

National Research University
Higher School of Economics

as a manuscript

Shcherbina Yuliya

**Interpretation of F.M. Dostoevsky's works
in Czech philosophy of the XX century**

Dissertation summary
for the purpose of obtaining academic degree
Doctor of Philosophy in Philosophy HSE

Academic supervisor:
Vladimir Kantor, Doctor of Sciences

Moscow, 2019

Contents

GENERAL DESCRIPTION.....	3
MAIN BODY OF THE THESIS	18
BIBLIOGRAPHY	366

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The relevance of research

Philosophical and religious ideas of the literary and diary heritage of F.M. Dostoevsky remain significant for modern European and Russian culture. For more than a century research on Dostoevsky has been ongoing in the humanities: there were held international congresses on the work of F.M. Dostoevsky: both in Russia and abroad. Let us name a few: the November conference “Dostoevsky and World Culture” in Saint-Petersburg, the International April Youth Readings “Works of F.M. Dostoevsky in the perception of readers of the XXI century” in Old Russia, there are conferences of the Russian Dostoevsky Foundation every two years and many others; every three years the valor of different countries gather at the Symposiums of the International Dostoevsky Society (last: Granada - 2016, Boston - 2019). Conferences are held at universities and Dostoevsky Societies of different countries: “Crime and Punishment at 150” (Vancouver, 2016), “Revolutionary Dostoevsky: Rethinking Radicalism” (London, 2017), The International Symposium “Dostoevsky’s Anthropology” in Sofia (2018) and others. During these events modern philosophers and scientists address current issues of today that was raised by Dostoevsky in his texts: violence, the meaning of human life, human identity, the issues of loss and gaining faith and truth.

Czech intellectuals became interested in Dostoevsky at the end of the 19th century. Since then his ideas have remained in their field of attention. As one of the most influential researchers of Dostoevsky’s work in the Czech Republic, Frantisek Kautman, testifies, “Dostoevsky’s works began to appear in Czech translations shortly after they were published in Russia.”¹ Moreover, even within the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the works of Prague citizen F. Kafka were largely

¹ Каутман, Ф. К вопросу об актуальности произведений Достоевского // Достоевский. Материалы и исследования. Т. 20. Санкт-Петербург: Нестор-история, 2013. С. 329-333. [Kautman F. K voprosy ob aktualnosti porizvedenii Dostoevskogo]

the result of his dialogue with the ideas of the Russian thinker and writer. It was in Prague in the 1920s on the initiative of Russian emigrants, first of all, A.L. Bem, a Dostoevsky Workshop was created in which the reports were read by N.O. Lossky, D.I. Chizhevsky. N.E. Osipov and others. Czech intellectuals also joined the seminar - writer Anna Teskova, literary critic Jiri Gorak, literary historian Jan Mahal. On the basis of the Seminary the first International Dostoevsky Society was created in 1930, which lasted until 1939 and resumed its activities in Prague in 2004.

Dostoevsky remains relevant for the Czech Republic even now: relations between the Russian writer and Czech culture continue to be conceptualized (for example, the theme “Kundera and Dostoevsky”), stage performances are created based on Dostoevsky’s works (The Idiot in 2008 at the Dejvice Theater directed by Miroslav Krobot), studies on Dostoevsky are published². There also new editions of his novels translations³ are published in Czech and international conferences⁴ are held in Czech Republic. Thus, the literary reception of Dostoevsky in Czech culture is known and continuously investigated.

The attention to the history of the attitude of Czech philosophers to the work of Dostoevsky, which became the basis of ideological polemics or productive dialogue to clarify their own political position, and the way of philosophizing in the works of T. Masaryk and J. Patočka, is also relevant, for at least two interrelated reasons. Firstly, in order to maintain a retrospective interest in Russian culture and history in Europe, which today is clearly not as active as, for example, it was in the 20th century. Secondly, because the intellectual history of the Czech Republic is closely, especially after the 1917 revolution was associated with Russian emigration. The actualization of this story, its study and comprehension,

² For example, *Sto roků kobry. Bestiář podle Dostojevského*. Brno, 2006; Pytlík R. F. M. *Dostojevskij: život a dílo*. Praha, 2008; Vrangel’ A. J. *Vzpomínky na Fjodora Michajloviče Dostojevského na Sibíři v letech 1854–1856*. Pelhřimov, 2009.

³ *Dostojevskij F.M. Zločin a trest*. Academia, 2004; *Dostojevskij F.M. Idiot*. Knižní klub, Odeon, 2004; *Dostojevskij F.M. Cizí žena a muž pod postelí*. Garamond, 2018.

⁴ *Dostojevskij dnes*. Sborník příspěvků z konference s mezinárodní účastí. Praha, 27. listopadu 2006 / Ed. M. Bubeníková, M. Hrabáková, R. Hříbková. Praha, 2007.

including in connection with the idea of Slavic cultural unity, is certainly in demand. Finally, thirdly, in the history of Russian philosophy, the problem of expanding the source base, which also relates to the history of reception and conceptualization of Dostoevsky's ideas outside Russia, including in the Czech Republic, remains relevant.

The stated topic of the dissertation research allows expanding the research material devoted to this problem in the works of T. Masaryk and J. Patočka: the dissertation introduces unknown to Russian audience works of J. Patočka into the history of Russian philosophy dedicated to the “existential-phenomenological” interpretation of Dostoevsky's ideas and works, which will strengthen interest in the topic being studied.

Extent of prior investigation of the topic

Dostoevsky is one of the most sought-after figures among Russian thinkers. Nevertheless, the elaboration of the problem of perceiving Dostoevsky in Czech philosophy cannot be considered quite complete. Both in Russian and in the Czech tradition there is a huge number of works that are dedicated to the personality and work of the writer, but coverage of specific topics “Dostoevsky and Czech Republic”, “Dostoevsky and Czech philosophy” is reflected in only a few works. Most of the studies cannot be called philosophical; rather, they are literary and aesthetic works on the work of Dostoevsky. The explanation for this is that Czech philosophers in the 20th century were more likely to address political and socio-historical issues. The main theme of Czech humanistic philosophy has always been the issue of freedom in its socio-political sense. Perhaps that is why most of Czech philosophers did not address the problems of literature, and if they did, they did not address the works of Dostoevsky. Philosophers were preoccupied with comprehending their own history and the problems and current socio-political issues. Among others, a special place was occupied by the problem of understanding one's own national identity. However, from the time after the First

World War until the end of the 20th century, Czech philosophers discovered the relevance of Dostoevsky's ideas for their own culture, and then philosophical interpretations of Dostoevsky's ideas began to appear. Of these, the most well-founded and original in their arguments are the works of T.G. Masaryk and J. Patočka. Both philosophers saw in Dostoevsky a significant figure not only in Russian literature, but also in a worldwide philosophy. So, Masaryk wrote about Dostoevsky as a "social philosopher," and Patočka was convinced that Dostoevsky was a genuine "philosopher of meaning". The most significant works are the three-volume work of Masaryk "Russia and Europe", as well as the work of Patočka "On Masaryk's Philosophy of Religion".

