

**ФИЛОЛОГИЯ И ФИЛОСОФИЯ**

УДК 82:1(470:497.2)

ББК 83.3(2Рос:4Бол)

**TYPES OF PHILOSOPHICAL RECEPTION OF DOSTOEVSKY  
IN BULGARIA FROM THE FIRST HALF OF THE 20th CENTURY**

N.I. DIMITROVA

Institute of Philosophy and Sociology at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

4, Serdika, Sofia, 1000, Bulgaria

E-mail: ninaivdimitrova@abv.bg

*The article is devoted to the philosophical interpretations of Dostoevsky's work in Bulgaria in the first half of the twentieth century. Dostoevsky's initial presence in Bulgaria was investigated as well the response of the Bulgarian intelligentsia to his ideas compared to those of Tolstoy. The beneficial influence on the image of the writer as a thinker, philosopher, exerted by the Russian emigration in Bulgaria since the beginning of the 1920s is noted. Particular emphasis is placed on the work of Petr Bitsill, one of the best experts in the field of Dostoevsky studies. The types of interpretations of Dostoevsky as a philosopher are distinguished as follows: Dostoevsky as a Nietzschean. Dostoevsky and Nietzsche (opposition and identification) – bearing in mind the strong influence of Nietzsche in Bulgaria since the beginning of the twentieth century; Dostoevsky as one of the founders of Russian religious philosophy – considering the penetration of the Silver Age ideas in Bulgaria; Dostoevsky and psychoanalysis; Dostoevsky as a religious philosopher and innovator. The author concludes that the study of the peculiarities of the reception of Dostoevsky's work in Bulgarian culture of the first half of the twentieth century reveals not only the variety of world views but also the specifics of the national spiritual tradition.*

*Keywords: comprehension of Dostoevsky's creativity in Bulgaria; philosophical motifs in Dostoevsky's work; national spiritual specificity; Bulgarian humanitarian periodicals*

**ТИПЫ ФИЛОСОФСКОЙ ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИИ ДОСТОЕВСКОГО  
В БОЛГАРИИ ПЕРВОЙ ПОЛОВИНЫ XX ВЕКА**

Н.И. ДИМИТРОВА

Институт философии и социологии – Болгарская академия наук

Сердика 4, София 1000, Болгария

E-mail: ninaivdimitrova@abv.bg

*Рассматриваются философские интерпретации творчества Ф.М. Достоевского в Болгарии первой половины XX века. Отмечено благотворное влияние русской эмиграции начала 20-х годов на развитие исследовательского интереса к творчеству Достоевского в Болгарии. Специальный акцент делается на творчество П.М. Бицилли, одного из самых лучших экспертов в области достоевсковедения. Типы философского осмысления Достоевского обособлены следующим образом: Ф.М. Достоевский и Ницше (противопоставление и объединение); Достоевский как основатель русской религиозной философии; Достоевский и психоанализ; Достоевский как религиозный мыслитель и религиозный новатор. Делается вывод о том, что исследования особенностей рецепции творчества русского писателя в болгарской культуре первой половины XX века позволили выявить не только разнообразие мировоззренческих установок, но и специфику национальной духовной традиции.*

Ключевые слова: рецепция творчества Достоевского в Болгарии; философские мотивы творчества Достоевского; национальная духовная специфика; болгарская гуманитарная периодика

**DOI:** 10.17588/2076-9210.2020.1.123–136

In the only specialized philosophical journal in Bulgaria from the first half of the twentieth century – «Filosofski pregled» [«Philosophical Review»], only one article was published, devoted to the philosophical ideas of the writer – «Dostoevsky's socio-ethical quest», 1938. The author Nikolay Kanev emphasizes the uniqueness of Dostoevsky as a *philosophical* thinker – incompatible with Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, Kant, Fichte, Hegel, etc. The reason for this claim is not only the lack of a clearly articulated philosophical worldview in Dostoevsky, but also the fact that the writer is «as deep and as beardless as a sea without a shore» [1, 62]. The freedom of the human person is identified as the main problem in the writer's work. The author emphasizes the depth and vastness of Dostoevsky, defining him as *the Russian Faust*. The definition is not original, but this research deserves the reader's attention.

Philosophical interpretations are also found in some other Bulgarian humanitarian publications, many of which were made on the anniversary of the writer<sup>1</sup>. These interpretations (as well as those close to philosophy – religious-philosophical, social-philosophical, philosophical-psychological, etc.) we will try to typologize in this article.

The presence of Russian intellectuals – historians, philosophers, theologians, in Bulgaria in the early twenties of the last century is especially contributing to the conception of Dostoevsky as a philosopher.

One of these Russian intellectuals-émigrés is the historian and philosopher Pyotr Michailovich Bicilli who forever linked his destiny with Bulgaria, with the University in Sofia. Bicilli is among the best researchers of Dostoevsky's work, he is the author of about 15 studies<sup>2</sup>, some of them published in the Bulgarian humanitarian periodical, in the journal edited by Michail Arnaudov – «Bulgarskamisyl» [«Bulgarian Thought»]. Bicilli was also the author of the preface to the Bulgarian translation of Dostoevsky's novel «The Adolescent», 1927. In the early 1930s, Bitsilli made known in Bulgaria both Russian religious-philosophical emigrant interpretations of Dostoevsky and Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of Dostoevsky's novel. Bicilli was critical of Bakhtin's conception, which, in his view, failed to resolve the question of the connection between the philosophical and artistic aspects of Dostoevsky's work. For Bicilli, Dostoevsky's novel is not only a *novel-tragedy* (Vyacheslav Ivanov), it is

<sup>1</sup> See: Димитрова Н. Достоевски в българската междувоенна хуманитаристика – «юбилейният» и «делничният» // България и Русия (XVIII–XXI век). Пътища и кръстопътища. София: Издателски център «Боян Пенев», 2017. С. 234–250 [2].

