

## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/3>

### FEATURES OF THE HERO'S IDENTIFICATION IN V. PELEVIN'S NOVEL IPHUCK 10

Petrukhina Natalya

Doctor of Sciences (DSc), Professor of the Department of Russian Literature and Teaching Methodology, Uzbekistan State University of World Languages

#### Abstract

The article examines the image of the devil in F. M. Dostoevsky's novel *The Brothers Karamazov* as one of the most philosophically profound figures in Russian literature. Special attention is given to the chapter "The Devil. Ivan Fyodorovich's Nightmare," in which the devil appears not as a supernatural being but as the personified inner voice of Ivan Karamazov. The analysis focuses on the devil's outward appearance, manner of behavior, and ideological function within the text. It is shown that the devil acts as the philosophical and moral double of the protagonist, logically carrying his ideas to the point of absurdity. The article also reveals the connection between Ivan Karamazov's worldview and the philosophies of Kant and Nietzsche, and interprets Ivan as a model of modern human consciousness, possessing absolute moral sensitivity while experiencing a crisis of meaning.

**Keywords:** F. M. Dostoevsky, Ivan Karamazov, image of the devil, philosophical double, nihilism, suffering, moral maximalism, Kant, Nietzsche.

#### Аннотация

В статье рассматривается образ чёрта в романе Ф.М. Достоевского «Братья Карамазовы» как одна из наиболее философски насыщенных фигур русской литературы. Особое внимание уделяется главе «Чёрт. Кошмар Ивана Фёдоровича», где чёрт выступает не как сверхъестественное существо, а как персонифицированный внутренний голос Ивана Карамазова.



## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/3>

Анализируется его внешний облик, манера поведения и идейная функция в тексте. Показано, что чёрт является философским и моральным двойником героя, логически доводящим его идеи до абсурда. В статье раскрывается связь мировоззрения Ивана Карамазова с философией Канта и Ницше, а также трактуется Иван как модель человеческого сознания нового времени, обладающего абсолютной нравственной чувствительностью, но переживающего кризис смыслов.

**Ключевые слова:** Ф.М. Достоевский, Иван Карамазов, образ чёрта, философский двойник, нигилизм, страдание, нравственный максимализм, Кант, Ницше.

### Annotation

Maqolada F. M. Dostoyevskiyning «Aka-uka Karamazovlar» romanidagi iblis obrazi rus adabiyotidagi eng falsafiy jihatdan sermazmun timsollardan biri sifatida ko‘rib chiqiladi. Ayniqsa «Iblis. Ivan Fyodorovichning dahshatli tushlari» bobiga alohida e’tibor qaratiladi, unda iblis g‘ayritabiyy mavjudot sifatida emas, balki Ivan Karamazovning shaxsiy ichki ovozining personifikatsiyasi sifatida namoyon bo‘ladi. Uning tashqi qiyoqasi, xatti-harakat uslubi hamda matndagi g‘oyaviy vazifasi tahlil qilinadi. Iblis qahramonning falsafiy va axloqiy egizagi bo‘lib, uning g‘oyalarini mantiqan absurd darajagacha yetkazib berishi ko‘rsatiladi. Maqolada Ivan Karamazov dunyoqarashining Kant va Nitsshe falsafasi bilan bog‘liqligi ochib beriladi, shuningdek Ivan yangi davr inson ongining modeli sifatida talqin etiladi — u mutlaq axloqiy sezgirlikka ega bo‘lsa-da, ma’no inqirozini boshdan kechiradi.

**Kalit so‘zlar:** F. M. Dostoyevskiy, Ivan Karamazov, iblis obrazi, falsafiy egizak, nigliizm, azob-uqubat, axloqiy maksimalizm, Kant, Nitsshe.



## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/3>

### Introduction

#### The Image of the Devil and Its Artistic Specificity

The image of the devil in the novel *The Brothers Karamazov* is one of the most complex and philosophically rich not only in Dostoevsky's work but in the entirety of Russian literature. The devil appears in the chapter "The Devil. Ivan Fyodorovich's Nightmare" and immediately loses his traditional demonological status. He is not presented as a real supernatural being; rather, he is perceived by Ivan himself as a hallucination, a product of a diseased consciousness, an inner interlocutor. Ivan emphasizes the unreality of what is happening, yet this does not lessen the torment of the experience.

The devil's outward appearance is deliberately diminished: a worn-out suit, an old-fashioned frock coat, a tired and unpleasant face, with no horns, tail, or hooves. He resembles a minor official or a provincial intellectual more than a romantic demon. His behavior is polite, his speech caustic and ironic, filled with everyday details, gossip, and self-irony. Thus, the devil gives the impression of a "shabby," ordinary being, deprived of grandeur.

This artistic strategy is fundamental: Dostoevsky emphasizes that evil does not necessarily have a frightening or grandiose appearance. It can be banal, rational, and "reasonable," and therefore especially dangerous. What the reader encounters is the devil of everyday life rather than metaphysical horror—a parody of the traditional image of the devil.