Research on Dostoevsky on issues of interest can be divided as follows.

- 1) A corpus of texts covering the development of the interpretation of Dostoevsky's works in Czech culture, regardless of the area of the reception of Russian writer's ideas took place: in literature, psychology, and philosophy. Among such works: articles by M. Bubenikova "Dostoevsky in the Czech Republic" (2008) and "Dostoevsky and the Czech Republic: Bibliography (second half of the 60s of the XX century - 2012)" (2013), article by F. Kautman "On the issue of Dostoevsky's works relevance" (2013), the book "The Struggle for Dostoevsky" by F. Kautman (1966), article by S. Sivak "Creativity of F. M. Dostoevsky in Czech Russian Studies." The first article by Bubenikova reveals the specifics and reasons for referring to Dostoevsky in literature, theater and painting. The second article by this author is a review of literature on Dostoevsky, published in the Czech Republic and Czechoslovakia, in Czech and Russian languages. Kautman aims to determine the relevance of Dostoevsky to modern Czech Republic in his article, and his book is also devoted to examining the ways of accessing Dostoevsky's works in Czech culture. The article by Sivak demonstrates the history of interest in Dostoevsky in Czech literary criticism, focusing on the creation of the Dostoevsky Society.

- 2) Works on T.G. Masaryk's interpretation of the texts written by Dostoevsky. Among them: the work of A.L. Bem "Masaryk is a critic of Dostoevsky" (1932), article by F. Kautman "The struggle of Masaryk with Dostoevsky" (2001), article by V.K. Kantor "Russia and Europe. Thomas Garrigue Masaryk" (2015), article by V. Doubek "Russia and Europe": the history of the book" (2003), article by O. Malevich "T. G. Masaryk" (2004), "T.G. Masaryk and F.K. Šalda about Dostoevsky" (2007), a study by O. Malevich co-authored with A. Abramov and E. Lavrik "Thomas Garrigue Masaryk: life, work, doctrine" (2004). In all these works, Masaryk's interpretation of Dostoevsky's works and personality is analyzed. Some of them are devoted to the biography of Masaryk, where however the theme "Masaryk-Dostoevsky" is presented. The task of others is to explain the specifics of understanding of Dostoevsky's works by Masaryk.
- 3) Texts that explain the importance of interpreting Dostoevsky's works for the philosophy of Jan Patočka. This problem is new for the Russian-speaking space: only three works by Patočka ("Heretical essays on the philosophy of history", "Europe and Post-Europe" and "Negative Platonism") are translated into Russian and there are no a single Russian-language study on the connection between the philosophy of Patočka and Dostoevsky. Among the authors who touch on this topic, one should mention the follower of Patočka and the head of his archive in Prague, Ivan Chvatík (articles "Jan Patočka's Study on Masaryk" in 2015, "Patočkovy studie o Masarykovi a problém sókratovskeho humanismu" in 2018) and Slovak researcher Lubica Učník (articles "Patočka's discussion with Dostoevsky on the future of Science and Christianity", "The problem of morality in a mathematized universe: time and eternity in Dostoevsky's The Brothers Karamazov and the Concept of love in Patočka's last essay", "Dostoevsky: A Seismographer of Disintegration: Patočkian Reflections" - all articles published in 2015). One of the most interesting sources on the

topic “Patočka - Dostoevsky” is the volume of the annual journal “The New Yearbook for Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy” published in 2015, which is completely devoted to the philosophy of Patočka. The articles by Chvatík and Učník are published there, as well as other works devoted to the theme “Masaryk - Patočka - Dostoevsky”. Among them are the texts of Patočka’s researcher Ludger Hagedorn (“Fatigue of Reason: Reading Fatigue of Reason: Patočka's Reading of the Brothers Karamazov”) and the phenomenologist Nicholas de Warren (“The Gift of Eternity”). Translation of Patočka’s “On Masaryk’s Philosophy of Religion” is also published in this volume.

There are also several works that shed light on the relation of Patočka to art and literature, additionally highlighting his interpretation of Dostoevsky: this is the article by Daniel Wojtek “Jan Patočka: On Art and Philosophy” (1999) and a book published in 2014 in Czech by Daniela Blahutkova and Milos Ševczyk “Patočkovy Interpretace Literatury”. These two works, however, are more devoted to the phenomenological approach of Patočka to art than to his understanding of Dostoevsky’s works. We emphasize once again that studies that deal with the topic "Dostoevsky - Patočka" are very few, and there are no such studies in Russian language.

Despite a certain variety of research texts on the subject of dissertation in foreign space, important questions remain unclear. Firstly, there are still no texts in the research literature that would systematically approach the problem of Dostoevsky’s interpretation in Czech philosophy of the 20th century. There are separate texts on separate interpretations of Dostoevsky’s plots among Czech philosophers, but all of them come not from the texts of the Russian writer, but from the concepts of these philosophers who interpreted his works in one way or another. Secondly, the historical retrospective of these studies is not considered, the context for the creation of these concepts is practically not introduced, the possible continuity and even interdependence in the interpretations of Dostoevsky by various Czech philosophers of the 20th century is not considered.

Object and subject-matter of the study

The object of this dissertation research is a corpus of texts by Czech authors who investigated the work of Dostoevsky. In particular, we are talking about such works as “On Masaryk’s Philosophy of Religion”, “What is Existence?”, “Heretical Essays on the Philosophy of History” by J. Patočka, “Works by Fedor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky” and “The Spirit of Russia”⁵ by T. G. Masaryk and others, as well as events of socio-political and cultural history, in the context of which these works were created.

The subject-matter of the research is the dialogue between Czech and Russian cultures, which is realized in the appeal of Czech philosophers of the late XIX-XX in their texts to the interpretation of Dostoevsky's ideas and works.

Study tasks and objective

The objective of the thesis is to study the influence of Dostoevsky's ideas on philosophical conceptualizations of Czech thinkers T.G. Masaryk and J. Patočka, identifying the reasons for their interest in Dostoevsky’s work and new approaches to the interpretation of his ideas and works in the context of Masaryk’s socio-political philosophy and the existential-phenomenological philosophy of Patočka.

To achieve the objective of the study, it is necessary to solve the following tasks:

1. To analyze the socio-cultural space of the Czech Republic from the late XIX to the 70s of the XX century and to trace how political changes in this period of history influenced Czech-Russian intellectual contacts, reflected in the interest in the work of Dostoevsky;

⁵ “Russia and Europe” in Russian translation.

2. To analyze the content and stages of the philosophical interpretation of the works of F.M. Dostoevsky T.G. Masaryk in the context of his own political and philosophical interests;
3. To identify the concepts of the philosophy of history of J. Patočka and comprehend their methodological capabilities for understanding his analysis of the works of Dostoevsky and the main content of the interpretation of Patočka;
4. To investigate Patočka's criticism Masaryk interpretation of Dostoevsky's works;
5. Show the reception of ideas and plots of literary works by Dostoevsky in philosophical and underground works of the Charter 77 movement;
6. To analyze the connection between philosophy and literature in an existential-phenomenological interpretation of the problem of existence in the concept of J. Patočka.