<sup>2</sup> See: Делчев К. Петър Бицилли за философията на Достоевски // Философски алтернативи, 2011, № 3. С. 79–86[3].

namely a *philosophical novel*<sup>3</sup>. This is especially true for Stavrogin – an incarnate demon, this character, according to Bicilli, covers all conceivable aspects of the eternal problems of the spirit; he provides the grounds for all theoretical possibilities, sympathizes with every idea, but is incapable of believing in any<sup>4</sup>.

(Bicilli was also the person who promoted in Bulgaria Dostoevsky's research conducted in Prague and published in collections edited by Alfred Bem).

The first step in our endeavor is to clarify Dostoevsky's presence in Bulgaria from the first half of the 20th century. The well-known estimates of the Slavophile Stefan Bobchev play a role in this respect. As a student in Russia, he attended both the famous *Pushkin's speech* and Dostoevsky's funeral. Bobchev's detailed impressions were published in the magazine «Nauka» [«Science»], 1882<sup>5</sup>, later in «Uchilishten-pregled» [«School review»]<sup>6</sup>. In the early twenties of the last century, other impressions related to Dostoevsky's work were published in the Bulgarian press – for example, a response from the the dramatization of the «Karamazov Brothers» at the Moscow Art Theater<sup>7</sup>.

Commenting on the theme of Dostoevsky in Bulgaria – as it was put in the Bulgarian humanities from the first half of the twentieth century, invariably we come across the juxtaposition between Tolstoy's reception and Dostoevsky's; we encounter reservations in the necessity of the perception of Dostoevsky's ideas. The traditional explanation is sought in the national folk psychology whose conclusions sound like this: the Bulgarian is not inclined to delve into the disharmonious and gloomy world of Dostoevsky with its religious antinomies. On the other hand, Tolstoy's closeness to Bulgarian national spirituality is not in doubt. As the writer Georgi Konstantinov says, the Bulgarian, with his tendency to seek a reasonable justification for each fact before recognizing it as useful, with his over-rationality is naturally predisposed to any religion, such as that of Tolstoy, where there is no mysticism and exaltation, where the truth of the god and the truth of man are the same<sup>8</sup>. The statement of the poet Emanuel Popdimitrov is complementary: «If Dostoevsky is one Dante of Orthodoxy, Tolstoy is a Christian-Bogomil ... » [10, c. 387]. As for the Bogomil movement, it is the interwar period that thematizes/updates its presence. Whether it is interpreted as a national achievement or as a spirit of negation, its Bulgarian character remains undoubtedly true.

Here we will comment on several texts specifically dedicated to the topic of Dostoevsky in Bulgaria. The first text was written on the occasion of the writer's anniversary. The author is Todor Borov, who identifies this research as too important

<sup>3</sup> Бицилли П.М. Достоевски в светлината на новите изследвания // Българска мисъл. 1930, № 7–8, с. 518 [4].

<sup>4</sup> Бицилли П. Тургенев, Достоевски и Бакунин // Българска мисъл, 1927, № 7–8. С. 482 [5].

<sup>5</sup> «To tell Dostoevsky how he spoke was simply impossible: a deeper and more glamorous thing can hardly be imagined» [6, с. 37].

<sup>6</sup> See: Бобчев Ст. Ф.М. Достоевски. Първи книжовни стъпки. Достоевски за славянството и България. Лични спомени // Училищен преглед. 1931. № 3. С. 686 [7].

<sup>7</sup> See: Весов Л. «Братя Карамазови» в Московския художествен театър // Везни. 1922. № 4. С. 120 [8].

<sup>8</sup> Константинов Г. Толстой и България // Българска мисъл. 1928. № 7. С. 552 [9].

and valuable. According to him, such a study would contribute to the knowledge of the Bulgarian national psychology: which of Dostoevsky appeals to the Bulgarian, what is the attitude of the Bulgarian to the basic ideas of Dostoevsky, and so on. It is these issues, not purely literary ones, that are important, and they must be posed when examining the influence of a writer like Dostoevsky – as the *conscience of humanity*<sup>9</sup>.

Another text that deals with the same topic – Dostoevsky's penetration, promotion and influence on the Bulgarian spirituality, is that of the writer Stilian Chilingirov. It is published in the jubilee issue of the weekly literary and political newspaper «Misył» [«Thought»] – Issue. 21 of 1931. The title of the article is «Dostoevsky and we». The article presents the history of the first translations *of* and publications *about* Dostoevsky in Bulgaria. According to Chilingirov, the situation with Dostoevsky's reception has changed dramatically over a relatively short period. He says that the new Bulgarian generations paid off to Dostoevsky. For twenty years now, Dostoevsky has been the most beloved and most translated Russian writer who has displaced almost all other contemporaries in the mind of the Bulgarian reader. Little known thirty years ago, today he is a measure of the Bulgarian culture and intelligence. Not knowing Dostoevsky basically means you don't know anything<sup>10</sup>.

The need for Dostoevsky as a spiritual guide is confirmed by numerous other publications in the Bulgarian humanities from the interwar period. Rarely will we encounter in the writings of another writer such an abundant and in-depth questioning of religious-moral and philosophical questions, says one of the typical commentaries of the era<sup>11</sup>.