#### Main Part. The Devil as Ivan Karamazov's Double

In essence, the devil is the second "self" of Ivan Karamazov, his philosophical and moral double. He embodies the thoughts from which Ivan seeks to escape and articulates them with merciless logical consistency. The devil speaks in Ivan's own words, knows all his arguments and doubts, and introduces nothing fundamentally new.



## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online)   Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/3>

It is important that the devil does not enter into a polemic with Ivan in the conventional sense. He does not refute Ivan's ideas but pushes them to their limit, demonstrating their existential consequences. The formula "if there is no God, everything is permitted" is not challenged but realized in the form of vulgarity, moral decay, and inner emptiness. In this lies his function not only as a mirror but also as the hero's moral accuser.

Ivan Karamazov appears as a bearer of the European critical reason of the nineteenth century. His consciousness is shaped by the philosophical ideas of Immanuel Kant, Arthur Schopenhauer, and Friedrich Nietzsche.

Immanuel Kant's conception is aimed at saving science, morality, and human freedom through a strict delineation of the limits of reason. Kant asserts that human beings know not "things in themselves" but only phenomena given in the forms of space and time and ordered by the understanding. God and free will cannot be theoretically proven; they function as postulates of practical reason. This autonomy of morality without reliance on religious revelation becomes an important premise of Ivan's worldview.

The philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche diagnoses the crisis of European culture as a consequence of the "death of God" and the collapse of old values. Ivan articulates precisely this crisis: God ceases to be the foundation of morality, and traditional values lose their binding force. However, whereas Nietzsche proposes a way out through the "creation of new values," Ivan proves incapable of such creation and remains trapped in destruction.

Ivan's philosophical position is grounded in rationalism and moral maximalism. He does not accept a world in which suffering—especially the suffering of children—is justified by a future harmony. At the same time, Ivan is not an atheist in the strict sense: he rebels not against the existence of God, but against a world order that permits the suffering of the innocent.

## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/3>

### Results and Discussion

This position is expressed most vividly in his conversation with Alyosha Karamazov in the chapter “Rebellion”: “...I maintain that the tear of one single tortured child is not worth the harmony of the whole future world” [1, p. 456]. What is at stake here is not doubt in God, but an absolute moral prohibition: no goal can justify the suffering of the innocent. From this follows the motif of “returning the ticket” to existence: “It’s not God that I don’t accept, Alyosha, I only most respectfully return Him my ticket” [1, p. 456]. Ivan refuses to be a participant even in a divine plan if it presupposes the sacrifice of the innocent. He does not consider it possible to forgive on behalf of others: “...let the mother forgive her child’s torturer if she can—I have no right to forgive for her” [1, p. 458].

His radical ethical principle is formulated unequivocally:

“If someone must suffer, let the guilty suffer, not the innocent child” [1, p. 457]. Harmony purchased at the price of pain is perceived by him as a moral trap: “I do not want harmony; out of love for humanity I do not want to accept it” [1, p. 456]. Ivan’s dialogue with the devil is not a meeting of two characters but a conversation of reason with itself. Ivan formulates ideas of freedom and negation, while the devil demonstrates their consequences: the devaluation of suffering, irony, and inner disintegration. If Ivan suffers “for everyone,” the devil neutralizes this suffering and turns it into an object of mockery. Attempting to distance himself, Ivan says: “You are a hallucination... my illness... the product of my disordered imagination” [1, p. 458]. Yet this denial does not relieve him of responsibility: the devil remains an inner voice that cannot be expelled, since it is generated by the hero’s own consciousness.

### Conclusion

Through the image of the devil, F. M. Dostoevsky does not present an abstract philosophical theory but anticipates an anthropological catastrophe that may



## Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/3>

befall a person who attempts to live “as if God did not exist.” Ivan Karamazov is not merely a literary type but a model of modern human consciousness, in which autonomous reason confronts a crisis of absolute foundations. For this reason, twentieth-century philosophers perceived Ivan not as a novelistic character but “as an anthropological scheme—a stable mode of experiencing the world in which thought, morality, and responsibility enter into a tragic conflict” [2, p. 76]. Thus, Dostoevsky shows that the crisis of faith is not only the loss of religious truths but also an anthropological crisis that affects the very structure of consciousness. The devil becomes a form of the self-observation of reason which, having freed itself from God, encounters emptiness, irony, and inner disintegration. In this sense, Ivan Karamazov is not a private individual but a model of the modern human being, in whom the highest moral demand is combined with the tragic impossibility of fulfilling it without a transcendent foundation.

### References

1. Dostoevsky, F. M. The Brothers Karamazov. Library of World Literature. Moscow: Eksmo, 2011.
2. Petrukhina, N. M. The Works of F. M. Dostoevsky as an Integral Factor in the Development of the World Literary Process. Tashkent, 2024.