Methodological basis of the study

The method of historical and philosophical reconstruction is used as the main method of dissertation research. It allows not only to analyze the problem, but also to fit it into a specific historical context - this enriches the understanding of the main research issues and allows us to establish a connection between the formulation of the problem and the historical and philosophical events that accompanied its formulation. The hermeneutic method based on the thesis of the interdependence of explanation, interpretation and understanding of the problem under study is also used in the dissertation. F. Schleiermacher, who proposed the term "hermeneutics," notes: "... as a whole is understood from the individual, but the individual can be understood only from the whole, it is so important for this art and so indisputable that the very first operations cannot be done without applying

it, and a huge number of hermeneutic rules are more or less based on it... ”⁶. The hermeneutic method allows you to delve deeper into the text being studied and find numerous evidence from various fields of both scientific and extra-scientific knowledge, from the historical context, from the facts of the author’s biography — that all together and in all its diversity makes it possible to understand the studied work in its entirety.

Another method is comparative analysis, designed to enable the researcher to compare two or more research subjects of interest: in our study, this is a comparison of interpretations by two Czech philosophers. Finally, the study uses biographical analysis, critical analysis; cultural, historical, contextual and representative approaches.

Originality of the study

The scientific novelty of the dissertation research is determined by several factors.

Firstly, for the first time in the discipline of the history of Russian philosophy, the problem of interpreting the works of F.M. Dostoevsky by Czech philosophers of the XX century.

Secondly, the context of studying Dostoevsky’s works in the Czech Republic is introduced and the reasons why the Russian writer remains relevant for Czech culture throughout the 20th century are explained.

Thirdly, not only the transformation of Masaryk’s interpretation of the works by Dostoevsky is revealed, but the reasons for this transformation are also explained, based on the political and philosophical ideas of the Czech thinker.

Fourthly, for the first time in the space of Russian philosophy, an analysis of J. Patočka's texts is introduced - "On Masaryk’s Philosophy of Religion", "On the

⁶ Шлейермахер Ф. Академические речи 1829. // Метафизические исследования. Выпуск 3. История II. СПб.: Лаборатория метафизических исследований при философском факультете СПбГУ, 1997. [Sleyrmacher F, Academic speeches]

Matters of The Plastic People of the Universe and DG 307" and "What is Existence?"

Fifthly, for the first time J. Patočka's philosophy of history is considered not only as a phenomenological description of the movement of history, but also as a methodology for interpreting a literary work.

Sixthly, for the first time a comparative analysis of two philosophical interpretations of Dostoevsky's works in Czech philosophy is given - the concepts of T.G. Masaryka and J. Patočka: common and specific features of both interpretations are revealed, their relationship is substantiated.

Statements to be defended

1. Interest in the works of F.M. Dostoevsky in the Czech intellectual culture took shape within a certain socio-political and cultural context, when the Czech Republic was part of Austria-Hungary, and the issue of its self-identification (language, culture, political independence) was on the agenda. In this sense, it is clear why literary interpretations of the writer's works appeared earlier than philosophical one's.
2. The appeal to the work of Dostoevsky was connected to the most important issue of the Slavic cultures of the 19th century - an understanding of the characteristics of each people, including the Czech, Russian and others, as part of the general Slavic world. Dostoevsky provided considerable material for reflection on this issue. At the same time, the development and interpretation of works by F.M. Dostoevsky in the Czech Republic went in parallel, and even ahead of German-language research. It is important that the publication of the writer's collected works in Czech significantly outstripped the German-language publication.
3. The Russian emigration after the 1917 revolution and the "help action", launched in 1921 with the support of Masaryk, who appreciated and

knew Russian culture well, created the situation of the so-called “Russian influence” in Czech culture. This increased the interest of Czech intellectuals in the study of Russian writer’s works.

4. Masaryk’s interpretation of the works by Dostoevsky is closely associated with a change in the socio-political context of the existence of Czech culture, so the transformation in Masaryk’s research, interpretations and evaluations of Dostoevsky’s ideas and works is understandable: from an enthusiastic and pathetic to a critical position. In his works, Masaryk first proves that Dostoevsky is a “philosopher of ethical realism” (the article “Works of Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky”), and at the end of his life presents him as a “social philosopher” (the 3rd part of “The Spirit of Russia”).
5. J. Patočka’s philosophy of the history, who was a student and follower of E. Husserl and M. Heidegger, was created in the framework of another philosophical school. The philosopher interpreted the legacy of Dostoevsky in a fundamentally differently way than Masaryk. His text “Heretical essays on the philosophy of history” contains not only the author’s interpretation of the philosophy of history. It is important that the concepts that Patočka considered in this work became a methodological pillar of the analysis of Dostoevsky's ideas.
6. A similar analysis of Dostoevsky’s interpretations by J. Patočka gives reason to agree with his assertion that the Russian writer can be called a “philosopher of meaning”. Within the framework of the “existential-phenomenological” tradition, Patočka builds a complex historical and philosophical problematic construction, involving in his analysis the work of Kant and the semi-forbidden philologist of the Soviet era E. Golosovker about Kant and Dostoevsky, as well as his own interpretations of reading the writer's works. His conclusion: Dostoevsky appears as a semantic "bridge" between the Kantian and post-Kantian concepts of morality. He defines the concept of meaning

as such a way of understanding an object that is loaded with human feelings and actions and therefore has a certain value. The meaning turns out to be connected with the problematic nature of being - it is precisely this problematic, "negativity" in the works of Dostoevsky that becomes the basis of the concept of Patočka.

7. Masaryk, according to Patočka in his work "On Masaryk's Philosophy of Religion," limited himself to analyzing Kirillov's reasoning from the novel "The Brothers Karamazov" and defined suicide as a phenomenon of materialistic atheism in the context of socio-political ideas of the beginning of the twentieth century, without paying attention to the "inactive", "insignificant" people in the works of the writer. This allowed him to consider Dostoevsky a "rational theologian." Patočka expanded the analysis range and included into it Dostoevsky's "underground people" and showed that the writer solves the problem of suicide in various works as the problem of faith, love, and betrayal / finding God. According to Patočka, Dostoevsky overcomes "rational theology" and moves on to the "phenomenology of love."
8. An analysis of the political texts by Patočka ("On the matters of The Plastic People of The Universe and DG 307") suggests that Dostoevsky became a philosopher whose work becomes the basis for political reflection on the problems of freedom and responsibility for Patočka.
9. Analyzing the problem of existence from the standpoint of existential-phenomenological philosophy (the text "What is existence?"), Patočka resorts to interpreting the novel "Idiot" by Dostoevsky, which allows us to talk about the convergence and interconnected problems of philosophy and literature in Patočka's conception.