*Dostoevsky as a Nietzschean; Dostoevsky and Nietzsche;  
Dostoevsky contra Nietzsche*

As for the variants of Dostoevsky's Bulgarian reception as a thinker, the most significant is the Russian writer's understanding through Nietzsche. Nietzscheanism was particularly popular in Bulgaria in the early twentieth century. As the philosopher Dimitar Ivanchev, a longtime Nietzschean, points out, «In the years before the war, there was a whole generation that went to bed with «Also sprach Zarathustra» [14, c. 279]. After the First World War, the peak of Nietzscheanism gradually began to pass, but then *the German glory* of Dostoevsky reached Bulgaria. (In the words of Hans-Georg Gadamer: «The Karamazovs was the most important book after the Bible in the 20's» [15, c. 228]).

The writer Alexander Balabanov also refers to this *German psychosis* by Dostoevsky; he diagnosed Dostoevsky as a condition – fateful and irrevocable – of German spiritual life. Balabanov, however, does not want the Bulgarians to be blind imitators of this fashion and urges Dostoevsky to remain as he has presented himself to

<sup>9</sup> See: Боров Т. За Достоевски у нас // Развигор. 1922. № 52 [11].

<sup>10</sup> Чилингиров С. Достоевски и ние // Мисъл. 1931. № 31 [12].

<sup>11</sup> Попов Б. Три образа в «Бесове» // Духовна култура. 1937. № 83. С. 855 [13].

the Bulgarian public – only through his works: «We, the Bulgarians, have long read with joy, passion and know as our Dostoevsky. For a long time and completely, without the Germans» [16, c. 1].

Despite Balabanov's pathos, an essential part of Dostoevsky's presence in Bulgaria is due precisely to the German influence, mainly to the Nietzschean one. The most significant are the researches of the philosopher Dimitar Ivanchev from the thirties of the twentieth century. He contrasts Nietzsche's *Übermensch* and Dostoevsky's man-God, with his preferences firmly on Nietzsche's side. The author's thesis is that, going to solve the same problems, Nietzsche and Dostoevsky come to opposite conclusions. According to Ivanchev, Dostoevsky poses the most important life problems in a new way, but solves them the old way. Nietzsche – unlike Dostoevsky – affirms life and therefore has no place for Ivan Karamazov's «sick conscience», which is humiliating to man. Nietzsche's goal is to free man from this sick conscience. According to the Bulgarian philosopher, mangodhood should not mean wrongdoing. According to him, Dostoevsky is a *denier of life*: «This exuberant energy that we find in Nietzsche has left no trace in Dostoevsky. In him everything is exhausted, nervous, hysterical, sick» [17, c. 167]. While Dostoevsky was frightened and stopped hesitantly in the middle of the common road, Nietzsche vigorously made his conclusions. I will not comment here on how unfair and inaccurate this reception of Dostoevsky is.

Defining him as a *typical decadent* is also in line with the Nietzschean interpretation. However, it is fair to note that the proposed interpretation also used the works of Russian religious philosophy – Berdyaev, Shestov, etc.

Just the opposite is the attitude of the author of another article on the Nietzsche-Dostoevsky relationship. The theologian Boris Popstoimenov points out the common moments between them – both of which are imbued with an extraordinary religious pathos. Both are equally tormented by the fire of their religious doubts. They are equally troubled by the great problems of Being, and especially the problem of the being of God. But Nietzsche's philosophy and poetry are a cry of despair, a song of a dying swan killed by the sadness of the dead God, while with Dostoevsky we rise above the stars, in a palace of supreme joy<sup>12</sup>.

The Jubilee issue of the «Thought and Will» newspaper also featured an article on the Dostoevsky-Nietzsche parallel. The author V. Peev is fascinated by the two of them and expresses his delight at their complementarity in the newspaper's very typical rhetoric: «Coming from two different worlds, they meet on the tops of a giant spirit struggle over the last century as two Lucifers: the first in the flesh-shroud, torn by the flesh ulcers, the other – a swirling horseman on a stallion of light and madness» [19, c. 1].

The Nietzsche-Dostoevsky relationship (with referring to Shestov) was also analyzed by the writer Nikolai Raynov, author of the preface to the 1928 edition of «The Demons». In addition to Nietzsche, theosophy intervenes here, whose

---

<sup>12</sup> Попстоименов Б. Достоевски и Ницше (Религиозно-философски мотиви) // Зов. 1926/27. № 9–10. С. 272–275 [18].

representatives in Bulgaria are at the same time highly respected by Nietzscheanism. Paradoxically, the Bulgarian writer sees the personification of the *all-human* from Dostoevsky's *Pushkin's speech* in Elena Blavatsky<sup>13</sup>.

«The tragedy of man according to Dostoevsky» – this is the name of a small book by Hristo Savov<sup>14</sup>, which again contrasts Nietzsche with Dostoevsky, but emphasizes the difference in their ideals (*man-god* and *God-man*) already in the spirit of the Russian religious philosophy. Although quoting only Berdyaev, the writing makes clear the author's acquaintance in general with the spirit of the Silver Age, with its resistance to the *conservative Orthodoxy*, respectively with the apology of Dostoevsky's *apocalyptic Christianity*.

So, while Bulgarian passion for Nietzsche is much more noticeable and constant, even in the years when other philosophical *fashions* have invaded, however, as far as Dostoevsky is concerned, it would be unfair to deny the popularity of the dedicated to him works of Merezhkovsky, Rozanov, Berdyaev, Bem, Steinberg and many more.

