsically distant from Dostoevsky,’ Bakhtin says. I daresay, Hegel’s spirit is intrinsically distant from Bakhtin as well and the polemic with Hegelian dialectic lays deep in the fundament of his worldview – I will try to say a few more words about this below. Bakhtin goes on saying that if we should look for an image of Dostoevsky’s world according to his own worldview, this would be ‘the church as a community of distinct souls… or maybe the image of Dante’s world...’ In the text of the book, this sentence is indeed followed by a remark: ‘Yet the image of the church still remains merely an image, explaining nothing of the structure of the novel itself... The concrete artistic connections between the plans of the novel, their combination into the unity of the work must be explained and demonstrated on the material of the novel itself, and the “Hegelian spirit” and the “church” equally evade this direct task.’ Turns out, he was still concerned about this remark, repeated in the edition of 1963, at the height of his world fame, ten years later). I protested (…) — Yet in the first chapter, — this is what I said, — you settled accounts with philosophical criticism and revealed its inadequacy to explain the main issues in Dostoevsky, you revealed that to philosophize with Dostoevsky (or rather with his heroes) on themes such as whether is everything permitted or not and so on it is not the same as reading Dostoevsky in depth. — It could be, — M.M. answered, — anyway, this is all literary studies (again, with a slight grimace). It is all in the immanent circle of literary studies, whereas there should be a way out to other worlds. No, the higher council will not consider this “word.” They will not read it there (Meaning: how they read the Master’s novel in Bulgakov’s).” [Bocharov, 1999, p. 475–476] One might say that the most far-reaching intention, the supra-stellar point of aspiration of Borisova’s article is to help Bakhtin’s word gain access to consideration “in a higher council” by transforming it in the minds of earthly readers.
In the first article of the section Elizaveta Apal’kova shows how Nikolay Narokov (Nikolay Vladimirovich Marchenko, June 26 (July 8), 1887 (Russia) — October 3, 1969 (USA), second-wave emigrant, writer, teacher) builds and metaphysically orientates his novel *Imaginary Magnitudes* on the base of Dostoevsky’s works, first of all *Crime and Punishment*.

The third article in the section presents a review of studies in English, mainly from the 21st century, by Violetta Evallyo. The review highlights a number of research strategies and themes that define the most representative work of English and American scholars during two decades of the new century in the study of poetics, biography, intertexts, ideologems, female images (considered in the perspective of feminist ideology and the phenomenon of co-dependence), problems of empathy, ethics, dialogism, self, suicide, nihilism, cruelty, brotherhood, religious origins of world-views and images, legal and medical aspects of Dostoevsky’s work.

The article by Evallyo serves as a gateway to the next section, *Summaries. Review*, containing summaries of the already mentioned international conferences of the current year dedicated to *Crime and Punishment*, prepared by myself and Nikolay Podosokorsky.

Nikolay Podosokorsky reviews the 25th-anniversary edition of the International Readings “Dostoevsky’s Works in the Perception of 21st-Century Readers,” where participated more than 40 scholars from four countries: Russia, Italy, Kazakhstan, Japan. The author states that the Readings “represent one of the most interesting and enduring academic and educational projects aimed at teaching young people the academic skills of in-depth textual analysis [now a mutual learning process among professional researchers and lovers of Dostoevsky’s work of all ages].”

My summary of the 2nd International Online Conference “*Crime and Punishment: Current State of Research*” is composed of the theses or abstracts of the participants’ papers. The conference was attended by participants from Russia, China, USA, Italy, Spain, Serbia, Uzbekistan, and (without papers) Japan and Turkey. The contributions were dedicated to the hermeneutics of the text, the historical and cultural allusions in the text, the role of the books mentioned in the novel, the problems of translation of Dostoevsky’s work into different national and cultural languages, the novel’s reflections in later literature, the ways of teaching it at school and university (here the theses are in some cases detailed enough to imagine and even reproduce the scheme of a successful lesson). The summary provides a coherent account of the latest trends in the study and teaching of *Crime and Punishment*. 
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The journal is on Vkontakte and Telegram (with already more than 7 600 followers). You can subscribe to our pages to follow news from both the Journal and Research Centre “Dostoevsky and World Culture.” Among other things, all the recordings from seminars and conferences organized by the Centre are published here. Books and articles dedicated to Dostoevsky are also available for download.

Vkontakte: https://vk.com/dostmirkult
Telegram: https://t.me/dostmirkult

The journal is published in cooperation with the Commission for the Study of Fyodor Dostoevsky’s Artistic Heritage at the Academic Council “History of World Culture” RAS. Our work is carried out in close contact with the Russian and International Dostoevsky Society.

As before, all quotations from Fyodor Dostoevsky’s works, if not specified otherwise, are cited according to the Complete Works in 30 vols. (Leningrad, Nauka Publ., 1972–1990) with the references formatted according to the rules of the Russian Science Citation Index. Capital letters in the names of God, the Virgin, as in other holy names and concepts, that were lowered in this edition because of Soviet censorship are here restored in accordance with the editions published during Dostoevsky’s life. The author’s original emphasis in quotations (where not specified otherwise) is indicated by italics; the emphasis of the author of the article is indicated by bold font.

Our email address is fedor@dostmirkult.ru. The journal accepts articles in Russian and English. We accept submissions related to the subject of the journal from Russia and abroad. The authors will be notified about acceptance or refusal within a month.
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