Theoretical and practical significance of the research

The results of the dissertation research deepen understanding of how and on what grounds the interpretation of Dostoevsky's works by Czech philosophers of the 20th century was carried out. The dissertation offers a systematic, causal review of Czech culture and philosophy in relation to the work of Dostoevsky and his perception in the Czech Republic. A thorough reconstruction of philosophical concepts of T.G. Masaryk and J. Patočka can be taken as a basis for further pedagogical activity and the development of a series of lectures, a special course or an elective course of choice for undergraduates and graduate students of the philosophical, philological and cultural studies departments within the framework of university education. Based on this dissertation research, a unique Russian-language special course can be created on the philosophy of the history of Jan Patočka. The philosophy of J. Patočka can also be used as a new approach to the interpretation of Dostoevsky's works.

Study results approbation

Some research results have been tested at international conferences and in publications of peer-reviewed scientific journals included in the list of Higher Attestation Commission, Scopus and Web of Science.

Among the conferences in which the results of the study were tested, it is worth highlighting several presentations:

1. International scientific conference "Russia a hundred years after the 1917 revolution: causes and consequences" (National Research University Higher School of Economics, Russia, Moscow, April 27-28, 2017). Report: "The significance of the revolution in Dostoevsky's works".
2. VIII international conference "Methods of thought, ways of speaking" (National Research University Higher School of Economics, Russia, Moscow, April 26-29, 2017). Report: "The role of the chthonic

principle in Dostoevsky's novel "Crime and Punishment": a philosophical analysis".

3. International Conference "Revolutionary Dostoevsky: Rethinking Radicalism" (University College London, Great Britain, London, October 20-21, 2017). Report: "Revolution as a shock in Dostoevsky's literature: to the problem of boredom and shame of the Underground Man".
4. International scientific conference "Fedor Stepun: Russian thinker between two revolutions" (National Research University Higher School of Economics, Russia, Moscow, September 28-29, 2017). Report: "F.M. Dostoevsky's creativity in the interpretation of F.A. Stepun: to the question of determining the idea of F.M. Dostoevsky".
5. Conference "History, body and Life-World" (Polish Academy of Sciences & Polish Phenomenological Society, Poland, Warsaw, December 15-16, 2017). Report: "Patočka's interpretation of Dostoevsky: from an Underground Man to Orgiastic Origins".
6. Conference "Dostoevsky and World Culture" (Dostoevsky Museum, Russia, St. Petersburg, November 9-12, 2018). Report: "Jan Patočka on the Dostoevsky's Philosophy".

Publications on the thesis

The works published by the author in journals indexed in the international databases of indexing and citation, as well as on the list of high-level journals of the HSE:

1. Shcherbina Y.I. Jan Patočka on the philosophy of Dostoevsky // *Voprosy filosofii*. 2019. No. 9. (in the press)
2. Shcherbina Y.I. Demonic in the novel F.M. Dostoevsky's "Crime and Punishment" // *Chelovek*. 2017. No. 5. C. 118-125.

3. Shcherbina Y.I. S.L. Frank on Dostoevsky's Humanism // Chelovek. 2019. No. 4. P. 149-155.

MAIN BODY OF THE THESIS

In the **introduction** to the dissertation, the relevance of the research topic is substantiated, the degree of its development is indicated, the object and subject of the study, the goal and objectives of the work are formulated, the research methodology is described, the scientific novelty is explained, the main provisions of the dissertation submitted for defense are described, and theoretical and practical significance of the research is indicated.

The **first chapter** of the dissertation is devoted to the historical and socio-political context of the perception of the works by F.M. Dostoevsky in Czech culture of the XIX-XX centuries. The main task of this chapter is to analyze the reasons why Czech intellectuals turned to the interpretation of the works by Russian writer. The chapter is divided into two paragraphs.

The **first paragraph** is devoted to the perception of Dostoevsky in Czech literature and literary criticism, fine arts and theater. In this part of the study, we analyzed the nature and frequency of appeals to the works of the Russian writer in Czech culture.

The works by Dostoevsky were almost not accepted by Czech intellectuals during the life of the writer, but after his death he became one of the most significant thinkers for them. The influence of Dostoevsky is experienced by such writers as F. Kafka, V. Rzhizach, E. Gostovsky. The artists are also interested in the work by Russian writer: illustrations of Dostoevsky's characters created by V. Hoffman, as well as paintings by E. Filla "The Reader of Dostoevsky" and F. Foltyn "Dostoevsky" become canonical images related to the heroes and personality of the writer. Performances based on Dostoevsky's works are constantly staged in Czech theaters, starting from the novels "Crime and Punishment" and "The Idiot", staged on the stage in 1928 and to staged by L. Janachek, "Notes from the Dead House" and "The Brothers Karamazov", ending

with modern adaptations of Dostoevsky. The intensity of the discussions about Dostoevsky in literary criticism and the frequency of theatrical productions based on the works of the Russian writer were also influenced by historical events: the interwar period became one of the most fruitful for interpretations of Dostoevsky's legacy, while the period of World War II and 1968 can be called the period of "silence about Dostoevsky".

The **second paragraph** focuses on Russian influence on Czech studies of Dostoevsky. Thanks to the Czech government and personally T.G. Masaryk's "action of assistance" to Russian emigrants, in the 1920s, Prague became the center of intellectual activity of Russian scientists and philosophers, including researchers of Dostoevsky's work. Books by N.A. Berdyaev's "Mirosozerzanie Dostoevskogo" (1923) and the texts by D.S. Merezhkovsky "The Life and Work of L. Tolstoy and Dostoevsky" (1920), "The Soul of Dostoevsky, the Prophet of the Russian Revolution" (1923) and "Tolstoy and Dostoevsky" (1929) were published in Prague. These works represented Dostoevsky as a philosopher and changed the perception of his works. A.L. Bem organized the Dostoevsky Workshop, which then was transformed into Dostoevsky's first international society. Community members were both emigrants (for example, N.E. Osipov, D. Chizhevsky and others), and representatives of Czech literary criticism - I. Horak, A. Teskova and others. Seminars and conferences were held as part of the Dostoevsky Society work, as well as collections of articles about the work of the Russian writer were published. In 1939, the Dostoevsky's Community ceases its activities and resumed it in 2004.

Thus, the first chapter gives an analysis of how and for what reasons the study of Dostoevsky's work in Czech culture was carried out, a number of factors are identified, the understanding of which is necessary for the whole study:

Firstly, the appeal to the work of Dostoevsky was associated with one of the most pressing issues of the Slavic cultures of the XIX century - the understanding of the unity of the Slavic world and the characteristics of each people that make up this unity. XIX century - is the era of the formation of national cultures. The

Czechs, who for a long time were under the political influence of Austria-Hungary, sought to realize the specifics of their own nation and themselves as part of the Slavic world and saw in Dostoevsky's texts a discussion of the same topic, but addressing the specifics of the Russian people and its culture.

Secondly, the study of Dostoevsky's works in the Czech Republic experienced both German and Russian influence. It was noted that studies of Dostoevsky's works by Czech authors quickly required the translation of his works into Czech: the first volume of Dostoevsky's collected works was published in 1891. In this regard, Czech culture was far ahead of German as the first volume of Dostoevsky's collected works in German was published only in 1906.