#### *Dostoevsky – the founder of the Russian religious philosophy*

Dostoevsky's reception through Russian religious philosophers (both from the Silver Age and the emigrant period) is the second most important fact in the chosen perspective of the topic of *Dostoevsky in Bulgaria*. We should mention here how Simeon Andreev commented on Berdyaev's book about Dostoevsky, which was just published in Berlin. In the spirit of Berdyaev, the Bulgarian author perceives Dostoevsky as a clairvoyant of the «terrible path of suffering and redemption, of the cross procession from the man-god to the God-man» [22, c. 566]. It should also be noted the foreword by Lyudmil Stoyanov to the book by Leonid Grossman on Dostoevsky, but certainly one of the two books available for the period and dedicated to the Russian writer – the one of Hristo Vargov. (The other is the Savov booklet already mentioned). Dostoevsky is presented as a teacher of humanity, as a prophet and clairvoyant, as a caller to transformation, and his *white Christianity* – as the Christianity of the future. Vargov actually commented on all the topics raised by Dostoevsky's Russian studies in the Silver Age. In addition to Dostoevsky's apology (in the book we read rapturous speeches about all aspects of the creativity and personality of the writer), this study is one of the few in Bulgarian literature that also promotes the spirituality of the Russian Silver Age and its attempts at religious reformation. The author defines V. Rozanov, D. Merezhkovsky, N. Berdyaev, S. Bulgakov, A. Bely as *newcomers*, as people who want to renew Russian social life through the life-giving spirit of Christ, who yearn for a new, vital, reasonable, social Christianity, who yearn for the living Christ, for Christ not of the past but of the present and the future, not Christ – painted in the icons but Christ – dwelling in the hearts. These newcomers act

<sup>13</sup> Райнов Н. Предговор към: Ф.М. Достоевски. Бесове. София: Ив. Г. Игнатов и синове. 1928. С. 6–7 [20].

<sup>14</sup> See: Савов Х. Трагедията на човека в погледа на Достоевски. Видин, 1934 [21].

mostly in the spirit of Dostoevsky and Solovyov<sup>15</sup>. Vargov offers a similar interpretation years later, already on the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of the death of the writer<sup>16</sup>.

### *Dostoevsky as a psychoanalyst*

Psychoanalysis has been very popular in Bulgaria since the interwar period, for which the Russian émigré Ivan Kinkel, who maintains relations with Freud, has also contributed. But the topic of Dostoevsky and psychoanalysis has two aspects: the writer (and his characters, inseparable from his personality) as *a subject of psychoanalysis*, and he himself as *an expert psychoanalyst*. We will only mention the research of the psychiatrist Sotir Koshkov<sup>17</sup>, since it is not the psychoanalysis of Dostoevsky's work that interests us here, but the possible interpretations of his personality as a representative of depth psychology. (The Bulgarian psychiatrist also presents Dostoevsky himself as a psychoanalyst, points out his abilities in this regard, but his interest is more focused on the Oedipus complex found in Dostoevsky's novels).

The famous Bulgarian literary historian Mikhail Arnaudov confirms Dostoevsky's abilities for subtle psychological analysis, capable of arousing a lively interest even in the greatest psychiatrists<sup>18</sup>. It should be noted that Arnaudov, who asserts Dostoevsky as a profound psychologist, at the same time distinguishes himself from any Freudian interpretation.

In one essay entitled «Dostoevsky as a National and Religious Thinker», Mikhail Arnaudov emphasizes on the possibility that we, the Bulgarians, can also be deeply – like our Western contemporaries (who have long surpassed the fashion and conjuncture passion for Dostoevsky) – influenced by his ideas, because of the human nature of his work. Dostoevsky is recognized as an inspired apostle of spiritual renewal, that is, as a teacher of humanity (contrary to Freud's opinion), as its *conscience*. Compared to the «deepest creatures of poetic genius» – like Dante and Goethe, Dostoevsky is the observer of the secrets of the human soul, whose new picture he shows us.

But without mentioning Freud's teachings, M. Arnaudov implicitly opposes him, exhilarated by Dostoevsky's depth anthropology, by his intuitive knowledge, so startling with its surprises, with its deploying in the spiritual depths. This intuitive knowledge – unlike psychoanalysis – is accompanied by a teaching of love and mercy, by a cry for humility and brotherhood, which sounded like a gospel truth about the world<sup>19</sup>.

---

<sup>15</sup> Въргов Х. Пророк и ясновидец. Т.М. Достоевски (творчество и идеи). София. 1926.С 183 [23].

<sup>16</sup> See: Въргов, Х. Достоевски: пророкът от Сибир // Славянска беседа.1941. № 1.С. 18–29 [24].

<sup>17</sup> See: Кошков, С. Достоевски от психоаналитично гледище // Българска мисъл.1935. № 3. С. 177–188 [25].

<sup>18</sup> Арnaudов М. Личности и проблеми. Литературни очерки. София. 1925. С. 193 [26].

<sup>19</sup> Арnaudов М.Творчество и критика. Литературни портрети и характеристики. София: Хемус. 1938. С. 199 [27].

Dostoevsky's importance as a kind of psychoanalyst is also highlighted by Sirak Skitnik when commenting on the dramatization of the Karamazov Brothers at the Royal Theater. He says this dramatization makes Dostoevsky's prophetic gifts especially clear, as well as his frightening ability to grasp the innermost dark movements of human thought and feeling. The subconscious, the impure that we hide even from ourselves, the unformed even for us, does not escape the ruthless gaze of the writer. And in this throbbing of the human soul, in this touching with cold fingers of everything in and around us, he did not have and has no equal with himself. It is no accident this return of the Russians to Dostoevsky, as well as the newborn interest of the West in him. He is the new writer whom the West is yet to discover and study<sup>20</sup>.

*Dostoevsky as a religious thinker, religious innovator and theologian*

This aspect has been developed in most studies of the writer's work, but understandably, the emphasis on Dostoevsky as a religious thinker is placed predominantly in Bulgarian religious literature. Nikola Atanasov's article «Zhazhdataza Bog u Dostoevsky» [«The Thirst for God in Dostoevsky»] from 1910 is a very extensive text that presents Dostoevsky as more destructive than Nietzsche: «When Nietzsche dreamed of the *Übermensch*, he meant the progress of the human race, the growth of the human consciousness, the renewal of the human soul. And Dostoyevsky's character [Raskolnikov] does not depend on any ideals and yearns for freedom in the name of ... freedom itself, in the name of the consciousness that without will, without complete will, he would not be a human, but a bird, an insect. In such a case, he prefers to return to the Creator the ticket for the entrance into life and the world» [29, № 16, с. 5]. Dostoevsky's atheism is defined as metaphysical; his favorite theme – the struggle between the man-god and the God-man, is viewed in the light of metaphysics, not ethics.

Alyosha's response to Ivan – that he would not agree to base the harmony of happiness on the tears even of a single child, is appreciated by the author as remarkable because it was given by one of Dostoevsky's most religious characters. Thus Alyosha acknowledges – albeit for a moment – Ivan's righteousness. Although the author focuses on the doubts of Dostoevsky himself, as well as on the fact that the positive ones, ie. the religious characters in the novels of the writer are not able to give a solution to the mystery of existence, the article nevertheless ends with the following conclusion: «Dostoevsky sang the sinister anthem of Antichrist, but in the end he fell humbly and in repentance before the image of Christ» [29, № 16, с. 11].

The interpretation of the other philosophical article, «Chovekobo zhestvoto i Bogochovechestvoto u Dostoevsky» [«The Mangodhood and the Godmanhood in

<sup>20</sup> Сирак Скитник. Вечер на Достоевски // Сирак Скитник. Изкуство и публика. Съст. Л. Стоянова. Варненски свободен университет. 2012. С. 116 [28].



Dostoevsky's work»], published a little earlier, in 1906, is very similar<sup>21</sup>. If in the first article the writer is represented by his exceptional disharmony, the second focuses on the struggle between faith and unbelief and ultimately on the mangodhood of Dostoevsky himself.

In Vera Glusheva's article «Образът на Христа според Достоевски [«The Image of Christ according to Dostoevsky»] the writer's work is defined as knowledge, science of the spirit. The author points out that Dostoevsky's philosophy is the subject of much comment, and that the paths he points to leading humanity out of chaos to harmony are subject to careful study and criticism throughout the world.

The interest in the article is focused on Dostoevsky's faith. Glusheva is adamant that, according to Dostoevsky, God is a creative, vital principle that is manifested through love<sup>22</sup>. The motives for active love and freedom in religion characterize Dostoevsky's religiosity – this is the main point of the article.

### *Dostoevsky – «a noxious writer»*

One of the most striking examples of the political reading of the writer's work – the *left* political reading – will be mentioned here. The title of an anniversary text paradoxically bears the name above – «A noxious writer». Its author is the writer Dimitar Polyakov who long and widely discusses the *fall* of Dostoevsky and the concerns of the Russian *counter-revolutionaries* from him, as opposed to his completely ignoring attitude of Soviet Russia.

Polyakov explains his growing influence in Bulgaria with the painful interest of the audience in the written horrors due to their correspondence with the coming historical crisis (because *the thriller genre* is adequate for «the despondency in the permanence of capitalist society» [32, c. 4]). And after all this, the article suddenly ends with the statement that Dostoevsky remained «one of the greatest artists in world literature» [32, c. 4].

So far, some of the possible typologies on the theme «Dostoevsky in Bulgaria» have been briefly presented. Understandably, these are not «pure» types. The diversity of Dostoevsky's Bulgarian interpretations as a thinker is due, of course, to Dostoevsky's so rich and polysemantic work. At the same time, these interpretations are indicative of the different mental attitudes in the Bulgarian intellectual life in the first half of the twentieth century. Without pretending to be exhaustive, they prove a real and significant interest in the man «who, with his pen, has awakened the sleepy and the morally dead people, who has called in the wilderness for a joyful life, for a feat ... » [24, c. 29].

---

<sup>21</sup> See: Бакларов К. Човекобогът и Богочовекът на Достоевски // Славянски глас. 1906. № 3. С. 85–103 [30].

<sup>22</sup> Глушева В. Образът на Христа според Достоевски // Зов. 1926/27, № 7–8. С. 218 [31].

## Реферат

В единственном специализированном философском журнале в Болгарии первой половины XX века – «Философски преглед» («Философское обозрение») – в 1938 г. была опубликована статья, посвященная социально-этическим исканиям Ф.М. Достоевского. Основное внимание ее автор Николай Кынев акцентирует на проблеме свободы в творчестве писателя. Н. Кынев подчеркивает уникальность его философских идей, несопоставимость с Ницше, Шопенгауэром, Кантом, Фихте, Гегелем и т.д. Но рецепция философских идей Достоевского, изучение его образа мыслителя и философа начинаются в Болгарии еще с конца XIX века.