Thirdly, "Russian influence" intensified and brought new fruits in connection with the emigration of Russian intellectuals after the 1917 revolution in Russia. The Czechoslovak government led by T.G. Masaryk launched a "campaign of assistance" to Russian emigrants. Since 1921 A.L. Bem, N.E. Osipov, D. Chizhevsky and others, having support, continued their scientific research in Prague, where, with their efforts, a Seminar on the study of Dostoevsky's creativity was created and then transformed into the first international Dostoevsky Society. Czech literary scholars and writers joined the work in these organizations.

Fourth, the historical context of the twentieth century showed that the period between the two wars was one of the most fruitful for the Czech discussion on Dostoevsky, while the period of the Second World War, and then the time after 1968 led to the situation of "silence about Dostoevsky"; however, after the collapse of the socialist camp, the ideas and works of Dostoevsky again began to occupy Czech researchers' minds.

Fifthly, Dostoevsky's works were of interest to Czech intellectuals "of the secret depth and specificity of the human being" and "trends in the development of the world": that's why their posing problems in interpreting the ideas of the Russian writer went far beyond literary and aesthetic interpretations and receptions, revealing themselves in fine arts, theater and literature. Understanding Dostoevsky as a philosopher has become a special topic of Czech culture.

One of the most influential researchers of Dostoevsky in the Czech was the philosopher and political figure T.G. Masaryk; therefore, the **second chapter** is devoted to the consideration of his interpretation of the works by Russian writer. In particular, attention is paid to the transformation of Masaryk's attitude and ideas regarding Dostoevsky and the two main works of the philosopher about Russian thinker are analyzed: "The Works by Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky" and part of the three-volume work "The Spirit of Russia" - "The Struggle for God. Dostoevsky is a philosopher of the history of the Russian question". The publications of these two works have been separated for decades, so comparing them will make it possible to understand how and why Masaryk changed his mind about Dostoevsky.

In **paragraph 2.1.** the reasons why Masaryk became interested in the work of Dostoevsky are outlined. He looked in his works for an explanation of the specifics of the Russian people and Russia itself. This problem worried Masaryk both for political and personal reasons. On the one hand, he sought to fit the Czech people into the paradigm of the Slavic world. On the other hand, against the background of the Czechs' attempts to gain independence from the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Masaryk needed to understand the features of possible political allies, and Russia was one of such allies and an influential player on the political map of the world. From the very beginning of his political and academic career, Masaryk believed that it was Russian literature that was able to explain the specifics of Russian politics and social structure - that's why he studied Dostoevsky's literary and journalistic heritage, seeing in him "the greatest Russian social philosopher", who showed all the depth of Russian people character.

Section 2.2. reveals the specifics of Masaryk's reception of Dostoevsky's ideas and reveals the main problems that Czech philosopher considers in his analysis of the writer's work. In his article "Works by Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky" Masaryk offers the reader a brief but rich overview of the main ideas of the thinker. The main topics of his research are:

- turning points in the writer's biography (Dostoevsky's "catastrophe"): death sentence, its abolition, exile to Siberia, epilepsy that the writer suffered from;
- "philosophy of ethical realism" by Dostoevsky: its main ideas;
- Dostoevsky's philosophy of history: presentation and interpretation of "Legend of the Grand Inquisitor";
- specificity and selectivity of the Russian people;
- philosophical analysis of the works of Dostoevsky;
- criticism of Dostoevsky's ideas by other thinkers.

Masaryk then raises these same themes in his work "The Spirit of Russia", however, in this work the character and tone of his research changes.

An analysis of both works suggests two lines of interpretation of Dostoevsky's philosophical ideas by Masaryk. The first line is a religious and anthropological issue that incorporates topics such as nihilism, theism-atheism dichotomy, the problem of murder-suicide, the concepts of the vseheloveka, bohocheloveka. The second line is socio-political: it includes such problems as the specifics of the Russian people, relations between Russia and Europe, liberalism, and semi-education. Both lines of reasoning by Masaryk are intertwined.

In **subclause 2.2.1**. Masaryk's vision of the impact of the "catastrophe" of Dostoevsky — the abolished execution and the writer's exile to Siberia — to his work is explained. This is a fundamental moment not only to understand what topics the Czech philosopher refers to when analyzing Dostoevsky's work, but also allows us to draw a conclusion about the research methodology that he uses: Masaryk resorts to a biographical method for examining the ideas of a Russian writer. In the first article, Masaryk estimates the "catastrophe" as a unique experience that allowed Dostoevsky to gain insight into the essence of the Russian people, since the prison was for the writer in a sense a "psychological laboratory" in which he was able to observe different people. In "The Spirit of Russia" Masaryk notes that despite the significance of this event for the life and work of Dostoevsky, the writer was not able to overcome his negative experience.

Subclause 2.2.2. reveals Masaryk's understanding of Dostoevsky as a philosopher of "ethical realism." Masaryk focuses on explaining the philosophical system of Dostoevsky, which is aimed at studying the inner world of man: the basic concepts of Dostoevsky's philosophy that are operated by Masaryk are revealed: vsechelovek, bogochelovek, nihilism, murder, suicide, etc. In "Works by Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky", Dostoevsky's philosophy is not analyzed systematically: we find elements of the thinker's philosophy in different parts of the text. In "The Spirit of Russia" Masaryk makes an attempt to fully describe the philosophical ideas of the Russian writer and offers the reader a "Dostoevsky's formula" that can be briefly reduced to the fact that nihilism necessarily leads a person to atheism.

Subclause 2.2.3 shows Masaryk's attitude to the concept of "the choosiness of the Russian people" and presents his vision of Dostoevsky as a philosopher of history. Masaryk analyzes the "Legend of the Grand Inquisitor", seeing in it an exposition of the philosophy of the history of Dostoevsky. In accordance to the idea of Ivan Karamazov, miracle, mystery and authority are things with which you can take hold of the minds of ordinary people. This will definitely bring them happiness, but it will be external happiness, not internal happiness. Inner happiness must flow from freedom of conscience, which is subordinated to God. Thus, on the basis of the pursuit of external happiness, Rome founded its world domination. Then Christ showed people how to find inner happiness. After Christ was crucified, Catholicism took over world domination, leading people away from true happiness. After some time, Protestantism and science revolted against Catholicism, and after that socialism entered the struggle. Thus, history becomes the scene of the struggle between faith and unbelief, but only faith is compatible with freedom. Unbelief, in turn, turns freedom into rebellion, ending with pessimism and a series of suicides. The cure for this path is "living in harmony with the pure and undistorted teaching of Christ". This interpretation of the "Legend of the Grand Inquisitor" coincides with the interpretation of the causes of

suicide, which Masaryk described in his dissertation, “Suicide as a Social Phenomenon”.

The philosophy of history, in turn, is closely connected with the concept of “the choosiness of the Russian people”: the Russian people are called upon to fulfill a certain mission that will benefit all of humanity. The mission of the Russian people does not stem from geographic location or any other factors, but from the spiritual components of the Russian people.