Комментируя влияние взглядов Достоевского в Болгарии, мы должны отметить болгарского славянофила Стефана Бобчева, который присутствовал на *Пушкинской речи* и на похоронах писателя. Его впечатления были несколько раз – в разные периоды – опубликованы в болгарской прессе. Но особое влияние на *философское* (философско-религиозное, социально-политическое) толкование произведений Достоевского оказало сообщество русской эмиграции в Болгарии в начале 20-х годов прошлого века. Одним из представителей этого сообщества русских интеллектуалов был историк Петр Михайлович Бицилли, автор более 15 исследований о Достоевском. Некоторые из них были опубликованы в болгарской гуманитарной прессе – в газете «Литературен глас» («Литературный голос»), в авторитетном журнале «Българска мисъл» («Болгарская мысль»). Именно Бицилли болгарская публика обязана своим знакомством с философской интерпретацией текстов М.М. Бахтина, а также и с исследованиями произведений русских мыслителей в Праге под руководством Альфреда Бема.

Рецепция идей Достоевского в Болгарии является отражением национальной психологии в большей степени, чем, скажем, рецепция идей Толстого – по распространенному мнению, болгарам не очень близок и понятен дисгармоничный и угрюмый мир писателя с его религиозными антиномиями. Философ и поэт Эммануиль Попдимитров говорит, что если Достоевский – это Данте православия, то Толстой – христианин-богомил (т.е. представитель национальной религии). (Кстати, в начале 20-х годов группа болгарских «толстовцев» имела значительное влияние в общественной жизни.)

Таким образом, изучение специфики рецепции идей Достоевского выявляет важные черты болгарской ментальности. Литературная критика к началу 30-х годов уже констатирует, что именно сопричастность философским идеям Достоевского становится критерием культурности и интеллигентности болгаров.

В процессе философского осмысления творчества Достоевского в Болгарии можно выделить несколько основных тенденций.

*Достоевский – ницшеанец. Достоевский и Ницше*

Сопоставление Достоевского с Ницше – одна из модных тенденций болгарской духовной жизни 20-х годов, когда ницшеанство было очень влиятельным в Болгарии. К этому направлению можно отнести исследования Димитра Иванчева, Николая Райнова, Христо Савова и многих других. Интерпретации давались самые разные. *Ницшеанцы* отдают предпочтение германскому философу, потому что у русского писателя они видят ту «больную совесть», от которой Ницше освободил человечество. Писатель Николай Райнов известен своими теософскими взглядами, автор предисловия к болгарскому переводу «Бесов» (1928 г.), наоборот, считает, что Достоевский и Ницше очень близкие по духу люди. По его мнению, Елена Блаватская является возможной персонификацией *всечеловека* Пушкинской речи. Никола Атанасов, автор религиозного толка, тоже сближает Ницше с Достоевским, однако с точки зрения деструктивности их творчества утверждает, что мотив *своеволия* у Достоевского особенно силен и превосходит по своей исключительности ницшеанского сверхчеловека.

Христо Савов, который написал книгу о Достоевском (о трагедии человека в его творчестве), формулирует квинтэссенцию мировосприятия писателя как утверждение апокалиптического христианства. При этом автор придерживается позиции Бердяева, которого он цитирует в своей книге.

*Достоевский как один из основателей философии Серебряного века*

Посвященные Достоевскому сочинения, авторы которых принадлежат к эпохе Серебряного века, приобрели популярность в Болгарии особенно в связи с русской эмиграцией начала 20-х годов XX в. В авторитетном литературном журнале «Златорог» (1923 г.) была опубликована пространная рецензия Симеона Андреева о только что вышедшей в свет книге Н. Бердяева «Миросозерцание Достоевского». Андреев выражает свое восхищение бердяевской интерпретацией.

Христо Варгов в своей книге о Достоевском «Достоевский: Сибирский пророк» (1926 г.) представляет русские (главным образом эмигрантские) сочинения, посвященные писателю. Он характеризует Достоевского как пророка и учителя человечества, подчеркивая, что его *белое христианство* – христианство будущего. Русских философов Серебряного века автор называет *первопроходцами*. По мнению Варгова, они призваны обновить русскую общественную жизнь этим *белым* христианством.

*Достоевский и психоанализ*

В Болгарии данного периода очень популярным было и учение Фрейда. Как известно, творчество Достоевского очень благодатно для специалистов по душевным патологиям. В разнообразии точек зрения относительно «случая До-

стоевского» выделяется точка зрения на писателя как *объекта* психоанализа и *субъекта* такого же экспертного анализа: писатель выступает в роли клинического психолога, профессионально описывающего патологию своих героев.

Главный представитель этого направления – психиатр Сотир Кошков. В сочинении «Достоевский с точки зрения психоанализа» («Болгарская мысль», 1935 г.) он придерживается классического толкования Фрейда. Но Достоевского как психолога и психопатолога рассматривает и ряд других авторов.

### *Достоевский как религиозный мыслитель и новатор*

В начале XX века в болгарской религиозной периодике был опубликован ряд статей, в которых обсуждалась философская вера Достоевского. В своем исследовании о соотношении мотивов Богочеловечества и человекобожества Константин Бакларов делает вывод о человекобожестве самого Достоевского. А в статье, посвященной образу Христа в творчестве Достоевского (1926 г.), Вера Глушева утверждает представление писателя о Боге как активном, живом, творческом принципе.

### *Достоевский – вредный писатель*

Среди представителей этого направления следует отметить левого писателя Дмитра Полянова, его политическую оценку, высказанную им – парадоксально – по поводу юбилея Достоевского (1931 г.). Болгарский автор отвергает апологию Достоевского русскими «контрреволюционерами», подчеркивает *прогрессивное* отношение к упадническим настроениям, но вдруг заканчивает статью утверждением, что Достоевский все-таки является «одним из самых великих художников всемирной литературы».

Условная типология философских интерпретаций творчества Достоевского в Болгарии первой половины XX века выявляет не только разнообразие мировоззренческих установок, но и оказавшее на них влияние специфики национальной духовной традиции.

### Список литературы

1. Кънев Н. Социално-етичните лутания на Достоевски // Философски преглед. 1938. № 1. С. 62–71.
2. Димитрова Н. Достоевски в българската междувоенна хуманитаристика – «юбилейният» и «делничният» // България и Русия (XVIII–XXI век). Пътища и кръстопътища. София: Издателски център «Боян Пенев», 2017. С. 234–250.
3. Делчев К. Петър Бицилли за философията на Достоевски // Философски алтернативи. 2011. № 3. С. 79–86.
4. Бицилли П. Достоевски в светлината на новите изследвания // Българска мисъл. 1930. № 7–8. С. 512–522.
5. Бицилли П. Тургенев, Достоевски и Бакунин // Българска мисъл. 1927. № 7–8. С. 480–490.
6. Бобчев Ст. Ф.М. Достоевский // Наука. 1882. № 1. С. 31–37.
7. Бобчев Ст. Ф.М. Достоевски. Първи книжовни стъпки. Достоевски за славянството и България. Лични спомени // Училищен преглед. 1931. № 3. С. 685–692.

8. Весов Л. «Братя Карамазови» в Московския художествен театър // Везни. 1922. № 4. С. 15.
9. Константинов Г. Толстой и България // Българска мисъл. 1928. № 7. С. 550–560.
10. Попдимитров Е. Толстой като художник и мислител // Философски преглед. 1935. № 5. С. 385–392.
11. Боров Т. За Достоевски у нас // Развигор. 1922. № 52. С. 1.
12. Чилингиров С. Достоевски и ние // Мисъл. 1931. № 31. С. 2.
13. Попов Б. Три образа в «Бесове» // Духовна култура. 1937. № 83. С. 855–861.
14. Иванчев Д. Ницше в българската литература // Философски преглед. 1934. № 3–4. С. 279–299.
15. Гадамер Г.-Г. Русские в Германии // Логос. 1992. № 3. С. 228–232.
16. Балабанов А. Бездната в хаоса на Достоевски // Литературен глас. 1931. № 101. С. 1.
17. Иванчев Д. Проблемата за личността у Достоевски // Иванчев Д. Философия на отрицанието. Индивидуализъм и аморализъм. София, 1937. С. 154–168.
18. Попстоименов Б. Достоевски и Ницше (Религиозно-философски мотиви) // Зов. 1926/27. № 9–10. С. 269–276.
19. Пеев В. Достоевски и Ницше // Мисъл и воля. 1931. № 22. С. 1.
20. Райнов Н. Предговор към: Ф.М. Достоевски. Бесове. София: Ив.Г. Игнатов и синове, 1928. С. 5–9.
21. Савов Х. Трагедията на човека в погледа на Достоевски. Видин, 1934. 54 с.
22. Андреев С. Една книга за Достоевски // Златорог. 1923. № 9. С. 565–569.
23. Въргов Хр. Пророк и ясновидец. Т.М. Достоевски (творчество и идеи). София, 1926. 240 с.
24. Въргов Хр. Достоевски: пророкът от Сибир // Славянска беседа. 1941. № 1. С. 15–23.
25. Кошков С. Достоевски от психоаналитично гледище // Българска мисъл. 1935. № 3. С. 177–188.
26. Арнаудов М. Личности и проблеми. Литературни очерки. София, 1925. 243 с.
27. Арнаудов М. Творчество и критика. Литературни портрети и характеристики. София: Хемус, 1938. 320 с.
28. Сирак Скитник. Изкуство и публика. Съст. Л. Стоянова. Варненски свободен университет, 2012. 223 с.
29. Атанасов Н. Жаждата за Бог у Достоевски // Духовна пробуда. 1910. № 15. С. 3–8; № 16. С. 6–11.
30. Бакларов К. Човекобогът и Богочовекът на Достоевски // Славянски глас. 1906. № 3. С. 85–103.
31. Глушева В. Образът на Христа според Достоевски // Зов. 1926/27. № 7–8. С. 216–220.
32. Полянов Д. Вреден писател (Ф.М. Достоевски) // Наковалня. 1931. № 212. С. 4.