Subclause 2.2.4. explains the reasons why Masaryk saw in Dostoevsky “the largest Russian social philosopher” and draws the reader’s attention to such concepts as violence, faith, European liberalism and education, with the help of which the Czech thinker describes the philosophical system of Dostoevsky. Particular attention is paid to the analysis of the concept of a nihilist, who was understood by Dostoevsky as a person who renounced God. It can be represented by ordinary unbelievers, or it can be transformed into a bearer of political revolutionism. Nihilism and atheism is characterized by the fact that the nihilist is angry, skeptical and enjoys tormenting himself. Masaryk describes nihilism as a rebellion burning with anger, revenge, indulging in his despair with pleasure. The rebellion of a nihilist is a rebellion against God. Nihilism and atheism are distinguished by Masaryk as the basic concepts of Dostoevsky's philosophy, since it is precisely in them lies the reason for suicide in modern Czech thinker society.

In **subclause 2.2.5.** the problem of “Russian man” is considered - the main question of Masaryk, addressed to Dostoevsky and his attempt to understand the specifics and features of the Russian people. Masaryk identifies several of these features of the Russian people, which Dostoevsky pointed out, and analyzes them. Among these characteristics:

- Russian man is a person of feelings;
- Russian people - a people sympathizing with their neighbor;
- Russian people - a harsh people;
- Russian people are immoderate, they lack a sense of proportion;
- Russian man prone to sudden moods;

- Russian man is clean and chaste.

Masaryk analyzes both the “everyday” characteristics of the Russian people and his “choosiness”. However, if in his first article the Czech philosopher agrees with Dostoevsky that it is under the Russian people that the whole Slavic world will be able to unite, and then in "The Spirit of Russia" he focuses on the everyday characteristics of the Russian people, in many ways arguing with the Russian writer. For example, when Dostoevsky calls the Russian people deceitful, Masaryk notes that this is not only a trait of the Russians, but also, for example, of the Polish people. He also does not agree with Dostoevsky regarding the election of the Russian people, believing that such an interpretation can lead to a situation of imperialism and chauvinism.

Clause 2.3. reveals the features and causes of the metamorphosis that occurred in Masaryk’s evaluation of Dostoevsky’s works. Masaryk appreciated Dostoevsky both as a writer and as a philosopher, however, as we see, his attitude towards the Russian genius gradually changed. The features of this transformation, which are due to several factors, are noted:

- Masaryk uses a biographical method for interpretation, widespread at the beginning of the 20th century. The biographical method allows you to draw conclusions, not only based on the work itself or the analyzed text, but based on the personal life of the author. On the one hand, it provides some psychological ground for a better understanding of the text; on the other hand, it seems to obscure the text from the reader, replacing it with the figure of the author.
- Masaryk does not distinguish the very figure of Dostoevsky, his fiction and journalistic texts. For Masaryk, Dostoevsky is one in all forms. Such a mixture of aspects of the writer's various activities and his own personality allows Masaryk to see the contradictions between Dostoevsky's literary works and his journalism.
- In his study, Masaryk relied heavily on the six-volume edition of Dostoevsky’s works brought by him from Russia. By virtue of this,

Masaryk, obviously, might not be familiar with some of the details of the life and work of the writer.

The transformation of Masaryk's attitude towards Dostoevsky itself takes place in relation to the following:

1. The main issues discussed by Masaryk in both texts remain the same. As in the first article, and in the subsequent work, the Czech philosopher addresses the themes of Dostoevsky's philosophy, his personality, the problem of the specifics of the Russian people. As in the first text, so in the second, the problems are closely interconnected. Changes occur only in "The Spirit of Russia": a critical block is added, which concerns both Dostoevsky's philosophical ideas and the personality of the writer.
2. The theme "Dostoevsky's philosophy" is defined in "The Spirit of Russia" not as "ethical realism" (Article "Works by Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky"), but is transformed into the theme "Dostoevsky's formula"; the theme "specificity of the Russian people", shown in the first article through the prism of the problem of electiveness, in the second work is saturated with some everyday characteristics. In addition, Masaryk is not so much looking for the peculiarities of the Russian people themselves, as he pays attention to the qualities attributed to Dostoevsky by them, which can be successfully found in other peoples. The personality of Dostoevsky is also criticized.

The reasons for this transformation are:

- political reasons: Masaryk is changing its attitude towards Russia in a geopolitical perspective;
- religious reasons: although Masaryk notes the initial similarity of his own ideas with the ideas of Dostoevsky, they look at religion

differently. Masaryk is a Protestant and adherent of democracy, Dostoevsky is an Orthodox theocrat.

- personal reasons: Masaryk bases his criticism, among other things, on his own assessment of the personality of Dostoevsky, whom he characterizes as an inconsistent thinker, not sufficiently acquainted with classical philosophy.

Chapter 3 reveals the features of the existential-phenomenological interpretation of the works of Dostoevsky by the Czech phenomenologist J. Patočka. This chapter reveals the features of the appeal of Patočka to the work of the Russian writer in both his philosophical and political texts. Mentions of Dostoevsky in the texts of Patočka can be divided into several directions.

The first direction is hidden and explicit references to Dostoevsky in the work of Patočka “Heretical essays on the philosophy of history”.

The second direction is his interpretation of the works of Dostoevsky, proposed in the text “On Masaryk Philosophy of Religion”.

The third direction is other references to Dostoevsky’s in such works as “On the matters of The Plastic People of the Universe and DG 307” (1977) and “What is Existence?” (1969).

Clause 3.1. explains the specifics of the philosophy of the history of Patočka and introduces into the Russian philosophical space the basic concepts of Czech thinker’s philosophy - such as “care for the soul”, “responsibility”, “orgiasm”, “ancient Greek polemos”, “solidarity of the shocked”, “freedom”, “technical civilization”, etc.

The main question of the Heretical Essays on the Philosophy of History, a work in which Patočka presents a diagram of the movement of history, is - does history make sense? When transferring the proposed Scheme of the history scheme to human life, the philosophy of the history of the Czech thinker acts as the methodological basis for the interpretation of the works and ideas of Dostoevsky, which allows to deepen the understanding of the philosophy of the Russian thinker.

In **clause 3.2.** Dostoevsky is regarded as a philosopher of meaning, which becomes a necessary link between Kantian and post-Kantian ethics. In Kant's philosophy, Patočka is concerned with three main points.

Firstly, Patočka argues that in Kantian philosophy, purpose and meaning mutually assume each other, i.e. the meaning of human existence is subordinated to a certain goal.

Secondly, moral theology is possible only through a goal leading away and realized in transcendental noumenalities, and therefore the meaning of human life cannot be absolutely autonomous.

Thirdly, in connection with the previous paragraph, the problem of “rational self-love” arises, in the framework of which the moral subject is obsessed with himself.

It is in the works of Dostoevsky that the Czech philosopher sees a way out of this situation. As Patočka notes, in Dostoevsky's works and in “The Brother Karamazov” in particular, Dostoevsky presents an argument against a “moral vision of the world,” which leads people to being as separated, selfish monad-entities. Based on this thesis, Patočka builds his own interpretation of the novel “The Brothers Karamazov”, presenting it as an answer to the categorical imperative proposed by Kant.