### References

1. Kanev, N. Sotsialno-etichnite lutaniya na Dostoevski [Dostoevsky's socio-ethical quest], in *Filosofski pregled*, 1938, no. 1, pp. 62–71.
2. Dimitrova, N. Dostoevski v b"lgarskata mezhduvoenna khumanitaristika – «yubileyniyat» i «delnichniyat» [Dostoevsky in Bulgarian interwar humanities – anniversary and ordinary], in *B"lgariya i Rusiya (XVIII–XXI vek). P"tishcha i kr"stop"tishcha* [Bulgaria and Russia (XVIII–XXI Century). Roads and crossroads]. Sofia: Izdatelski tsent"r «Boyan Penev», 2017, pp. 234–250.
3. Delchev, K. Pet"r Bitsilli za filosofiyata na Dostoevski [Pyotr Bicilli on Dostoevsky's philosophy], in *Filosofski alternativi*, 2011, no. 3, pp. 79–86.
4. Bitsilli, P. Dostoevski v svetlinata na novite izsledvaniya [Dostoevsky in the light of new research], in *B"lgarska mis"l*, 1930, no. 7–8, pp. 512–522.
5. Bitsilli, P. Turgenev, Dostoevski i Bakunin [Turgenev, Dostoevsky and Bakunin], in *B"lgarska mis"l*, 1927, no. 7–8, pp. 480–490.
6. Bobchev, St. F.M. Dostoevskiy [F.M. Dostoevsky], in *Nauka*, 1882, no. 1, pp. 31–37.
7. Bobchev, St. F.M. Dostoevski. P"rvi knizhovni st"pki. Dostoevski za slavyanstvoto i B"lgariya. Lichni spomeni [First literary steps. Dostoevsky on Slavs and Bulgaria. Personal memories], in *Uchilishchen pregled*, 1931, no. 3, pp. 685–692.
8. Vesov, L. «Bratya Karamazovi» v Moskovskiyata khudozhestven teat"r [«The Karamazovs brothers» dramatized at the Moscow Art Theater], in *Vezni*, 1922, no. 4, p. 15.
9. Konstantinov, G. Tolstoy i B"lgariya [Tolstoy and Bulgaria], in *B"lgarska mis"l*, 1928, no. 7, pp. 550–560.

10. Popdimitrov, E. Tolstoy kato khudozhnik i mislitel [Tolstoy as an artist and thinker], in *Filosofski pregled*, 1935, no. 5, pp.385–392.
11. Borov, T. Za Dostoevski u nas [About Dostoevsky in Bulgaria], in *Razvigor*, 1922, no. 52, p. 1.
12. Chilingirov, S. Dostoevski i nie [Dostoevsky and we], in *Mis"l*, 1931, no. 31, p. 2.
13. Popov, B. Tri obraza v «Besove» [Three images in «The Demons»], in *Dukhovna kultura*, 1937, no. 83, pp. 855–861.
14. Ivanchev, D. Nitshe v b"lgarskata literatura [Nietzsche in the Bulgarian literature], in *Filosofski pregled*, 1934, no. 3–4, pp. 279–299.
15. Gadamer, G.-G. Russkie v Germanii [The Russians in Germany], in *Logos*, 1992, no.3, pp. 228–232.
16. Balabanov, A. Bezdna v khaosa na Dostoevski [The abyss in the chaos of Dostoevsky], in *Literaturne glas*, 1931, no. 101, p. 1.
17. Ivanchev, D. Problemata za lichnostta u Dostoevski [Dostoevsky's personality problem], in Ivanchev, D. *Filosofiya na otritsaniето. Individualiz"m i amoraliz"m* [Philosophy of negation. Individualism and immorality]. Sofia, 1937, pp. 154–168.
18. Popstoinenov, B. Dostoevski i Nitshe (Religiozno-filosofski motivi) [Dostoevsky and Nietzsche (Religious and philosophical motives)], in *Zov*, 1926/27, no. 9–10, pp. 269–276.
19. Peev, V. Dostoevski i Nitshe [Dostoevsky and Nietzsche], in *Mis"l i volya*, 1931, no. 22, p. 1.
20. Raynov, N. *Predgovor k"m: F.M. Dostoevski. Besove* [Preface to: F. M. Dostoevsky. The Demons]. Sofia, 1928, pp. 5–9.
21. Savov, Kh. *Tragediyata na choveka v pogleda na Dostoevski* [The tragedy of man according to Dostoevsky]. Vidin, 1934. 54 p.
22. Andreev, S. Edna kniga za Dostoevski [A book about Dostoevsky], in *Zlatorog*, 1923, no. 9, pp. 565–569.
23. V"rgov Khr. *Prorok i yasnovidets. T.M. Dostoevski (tvorchestvo i idei)* [Prophet and clairvoyant. F. M. Dostoevsky (Creativity and ideas)]. Sofia, 1926. 240 p.
24. V"rgov Khr. Dostoevski: prorok"t ot Sibir [Dostoevsky: The prophet from Siberia], in *Slavyanska beseda*, 1941, no. 1, pp. 15–23.
25. Koshkov, S. Dostoevski ot psikoanalitichno gledishche [Dostoevsky from a psychoanalytical point of view], in *B"lgarska mis"l*, 1935, no. 3, pp. 177–188.
26. Arnaudov, M. *Lichnosti i problemi. Literaturni ocherki* [Personalities and problems. Literary essays]. Sofia, 1925.243 p.
27. Arnaudov, M. *Tvorchestvo i kritika. Literaturni portreti i kharakteristiki* [Creativity and criticism. Literary portraits and characteristics]. Sofia, 1938. 320 p.
28. Sirak Skitnik. *Izkustvo i publika* [Art and audience]. Varna, 2012.223 p.
29. Atanasov, N. Zhazhdata za Bog u Dostoevski [The thirst for God in Dostoevsky], in *Dukhovna probuda*, 1910, no. 15, pp. 3–8; no. 16, pp. 6–11.
30. Baklarov, K. Chovekobog"t i Bogochovek"t na Dostoevski [The Mangodhood and the Godmanhood in Dostoevsky's work], in *Slavyanski glas*, 1906, no. 3, pp. 85–103.
31. Glusheva, V. Obraz"t na Khrista spored Dostoevski [The image of Christ according to Dostoevsky], in *Zov*, 1926/27, no. 7–8, pp. 216–220.
32. Polyanov, D. Vreden pisatel (F.M. Dostoevski) [A noxious writer (F.M. Dostoevsky)], in *Nakovalnya*, 1931, no. 212, p. 4.