Section 3.3. reveals the interpretation of the concept of the concept of an underground in the work of Dostoevsky. Analyzing the story "Notes from the Underground", Patočka identifies several basic characteristics of the Paradoxalist.

- Firstly, his relationship with other people is significant for understanding an underground person. For the Paradoxalist, others are hell. They alienate the underground man from himself, but it is precisely this alienation that allows the underground man to be himself. At the same time, “others” is not someone specific, but others in general - the Paradoxalist is thus under the influence of “anonymous otherness”. Others for him are just an excuse for fun: an underground person believes that they provoke and scoff at him. But his paradox

lies, among other things, in the fact that he enjoys these bullying, his miserable position, his weakness before others and his inability to distance himself from them so much that he does not depend on them. At the same time, it is this addiction and the enjoyment of one's addiction that makes an underground person who he is. In such a situation, being underground becomes a state from which there is no way out, real torture. But the Paradoxalist really enjoys it; he revels in his own insignificance and understanding that he is nothing.

- Secondly, despite contempt for his own personality and worries about what other people think of him, the underground man considers himself a smart, conscious person - and it is in this fact he sees the foundation of his own significance and simultaneous insignificance.
- Thirdly, the underground man is in love with himself to the point of madness, he values himself and considers himself above others, since he is a conscious person, and others are not. At the same time, he realizes his worthlessness.
- Fourthly, an underground person contrasts himself with “normal” people. Normal people are the entire environment of an underground person that we encounter throughout the story. Their main difference from the Paradoxalist is that, although they also depend on other people (their approval, recognition, affection), they are not aware of this dependence. It is this that gives the underground man a kind of sense of superiority over them - and at the same time, only emphasizes his dependence on them, because the sense of superiority must be constantly nourished. In the end, this superiority gives him nothing but the realization of his own insignificance.

The underground man, therefore, turns out to be a man without qualities, a round zero about whom nothing positive can be said; everywhere he is characterized only by negative epithets: The Paradoxalist appears before the reader as absolute, “negative anonymity”.

Another example of an underground person that Patočka examines is the ridiculous person from the story “The Dream of a Ridiculous Man”. For Patočka, a ridiculous person becomes the answer to the question of whether it is possible to overcome this “negative anonymity”?

In this connection, the “Dream of a Ridiculous Man” becomes for Patočka the key to understanding of Dostoevsky’s ideas, one of which he calls the “transformation of life”, which a ridiculous person experiences through getting to another planet.

The specificity of each of the characters lies in the difference between the fate of the underground and the ridiculous man: if the underground man remains immersed in his negativity and boredom, which is the consequence of this negativity, then the ridiculous man overcomes his own negativity and this overcome is possible due to his ability to love. Thus, Patočka proposes for analysis the Dostoevsky doctrine of love, which boils down to the following.

1. The Czech philosopher is of the opinion that in the work “The Dream of a Ridiculous Man” Dostoevsky shows the myth of the Golden Age, followed by the image of the fall and original sin. For Patočka, both myths - especially the last one - are primarily associated with being as such, since they bring us closer to understanding the essence of human existence. Being, in turn, is associated with love, because being is that through which love is possible. Being reveals the essence of things and intertwines everything with the “invincible power of love”. This leads to the fact that people from another planet, whom Dostoevsky describes, perceive the world in a different way - not with the help of analytical methods of science and experiments, but with the help of “sympathetic understanding”. The disclosure of Truth, therefore, is not influenced by the fall, and its causes remain unknown, since “Because

no event is commensurable with this outcome, just as the fruit of paradise is without a common measure”⁷.

2. Sin is perceived as a certain game, a temptation - "what if? ...". It is this temptation that leads people to negativity. It turns out that even the slightest hint of temptation leads people to bloody, terrifying consequences. First of all, a deception appears on the stage, which separates people, separates them from each other and alienates them from each other, estranges people from being and the essence of their existence, takes them away from the authentic way of life. In addition, fraud is originally something to be blamed for, is a consequence, not a cause. The reason is the ability to avoid following the right path. In turn, a deviation from the true path is possible due to free will, which is granted to man. Following Kierkegaard, Patočka argues that this opportunity is an opportunity to encounter “nothing” and is based on anxiety. Anxiety - a state of uncertainty, which manifests itself in three main points: anxiety before a fall, flight and transformation. It is with this kind of anxiety that a ridiculous person encounters.
3. The main question posed by Patočka is how is it possible that a little temptation leads us to such serious, cruel and monstrous consequences, to the destruction of humanity? In accordance with the idea of Patočka, the sphere of morality, on the one hand, is represented by love, and on the other hand, by guilt. According to Dostoevsky’s formula, everyone is responsible for everything on earth, and therefore everyone is guilty. Moreover, any human being is potentially guilty. Being aware of your responsibility is the only way to judge and influence others.

Clause 3.4 contains a critical analysis of Masaryk's interpretation proposed by Patočka.

⁷ Patočka, J. On Masaryk’s Philosophy of Religion (1977) // The New Yearbook for Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy XIV. Routledge, 2015. PP. P. 109.

Firstly, he is interested in how Masaryk and Dostoevsky understand the problem of suicide.

Secondly, Patočka refers to Masaryk's interpretation of Dostoevsky's works and shows how the interpretation of Masaryk differs from his own interpretation. Patočka convincingly proves that Masaryk's interpretation does not meet the foundations of existential philosophy.

Thirdly, he connects the philosophy of Masaryk and the philosophy of Kant, exposing the connection of his interpretation with this philosophical, rational tradition.

Finally, fourthly, touching upon the theme of the crisis of the modern world, Patočka cannot ignore the connection in the reception of Masaryk's problem of two thinkers: Nietzsche and Dostoevsky.

In **clause 3.5.** the socio-political history of the creation of the text "On the issue of The Plastic People of the Universe and DG 307" and the role of Dostoevsky in writing this text is revealed. Patočka wrote this article as a response to the detention of members of the underground groups "The Plastic People of the Universe" and "DG 307" by the Communist government of Czechoslovakia in the 1970s. In this text, Patočka completely reverses the main plot of the story "The Dream of a Ridiculous Man" and the text of his essay becomes the reasoning that receives the plot opposite of the text of Dostoevsky. As we remember, the story of Dostoevsky refers to the fact that at some point a completely sinful person in a dream enters a world that does not know perversity. And although he does not want this, the hero of the story gradually seduces all the inhabitants of a sinless planet and, in the end, wakes up from a dream - at the moment of the greatest sorrow that visited his heart, when he realizes that he has completely changed the beautiful planet and its inhabitants. Patočka turns the storyline around and in his essay asks the question: what would happen if sinless "astronauts" landed on a sinful planet - would they succumb to temptations or retain their purity? This essay is, firstly, devoted to the topic of "right life". Secondly, in this text, Patočka, in the most frank form, shows his own attitude to communism, revealing it as a "regime

of universal lies”. For our study, it is important that this text of Patočka combines the study of Dostoevsky and his political philosophy.

Section 3.6. reveals the connection of literature and philosophy in the work of Patočka. In his text “What is Existence?” Patočka gives an existential interpretation of the problem of existence, referring to such philosophers as M. Heidegger, K. Jaspers and J.P. Sartre. However, he supplements it with literary examples - one of them is the novel "Idiot" by Dostoevsky.

Patočka notes the complexity of the problem itself, which lies in the fact that the “objective concept” of existence is still missing. The concept involves objectivity. But a person is not always able to lay out the fullness of scientific knowledge on any issue, his knowledge is diverse: from myth to scientific reasoning, works of art, etc. Each expression of a person’s thought - whether it is a harmonious scientific theory or an art picture - has a deep meaning, which can sometimes claim the title of truth, which gives the philosopher the right to refer to literary texts. He does this at the very beginning of his work, then moving on to various philosophical interpretations of the problem of existence in an existentialist tradition - from Jaspers, Heidegger and Sartre to considering his own vision of the problem and presenting a model of the three movements of human existence. Patočka resorts to Dostoevsky as an example of a multi-level narrative: in the case of novel “The Idiot”, the point is that there are people in the plot who, in essence, would never have to meet, because they belong to different social groups. Due to the fact that Patočka illustrates the problem of existence through literary examples, we can talk about the connection of his philosophy and literature. If in his philosophy of history and interpretation of Dostoevsky’s works, Patočka relies on philosophy for the analysis of literary texts, then in the article “What is existence”, on the contrary, he relies on literature for a more accurate analysis of the philosophical problem.

Section 3.7. reveals the problem of the interpretation of Dostoevsky in Czech philosophy after Patočka. He died in 1977 - by then Czech philosophy conditionally divided into several directions.

Firstly, followers of Patočka himself who are interested in phenomenology, philosophy of history and ancient philosophy (Ivan Chvatík, Ladislav Heydaneck, Pavel Kouba and others). Secondly, followers of Marxism and, finally, thirdly, followers of the analytical branch of philosophy.

Only a few representatives of modern Czech philosophy address the theme of Dostoevsky's work. These are mainly researchers of Jan Patočka's heritage, who regard Dostoevsky not as an independent source of philosophical ideas, but as an object of interest for Patočka himself. The researchers from the former territory of Czechoslovakia, who had the greatest influence on the understanding of Dostoevsky's works by Patočka, include Ivan Chvatík and Lubica Učník.

Ivan Chvatík is a direct student of Patočka, who participated in his seminars and is the head of the Patočka's archive in Prague. Chvatík is the author of numerous works on the phenomenology and philosophy of the history of Patočka, paying special attention to the topic of Christianity and the moral crisis in the work of Patočka: Chvatík considers this topic one of the main for the work of his teacher. One of the topics that Chvatík considers no less significant is the philosophical connection of Dostoevsky, Masaryk and Patočka. Chvatík sees the main question in the role of Christianity, which Patočka assigned to this religion as part of his philosophy of history. One of the most significant problems that Chvatík notes is that, seeing the failure of Christianity for a technical civilization, Patočka still insisted that this religion could help a person to cope with the influence of the orgiastic principle, which especially manifests its strength in "technical civilization". Patočka wrote that the answer to the question of how Christianity can be transformed is the work of Dostoevsky, but Patočka did not express his idea in special works.

Lubica Učník is a professor at the Murdoch University of Australia in Perth, a native of Slovakia. Her research interests are concentrated in the field of phenomenology. One of the scientific interests of Učník is the dispute between Patočka and Dostoevsky about the future of Christianity and science.

Modern philosophical studies, the central figure of which is Dostoevsky and his works, are few in the Czech Republic. As already mentioned, they are mainly a study of the philosophical and political heritage of Patočka, i.e. the primary figure for them is not the Russian writer and his ideas, but Patočka and his interpretation of Dostoevsky's works, as well as the connection of this interpretation with the philosophy of the history of Patočka. Until now, there are no systematic studies that would fully reflect and analyze the entire spectrum of Patočka's appeals to Dostoevsky. Researchers are interested in certain aspects of the interpretation of Patočka, namely:

- the relationship of the works of Dostoevsky and Kant's philosophy;
- Dostoevsky's interpretation of moral issues;
- the role and significance of Christianity in the works of Dostoevsky;
- the concept of love and an attempt to construct with the Patočka's phenomenology of meaning based on the interpretation of Dostoevsky's works.

Thus, researchers-philosophers of Dostoevsky's creativity in the Czech Republic represent the historical and philosophical branch of philosophizing and are focused on the content of the works of the Russian writer, i.e. they interpret the ideas that Dostoevsky put into the mouths of the heroes of his works, and not the writer's own ideas, which he, for example, expressed in his "Writer's Diary".

The **conclusion** presents the main results of the research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources in Russian

1. Бердяев Н.А. Миросозерцание Достоевского. – Прага: Издание Издание The YMCA PRESS Ltd. Американское издательство, 1923. [Berdyayev N.A. Mirosozerzanie Dostesvskogo]
2. Каутман, Ф. К вопросу об актуальности произведений Достоевского // Достоевский. Материалы и исследования. Т. 20. Санкт-Петербург: Нестор-история, 2013. С. 329-333. [Kautman F. K voprosy ob aktualnosti porizvedenii Dostoevskogo]
3. Масарик Т.Г. Россия и Европа: в 3-х томах. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство РХГ, 2004. [Masaryk T.G, The Spirit of Russia]
4. Шлейермахер Ф. Академические речи 1829. // Метафизические исследования. Выпуск 3. История II. СПб.: Лаборатория метафизических исследований при философском факультете СПбГУ, 1997. [Sleyrmacher F, Academic speeches]

Sources in other languages

5. Dostojevskij dnes. Sborník příspěvků z konference s mezinárodní účastí. Praha, 27. listopadu 2006 / Ed. M. Bubeníková, M. Hrabáková, R. Hříbková. Praha, 2007.
6. Dostojevskij F.M. Cizí žena a muž pod postelí. Garamond, 2018.
7. Dostojevskij F.M. Idiot. Knižní klub, Odeon, 2004.
8. Dostojevskij F.M. Zločin a trest. Academia, 2004.
9. Merežkovskij D.S. Duše Dostojevského, proroka ruské revoluce. Praha: Rudolf Škeřík, 1923.

10. Merežkovskij D.S. Tolstoj a Dostojevskij : život, tvorba, náboženství. [Díl] I. Praha: Kvasnička a Hampl, 1929.
11. Merežkovskij D.S. Život a dílo L. Tolstého a Dostojevského. 1. díl. Praha: B. Kočí, 1920.
12. Patočka, J. On Masaryk's Philosophy of Religion (1977) // The New Yearbook for Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy XIV. Routledge, 2015. PP. 95-136.
13. Pytlík R. F. M. Dostojevskij: život a dílo. Praha, 2008.
14. Religion, War and the Crisis of Modernity. A Special issue Dedicated to the Philosophy of Jan Patočka. The New Yearbook for Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy XIV – 2015.
15. Sto roků kobry. Bestiář podle Dostojevského. Brno, 2006.
16. Vrangel' A. J. Vzpomínky na Fjodora Michajloviče Dostojevského na Sibíři v letech 1854–1856. Pelhřimov, 2009.